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Abstract

This thesis presents an in-depth study and detailed exploration of the eighteenth-century recorder concerto repertoire as a whole. Whilst there has already been useful research on the recorder concertos of Bach, Telemann, Vivaldi, and some of the concertos from English sources, there are still large gaps needing to be filled. In this respect, my research focuses on several areas across Europe where there are a number of substantial recorder concerto sources, but which have had little investigation. These include Bentheim-Tecklenburg-Rheda, Mecklenburg-Schwerin, the ‘Harrach’ family collection, as well as Sweden more generally. Since concertos are such a significant part of any instrument’s repertoire, offering some of the greatest technical challenges and musical rewards, there is a considerable need for an up-to-date and detailed study of recorder concertos.

This thesis gives a clearer picture of the advent and popularity of the recorder concerto in Europe, and shows recorder concertos to be popular in certain areas of Europe well into the 1730s (and even into the 1740s). I also show evidence of the recorder remaining in use in professional settings in many places around northern Europe as late as the 1740s and 1750s. In addition, I provide insights into the repertoire from my own perspective as a performer, and I also address the perceptible lack of knowledge on the size and scope of recorder concerto sources. My research draws connections between a number of concerto sources, and also offers suggestions regarding some works with ambiguous or disputed authorship.

A catalogue of all known recorder concertos is included as an Appendix.
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All musical works consulted in this thesis have been considered and studied from the original manuscript or publication. Where possible, I have included musical extracts from the original manuscript or publication in this thesis. I am grateful to the many libraries consulted in this research project for giving me permission to view and include these manuscripts in my thesis. Sometimes however, when the manuscript is not particularly clear or legible, or where the manuscript is made up of separate instrumental parts, I have included my own transcriptions. These have been edited with minimum editorial changes; with the main decisions being recorder parts in French violin clef transcribed into treble clef, and any transposing recorder parts (usually for a ‘little flute’) included at sounding pitch, for ease of reading and comparison with other works. Occasionally, just the solo recorder line of a transposing recorder part is included as an extract. Here, the recorder line is included at the pitch of the recorder part (rather than at sounding pitch), usually to examine the recorder fingerings of these parts.
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Introduction

Origin and aims

The impetus for this research topic comes from my experience as a performer on the recorder, and my interest in performing recorder concertos. This background inspired me to further investigate this repertoire, with the idea of expanding my knowledge of available recorder concertos for performance. In my review of the existing research on this topic, I found surprisingly that, though there has been much useful scholarship on several specific works, there were no detailed studies on the recorder concerto in a number of regions of Europe; and no in-depth study of the recorder concerto repertoire as a whole. Since concertos are such a significant part of any instrument’s repertoire, offering some of the greatest technical challenges and musical rewards, I realised there was a need for an up-to-date and detailed study of recorder concertos. This thesis therefore presents the first in-depth exploration of the eighteenth-century recorder concerto repertoire as a whole, and focuses on particular areas of popularity of the recorder concerto - England, Italy, Germany (as well as the Austrian ‘Harrach’ collection), and Sweden.

Of course, there already exists some extremely useful research in this area. David Lasocki’s corpus has produced important research into the recorder and woodwind instruments in general. His Ph.D. thesis ‘Professional Recorder Players in England, 1540-1740’ provides deep insight (for researchers and players alike) into the use and history of the recorder in England. It is a vital resource for anyone with an interest in this field, and I urge all readers to go and explore it. Furthermore, Griscom and Lasocki’s *The Recorder: A Research and Information Guide* is an essential resource for all researchers into the instrument and its repertory, and has been a very important research tool for my own study. This thesis is intended to be used in conjunction with Griscom and Lasocki’s *Guide*. For the use of the reader, reference numbers to the *Guide* have been supplied throughout this thesis, covering works that I have either directly explored myself from an initial reference in the *Guide*, or other topics and further reading that, due to limits of time and scope, cannot be explored in detail in this thesis. Thankfully, Griscom and Lasocki’s *Guide* is carefully laid out, with topics and themes split into
separate sections, and each article or book having its own unique reference number. In this thesis, all references to Griscom and Lasocki’s *Guide* will be included in square brackets, with the number denoting the *Guide* reference number, e.g. [GL 1451].

There is other important literature in this area which has been vital to my research. Steven Zohns’s *Music for a Mixed Taste* provides much useful information about the instrumental output and concertos of Telemann; Federico Maria Sardelli’s *Vivaldi’s Music for Flute and Recorder* provides great insight into Vivaldi’s concertos; and Richard Maunder’s *The Scoring of Baroque Concertos* includes a small number of recorder concertos as part of his general examination of ensemble size in concertos. And yet, there are still large research gaps needing to be filled. This thesis focuses on several regions where there are a number of substantial recorder concerto sources, but which have had very little, or no, investigation. This includes Bentheim-Tecklenburg-Rheda, Mecklenburg-Schwerin, the ‘Harrach’ family collection, as well as Sweden more generally (Uppsala, Lund and Stockholm). Additionally, I aim to provide further insight, particularly using my knowledge as a performer of the recorder, into the recorder concerto sources from Naples, as well as the output of Telemann and Vivaldi. The chapters on the recorder concerto in England aim to provide an overview of current research (predominantly by Lasocki), and contribute some further research into recorder concerto advertisements in English eighteenth-century newspapers. Furthermore, I will provide additional performing insights into the English recorder concerto repertoire.

More specific information and objectives of each chapter in this thesis is included in the introduction to each section. Here, however, I wish to draw attention to some more general themes and objectives of this thesis, which are common to all chapters. The first overall objective is to provide a clearer picture of the advent of the recorder concerto, and its periods of popularity across Europe. Many musicians today still think of the recorder as an instrument that was popular from the end of the seventeenth century until the 1720s, before musicians and audiences lost interest and instead turned to the flute. I will examine whether there is evidence for this view specifically in relation to recorder concertos (and some non-concerto works) in particular regions and courts. My second overall objective is to provide clarity about the nature and size of the recorder concerto repertory. There is a perceptible lack of knowledge on the size and scope of many recorder concerto sources; in the instrument terminology in some of the concertos (i.e. whether they are intended for the recorder at all); and in their technical complexity. I
aim to provide new information regarding the overall size and nature of the concerto repertory, and give my own insights into the recorder writing and the technical level of some of these works. Inevitably, this process may draw attention to a number of little-known or even completely unknown works. My third overall objective is to provide an analytical and technical examination of the music itself, and point to connections between several substantial recorder concerto sources. Where a composer of a work is ambiguous or disputed, I will also offer suggestions that may help to establish authorship.

There are three appendices included in this thesis. The first is a survey of advertisements of recorder concerto performances included within eighteenth-century English newspapers; the second is the 27 musical incipits of recorder concertos listed in the ‘Catalogus Musicus’ (from 1750) of Bentheim-Tecklenburg-Rheda; and the third is a catalogue of all known recorder concertos, (both extant concertos, and any concertos of which there are records, but where the music itself has not survived). This catalogue includes library and manuscript (or publication) information, and where relevant, details of useful modern editions. This is a comprehensive catalogue, and will hopefully be a useful resource for researchers and performers of the recorder.

There are two existing catalogues of recorder repertoire which have been useful in my own research. The first is the (online) Catalogue of Historical Recorder Repertoire, found at the Stichting Blokfluit website (www.blokfluit.org/historical). This is a well-known resource to modern players, and, along with the Catalogue of Contemporary Recorder Music on the same website (www.blokfluit.org/modern), provides a large number of references for the modern player and researcher to explore. Its search function is accurate, and it provides detailed and annotated information for any work included within the Stichting Blokfluit catalogue.

The second existing relevant catalogue (this time an offline catalogue) is Ingo Gronefeld’s Flötenkonzerte bis 1850: Ein thematisches Verzeichnis. This is a catalogue of ‘flute’ concertos (including some recorder concertos) to the year 1850. It is a useful catalogue (particularly for transverse flute players and especially for concertos of the nineteenth century), although it contains some minor misattributions of recorder concertos as flute concertos, and several recorder concertos are also missing. Cross-references to Gronefeld’s catalogue are included in my own Catalogue of Recorder Concertos (Appendix C).
There are two further online resources which are very useful to modern players and researchers, and should be noted here. The first is Andrea Bornstein’s flauto dolce website (www.gardane.info/flautodolce), and the second is Nicholas Lander’s Recorder Homepage (www.recorderhomepage.net). Bornstein’s ‘Flauto Dolce’ site requires registration, but once access is obtained, it provides a useful resource for performing editions of eighteenth-century repertoire (including editions of many concertos mentioned in this thesis). Lander’s Recorder Homepage is an extremely extensive and important online resource, and is very well known to modern players. It provides information and further reading for nearly every aspect of the recorder: its history, repertoire, instruments, technique, iconography, recordings, concerts and modern societies. If the reader is not already aware of Lander’s website, I urge them to explore it.

Scope and areas covered by the study

The focus of this thesis is on those regions where the recorder concerto was popular, either with composers or performers. Although this emphasis covers the large majority of recorder concertos included in the catalogue of Appendix C, it will mean that some concertos are not discussed. This study naturally concentrates on solo recorder concertos, though works with recorder included in other types of concerto (concerto grosso, chamber concertos, ‘ensemble’ concertos) are sometimes also included. ‘Concerto’ terminology in the early eighteenth century was ambiguous at times, with concertos, as we think of the form today, occasionally marked as sonatas, suites, or even sinfonia. I have tried to include as broad a repertoire as possible, without arbitrarily ignoring works. If the work was marked as a ‘concerto’, either by the composer or the copyist, it has been included; as have some other works which were not marked as a concerto, but would generally be classed as a concerto in the modern sense of the word.

There are many surviving manuscripts and sources of recorder concertos. In particular, I concentrate on regions and places that require more research. Two especially famous concertos with recorder which have not been included in this thesis are Bach’s Brandenburg Concerto’s No. 2 and No. 4. These have already had much
excellent scholarship (as has the ‘Fiauti d’Echo’ controversy of No. 4).\textsuperscript{1} Similarly, due to the very useful research on Vivaldi and Telemann’s instrumental output, I simply aim to provide further insights as a performer into the recorder concertos of these composers.

\textbf{Structure and sources}

For the most part, the thesis is structured chronologically in overlapping periods of apparent interest in the recorder concerto. More specific information and objectives about each particular chapter are included in the course of the thesis.

I have undertaken several research trips as part of this thesis to view as many of the sources in person. I have viewed and studied, (in person), the many sources of recorder concertos found in Darmstadt, Frankfurt, Münster, Schwerin, Vienna (‘Harrach’), Naples and London. Sources of recorder concertos discussed in this thesis which fall outside of these areas have been viewed as electronic documents.

\textbf{Summary}

This thesis was undertaken with the primary aim of providing a deeper understanding of the recorder concerto repertory; its significance and size; the areas and periods where it was of interest amongst composers and performers; and its musical attractions and technical difficulties. In doing so, I aim to provide a number of resources useful to future researchers and modern performers, particularly giving them further opportunity to perform lesser-known, musically interesting, and occasionally challenging recorder concertos. This last aim is one which is particularly important to me, especially since this research study originated from my experiences as a performer, and from my desire to expand my own repertoire of recorder concertos. There has been a notable trend in early music ensembles and orchestras over the last decade or so to find and perform lesser-known works, rather than simply regurgitating a narrow spectrum of well-known pieces. Hopefully this research project will assist in encouraging performers and ensembles to include some of these lesser-known or unknown recorder concertos in their concert programming.

Part I

England
1

The Recorder and the Concerto in England

The ‘Gentleman’s Flute’

Before we can fully study the English recorder concerto, it is first necessary to have an overview of the history and use of the instrument in England, as well as an idea of eighteenth-century English musical life. This chapter only aims to provide a brief overview of the recorder in eighteenth-century England, as well as some background to the concerto in England during this period. For a comprehensive history of the use of the recorder in England, I direct all readers to David Lasocki’s thesis ‘Professional Recorder Players in England, 1540-1740’; they will find it most rewarding.¹

At the start of the eighteenth century, the recorder had grown to become an extremely popular musical instrument in England. The recorder was not only widely used in professional settings during this period, such as in public concerts, theatres and opera houses, but it also became a very important instrument for the keen amateur musician, from the seventeenth century onwards. To give one famous historical example, in the late seventeenth century, Samuel Pepys mentioned playing and enjoying the recorder in a number of entries in his diaries. On 8 April 1668, Pepys visited the instrument-maker Samuel Drumbleby:

…and thence I to Drumbleby’s and there did talk a great deal about pipes and did buy a Recorder which I do intend to learn to play on, the sound of it being of all sounds in the world most pleasing to me.²

Later that evening, Pepys returns ‘…home to my chamber, to be fingering of my Recorder and getting of the scale of Musique without book…’ He clearly was unable to make recorder practice a priority, as a week later on 16 April, Pepys writes ‘Begin this day to learn the Recorder’.³

---

² Pepys, The Diary Of (8 April 1668), 156-157.
³ Ibid., 164.
During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, owning instruments for pleasure (i.e. not for a profession) was generally limited to the realms of the aristocracy and gentry, with occasional, usually quite wealthy, exceptions. The household accounts of many aristocratic households in the sixteenth and seventeenth century often mention owning, playing and maintaining lots of varied instruments. The recorder was particularly abundant in these accounts, and along with more complex instruments such as viols, lutes, and virginals, the recorder, particularly by the late seventeenth century, had become associated with a certain kind of status, and had gained a particularly English association: that of being a desirable instrument for the cultured ‘gentleman’ to own. It seems that, by the beginning of the eighteenth century, the English ‘gentleman’ had become so enamoured with playing on and listening to the recorder, that gentlemen’s butlers started advertising that they played the instrument (usually along with the violin). For example, in January 1703, a personal notice appeared in The Post Man:

A Sober Man about 30 years of age, that plays upon the Flute [recorder] and the Violin, willing to be a Butler to a Person of Quality, or wait upon a young Gentleman, where they will not oblige him to wear a Livery, can give very good security: He may be heard of at Mr Farby’s over against the British Coffee-house in Great Wildstreet near Drury Lane.

John Hawkins in A General History of the Science and Practice of Music (1776), looking back to the seventeenth and early eighteenth century, writes:

That the flute [recorder] was formerly the instrument of a gentleman may be inferred from the following circumstance: in that species of graphical representation called Still Life, we observe a collection of implements and utensils thrown in disorder on a table, exhibiting a group of various forms, contrasted with each other, at the will of the artist. He that shall carefully attend to pictures of this kind, will seldom fail to find a lute, and also a flute, frequently with a book of lessons for one or the other instrument.

As Hawkins mentions, this image of the recorder as a certain kind of status symbol appeared in a number of late seventeenth and early eighteenth-century artworks. This seemed to originate first outside of England, as still life paintings with instruments indicating ‘status’ became common throughout Europe during the seventeenth century (for example, the vanitas still life artists of seventeenth-century Netherlands).

---

5 The Post Man – Issue 1565. 3-5 January 1703.
This caught on a little later in England, and a particularly English stereotype of a wealthy gentleman holding or playing his recorder emerged by the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century.

---

7 Private owner, sold by Sothebys in 2011 (Lot 259). Collier also signs his name on the bottom right hand of the music score. The recorder is an alto recorder, with ivory mouthpiece and joint decoration.
8 Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, illustration 44196, 2014-col. Meall was an English artist active in the late seventeenth century.
The Rise of the Recorder

As well as becoming associated with a particular English type of ‘gentleman’, as we saw from Pepys, the recorder also started to be commonly owned by the English middle classes. This rise of the recorder’s popularity in England through the seventeenth and into the eighteenth century is due to two important factors. The first was the introduction of the so-called ‘baroque’ recorder, likely originating in France in the early 1670s, before making its way across the Channel soon after this. David Lasocki attributed the introduction of the ‘baroque’ recorder in England to the year 1673, when four French recorder players (Maxant De Bresmes, Pierre Guiton, Jean Boutet and James Paisible, who became the most significant recorder player in England during this period), brought the new design of instrument with them when they came across from France with the

---

9 Printed and published by Charles and Samuel Thompson, London (c.1760). Currently in a private collection (Margaret Rees: 2002:55, Fig. 2 and 99).
10 This development in woodwind instrument-making has been extensively covered in a number of important academic texts. Bruce Haynes’s The Eloquent Oboe: A History of the Hautboy from 1640 to 1760 gives a particularly good account of the drastic changes to woodwind instruments during this period. Edgar Hunt’s The Recorder and its Music (first published in 1962) also gives an enjoyable overview of the physical changes of the ‘baroque’ recorder, although it is obviously a dated account today.

It is also worth noting that David Lasocki mentions in his New Grove article ‘Recorder’ that these structural changes ‘may have happened independently in Italy, France, and perhaps elsewhere’. (Lasocki, ‘Recorder’ (iii) Baroque. Grove Music Online.)
composer Robert Cambert. The new ‘baroque’ recorder was made in three pieces, with a much more sophisticated bore structure that extended its range, flexibility, and produced a different and ‘sweeter’ tonal character. This new design of recorder (and the new design of oboe which also arrived on English shores) was greatly admired, and quickly became popular.

The second reason for the recorder’s popularity was due to the rise of the musical middle classes in England in the early eighteenth century, both as listeners and as players. Towards the end of the seventeenth century, towns and cities in England underwent a period of growth and economic prosperity. Though there was still severe poverty throughout the country, there was also somewhat improved employment opportunities and a general rise in living standards across the country. By the beginning of the eighteenth century, the country became much more urbanised than at any time before. In 1600, around 8 per cent of England’s population lived in settlements of over 5,000; by 1700, this had increased to 16.5 per cent (with another 19 per cent of the population living in settlements of over 2,500 people). This urbanisation led to both commercial and industrial growth, but importantly, also to a rise in demand for high-status social and leisure services.

We can see this rise in the recorder as a popular leisure interest, and demand for material for the instrument, in the various tutor books that started being written and printed in increasing numbers. Advertisements for these tutor books often appeared in English newspapers. These tutor books were often aimed at the image of the ‘gentleman’ musician that we outlined above. To give just a few examples: in 1693, there was published New Ayres Composed for the Flute, together with plain Directions for Learners, digested into an easier Method than has hitherto been extant. In 1695, Walsh first published The Compleat Flute-Master: Or, the Whole Art of Playing on the Recorder. In 1696, John Hudgebutt published The Gentleman’s Tutor to the Flute. In 1699, Walsh published The New Flute Master: Or, The Art of Playing on the Flute.

---

14 Ibid., 117.
15 A Collection for the Improvement of Husbandry and Trade. 13 October 1693.
17 The Post Boy. 22 December 1696.
Improved.\textsuperscript{18} In 1702, \textit{The Flute Improved} by J. Cullen was published;\textsuperscript{19} followed in 1703 by the publication of \textit{The Gentelman’s Diversion, or the Flute Made Easy} by J. Young.\textsuperscript{20} This demand for recorder tutor books continued well into the 1720s. It was not only the demand for amateur music-making that increased at the beginning of the eighteenth century, but also the demand for attending music performances.

\textbf{Public concerts}

Public concerts started to become a regular leisure activity of the middle classes, with the first public concerts appearing in London in 1672.\textsuperscript{21} Roger North wrote that ‘the Grand secret, that the English would follow Musick and drop their pence freely, of which some advantage hath bin since made.’\textsuperscript{22} John Banister’s series of public concerts in Whitefriars is often credited as the first public concert series, though Peter Holman notes that similar events had actually already happened in Oxford during the Commonwealth period.\textsuperscript{23} Roger North described Banister’s concert series as follows:

the first attempt was low: a project of old Banister, who was a good violin, and a theatricall composer. He opened an obscure room in a publik house in White fryars; filled it with tables and seats, and made a side box with curtaines for the music… Here came most of the shack\textsuperscript{24}-performers in towne, and much company to hear; and divers musicaull curiositys were presented, as, for instance, Banister himself, upon a flageolet in consort, which was never heard before nor since...

Holman noted that ‘The public concert was an English invention.’\textsuperscript{25} These first concerts became the model for similar series elsewhere, such as the ones at York Buildings, Bow Street and Charles Street.\textsuperscript{26} Newspaper advertisements for these public concerts started to appear often, with one of the first surviving extracts from the \textit{London Gazette} in 1674, advertising a concert in the Fleece Tavern that ran ‘about two of the clock in Afternoon every day in the Week (except Sundays)’. The concert was for the rather unusual instrumental combination of ‘four Trumpets Marine’ [tromba marina] that according to

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{18} Lasocki, ‘The London Publisher…’, 355.
\item \textsuperscript{19} \textit{The Post Boy}. 7 May 1702.
\item \textsuperscript{20} \textit{The Post Boy}. 26 January 1703.
\item \textsuperscript{21} Lasocki, ‘Professional Recorder Players…’, 331.
\item \textsuperscript{22} Wilson(ed.), \textit{Roger North on Music}, 305n.
\item \textsuperscript{24} Wilson notes that ‘shack’ is roughly equivalent to a ‘vagabond’
\item \textsuperscript{25} Holman, \textit{op. cit.}, 266.
\item \textsuperscript{26} Tilmouth, ‘Some Early London Concerts and Music Clubs, 1670-1720’, 13.
\end{itemize}
the advertisement was ‘never heard before in England’.\textsuperscript{27} In order to gain entry to the concert, ‘the best places are one shilling, the other six pence.’\textsuperscript{28}

One of the earliest surviving references to a newspaper advertisement for a concert involving the recorder appears in an edition of the \textit{London Gazette}, on 11 March 1686. It was a reference to a John Banister concert ‘at his Chamber in Essex Street the next door to the Clock’, of ‘several Overtures or Sonatta’s containing variety of Humors, as Grave Aires, Minuetts, Borees, &c. Composed and purposely contrived for Two Flutes, by R. Courtiville\textsuperscript{29}… recommended by Mr John Banister as more proper for those instruments than any yet Extant…’\textsuperscript{30}

Concerts and concert series soon sprang up all across London, at venues such as York Buildings, Bow Street, Charles Street, and later on, Stationers Hall, and Hickford’s Rooms, amongst many other more minor venues. These concerts often grew out of regular amateur music meetings, and York Buildings was probably the first to appear regularly. The first advertisement in the newspapers for a weekly series of concerts in York Buildings appeared in November 1685 (where they advertised playing ‘Several Sonatas’s, composed after the Italian way…’).\textsuperscript{31} Roger North was not particularly impressed with the concerts in general at York Buildings, amusingly describing them thus:

I observed well the musick here, and altho' the best masters in their turnes, as well as solo, as concerted, shewed their gifts, yet I cannot say, whatever the musick was, that the entertainement was good; because it consisted of broken incoherent parts; now a consort, then a lutinist, then a violino solo, then flutes, then a song, and so peice after peice, the time sliding away, while the masters blundered and swore in shifting places, and one might perceive that they performed out of spight to one and other.\textsuperscript{32}

Public concerts were not only limited to London, and in fact concert-going became an important leisure activity in many provincial centres across England.\textsuperscript{33} J.H. Plumb

\textsuperscript{27} Considering that ‘tromba marina’ were known in England as early as the fifteenth century, this is perhaps a rather large marketing exaggeration.
\textsuperscript{28} \textit{London Gazette – Issue 961}. 1 February – 4 February, 1675.
\textsuperscript{29} ‘R.Courtiville’ is Raphael Courteville (c.1687-1735), organist and composer born in England and whose surviving works include one recorder sonata, and a set of six duets for two recorders (alongside a small number of other vocal and instrumental works). [For more information, see: Spink, Ian: ‘Courteville, Raphael [Ralph]’ \textit{Grove Music Online}]
\textsuperscript{32} Wilson, \textit{Roger North on Music}, 305.
described England as having a ‘cultural poverty’ before the eighteenth century, and that over the course of the eighteenth century, a ‘culture-hungry consumer society’ developed, and caused a dramatic expansion of cultural activities, including theatres, galleries, museums, libraries and public concerts. These concerts and performances became an important leisure activity for the affluent, and a very important source of income for professional musicians.

**Theatres**

Alongside a rising interest in public concerts, there was also a large rise in theatre-going during this period. The famous Drury Lane theatre first opened in 1663. After being destroyed by a fire, a second theatre was built on the same plot in 1674, possibly by Christopher Wren. In 1693, Drury Lane had its auditorium expanded (at the expense of the stage area), to house an audience variously estimated at between 663 and ‘nearly a thousand’. Drury Lane’s initial rival was the theatre at Lincoln’s Inn Fields. This theatre first opened in 1662, where it ran until 1671. It opened again from 1695 until 1705, before most of the company became absorbed into the new Queen’s Theatre in Haymarket (renamed as the King’s Theatre after the death of Queen Anne). In 1714, a new theatre was again opened on the Lincoln’s Inn Fields site, and this company once again provided powerful rivalry to Drury Lane (and it continued to provide such competition after the Lincoln’s Inn Fields company moved to Covent Garden in 1732). Throughout a large part of the eighteenth century, London only had two theatres that presented plays in English. After the Restoration, Charles II (who had a keen interest in the theatre) authorised the establishment of two patent theatres, granting exclusive rights to present plays in English. The patents were given to Drury Lane throughout the whole of the eighteenth century, and Lincoln’s Inn Fields between the period of 1714 to 1732, and from then on to Covent Garden (after the company’s move). This made the two theatre companies, in effect, servants of the crown, and they were both designated as ‘Theatres Royal’. It is worth noting that this exclusivity only applied to spoken dialogue

---

34 Plumb, *The Birth of a Consumer Society*, Ch. VI.
36 Though a number of modern scholars dispute Wren’s involvement in the Drury Lane building.
in English. However, due to growing English interest in Italian opera, many opera houses also opened in London (and elsewhere in the country) in the early eighteenth century. Since these opera houses did not present plays in English, they were not in breach of the two ‘Theatre Royal’ patents, and were therefore allowed to continue operating.\textsuperscript{39}

Both Drury Lane Theatre and Lincoln’s Inn Fields employed a small orchestra attached to each company. These orchestras had two main functions in the theatre: the first was to provide incidental music during the plays and operas itself (even completely spoken plays would have regularly used instrumental music throughout the play); and the second was to provide mini-concerts and entertainments, before, after, and during the intervals of the plays. As Curtis Price notes in \textit{Music in the Restoration Theatre}: ‘During no period in the history of English drama has the play been more infused with music, and never was music considered more essential to dramatic representation.’\textsuperscript{40}

Plays would very often include music that contributed significantly to the drama of the play – for example, instrumental music to indicate death, or love, or for comic effect. Further to this, and particularly after the Restoration, music became vital to the actual structure of a play. Music would fill the auditorium before the actors had even entered the stage. Before the curtain rose, the orchestra would play the ‘First Musick’ followed by the ‘Second Musick’, and so on, and after the last music was finished, the ‘prologue’ would enter the stage to deliver their address to the audience. After this, the orchestra would play an overture (very often played as the curtain started to rise, and therefore often called the ‘curtain tune’).\textsuperscript{41} Between the various acts of the plays, the orchestra would play ‘Act Tunes’, to separate the acts, and also to allow time for costume changes, etc. Alongside this, there would often be scenic music in the play itself, as well as music long before the play started and long after it ended. Finally, there were also regular mini-concerts during the interval of the play. Since both the Drury Lane and Lincoln’s Inn Fields theatres often performed on the same nights (they were constantly in direct competition with each other), the orchestras at these two theatres were made up of separate groups of musicians. Though instrumentalists signed contracts for one season

\textsuperscript{39} Holman, \textit{op. cit.}, 2. Very occasionally, a rival theatre would break the law and present a play in English; particularly, on occasion, the New Theatre in the Haymarket.
\textsuperscript{40} Price, \textit{Music in the Restoration Theatre}, xiv.
\textsuperscript{41} Ibid., 55.
at a time, they often actually stayed in the same theatre year after year, essentially providing some of the first standing professional orchestras in the country.\footnote{Price, \textit{op. cit.}, 278.}

The recorder started to appear regularly within the theatre ensembles and theatrical music during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, featuring in both the incidental music of plays, and eventually in the interval concerts and ‘entertainments’ of the theatre.

\textit{Opera}

John Blow’s \textit{Venus and Adonis} is variously described as either the last English court masque, or the first English opera.\footnote{For instance, it is described in the \textit{The New Grove Dictionary} as the earliest surviving English opera. See: Price, ‘Venus and Adonis’ (\textit{The New Grove Dictionary of Opera}).} Although there is no date of the original performance, a copy of a word-book for a revival performance survives. This describes it as ‘Perform’d before the King, afterwards at Mr. Josias Preist’s Boarding School at Chelsey’, and dates this performance as 17 April 1684.\footnote{Wood (ed.), \textit{John Blow - Venus and Adonis}, xi.} It is a work that really stands at the junction of both masque and opera, and the fact that it was also a model for Henry Purcell’s \textit{Dido and Aeneas} shows how important Blow’s work was. \textit{Venus and Adonis} names only strings and ‘flutes’ (recorders) in the score, and the recorders are predominantly used in the music to symbolise love. Another earlier work which had a big impact on Purcell was Louis Grabu’s \textit{Albion and Albanius}, first performed in 1685. This work was influential to Purcell’s series of dramatic operas, beginning with \textit{Dioclesian} in 1690. Roger North described \textit{Albion and Albanius} as ‘in English, but of French genius.’ There are numerous passages for two recorders in the work, including a section titled the ‘Concert of Venus’ that sees two violins engage in interplay with two recorders (and in fact, the stringed bass also gives way to a bass recorder in these sections). This is a particularly interesting moment, because it is one of the earliest works where we start to see more complex passages given to the recorder in theatrical settings. From this point on, we begin to see the recorder in England treated more as a solo instrument, and used in greater interplay with the other instruments in the band.
All of Purcell’s semi-operas include the use of the recorder, though slightly surprisingly, Purcell’s important court opera, *Dido and Aeneas*, does not. Purcell’s recorder parts are nearly always in pairs, relatively simple to play, and often very beautiful. There are numerous sublime examples to give, but one need look no further than the exquisite recorder duet ‘Two in One Upon a Ground’ from Purcell’s *Dioclesian*. Other slightly later English composers also included recorders amongst their dramatic and theatrical works. For example, John Eccles, in the music for *Don Quixote* included an attractive song entitled ‘The Dirge..’, which is set for two voices and three recorders. In *Rinaldo and Armida*, Eccles includes the recorders in Act 3 – first accompanying Venus as she asks ‘Cupid, cupid, come to the relief. Of thy mother’s piercing grief’; and later on, in a beautiful chaconne for two recorders and strings. The chaconne alternates eight bars of strings, followed by eight bars of recorders throughout, often involving quite difficult division-based passagework.

Moving into the eighteenth century, an important development for the use of the recorder within operatic and theatrical works arose from the journey of Handel to England in 1710. Up until about 1730, Handel’s focus was largely on Italian opera; after this, he gradually shifted his focus to the genre of oratorio. In total, recorders are used in six of Handel’s oratorios and twenty-five of his operas. Handel’s writing for the recorder always brought the instrument to life. He utilised the particular characteristics of the recorder to great effect, producing some wonderful music for the instrument. His recorder sonatas are known and loved by all recorder players for the masterful way they are written for the instrument. Many of the arias with recorder from Handel’s operas and oratorios share a similar idiomatic way of using the recorder, fully bringing out the sounds and particular qualities of the instrument. After 1738, with one exception (the 1747 oratorio *Judas Maccabeus*), Handel wrote no more music for the recorder in any of his works.

---

45 *Prophetess or The History of Dioclesian* (1690), *King Arthur or The British Worthy* (1691), *The Fairy-Queen* (1692), *Timon of Athens* (1694) and *The Indian Queen* (1695)

46 *Don Quixote* was an ambitious dramatization by Thomas Durfey, issued as three separate plays. Parts 1 and 2 were first performed in May and July 1694; Part 3 was performed in November 1695. The music was provided by two composers: John Eccles and Henry Purcell.

47 *Rinaldo and Armida* was a tragedy by John Dennis, with ‘Musical Entertainments’ by John Eccles, and first performed at the Lincoln’s Inn Fields theatre in 1698.

48 Levin, ‘The Recorder in the Music of Purcell and Handel’ (1981), [GL 2102]. See also: Cornsweet, ‘Handel’s Use of Flute and Recorder in Opera and Oratorio’ (1990), [GL 2107].
The (Recorder) Concerto in England

Concertos made their way across from Italy to London very quickly. In the decades after the Restoration, Italian instrumentalists and singers flourished in England. Italian opera, of course, also took off in England in a big way at the beginning of the eighteenth century. Roger North, referring to England’s gradual shift towards a taste for Italian instrumental music, wrote:

> the numerous traine of yong travellers of the best quality and estates, that about this time went over into Italy and resided at Rome and Venice, where they heard the best musick and learnt of the best masters…they came home confirmed in the love of the Italian manner… Then came over Corelly’s first consort that cleared the ground of all other sorts of musick whatsoever. By degrees the rest of his consorts, and at last the conciertos came, all which are to the musitians like the bread of life.49

Corelli’s music in particular played a big part in the vogue for the Italian taste in England. North again:

> …an Italian taste should prevaile…there were other incidents that continued to establish it. One of the chief was the coming over of the works of the great Corelli. Those became the onely musick relished for a long time… for if musick can be immortall, Corelli’s consorts will be so.50

Prints of Corelli’s Op. 5 violin sonatas started to circulate around England (possibly brought by John Bannister II and Robert King) as soon as the early 1700s, and ‘Corelli societies’ were set up across the whole of the country; between 1725 and 1750, over fifty clubs subscribed to Corelli prints. The printing of this music in England (particularly by Walsh) played a large part in establishing and popularising the ‘new’ Italian style. This vogue for Corelli applied to all instruments. In 1702, Walsh published anonymous arrangements of Corelli’s Op.5 violin sonatas for the recorder and basso continuo. These arrangements were ‘Exactly Transpos’d and Made Fitt for a Flute and Bass with the Aprobation of Severall Eminent Masters’.51 Corelli’s Op.5 sonatas were also arranged into concertos:52 both Geminiani and Obadiah Shuttleworth made arrangements of these sonatas into ‘Concerti Grossi’ which were published in 1726.53

---

50 Ibid., 358.
51 Corelli’s Six Solos for a Flute and a Bass… (Walsh & Hare, 1702).
52 Helyard, ‘But Corelli’s The Man After All: Professionals and Amateurs in the Cult of Corelli’, 8.
53 In 2010, Maurice Steger and The English Concert released a recording of some of these Op. 5 concerto arrangements (originally for violin) played on recorder – Mr. Corelli in London (Harmonia Mundi, 2010).
Corelli’s Op. 6 Concerti Grossi was first published in England in 1715. Not long after this, two different arrangements of these concertos for recorder were published by Walsh. The first, in 1720, arranged the concertos into a trio sonata for ‘Two Flutes and a Bass’, by ‘an eminent Master’, which in this case was Johann Christian Schickhardt. The second, published in 1725, was an anonymous arrangement, which retained the concerto grosso format, but instead utilised various different sizes of recorder: ‘the Proper Flute Being Nam’d to Each Concerto, and So Adapted to the Parts That They Perform in Consort with the Violins and Other Instruments Throughout.’ These concertos are briefly considered in Chapter 3.

The first advertisement for a publication of concertos in England was an edition of Albinoni’s Op. 2, advertised by Roger’s London agent in The Post Man, on 18 August 1702. The advertisement lists music ‘lately brought over from Amsterdam’, one of which is Albinoni’s ‘…opera 2d, 6 Son. [sonatas] And six Concerts for 2 and 3 violins…’ The word ‘concerto’ (rather than ‘concerts’) doesn’t appear for another two years, until 1704. In The Post Man, on the 22 August 1704, there appears an advert by music publishers John Walsh and J. Hare, for: ‘A Sonata Concerto Grosse for Violins, in 5, 6, and 7 parts, Compos'd by Signior Albinoni, and perform'd by Signior Gasperini and others at the Theatre…’ This is an advertisement for Walsh’s edition of concerto No. 6 from the same Albinoni Op. 2 collection. It is worth noting that this advertisement is also one of the first mentions of concertos being performed at the theatre. The first advertisement that specifically mentioned an upcoming public performance featuring concertos appeared in The Daily Courant on 18 March 1707. The advertisement was for a concert at the York Buildings on the following day:

…a Consort of new Musick Vocal and Instrumental, comos’d by Wm Corbett, several Pieces of Flutes, and Concerti Grossi, with a new Italian Solo perform'd by him, being the first he ever play’d in Publick.

As noted in the advertisement above for Walsh’s edition of Albinoni’s Sonata Concerto Grosse for Violins, in 5, 6, and 7 parts, they were ‘as performed by Signior Gasperini

---

55 Corelli’s XII Concertos, Transpos’d for Flutes… (Walsh & Hare, 1725). Anonymous arrangement.
56 The Post Man – Issue 1005. 15 August – 18 August, 1702. This advertisement also includes ‘6 New Sonatas for 2 Flutes only by Mr Paisible.’
58 Walsh brought out his own edition of the complete set of Albinoni’s Op. 2 in 1709.
and others at the Theatre’. This was the start of regular advertisements for concertos as part of ‘entertainment’ concerts at the theatre. The first advertisement to specifically mention a performance of a concerto at the theatre occurs on the 27 August 1711, in Greenwich. The play was *Timon of Athens*, and a ‘Celebrated Concerto, compos’d by the famous Albinoni’ was included in the musical entertainments (alongside a Sonata by Tibaldi, and ‘that excellent Piece for the Violin and Flute of Seignior Gasperin’). ⁶⁰ From this point on, concertos appeared frequently in newspaper advertisements for plays and concerts.

---

The Recorder Concerto in English Newspaper Advertisements, 1710-1735

The first half of this chapter focuses on a survey and analysis of recorder concerto performances advertised in early eighteenth-century English newspapers. The complete list of newspaper advertisements is included in Appendix A. The latter section of this chapter provides information about the advertised performers of these recorder concertos. For this, Lasocki’s thesis ‘Professional Recorder Players in England, 1540-1740’ [GL 184], as well as *A Biographical Dictionary of Actors, Actresses, Musicians, Dancers, Managers & other stage personnel in London, 1660-1800* were both invaluable resources, providing most of the information regarding the recorder performers in England during this period. My own research has added some small, additional details about some of these performers.

The aim of the chapter is to give a clearer picture of the popularity of the recorder concerto in England during the first half of the eighteenth century. By giving a detailed breakdown of the recorder concerto performances advertised, we gain some additional insights into the popular trends and tastes of the time, and the fluctuating prevalence of the recorder concerto in English musical life. Newspaper advertisements give some indication of this: concerts and theatres used advertisements of music by specific composers, and particularly, specific performers, to try and gain a larger audience. The newspaper music advertisements in general follow the ebb and flow of the tides of public interest: for example, they show the rise of Italian opera in England, the particular English fascination with the music of Corelli, the various successes of Handel’s operas, and the huge popular success of *The Beggar’s Opera*. Similarly, advertisements of concerto performances provide some additional insights into public interest, showing when particular concertos, performers and instruments were especially enjoyed by English audiences. It should be noted that there are obvious limits to this survey.

---

2 Highfill, Jr., Burnim, and Langhans (eds.), *A Biographical Dictionary of Actors, Actresses...*
Newspaper advertisements clearly do not cover all musical activity during this period, and it is almost certain that many more concerto performances took place than are available in surviving newspaper sources (this limitation is discussed in more detail later on in the chapter). However, even so, the survey still provides some useful additional information regarding the recorder concerto in England during this period.

**‘Flute’ Terminology in Newspaper Advertisements**

As we saw earlier in this chapter, references to the recorder started to appear from 1686 onwards in the *London Gazette*, and then in other papers by the early eighteenth century. In these advertisements, the recorder is always referred to as the ‘Flute’ or ‘Little Flute’. The word ‘recorder’ (or variants such as ‘recorde,’ ‘recourdour,’ ‘recordys’) has appeared in English since the fifteenth century onwards. However, once the redesigned wind instruments made their way across to England from France in the early 1670s (most likely, as Lasocki notes, with French musicians in 1673), this ‘new’ design of recorder also brought with it the French name of ‘flute douce’ (literally, sweet flute). This became shortened, and the recorder in England during this period was almost exclusively referred to as simply ‘Flute’. What we know as the flute today (of the transverse variety) became known in England as the ‘German Flute’, or occasionally, variations of ‘Flute Transvers’. As the ‘German Flute’ took hold, and the recorder started its decline in popularity, the recorder generally started to be referred to as the ‘common Flute’, to distinguish it from its ‘German’ competitor. Eventually the term ‘German Flute’ itself became shortened to ‘Flute’, and the term ‘Flute’ as a name for the transverse variety, took hold in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. During the period of this survey, all references to the ‘Flute’ in England refer to the recorder.

The term ‘Little Flute’ (occasionally, ‘small Flute’) also crops up routinely during this period. This refers, literally, to a little recorder. These small recorders came in many varieties, including a fourth flute, a fifth flute, a sixth flute, and an octave flute. The term ‘little flute’ corresponds roughly to the Italian term of *flautino*, made famous by Vivaldi’s extraordinary *flautino* recorder concertos (see Chapter 4). In England, the most commonly used sizes of small recorder were the fifth flute, and the sixth flute. The fifth flute is a descant recorder in C (the modern descant recorder, a ‘fifth’ above the alto

---

recorder in F, so often heard today in primary school music education); and the sixth flute is a descant recorder in D (being a ‘sixth’ above the normal alto recorder in F).

**English Newspapers**

The *London Gazette*, often referred to as Britain’s first newspaper, was first published as the *Oxford Gazette* in 1665. It moved to London and became the *London Gazette* in 1666, when the Court returned to London once the plague had subsided. It was the official paper of the authorities, and was Britain’s sole newspaper for the next thirteen years. The *London Gazette* was formatted to be a one page, double-sided sheet, and included official notices, foreign and shipping news, and eventually a section for ‘Advertisements’. Advertising in general started to become an important source of revenue for newspapers in the early eighteenth century, and these advertisements usually included concerts, plays and eventually printed sheet music. The *British Apollo* eventually started to run a regular music supplement, printed by John Walsh. In 1730, *The Daily Advertiser* was first printed, which carried no news, only advertisements. These newspapers gave concert organisers and theatre managers new opportunities to advertise daily concerts and musical performances.

The theatres in particular consistently utilised the newspapers, often using many newspapers for the same advertisements. Occasionally they made agreements with particular newspapers to carry only their advertisements for certain seasons. For example, at the opening of the 1719 theatrical season, *The Daily Post* announced that it had secured a monopoly of the advertisements for both the Drury Lane and Lincoln's Inn Fields theatres, a situation which continued until 28 January 1720, when their monopoly was ended, and the advertisements reappeared in *The Daily Courant* (whilst

---

4 Williams, *Read All About It! The History of the British Newspaper* [e-book], ch. 2, sec. 2.

5 Following the Glorious Revolution in 1688, greater freedom was allowed for printers and publishers, and by 1695, the strict Licensing Act was repealed. Following this, London saw an explosion in newspapers, and the rise of the daily newspaper. By 1709, eighteen papers were published regularly in London, including the *Daily Courant*, which became Britain’s first ever daily newspaper. The *Daily Courant* was a single sheet paper, with advertisements usually printed on the reverse side. Other newspapers running in London in 1709 were generally published ‘tri-weekly’, including: *The Tatter, The British Apollo, The Post Man, The Postboy, The Postboy Junior, The Flying Post, The Evening Post, The Rehearsal, The Whisperer*.

6 Tilmouth, ‘A Calendar of References to Music in Newspapers Published in London and the Provinces (1660-1719)’, III.
still continuing in *The Daily Post*). In general, the main newspaper sources for theatrical information during the early eighteenth century are *The Daily Courant* and *The Daily Post*. Drury Lane tended to advertise in both, whereas Lincoln's Inn Fields often had periods of only advertising in the *Post*.7

**Survey Overview**

A detailed survey of all newspaper advertisements referring to a concerto performance on any instrument is my initial starting point for a survey of recorder concerto advertisements. This larger survey allows a full comparison of the number of performances of recorder concertos versus the number of performances of concertos on other instruments. The chronological list of newspaper advertisements for recorder concerto performances is included in Appendix A.8

The survey of recorder concerto advertisements focuses on all distinct advertisements for performances of recorder concertos in concert and at the theatre. In this context, a ‘distinct’ advertisement refers only to the first advertisement for a particular performance. Otherwise, the survey would be skewed by advertisements for the same performance, which were often repeated in newspapers on other days leading up to the event. Where possible, I have included information about repeated advertisements in Appendix A, though these advertisements are not listed as separate entries. Therefore, my survey analysis consists only of initial advertisements referring to a ‘distinct’ performance of a recorder concerto. It is also worth noting that because the survey concerns itself solely with advertisements for recorder concertos, there are many other advertisements for other performances of non-concerto recorder music which are not included.

**Dates of survey**

My initial survey of concerto advertisements for all instruments pertained to the broad dates of 1700 to 1740. In reality, the survey results are narrower than this. The first
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8 The chronological list of advertisements for concertos on all instruments is not included in this thesis simply due to space, though I will happily make this larger survey available to anyone who wishes to examine it.
English newspaper advertisement of a publication of concerto music (Albinoni’s Op. 2) appeared in 1702. The first advertisement for a public performance of a concerto was not actually until 1707. Though the recorder appeared regularly in newspaper advertisements during the 1700s, the first newspaper advertisement specifically mentioning a recorder concerto performance was not until 1713. In 1709, there appeared an advertisement in The Daily Courant which mentioned, amongst other things, a performance of ‘a Concerto Grosso by Mr Baston’s two sons…’ 9 This is possibly the first implied reference to a recorder concerto, as Thomas and John Baston generally performed concertos together on the violin and recorder. However, the advertisement does not mention the recorder specifically. Regarding the end date of the survey, apart from one isolated advertisement for a performance of a recorder concerto in 1738, the recorder concerto stopped being advertised after 1734. I have kept my survey discussion, and comparisons of advertisements, to the slightly broader date range of 1710 to 1735.

**Limits of using newspaper advertisements**

As mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, newspaper advertisements clearly do not cover all musical activity during this period. They do not even cover all public performances, since it cannot be assumed that all concerts and theatrical performances will have been advertised in the newspapers. Examples of missed performances are given to us by the newspapers themselves. For example, in 1718, there appeared a newspaper advertisement announcing the cancellation of a concert at Stationer’s Hall for the benefit of Mr Cuthbert. However, there seems to have been no advertisements posted in the newspapers before this notice for the concert itself, prior to its cancellation. 10 This implies that not every single concert or performance was advertised in the newspapers. Furthermore, there are occasionally advertisements for concert series, where only the initial concert in the series was advertised. This could either mean that the series continued but was not advertised after the first concert; or that the first concert was not a success, and so the series did not continue. 11 This clearly places a substantial limitation on the survey of newspaper advertisements, and the reader should be particularly made aware that any one year in the survey could be easily skewed by
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missed performances. For example, there are three surviving newspaper advertisements of a recorder concerto performance from 1726 – if there were many other unadvertised recorder concerto performances that happened in that year, then a different picture of the recorder concerto in 1726 emerges. However, even after fully accepting this limitation, there are still insights to be gained from a survey of newspaper advertisements, not least because these concerts and plays were commercial events which needed to gain sizeable audiences to survive. Commercial advertisements therefore give some indication (even if a limited one) of changing audience tastes during this period.

Sources

I have used a number of sources to complete these surveys. The first, and most important, is the ‘17th and 18th Century Burney Collection’. This is a collection of newspapers and news pamphlets, first collected by the Reverend Charles Burney, with the original facsimiles held at the British Library. This represents the largest and most comprehensive collection of early English news media, and totals almost one million newspaper pages.12

To supplement my searches of the Burney Collection, I also used two additional reference works: Michael Tilmouth’s A Calendar of References to Music in Newspapers Published in London and the Provinces (1660-1719), and particularly, The London Stage 1660-1800.13 In September 2014, all five parts of The London Stage were released online as a digital resource, available through the Hathi Trust (eleven volumes, and 8000 pages in total).14 This digitisation has made what was already an invaluable resource even more vital to all theatre and literary scholars. Further information relevant to my recorder concerto survey was found in A Checklist of New Plays and Entertainments on the London Stage (compiled by William J. Burling), A Register of English Theatrical

---
12 These facsimiles were digitised, and published online by subscription access, through Gale. This has created an extremely valuable and useful tool for all researchers of the long eighteenth century: the digitisation of the collection has made it possible to conduct systematic keyword searches, allowing for much more complete and comprehensive surveys of the whole collection. This is particularly the case when ‘fuzzy’ keyword searches are utilised, which give a huge number of results, and ensures searches are as detailed as possible.


Survey of Newspaper Advertisements, 1710-1735

Between 1710 and 1735, there exist 212 ‘distinct’ advertisements (i.e. not including repeated advertisements for the same performance) for performances in concert or at the theatre which advertised a concerto on any instrument. Out of the 212 distinct newspaper advertisements, 64 advertise a performance of a recorder concerto in some form (either for the ‘Flute’ or the ‘Little Flute’). These are all listed in Appendix A. See Table 2.1 below for details of each year to 1735.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>All Concertos</th>
<th>Recorder Concertos</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>All Concertos</th>
<th>Recorder Concertos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1710</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1711</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1724</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1712</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1725</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1713</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1726</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1714</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1727</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1715</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1728</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1716</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1729</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1717</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1718</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1731</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1719</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1732</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1722</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1735</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: A comparison of newspaper advertisements of ‘distinct’ concerto performances, 1710-1735

How does this number of recorder concerto advertisements compare with the number of concerto advertisements for other instruments? Out of all 212 advertisements between 1710 and 1735, it comes as no surprise that the violin concerto appears the most, with
101 advertisements in total. The oboe concerto appears in 35 advertisements. The trumpet and the horn concerto both appear in 23 advertisements each, and the (transverse) flute concerto appears in 15 advertisements. Table 2.3 below puts the recorder concerto into this context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violin</th>
<th>Recorder</th>
<th>Oboe</th>
<th>Trumpet</th>
<th>Horn</th>
<th>Flute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2: Instrumental concerto advertisements (each instrument), 1710-1735

It should be noted that the figures in Table 2.2 do not add up to 212 (in fact, they are well above 212). This is because many of the newspaper advertisements which mention performances of concertos often list a number of concertos by different instruments (for example, ‘…several new Concerto's for the Hautboy, Flute, German Flute, Trumpet, and other Instruments’). There are also a number of concerto advertisements which do not mention any specific instrument whatsoever (for example, ‘… with several Concertos and Dances between the Acts’). I have also categorised a concerto advertisement as one for a particular instrument, if the instrument is implied by the composition or, where possible, the performer.

1700 to 1709

Though outside the start date of our survey, it is useful to first provide some further information regarding the first years of the eighteenth century. This is the period that the concerto in general first started to appear routinely in English newspaper advertisements. The first advertisement for a publication of concerto music appeared in 1702 (for Albinoni’s Op. 2). As already mentioned, the first newspaper advertisement for an actual performance of a concerto appears in 1707 (William Corbett’s ‘Concerti Grossi’, in a concert at the York Buildings). On 24 August 1709, there appeared an advertisement

16 The Spectator – Issue CCCCXXXVI. 17 July 1712.
17 The Daily Courant – Issue 1589. 18 March 1707.
for a concert which included a ‘Concerto Grosso by Mr. Baston’s two Sons, who perform’d the same lately with great Applause.’\textsuperscript{18} This could possibly be the first reference to a performance of a recorder concerto in English newspapers. ‘Mr Baston’s two Sons’ refers to John Baston, who was a composer, cellist, and recorder player, and to Thomas Baston, who was a violinist. As will be seen, John Baston often appeared in performances on recorder with his brother. Since it is possibly a recorder concerto advertisement, without being confirmed as such, I have also included it (in brackets) in Appendix A.

The recorder in general really started to take off during the first few years of this decade. By the start of the eighteenth century, the plays at Lincoln’s Inn Fields and Drury Lane were filled with music, and the recorder started to appear in the advertisements of these theatrical musical ‘entertainments’. Recorders first appear in 7 July 1702, at a performance of the play \textit{Oroonoko}, ‘…with new Musick set to the Flutes; and to be perform’d by Mr Banister and his Son.’\textsuperscript{19} This was John Banister, and his son, who was also called John Banister (the third). The elder Banister was a violinist, and also a recorder player. He started to appear frequently in the interval entertainments at Drury Lane, and was therefore presumably a member of the Drury Lane orchestra.\textsuperscript{20} His principal instrument in the band was the violin, but he appeared more often in newspaper advertisements on the recorder. Drury Lane used more recorder music in their advertisements in October of the same year. On 30 October, there was a performance of \textit{Ibrahim}, with ‘An Extraordinary Entertainment, all of Flutes, to be perform’d by Mr Paisible and others.’\textsuperscript{21} Mr. Paisible here refers to James Paisible, mentioned earlier as one of the French musicians that possibly brought the ‘baroque’ design of recorder from France to England in 1673. He eventually became one of the leading recorder players in England during this period, and as we shall see, appeared regularly in the newspaper advertisements of theatre interval entertainments (often advertised playing recorder concertos). Paisible also performed on a number of occasions with the Italian violinist Gasparo Visconti (sometimes referred to under his nickname of ‘Gasperini’), and the two of them appeared together in several advertisements for performances of Visconti’s ‘incomparable’ sonata, which they performed together multiple times during this period.

\textsuperscript{18} The Daily Courant – Issue 2444. 24 August 1709.

\textsuperscript{19} The Daily Courant – Issue 67. 6 July 1702.

\textsuperscript{20} Ashbee and Lasocki, A Bibliographic Dictionary of English Court Musicians, 75, [GL 179].

\textsuperscript{21} The Daily Courant – Issue 168. 30 October 1702.
On 19 November 1703, an advertisement appeared in *The Daily Courant* for a performance the same day of a play called *The Constant Couple*, which included the same ‘incomparable’ sonata, this time described as: ‘a piece of Musick for the Violin and Flute by Signior Gasperini and Mr Paisible, it being the most Masterly perform’d of any Musick that was ever heard upon the English Stage’. Visconti’s sonata survives today, though in an incomplete copy in the British Library. Other recorder music advertised in the theatre on the recorder during this period included, among others, trio sonatas by Corelli (who was becoming particularly popular in England), recorder solos to a ground, as well as recorder sonatas for two, and three recorders.

There was also a substantial amount of recorder music published in London between 1700 and 1709. Alongside the various tutor books for the recorder already mentioned, there were large numbers of collections of sonatas published for one, two and even three recorders, as well as airs, grounds and divisions (particularly, the famous *Division Flute*, first published by Walsh & Hare in 1705). This large amount of music really emphasises the burgeoning market for recorder music amongst amateur recorder players; and most of the published music was playable by good amateurs. There was also a particularly big market for recorder arrangements (usually for one or two recorders) of opera and theatre music. These collections were very much designed to appeal to the amateur music enthusiast, who would have heard and enjoyed these tunes as audience members of the plays and operas.

*1710 to 1719*

The first newspaper advertisement which specifically refers to a concerto for recorder, albeit amongst concertos for many other instruments, appeared in *The Guardian*, on 25 March 1713. It is an advertisement for a concert at Hickford’s Room.

…a consort of Vocal and Instrumental Musick… a new Concerto on the Mandolin, being an Instrument admired in Rome, but never Publick here. A

---

24 *The Daily Courant* – Issue 1114. 8 November 1705.
27 *The British Apollo* – Issue 117. 21 July 1708. Gottfried Finger, Gottfried Keller, Jakob Kremberg and Johann Christoph Pepusch are all known to have written music for three recorders.
Solo on the Eccho Flute by Mr Peasible, accompanied by Mr. Babel, Jun. on the Harpsichord. **With several new Concerto's for the Hautboy, Flute, German Flute, Trumpet, and other Instruments,** Compos'd by Mr. Corbett, and perform'd by him, and the best Masters in the Opera...\(^{28}\)

These concertos by Corbett are presumably the same concertos that were mentioned in Hawkins as the ‘twelve Concertos for all instruments’,\(^ {29}\) which had been composed by Corbett earlier in his life. These concertos have not survived today. The only set of concertos composed by Corbett that does survive today is his ‘Bazzaria’ concertos, composed during and after his travels to Italy, and eventually published in 1728.

In October 1714, Estienne Roger’s London agent, Henri Ribboteau, advertised in *The Post Man*: ‘*To all Lovers of Musick, this Day is Published, Six Concertos for 4 Flutes and a Bass, by Schickhardt, Opera 19...*’.\(^ {30}\) Six sets of Schickhardt’s music was published by Walsh and Hare in London,\(^ {31}\) including the above *Six Concertos for 4 Flutes*. This seems to be the first set of concertos for the recorder published in England which has survived today (Corbett’s early concerti grossi mentioned above were presumably the first published concertos in England that included recorder, though they do not survive).

We have already seen numerous advertisements for performances of recorder music at the plays of the Drury Lane theatre (particularly by Paisible and Bannister). There were of course many other theatres that sprang up in London, but Drury Lane’s main rival was the theatre at Lincoln’s Inn Fields (and as is mentioned earlier in this chapter, Drury Lane and Lincoln’s Inn Fields – later Covent Garden - were granted an exclusive royal patent to present plays in English language, designating them as ‘Theatres Royal’). The Lincoln’s Inn Fields first opened in 1662, and ran for a few years until 1671. It reopened again in 1695, though the theatre there was by all accounts rather small and poorly furnished.\(^ {32}\) A more impressive theatre was required to compete with the rival theatres, and on the 18 December 1714, a new theatre (built on the same spot as the old) was opened, having been commissioned by Christopher Rich.

---

\(^ {28} \) *The Guardian – Issue XII.*


\(^ {31} \) These publications by Walsh and Hare were Schickhardt’s Op.2 (1717), Op. 5 (1715), Op. 10 (1719), Op. 17 (1721), Op. 19 (1719) and Op. 20 (1718)

\(^ {32} \) Avery (ed.), *Introduction to the London Stage, Part 2, 1700-1729*, xxiii.
As we can see from 1700-1709, Drury Lane was much quicker than Lincoln’s Inn Fields in utilising newspaper advertisements. However, by around 1707, Lincoln’s Inn Fields had also started to include notices in the newspapers, and by 1714, they were utilising the newspapers just as frequently as Drury Lane. There are no newspaper advertisements for performances of recorder concertos in 1715. However, the recorder still maintained an important role in the theatre entertainments during this year. On 22 March 1715, at Lincoln’s Inn Fields, there was a performance of *The Jew of Venice* (an adaptation of Shakespeare’s *Merchant of Venice*, also containing a masque, *Peleus and Thetis*), with ‘a Flute Solo by Mr. Baston…’33 Similar advertisements continued appearing over the next few months. 1715 also seemed to be the start of a period of quite intense competition between the advertisements involving rival virtuoso recorder players at the two theatres: John Baston at Lincoln’s Inn Fields, and James Paisible at Drury Lane.

It was in 1716 that the recorder concerto really started to take off in English newspaper advertisements. During this year, the first newspaper advertisements appear for performances of recorder concertos at the theatres. The first advertisement occurs on 16 April 1716, at Drury Lane. The play was *The Maid’s Tragedy*, and the advertisement included a ‘New Concerto by Paisible and others.’34 Though the recorder has not been mentioned in this advertisement by name, all other references to a concerto by Paisible involve Paisible playing on the recorder, so it can be assumed that this was also a performance of a recorder concerto. Just over a week later, on the 25 April, the recorder concerto also first appeared in a performance at Lincoln’s Inn Fields. The advertisement was for a performance of the *Second Part of the Comical History of Don Quixot*, with ‘…a new Concerto for the Flute to be perform’d by Mr. Baston, Sen., Mr. Baston, Jun. and others…’35 Just from these two small examples, we can see the underlying competition between the theatres of Drury Lane and Lincoln’s Inn Fields. In our survey analysis so far, there have appeared no advertisements for a recorder concerto at the theatre; and yet, within nine days of the first advertisement in Drury Lane performed by Paisible, there also appears an advertisement for a recorder concerto at Lincoln’s Inn Fields, performed by Baston.

34 Ibid., 397.
35 *The Daily Courant* – Issue 4528. 25 April 1716.
In total in 1716, there were 13 unique advertisements of performances of concertos for all instruments. Out of these 13 advertisements, 8 of them specifically referred to a performance of a recorder concerto. All 8 of these advertisements for recorder concertos in 1716 were advertised as being performed by either John Baston at Lincoln’s Inn Fields, or by James Paisible at Drury Lane. Out of these 8 advertisements, 3 were for a ‘Concerto for the Violin and Flute, compos’d by Mr John Baston, and to be perform’d on the Stage by himself and his Brother.’ These were presumably some of the concertos from Baston’s set of concertos for recorder, eventually published in 1729. The concertos contain violin obligato parts, which were performed at the theatre by his brother, Thomas Baston. The title page of the 1729 publication of the concertos notes that they were ‘Performed at the Theatre with great Applause.’

1716 was also the first year that a concerto for the ‘little flute’ was advertised. On Wednesday 6 June, 1716 at Drury Lane theatre, there was a performance of the play Love’s Last Shift, with ‘… a New Concerto for the Little Flute, by Paisible and others.’ Though the term little flute has been used in newspaper advertisements before this, this is the first advertisement for a little flute concerto in English newspapers. There was also an element of prestige attached to this particular performance; it was advertised as ‘for the Entertainment of His Excellency Don Luis da Cunha, Ambassador Extraordinary from the King of Portugal’.

In 1717, performances of recorder concertos remained popular. There were 10 unique newspaper advertisements of performances of concertos, and out of these 10, five advertisements mentioned a recorder concerto. On Friday 1 March, 1717, both Drury Lane and Lincoln’s Inn Fields theatres staged a play on the same evening (Sir Courtly Nice at Drury Lane, and The Second Part of the Comical History of Don Quixote at Lincoln’s Inn Fields). Competition on the same night by the two theatres was a common occurrence. However, what was particularly interesting about this evening was that both theatres also advertised a performance of a recorder concerto. At Drury Lane,
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37 Baston’s Six Concertos in Six Parts for Violins and Flutes, viz. a Fifth, Sixth and Consort Flute. The Proper Flute being nam’d to each Concerto (Walsh and Hare, 1729)
38 The Daily Courant – Issue 4564. 6 June, 1716.
39 When the advertisement refers to ‘by Paisible and others’, it is referring to the performers of the concerto, and not the composer. It was much more common for newspaper advertisements in this period to refer to the musicians in the performance, and only occasionally to the composers of the music.
there was ‘…a new Concerto by Paisible and others, never perform’d before’. And at Lincoln’s Inn Fields, there was ‘… a Concerto for the Violin and Flute, compos’d by Mr. John Baston, and to be perform’d on the Stage by himself and his Brother.’ The theatres are here pitching the two recorder maestros in direct competition, and using the promise of a recorder concerto to try and bring in bigger box office takings.

In comparison to 1716 and 1717, there are fewer surviving newspaper advertisements for recorder concertos from 1718 and 1719. In 1718, the recorder concerto appeared in two surviving concerto advertisements, and in 1719, it appeared in three. A particularly interesting advertisement for the recorder concerto appeared on the 16 May 1718. The advertisement was for a play at Drury Lane (King Henry the IVth), and the musical entertainments consisted of ‘A Concerto upon the Little Flute by Mr. Paisible, and one entirely new, compos'd by Mr Hendel’ [Handel]. There is an intriguing syntactic ambiguity in this sentence. The first reading of this sentence is that the performance would consist of a concerto on the little flute performed by Paisible, and one entirely new concerto (on any instrument), composed by Handel. The second reading is that there is a performance of a concerto on the little flute by Paisible, followed by one entirely new concerto also on the little flute, composed by Handel. The intrigue of this advertisement is magnified by the fact that in the Universitätsbibliothek, in Rostock, there survives a concerto in B-flat major, titled: ‘Concerto à 4. Strom: Flautó Piccolo, 2. Violini e Violoncello. Di Sig’ Hendl.’ [Händel]. This concerto has actually been published in a modern edition as a concerto for soprano recorder by Handel. However, an incipit of this concerto also appears in the Breitkopf catalogues of 1763, but under the name ‘di Montenari’. I discuss this concerto, and the authorship question, in detail in Chapter 3.

1720 to 1729

This decade is marked by the expansion of the theatre in London. In December 1720 a new playhouse opened, the New Theatre in the Haymarket. During this period, the New Theatre was used by several different companies, and in particular, troupes of foreign

---

40 The Daily Courant – Issue 4793. 1 March 1717.
41 Ibid.
42 The Daily Courant – Issue 5169. 16 May 1718.
43 D-Rou Mus.Saec.XVIII:33.1.0
44 Concerto in B – Georg Friedrich Händel (Carus-Verlag, 1987, ed. Thailheimer)
comedians offering foreign plays and comedies. In 1728, the theatre in Haymarket also started producing English plays, and therefore offered the first real competition to the duopoly of Drury Lane and Lincoln’s Inn Fields. Spurred on by the increasing interest in drama, and particularly, by the huge popularity and success of *The Beggar’s Opera* (as well as *The Provoked Husband*), a new theatre also opened in Goodman’s Fields, in 1729. This led to some very active theatrical seasons, and further competition to the theatres of Drury Lane and Lincoln’s Inn Fields.\(^{45}\) Concert-going remained a popular activity, and there were a number of popular concert venues across London, particularly the Great Room at York Buildings, Hickford’s Room, and the houses in Richmond. Musical and theatrical advertisements during this decade generally appeared in the newspapers of *The Daily Courant*, *The Daily Post*, and *The Daily Journal*, though occasionally in other papers as well.

The first four years of this decade, 1720 through to the end of the 1723, was perhaps the period where the recorder concerto was at the peak of its popularity. This short four-year period also included a sad event for recorder playing in London, with the death of James Paisible in August 1721. His last performance at Drury Lane, or at least his last advertised performance, was on 9 May 1719, where Paisible played a ‘new Piece for the Ecchoe Flute’ at a performance of the play *Rule a Wife and Have a Wife*.\(^{46}\) In his will, Paisible described ‘finding myself very sick and weak in body’.\(^{47}\) This would explain Paisible’s absence from newspaper advertisements in 1720 and early 1721. Instead, concerto advertisements in 1720 were dominated by Baston. On 5 May 1720, there was a performance at Lincoln’s Inn Fields of the *Comical History of Don Quixote*, with ‘…a Concerto on the Sixth Flute by Mr. Baston Jr…’\(^{48}\) This was clearly well received, because three other plays that month, on the 12 May, 18 May and 27 May, were also advertised as including a ‘Concerto on the Sixth Flute’ by Baston. This could have been one of Baston’s concertos from his set of six concertos, published by Walsh & Hare in 1729. Out of the six concertos in the set, *Nos. 2, 4 and 5* are written for the sixth flute. However, these published concertos are musically weak and relatively unimaginative, and it seems unlikely that any one of these concertos would have become popular. Perhaps Baston also composed some more interesting and virtuosic concertos for

---


\(^{46}\) *The Daily Courant* – Issue 5475, 9 May 1719.


\(^{48}\) *The Daily Post* – Issue 184, 4 May 1720.
himself, which never appeared in the published set? In 1720 and 1721, there also appeared newspaper advertisements of published arrangements for recorder of Corelli’s very popular Op. 6 set of concertos, nicely combining London’s interest in both the recorder and Corelli during this period.\footnote{The Evening Post – Issue 1683. 12 May - 14 May, 1720; The Post Boy – Issue 4967. 23 May - 25 May, 1721.}

As already mentioned, the years 1722 and 1723 were, in advertisement terms, the pinnacle of the popularity of the recorder concerto in London’s musical life. As the following table indicates, advertisements of recorder concertos outnumbered concertos for any other instrument during this period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recorder</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violin</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oboe</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumpet</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{Table 2.3: Surviving concerto advertisements by instrument, 1722-1723}

At Drury Lane, on 11 May 1722, there was a performance of a comedy called \textit{Sir Courtly Nice}, advertised with ‘Select Pieces of Musick, between the Acts: particularly, a Concerto for the Little Flute composed by Monsieur Dieupart, and performed by Mr. Baston, and others.’\footnote{The Daily Courant – Issue 6413. 11 May 1722.} This could well have been a performance by Baston of Dieupart’s concerto in A minor for fifth flute. We see from this advertisement that Baston was now performing at Drury Lane, rather than for his previous employer at Lincoln’s Inn Fields. Following Paisible’s death, John Baston switched his employment from Lincoln’s Inn Fields to Drury Lane, and continued to appear in newspaper advertisements on the recorder at Drury Lane for a number of years (until 1733). In April 1722, there was a cartel agreement formed between Drury Lane and Lincoln’s Inn Fields. A formal legal contract was signed, and this specified that neither company would employ anyone already working at the other, unless a written discharge notice could first be presented.
The penalty for breach of this agreement was £20.\textsuperscript{51} This coincides very well with the timing of Baston’s move from Lincoln’s Inn Fields to Drury Lane – Baston’s first advertised performance at Drury Lane was in early May 1722, so presumably he would have moved jobs before this. Perhaps Baston was one of the employees who was tempted across to Drury Lane whilst still under contract, and therefore caused the cartel agreement to be put in place?

Money was presumably part of the reason for Baston’s move across from Lincoln’s Inn Fields to Drury Lane. On 9 March 1723, an article appeared in the \textit{Weekly Journal}, which stated that Lincoln’s Inn Fields is ‘so poorly follow’d’ that there is no money to be made there. The writer of this article, however, was seemingly not fond of Drury Lane either, lamenting the ‘miserable Decay of Dramatick Poetry… initrely owing to the Management of Drury-Lane Theatre.’\textsuperscript{52}

On the same day of Baston’s first performance at Drury Lane (11 May 1722), there was also an evening concert of ‘Vocal and Instrumental Musick’, held at the New Theatre in the Haymarket.\textsuperscript{53} The concert was a benefit concert for ‘Mr L. Grano’, and included the following the programme:

A Trumpet Concerto by Mr. Grano, Singing by Mr. Legate, Two Concerto’s of Corelli’s, by the two first Violins in the Opera. A Concerto for the Hautboy by Mr. Kytch. A Solo on the German Flute by Mr. Grano. A Concerto on the Little Flute by Mr. Grano. A Solo on the Hautboy by Mr. Kytch. A Concerto for two Trumpets, and two French Horns.

It is interesting to note that ‘Mr. Grano’ performed a concerto on the little flute. The ‘Grano’ mentioned here is Lewis Granom (the concert was for the benefit of a Mr L. Granom), who was the younger brother of Johann Granom. Lewis Granom did not appear in as many newspaper advertisements as his brother, but on the few occasions he did, he was always advertised as playing on the trumpet or the transverse flute. This is the only recorded occasion of him performing in public on a ‘little flute’. Perhaps this was simply an interesting concerto to include among many other concertos in the concert. However, it is also tempting to read a little further in to the concert programme, and see it as a subtle response to Baston moving to Drury Lane. It is strange that, almost exactly a year from the last advertised performance of a recorder concerto in the theatre

\textsuperscript{52} \textit{Weekly Journal} / Saturday’s Post. 9 March 1723.
\textsuperscript{53} \textit{The Daily Courant} – Issue 6412. 10 May 1722.
(9 May 1721), the next two performances are both on the same day, a year later (11 May 1722). It would presumably have been known at the Haymarket that Baston had swapped his allegiances to Drury Lane, and that this was his first night. Perhaps, knowing that the popular Baston would be performing his first little flute concerto at Drury Lane, Grano decided to also include a little flute concerto in his own benefit concert at the Haymarket?

The next few years for the recorder concerto, towards the end of the decade, included the complete domination of performances of recorder concertos by John Baston, alongside a gradual decrease in the number of advertisements for recorder concertos. The large respect for Baston as a performer is shown in a rather unusual performance at Mr. Penkethman’s Theatre in Richmond, on 2 September 1723. This was first advertised in the *Weekly Journal* on 24 August as:

...a Farce of one Act call’d Pyramus and Thisbe. Written by Shakespear… To which will be added… a Concerto on the small Flute by Mr. John Baston. And several surprising Entertainments of Rope Dancing by a young Lad lately come from France, who flourishes the Colours, plays on the Violin, and turns several Times on the Rope without a Pole. And Ladder-Dancing by the greatest Performer in the World, who stands on the Top Round of the Ladder, drinks a Glass of Wine, with his other Hand above his Head in the Middle of the Stage. With Dancing both Serious and Comick.  

The event was actually quite a prestigious one; in a review of the performance in the *Daily Post* a few days later, it mentioned some notable audience members:

Mr Penkethman... had the Honour to divert their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Wales, with Entertainments of Acting and Tumbling perform'd to Admiration… There were present Nobility, Gentry and Ladies upwards of 200.  

What is also noticeable in this advertisement is that the only serious music chosen to impress the Prince and Princess of Wales was a little flute concerto performed by Baston.  

From the survey figures, we can see a gradual decline of recorder concertos in newspaper advertisements during the last half of the decade. Recorder concertos appeared in only two unique advertisements in the years 1724 and 1725, three advertisements in 1726, and only one advertisement in each of the years 1727, 1728, and 1729. Between 1724 and 1729, out of the 50 total surviving newspaper advertisements

---

54 *Weekly Journal or British Gazeteer*. 24 August 1723.  
of concerto performances, the recorder concerto only appeared in 10 of them. This decline in advertisements is surprising given that Walsh & Hare decided to publish their various sets of recorder concertos in the last few years of the 1720s. In December 1725, they published a different arrangement of Corelli’s Op. 6 collection ‘Transpos’d for Flutes, viz. a Fifth, a Sixth, a Consort, and Voice Flute’. In 1726, they published recorder concertos by William Babell; in 1727, recorder concertos by Robert Woodcock; and in 1729, recorder concertos by John Baston. Why, as the recorder concerto was seemingly starting to fade in England, did Walsh & Hare choose this period to publish a number of sets of recorder concertos, most of which had been composed many years before? It is worth mentioning here that Walsh was a particularly successful businessman, who managed to make a lot of money from music publishing: on his death, in 1736, Walsh left a fortune of around £30,000 to his son. Since Walsh would in all likelihood not have published these concertos without at least the possibility of a profit, this implies that there was a market for recorder concertos at the end of the 1720s. As we move into the last five years of our survey, we see examples of this, and of the recorder concerto remaining somewhat present in London’s musical life through the first few years of the 1730s.

1730 to 1735

In the first three years, between the start of 1730 and the end of 1732, we see an upturn in recorder concerto performances appearing in newspaper advertisements once more. In 1730, out of five surviving concerto newspaper advertisements in total, the recorder concerto appears in four of them. In 1731, out of another five concerto newspaper advertisements, the recorder appears in two of them. In 1732, out of a larger 12 concerto advertisements that survive today in total, the recorder concerto appears on three occasions. Though most of these concertos were again by Baston, two of the advertisements were for different performers. At the theatre in Goodman’s Fields, on 11 June 1730, there was a performance of a comedy called The Widow Bewitch’d, ‘to which will be added a new Concerto on the Flute to be play'd on the Stage, by Mr Jacob Price,
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56 Corelli’s XII Concertos, Transpos’d for Flutes… (Walsh & Hare, 1725)
57 Babell’s Concertos in 7 Parts… (1726); Woodcock’s XII Concertos in Eight Parts… (1727); Baston’s Six Concertos in Six Parts for Violins and Flutes… (1729).
58 Kidson, British Music Publishers, Printers and Engravers, 142.
who never perform'd in publick before.' And at the Haymarket, on 10 May 1731, there was a benefit concert for a ‘Family in Distress’, with a play, along with an ‘Operatical Puppet-show’, and ‘...at the End of the Puppet shew, a Concerto Grosso on the Flute, by Mr. Kytch.’

Sadly, after this brief resurgence between 1730 and 1732, we do start to see the final days of the eighteenth-century recorder concerto in England. In 1733, the recorder concerto appeared in only two newspaper advertisements. The first, on the 13 April, was for the rare combination of a ‘Concerto with Flutes and German Flutes’. And the second, on the 9 May at Drury Lane (though the initial advertisement appeared much earlier on the 30 April), included a ‘Concerto on the Little Flute by Mr. John Baston…’ This was Baston’s last appearance in a newspaper advertisement performing a recorder concerto. In 1734, on Wednesday 8 May at Goodman’s Fields, there was a play of King Richard the Thir’, with ‘...a Concerto of the late Mr Woodcock’s on the little Flute.’ This is the one and only appearance of the recorder concerto in newspaper advertisements in 1734, and it is also the last recorder concerto in our survey.

There is, in fact, one more advertisement for a performance of a recorder concerto in eighteenth-century English newspapers. Four years later, at the Marleybone Gardens on 12 July 1738, there was a ‘Concert of Musick by the best Masters’, which will ‘continue every Evening during the Season’. In total, two ‘little flute’ concertos are listed in the concert programme. The eighteen pieces to be performed in the concert series was listed as follows:

The Overture of Hester. A Concerto on the little Flute, and two songs. A Concerto of Corelli. A Concert on the Hautboy. Concert on the German Flute, and two songs. Concerto on the Little Flute. Concerto of Giminiani. Overture of Alcins. Concerto on the Hautboy and two songs. Concerto of Mr. Handell’s. Concerti for Two Hautbois of Mr. Giminiani. To perform the same Number of the celebrated Pieces every Evening during the Season, with Alterations. The best of Wines and Eatables that the Town can afford, will be furnish’d at the most reasonable Prices of every thing, and fix’d in several Parts of the Garden. Gentlemen are humbly desired not to smoke in the Walks.

59 The Daily Courant – Issue 8946. 11 June 1730.
This was a new play, with the premier of the play only three days earlier (Burling, A Checklist of New Plays and Entertainments on the London Stage, 1700 – 1737, 136.)
60 The Daily Post – Issue 3632. 10 May 1731.
62 The Daily Post – Issue 4250. 30 April 1733.
63 The Daily Post – Issue 1153. 10 July 1738.
The recorder itself did not completely die out in England in the second half of the eighteenth century, though many have gained the impression that it did. David Lasocki has shown there to be a number of instrument auctions from the 1740s onwards where recorders were sold (even as late as 1796). In the mid-eighteenth century, there were also occasional publications of arrangements for the ‘Common Flute’, the last of which was probably an edition of Pepusch’s *The Beggar’s Opera*, arranged for the ‘Common Flute’, and published by Thomas Lowndes in 1769.

From the above survey, we gain some idea of the specific periods of popularity in England between 1710 and 1735 of the recorder concerto, and of recorder concerto performers. We see a number of years where the recorder concerto dominated newspaper advertisements above all other instrumental concertos. And we also see further evidence that the decline of the recorder concerto and the recorder in general during this period was not simply a gradual one until the disappearance of the recorder concerto in the mid-1730s. Instead, it seemed that the recorder concerto re-emerged once more in the first two or three years of the 1730s. This last period is quite revealing, because it explains why Walsh decided to publish a set of recorder concertos by Baston in 1729 – it shows clearly there was still interest in the recorder concerto. This last period also coincides with Sammartini’s arrival in England in 1729 (though it is perhaps unrelated to it). We now turn to the advertised performers of these recorder concertos.
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65 Ibid., 41.
Performers of Recorder Concertos in English Newspaper Advertisements

From the complete survey of recorder concertos in newspapers advertisements (see Appendix A), there are a total of seven performers that are specifically mentioned in these advertisements for a performance of a recorder concerto. The two most prevalent names in the survey are James Paisible and John Baston. The other five performers are: Luis Mercy, Jean Christian Kytch, Lewis Grano [Granom], John Jones and Jacob Price. This section will provide an overview of these performers. David Lasocki’s comprehensive thesis ‘Professional Recorder Players in England, 1540-1740’, as well as A Biographical Dictionary of Actors, Actresses, Musicians, Dancers, Managers & other stage personnel in London, 1660-1800 has provided the vast majority of research in this area. My own research has added a small amount of additional information about some of these performers.

James Paisible

A large amount of information about Paisible’s life is known today, predominantly thanks to the research of David Lasocki. Detailed accounts of Paisible are given in A Biographical Dictionary of English Court Musicians, 1485-1714, as well as in A Biographical Dictionary of Actors, Actresses, Musicians etc.

James Paisible (also known as James Peasable or Pesible, and Jacques Paisible in France) was born around 1656 in (or near) Paris, and died in London in 1721. Paisible was first mentioned in an English document as a performer in John Crowne’s masque Calisto, in 1675. Lasocki notes that Paisible was ‘one of the four French musicians described in the Court recorders as both ‘hoboyes’ and ‘recorders’ who would have played on the remodelled Baroque oboe and recorder, and probably introduced those instruments to England.’ It is very likely that Paisible arrived with Robert Cambert and the other French musicians on English shores in September 1673. Upon the accession of James II to the throne in 1685, Paisible received a public appointment as a court musician in 1685 (being confirmed by certificate on 22 October 1685), and he is also listed amongst the 36 musicians who performed at James’ coronation. In December

---

67 Highfill, Jr., Burnim, and Langhans (eds.), A Biographical Dictionary of Actors, Actresses...
68 Ashbee and Lasocki, A Biographical Dictionary of English Court Musicians, II. 852, [GL 179].
69 Ibid., 855.
1686, Paisible married Mary Davis [Moll Davis], who was a singer, actress and
notoriously, a former mistress of Charles II. In the years that followed his marriage,
Paisible and his wife went to France for a few years (possibly due to the Glorious
Revolution of 1688, when Paisible’s Catholicism might have hindered his employment
opportunities in the Court).  

After returning to England, Paisible became very active as a performer, and found
employment in the Court, the theatre and public concerts, as well as through
composition. As is seen from the newspaper advertisement survey, Paisible was
originally a member of the band at the theatre at Drury Lane as early as 1702. In 1707,
Christopher Rich, the Drury Lane manager, dismissed Paisible and a number of other
musicians ‘upon suspicion of being concern’d in the Project of Acting Opera’s in the
Haymarkett.’ Following this dismissal, Paisible and the other musicians were
permitted to perform in the operas at the Queens Theatre in the Haymarket, where
Paisible performed in the band on the cello. In concerts given for the Duchess of
Shrewsburry in Kensington, Paisible is listed under ‘Base Viols’. In 1710, the German
traveller Zacharias Conrad von Uffenbach attended a concert in which Paisible played
in a trio sonata on the recorder. Uffenbach wrote that ‘The person who plays the recorder
is a Frenchman called Paisible, whose equal is not to be found’.

Newspaper advertisements for interval entertainments indicate that by April 1715,
Paisible had returned to Drury Lane once more. In June 1716, the Drury Lane managers
wrote to their treasurer, Castleman, and told him to pay Paisible ‘five shillings per diem,
and one guinea every time he performs anything on the stage.’ His last advertised
performance at Drury Lane was on 9 May 1719 (where Paisible played a ‘new Piece for
the Ecchoe Flute’). Paisible died two years later, in August 1721. On his death,
Paisible’s inventory of possessions included ‘three bass violins and one bass viol, a
guitar and two cases’, ‘a spinet upon a frame’ and ‘two voice flutes, one consort flute

70 Ashbee and Lasocki, op. cit., 857.
71 Milhous and Hume (ed.), Vice Chamberlain Coke’s Theatrical Papers, 1706-1715, 47.
72 Paisible is listed in the Haymarket Orchestra lists under ‘Violoncelli’ as Mr Paisible – see Vice
Chamberlain Coke’s Theatrical Papers; 151, 158, and 159.
73 Ibid., 192.
75 Ibid., 153.
and two small ones, an old hautboy and an old cane flute.\textsuperscript{77} Paisible was buried in the churchyard of St. Martin-in-the-Fields on the 17 August 1721.\textsuperscript{78}

\textit{Paisible’s compositions for recorder}

Paisible was an active composer as well as a performer, writing both instrumental music for the theatre, and instrumental chamber music. His music today predominantly survives in manuscripts. He had one set of six recorder duets (Op. 1) published in Amsterdam in 1702 (reprinted by Walsh & Hare in 1703), and also a \textit{Six Setts of Aires} (Op. 2), published by Walsh & Hare in 1720. Several manuscripts survive, including instrumental sonatas, triosonatas, and suites. A good number of Paisible’s sonatas for one and two recorders survive today.\textsuperscript{79} These sonatas are of a very high quality, showing a masterful command of the instrument. They are also filled with much virtuosic writing, and are certainly some of the more demanding works in the English recorder repertoire. Many of the sonatas have a playful quality to them, particularly shown by the endings of a number of their last movements. Paisible tends to write a virtuosic flourish in these final few bars, ending the sonatas with great verve (for example, see Figure 2.1 and Figure 2.2). This virtuosity perhaps explains why Paisible’s solo sonatas were never published in England, being too difficult for the amateur market.

\textsuperscript{77} Lasocki, ‘Paisible, James’, \textit{Grove Music Online}.
\textsuperscript{78} Ibid., 804.
\textsuperscript{79} In 2015, Michael Hell and the Musicke’s Pleasure Garden released the first recording of the complete recorder sonatas of Paisible (\textit{Paisible – Complete Recorder Sonatas}. Paladino Music, 2015)
Figure 2.1: Paisible, *Sonata No. 4*, v, *Allegro*, bars 13–20

Figure 2.2: Paisible, *Sonata No. 5*, iv, *Presto*, bars 30–40
John Baston

John Baston first appears in records from a newspaper advertisement on the 25 August 1709, where a ‘a Concerto Grosso by Mr Baston's two Sons’ was played.\(^8^0\) Details about his birth and early life are not known. ‘Mr Baston’s two sons’ were John Baston, who was a cellist and recorder player, and Thomas Baston, who was a violinist. John (the younger) and Thomas Baston appeared in two benefit concerts for themselves on 20 December 1711 at Coachmaker’s Hall, and 8 December 1712, at Stationer’s Hall. After Lincoln’s Inn Fields opened in December 1714, John and Thomas Baston performed regularly there, and John Baston remained at Lincoln’s Inn Fields until 1722. Following Paisible’s death in 1721, John Baston switched his employment to the Drury Lane theatre, where he remained until at least 1733.

One item of information about Baston that is seemingly not included in any other biographical account, is that in February 1730, Baston was briefly released by Drury Lane theatre. The treasurer of Drury Lane, Castleman, was told in a memo on 28 February 1730 to ‘Enter Signor Cattaneo at 3s 4d per Diem in the Band of Musick – and discharge Mr John Bastion from any further attendance from this day.’\(^8^1\) This was presumably for bad behaviour, because in another roster memo to the treasurer on 14 March 1730, he is ordered to reinstate ‘Baston’ at his former salary on the agreement of good behaviour, in place of a ‘Mr Doily’, who died of consumption ‘last Tuesday’.\(^8^2\) Any dispute between Baston and the theatre was presumably resolved quickly, because Baston performed again on the Drury Lane stage in April 1730. The last record of John Baston is on 28 August 1739, where he was one of the original subscribers to the Royal Society of Musicians.\(^8^3\) He does not appear in any more newspaper advertisements after May 1733, and it is not known how or when Baston died.

\(^8^0\) *The Daily Courant* – Issue 2444, 24 August 1709.
\(^8^1\) Roster memo, Drury Lane, February 1730 – Harvard Theatre Collection (from: Milhous and Hume (eds.), *Register of English Theatrical Documents, 1660-1737*, 750).
\(^8^2\) Roster memo, Drury Lane, March 1730 – Historical Society of Penna (Ibid., 750).
\(^8^3\) *A Biographical Dictionary of Actors, Actresses, Musicians…*, Vol. 1, 376.
Baston’s compositions for recorder

The only composition by Baston that survives today is his set of *Six Concertos in Six Parts for Violins and Flutes*, published by Walsh & Hare in 1729. These are discussed in detail in Chapter 3.

Luis Mercy

Luis Mercy (sometimes, Merci) appears only once in newspaper advertisements playing a recorder concerto: on 13 February 1719, Mercy played a ‘Concerto and Solo for the Flute’ in a concert in the Hickford’s Room.84

Luis Mercy first appears in records in an advertisement for a concert in Epsom on 26 July 1708, ‘being the second time of his performance in public, since his arrival in England.’85 Mercy is described by John Hawkins as an ‘Englishman by birth, though his name imports him to have been of French extraction.’ Hawkins includes a footnote where he also says that Mercy ‘seems to have been fearful of being mistaken for a Frenchman, for in the titlepage of one of his publications he styles himself di Nazione Inglesa.’86 Hawkins calls Mercy ‘a celebrated performer on the flute abec, and an excellent composer for that instrument.’ He continues: ‘Mercy lived at the time when the flute was becoming an unfashionable recreation for gentleman, and the German flute was growing into favour…’87 According to Hawkins, Mercy was involved with the proposal of Thomas Stanesby Jr. to make the tenor recorder, and not the alto, the standard size, as a way to counter the recorders declining popularity over other instruments. Mercy certainly had a real passion for the recorder. In the preface to his Op. 1 collection of recorder sonatas, published by Walsh & Hare in 1718, he defends the recorder over the violin, describing the recorder as being just as ‘capable of doing hard things as the violin’. Mercy described the recorder as a:

> very commodious instrument, always to be carried about you, and although soft, yet loud enough to be heard in consort and among twenty instruments; besides, never out of tune, nor can you stop well out of tune, and all your divisions are clean and pleasing to the ear, and never grating on the high

84 The Daily Courant – Issue 5398, 19 February 1719.
87 Ibid.
notes – that is, by being stopped out of tune, as they often are on the violin, although played by good masters, for there are few that stop clean.\textsuperscript{88}

Mercy composed his Op. 1 sonatas at Cannons (house), under the service of James Brydges. The sonatas are dedicated to Bridge, ‘under whose roof they were composed’. Other instrumentalists to play at Cannons included Jean Christian Kytch, who also appears below as another named recorder concerto performer. Mercy’s whereabouts and employment are not recorded after he left Cannons in 1720, though he did get married in July 1730.\textsuperscript{89} He appeared in a benefit concert for himself at York Buildings on 1 April 1735, where he played some of his own compositions. He does not appear in any other advertisements after this date.

**Mercy’s compositions for recorder**

There are no manuscripts of Mercy’s compositions surviving today; what does survive are publications. Mercy’s Op. 1 collection of *Six Solos for a Flute with a Thorough Bass for the Harpsichord or Violoncello* was published by Walsh and Hare in 1718. In 1720, Walsh & Hare published Mercy’s Op. 2 collection *2d Solos, for a Flute & a Bass*. Mercy himself also published a set of six sonatas for bassoon or cello around 1735 (Op. 3), and around ten years later, a set of six sonatas for transverse flute (which were also labelled as Op. 3). According to John Hawkins, Mercy additionally published ‘twelve Solos, the first six whereof are said to be for the Traverse-Flute, Violin, or English Flute, according to Mr. Stanesby’s new System…’,\textsuperscript{90} though these do not survive today. Hawkins also mentions that in the publication of these sonatas Mercy once again defends the recorder, but this time against the transverse flute. Hawkins states that: ‘Mercy… makes a comparison between the flute abec and the German flute, and asserts the former of the two is best in tune, and in other respects to be preffered.’\textsuperscript{91} These later sonatas of Mercy also do not survive today.

\textsuperscript{88} Mercy’s *Six Solos for a Flute with a Thorough Bass for the Harpsichord* (Walsh & Hare, 1718)
\textsuperscript{90} Hawkins, *op. cit.*, 364.
\textsuperscript{91} Ibid.
Jean Christian Kytch

Jean Christian Kytch [a large number of variations of spelling, including Keitsch, Kitch, Kaeyscht etc.] appears in three newspaper advertisements of recorder concerto performances: in the Hickford’s Room on 7 May 1719; in the Lincoln’s Inn Fields theatre on 9 May 1721; and at the Haymarket on 10 May 1731.

Kytch arrived in England, probably from the Netherlands, sometime around 1706 or 1707. Kytch was a woodwind specialist, and clearly a man of many instrumental talents. He played bassoon at the Kings theatre between 1709 and 1711, eventually becoming the first bassoon there, and he appeared regularly in various newspaper advertisements in concertos and solos on the oboe, recorder, (transverse) flute and ‘double curtell’ (this was probably a bassoon). At some point, he also became first oboist at the King’s Theatre (a concert at Hickford’s Room, on the 16 April 1729, was advertised as ‘For the Benefit of Mr. Kytch, First Hautboy to the Opera’). Kytch was also a member of the instrumental musicians at Cannons between 1719 and 1720, and was employed as an oboist for some of Handel’s Chapel Royal music between 1722 and 1726. Kytch was clearly very well respected, and also very active as a freelance musician. Charles Burney stated that Kytch played at ‘two or three private parties of an evening to play opera songs, etc. which he executed with exquisite taste and feeling.’

His life ended in very sad circumstances. He was found dead one morning in 1737, and after observing his poor living conditions, and the destitution of his two sons, Michael Christian Festing and Maurice Greene decided to raise a subscription for their benefit. This was the initial act which subsequently grew into the Royal Society of Musicians (a ‘Fund for the Support of Decayed Musicians or their Families’), a society which eventually provided great assistance to a number of musicians and their families in financial difficulty. Handel, who would probably have known Kytch well, was very sympathetic to the society. He became a founding member, and through public concerts, raised large amounts of money for the society. He eventually left the society £1000. In the introduction to the governance of the Royal Society of Musicians, Kytch is described as someone who ‘neglected his family then himself, consequently he became totally

93 The Daily Post – Issue 2982. 11 April 1729.
94 Burrows, Handel and the English Chapel Royal, 548.
96 Matthews, ‘Handel and the Royal Society of Musicians’, 79.
incapable of appearing before any respectable assembly; and at last, one, morning, he was found dead in St. James’s Market.\textsuperscript{97}

Kytch was not known to be active as a composer, and no compositions by Kytch survive today.

**Lewis Grano [Granom]**

A ‘Mr. Grano’ performed a ‘Concerto on the Little Flute’ at the Haymarket, on 11 May 1722.\textsuperscript{98} The ‘Mr. Grano’ mentioned here is Lewis Granom (since the concert was for the benefit of a Mr L. Granom). Lewis Granom was the younger brother of Johann Granom (John Baptise Grano), who also, confusingly, appeared regularly in newspaper advertisements as ‘Mr. Grano’. Lewis was possibly taught trumpet and flute by his elder brother.\textsuperscript{99} Whilst John retained the original spelling of Grano, Lewis (and his sisters) at some point added an \textit{m} to their surname.\textsuperscript{100} Lewis Granom did not appear in as many newspaper advertisements as his brother, but on the occasions that he did (and where it is obvious the Grano in question was Lewis rather than his brother), he nearly always played on the trumpet or the ‘German flute’. His first appearance in a newspaper advertisement was at his own benefit concert, already mentioned, at the Haymarket on 11 May 1722. In this concert he performed a trumpet concerto, a solo on the transverse flute, and a concerto on the little flute. This is the only reference to a performance by him on the recorder in newspaper advertisements.

After this initial concert, Lewis Granom did not appear again in newspaper advertisements until the 4 January 1729, when ‘L. Granom’s Weekly Concerts of Music’ were advertised, and to be ‘continued every Saturday successively.’ However, no more advertisements for this concert series were placed. This concert series was started by Lewis Granom in the middle of the eighteen months that John Grano was imprisoned in Marshalsea prison (from May 1728 until September 1729), where he famously kept a diary. Lewis maintained contact with his brother whilst John was in prison, and visited with clothes, music and musical instruments.\textsuperscript{101}

\textsuperscript{97} A Biographical Dictionary of Actors, Actresses, Musicians..., Vol. 9., 86.
\textsuperscript{98} The Daily Courant – Issue 6412. 10 May 1722.
\textsuperscript{99} Ginger (ed.), Handel’s Trumpeter - The Diary of John Grano, 24, [GL 1449].
\textsuperscript{101} Ginger, \textit{op. cit.}, 98.
Lewis Granom lived a long life (around 80 years), through three marriages and many children (Maurice Byrne originally thought there were two Lewis Granom’s, father and son, but his revised opinion is that it is more likely only one musician).\(^{102}\) Lewis Granom’s name does not appear in newspaper advertisements after 1730. However, although he stopped performing, he became an active composer. He left behind a substantial amount of music for the flute (of the transverse variety), and several songs. His Op. 1, twelve sonatas for ‘flauto traversiere solo’ was published in December 1742. In 1766, he published a treatise on *Plain and Easy Instructions for Playing the German Flute*, a fourth edition of which was published in 1772.\(^{103}\)

**John Jones**

‘Mr. John Jones’ played a ‘Concerto on the Small Flute’, at the end of the second act of the play *The Tragedy of Mariamne* at Lincoln’s Inn Fields on 30 April 1726.\(^{104}\) There are no other advertisements of a Jones playing on the recorder during this period. John Jones is a very common name, and there were many musicians with the same name active during this period, making it difficult for researchers to, so to speak, keep up with all the Joneses.

There was an instrument maker and publisher called John Jones active during this period, who seemed to publish quite a lot of recorder music. An advertisement in *The Daily Post* on 8 December 1719 by Jones lists 'The Yearly Subscription; or, The Harmonious Entertainment, a collection of songs transposed for the flute, and figured for the harpsichord’, and ‘New Sonata's for the Flute and Base’.\(^{105}\) This could possibly be the same Jones as the performer of the small flute concerto, though there is no way of telling.

Another possible Jones is the violinist ‘Mr. Jones’, who performed a ‘Solo on the Violin’ in a concert at the York Buildings on 12 March 1728.\(^{106}\) John Baston also performed in this concert (performing a ‘Concerto for the Little Flute’). Three years later, on 5 July 1731, a ‘Mr. Jones’ put on a benefit concert for himself at the Long Room

\(^{102}\) Ginger, *op. cit.*, 245.

\(^{103}\) For a detailed study of Lewis Granom and his music, see Helen Crown’s thesis ‘Lewis Granom: His Significance for the Flute in the Eighteenth Century’ (2013).

\(^{104}\) *The Daily Post* – Issue 2059. 30 April 1726.

\(^{105}\) *The Daily Post* – Issue 57. 8 December 1719.

\(^{106}\) *The Daily Post* – Issue 2643. 12 March 1728.
in Enfield, where he performed ‘several Concertos and Solo’s for the Violin’. Also performing in this concert was again John Baston (again performing a ‘Concerto for the little Flute…’).\textsuperscript{107} If both of these concerts involved the same violin-playing Mr Jones, then he likely would have known John Baston (since he performed at his benefit concert). Perhaps it was Baston who guided ‘Mr. John Jones’ in learning a ‘Concerto on the Small Flute’? We can, of course, only speculate about this.

\textbf{Jacob Price}

On 11 June 1730, at the newly opened theatre in Goodman’s Fields, Jacob Price, who had ‘never perform’d in publick before’, played ‘a new Concerto on the Flute to be play’d on the Stage’.\textsuperscript{108} As he appears in no other advertisements after this date, perhaps he never performed in public again? I have found no other records or information about Jacob Price.

The opening of the theatre at Goodman’s Fields provided additional competition for the two original patent theatres, and it had a big effect on London’s theatrical life. An article in the \textit{Daily Courant} on 25 December 1732, after lamenting the ‘present declining State of the Stage’, noted the difficulty of increased competition from Goodman’s Fields.\textsuperscript{109} John Baston, at Drury Lane, performed a number of concertos on the recorder in April and May of 1730 (on 25 April, 2 May, and 4 May). Perhaps Price was asked by Goodman’s Fields to perform a recorder concerto on the stage in June 1730, to encourage the audience away from Baston and Drury Lane.

\textsuperscript{107} \textit{The Daily Post} – Issue 3679. 3 July 1731.
\textsuperscript{108} \textit{The Daily Courant} – Issue 8946. 11 June 1730.
\textsuperscript{109} \textit{The Daily Courant} – Issue 5214. 25 December 1732.
Introduction

This chapter focuses on an examination of all sources of ‘English’ recorder concertos, both in published and manuscript form. The published sources include the three collections of solo (and double) recorder concertos by John Baston, William Babell and Robert Woodcock, published by John Walsh at the end of 1720s, as well as a set of concertos for ‘…4 Flutes’ by Johann Christian Schickhardt, published by Walsh in 1719. The published arrangements for recorder of Corelli’s Op. 6 Concerti Grossi are also briefly considered. The manuscript sources include a concerto by Giuseppe Sammartini, two concertos by Charles Dieupart, as well as a disputed work by Handel or ‘Montenari’.

It is worth mentioning that ‘English’ here is taken to mean any recorder concerto that was likely either written or published in England. The term ‘foreign’ composer is not a useful distinction here, since many musicians living and working in eighteenth century England were foreign-born. An example of this distinction causing problems is shown by Owain Tudor Edwards’s inventory and thematic catalogue *English Eighteenth-Century Concertos*, published in 2004.¹ This work is specifically a ‘register of concertos by British composers published in the eighteenth century’; and it therefore ignores all music published in England by foreign composers, even if they lived for a substantial length of time in Britain.² This is a severely limiting factor, clearly leaving out a large chunk of music that was a very important element of the English eighteenth-century concerto. Additionally, the catalogue also gives a rather misleading picture of the eighteenth-century recorder concerto. Edwards lists 52 concertos in total for one or two recorders, made up of the published concertos by Babell, Baston and Woodcock (17 concertos in total for the recorder), and then 35 concertos by William Corbett (*Le Bizzarrie Universali in Seven Parts*, 1742). This is misleading, because the recorder is

² Ibid., 2.
simply listed as one of many possible instruments in Corbett’s many concertos (in that sense, they are not really recorder concerto)s). Furthermore, Edwards does not include any of the manuscript recorder concerto}s mentioned above.

Douglas Macmillan, in 2006, published a brief article in the Consort journal titled ‘The Small Flute Concerto in 18th-Century England’, [GL 146]. It provides a relatively useful overview for the casual reader, but little else. Further insights into the Babell, Baston and Woodcock concerto}s are given by Richard Maunder in his study The Scoring of Baroque Concertos [GL 147], and by Lasocki in ‘Professional Recorder Players in England, 1540-1740’ [GL 184]. This chapter considers the music and musical sources of English recorder concerto}s as a whole, providing some further insight into this repertoire. It is a repertoire that has been convincingly explored by modern performers, and a number of notable recordings are worth mentioning here. Michael Schneider and Cappella Academica Frankfurt’s recording The Virtuoso Recorder III (CPO, 2015) is an invigorating recording, and includes concertos by Babell, Baston, Woodcock and Dieupart. Anna Stegmann and Ensemble Odyssey recently recorded all of Babell’s small flute concerto}s (Pan Classics, 2016), and Flautando Köln produced a complete recording of all six of Schickhardt’s 6 Concertos for 4 Flutes (Ars Musici, 2009). Particularly worth exploring is Dan Laurin’s Entertainments for a Small Flute (BIS, 2000), which includes a sublime recording of Sammartini’s concerto. Other concerto}s in the recording include delicate slow movement ornamentation, with Laurin clearly absorbing the English ornamentation examples given by Babell, discussed later in this chapter.

4 There is also a brief but useful article by Peter Holman on English recorder music – ‘Recorder Music in England c1680-1730’, Early Music Performer, (No.4, Winter, 2000, [GL 1989].
Published Recorder Concertos

William Babell

William Babell was born in London in 1690, and died in 1723, at the early age of 33.\(^5\) His father, Charles Babel was also a musician, who, according to Hawkins in his *A General History of the Science and Practice of Music* (1776), ‘played the bassoon at Drury-lane theatre till he was eighty years of age’.\(^6\) William was predominantly a harpsichord player, but also a competent violinist. From November 1718 until his death, he was also the organist of All Hallows Bread Street. He achieved a great reputation as a harpsichord player, particularly for his virtuosic arrangements. Hawkins fondly remarked that Babell ‘succeeded so well… as to make from it a book of lessons which few could play but himself, and which has long been deservedly celebrated.’\(^7\) Hawkins also reported that ‘It seems the fame of Babell’s abilities had reached Hamburgh, for Mattheson says he was a pupil of Handel’, but he goes on to say this is mistaken ‘for Handel disdained to teach his art to any but princes.’\(^8\) Babell did not impress all however. Charles Burney, in his *A General History of Music* (also published in 1776), thought that Babell:

\[\text{acquired great celebrity by wire-drawing the favourite songs of the opera of Rinaldo, and others of the same period, into showy and brilliant lessons, which by mere rapidity of finger in playing single sounds, without the assistance of taste, expression, harmony or modulation, enabled the performer to astonish ignorance, and acquire the reputation of a great player at a small expence … Mr Babell … at once gratifies idleness and vanity.}\(^9\]

Babell’s Six ‘Concertos in 7 Parts’

William Babell’s set of six recorder concertos (*Concertos in 7 Parts: The First Four for Violins and One Small Flute and the Two Last for Violins and Two Flutes…*) was published posthumously in 1726 by Walsh & Hare. In 2007, a short article by Zöe

\(^5\) According to Hawkins, in a first edition of his ‘General History’, ‘Babell died a young man, about the year 1722, having shortened his days by intemperance.’ Interestingly, Hawkins alters this paragraph in the revised edition of his *General History*, removing any reference to ‘intemperance’.


\(^7\) Ibid.

\(^8\) Ibid.

\(^9\) Gifford and Best, ‘Babell, William’, *Grove Music Online*. 
Franklin appeared in the *Consort* journal, titled *William Babell’s Concertos in 7 Parts* [GL 2003]. This article gives some stylistic insight into Babell’s concertos, but gets somewhat lost in speculation regarding the origins of these concertos, particularly since Franklin does not mention Babell’s connections with James Paisible or John Baston).\(^{10}\)

Babell appeared on a number of occasions in newspaper advertisements as a performer on the harpsichord, where he had contact with the recorder virtuosos James Paisible and John Baston. In a concert at the Hickford’s Room, on 25 March 1713, Babell accompanied on the harpsichord, ‘A Solo on the Echo Flute by Mr Peasible’.\(^{11}\) Babell also appeared in the same concert as Paisible on 27 March 1717 at Stationer’s Hall,\(^{12}\) 3 May 1717 again at Hickford’s Room\(^ {13}\); and 12 March 1718 at the ‘Tennis Court in the Haymarket’.\(^{14}\) Babell was also advertised as playing solos on the harpsichord in entertainments at Lincoln’s Inn Fields theatre: on 26 April 1718\(^ {15}\), and on 1 May 1718.\(^ {16}\) This was during the period when John Baston was employed at Lincoln’s Inn Fields, so Babell would presumably have known Baston as well. Though Babell’s set of six recorder concertos was published three years after his death, David Lasocki notes that at least one of the concertos (and possibly more) could have been written and performed as early as 1714. The catalogue of Thomas Britton’s music collection, sold after his death in 1714, includes ‘12 Concertos by Dr Pepusch, young Mr Babel and Vivaldi’ (a rather impressive compositional company for the ‘young Mr Babel’).\(^ {17}\) The title page to the publication reads: *Babell’s Concertos in 7 Parts: The first four for Violins and one small Flute, and the two last for Violins and two Flutes. The proper Flute being nam’d to each Concerto. Compos’d by the Late / Mr Willm Babell. / Perform’d at the Theatre with great applause*. David Lasocki suggests that the phrase ‘Perform’d at the Theatre’, along with Babell himself playing at Lincoln’s Inn Fields in 1718, gives the possibility that Babell’s concertos may have been written specifically for John Baston.\(^ {18}\)

Another possibility is that some of Babell’s concertos were actually written for Paisible, rather than Baston. Babell clearly performed quite a few times in concerts with

---

\(^{10}\) Franklin, ‘William Babell’s *Concerto in 7 Parts*’ (*Consort* 63, 2007), 62-73, [GL 2003].


\(^{13}\) *The Daily Courant* – *Issue 4838*. 23 April 1717.


\(^{15}\) *The Daily Courant* – *Issue 5152*. 26 April 1718.

\(^{16}\) *The Daily Courant* – *Issue 5156*. 1 May 1718.

\(^{17}\) Lasocki, ‘Professional Recorder Players in England 1540-1740’, 427, [GL 184].

\(^{18}\) Ibid.
Paisible between 1713 and 1718, and as noted above, one or more of Babell’s concertos was possibly composed as early as 1714. To take this suggestion further, perhaps Babell’s concertos were composed at different times for both Paisible and Baston to perform: some earlier concertos for Paisible, when Babell was performing in concerts with him, and some later concertos for Baston, once Babell had started working at Lincoln’s Inn Fields. The stylistic evidence of the concertos also seems to fit with this possibility. Richard Maunder suggests that the two concertos of the six which are Vivaldian concertos (No. 1 and No. 4) likely date from c.1715-20; and the other four, which are four-movement concertos, are stylistically earlier, possibly as early as c.1710.¹⁹ Perhaps the later concertos were written for Baston, and the earlier concertos for Paisible?

Included at the beginning of the flute part to Babell’s concertos is a Preface, written by John Walsh. The Preface is a moving eulogy by Walsh about Babell, who was clearly his friend (the obvious emotion in this Preface suggests that Walsh and Babell had a close relationship). The set of concertos was published three years after the death of Babell, who died at the young age of 33. I have included most of the Preface here; it is a powerful tribute, but also highlights the fact that, unlike Charles Burney’s strong criticism, Babell was held in high regard by some:

The Occasion of this Preface, was to congratulate the Harmonious on the Publication of this work, Compos’d by my late lov’d Friend, Mr William Babell.

When the World is so unfortunate to lose an esteem’d Author, the only consolation we have, is the enjoyment of his Works… Harmony is so Universally esteem’d, that to conceal any of his Performances, would be in some measure doing an Injustice to the Public : Burying a Treasure that might be enjoy’d by others without loss to the Donor : and denying him that Beautifull and lasting Monument which his Genius rais’d to him in his Works.

In fine, our Author may justly be Recorded, an Inexhaustible Treasure of Harmony : And, had he lived in Shakespear’s time; we might justly have concluded him the Occasion of the followings Lines

If Music be the Food of Love, play on:  
That Strain again, It had a dying Fall:

¹⁹ Maunder, Scoring of Baroque Concertos, 119, [GL 147].
Maunder thinks that specifically Babell’s concertos No. 5 and No. 6 from the set were the earliest composed, and stylistically could date from as early as c.1710.
Oh! it came o’re my Ear like a sweet Sound
That breathes upon a Bank of Violets
Stealing and giving Odours.\textsuperscript{20}

The first four of Babell’s six concertos are written for ‘Violins and one small Flute’ - the small flute in question being the ‘sixth flute’. The last two concertos of the set are written for ‘Violins and Two Flutes’ – the fifth concerto is written for two ‘sixth flutes’, and the sixth concerto for two ‘concert flutes’ (two alto recorders). The practice in England at the time was to treat the ‘sixth flute’ as a transposing instrument, with the alto recorder fingering system as standard. By writing the recorder part a third higher, the recorder player plays the part as if fingering an alto recorder, and the sixth flute will sound in the correct key.\textsuperscript{21}

The concertos in Babell’s set are divided into two styles: two of the concertos are in three movements, with a ritorne first movement, and heavily influenced by the ‘Venetian’ concerto (No. 1 and No. 4); the other concertos are instead all in four movements (No. 2, No. 3, No. 5 and No. 6). The three-movement concertos, Nos. 1 and 4, open with first movements that begin almost identically: a unison rising major scale ending in an octave quaver leap, followed by several bars of driving, stepwise semiquavers.

\textbf{Figure 3.1: Babell, \textit{Concerto No. 1}, i, bars 1-3}

\textsuperscript{20} Babell’s \textit{Concertos in 7 Parts}… (Walsh & Hare, 1726)
\textsuperscript{21} Though using alto fingering for little flute transposition was standard practice, it seems this was not always the case. Francis Dieupart, born in France but settled in England, published his six harpsichord suites in a version for violin or recorder in 1705. Suite Nos. 5 and 6 mention a fourth flute (a descant recorder in B-flat), but the transposition given by Dieupart only works if the performer uses the soprano fingering system, rather than the alto. For further information, see: Lasocki, ‘The C Recorder in the 18\textsuperscript{th} Century’, 20, [GL 278].
Both first movements are in ritornello-form, though No. 4 is structurally the more interesting of the two concertos. No. 1 essentially utilises only two themes, with the majority of the movement made up of variants of the opening ritornello theme, apart from one interlude of soloistic passagework for the violin in the middle of the movement. No. 4 utilises much more thematic material throughout, and also includes some slightly more progressive harmonic movement away from the tonic in the long solo passages for the recorder and the violin. Table 3.1 and Table 3.2 below outline the ritornello structure of both first movements.

N.B. Solo sections (marked as S) are for solo recorder, unless stated as a section for solo violin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bars</th>
<th>1-12</th>
<th>13-24</th>
<th>25-26</th>
<th>27-35</th>
<th>35-52</th>
<th>53-60</th>
<th>61-64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ritornello / Solo</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>S3 (violin)</td>
<td>S4</td>
<td>R3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I → V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>I → vi (III V)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic</td>
<td>M1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>M1&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>M1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>M1&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>M1&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>M1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Timeline of Babell’s *Concerto No. 1* – first movement (D major)
The opening ritornello theme is here repeated by the recorder solo in bar 13, where it moves towards the dominant at the reintroduction of the ritornello in bar 25. This brief foray away from the tonic is cut unexpectedly short, and is followed by another short ritornello motif by the solo recorder in the home key again. At bar 35, the violin introduces some new step-wise passagework which, every other bar, the recorder ‘comments’ on, before the movement ends with the opening motto one final time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bars</th>
<th>1-7</th>
<th>8-15</th>
<th>16-22</th>
<th>22-44</th>
<th>42-44</th>
<th>44-69</th>
<th>70-88</th>
<th>89-95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ritornello / Solo</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>S3 (violin)</td>
<td>S4</td>
<td>R5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V → I</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V (IV iv) →</td>
<td>A →</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>M4(^a)</td>
<td>M4(^b)</td>
<td>M1(M2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2: Timeline of Babell’s *Concerto No. 4* – first movement (D major)

In comparison, *No. 4* has a more developed structure to *No. 1*. As can be seen from the tables, *No. 1* is predominantly based around the initial melodic motto throughout the movement (M1\(^a\), M1\(^b\) etc.), whereas *No. 4* instead utilises more varied melodic mottos throughout (M1, M2, M3 etc.). In *No. 4*, the recorder does not enter until bar 8, where it holds a long trill. The opening ritornello motto is returned to in bar 16, this time in the dominant. The first extended recorder solo offers inventive passagework, until the strings offer a brief return to the opening material in the home key. At bar 44, the violin introduces a new motto (based around five repeated quavers) which eventually moves through a number of keys, and this motto is then reiterated (and expanded) by the solo recorder at bar 70. The final seven bars of the movement attractively combine the opening ritornello motto [M1] in the violins and bass, with the second motto [M2] in the recorder line (the trill figure).
Babell’s four-movement concertos (Nos. 2, 3, 5 and 6) share several similarities with each other. They all correspond to the slow-fast-slow-fast movement structure, with the fourth movements usually dance movements (though no dance is actually indicated in the movement title). In No. 2, Babell only uses the recorder in the third and fourth movements of the concerto (the first two movements are for strings only). No. 5 and No. 6 are both written with a different sound and texture in mind than the other concertos in the set. No. 5 (for two sixth flutes), renames the violin parts as ‘Violino or Hautboy Primo’ and ‘Violino or Hautboy Secondo’ (the other concertos in the set do not mention the oboe). This scoring for two recorders and two oboes brings to mind Pepusch’s Op. 8 set of concertos for two recorders, two oboes and basso continuo. This set was published by Roger in Amsterdam in 1718, though the concertos would have been known in England in the early 1710’s. According to Hawkins, in the revised edition of his General History of Music, Babel was actually instructed by ‘Dr. Pepusch in the practice of Composition’.22 Perhaps No. 5 was therefore the earliest composed concerto

22 Hawkins, A General History…. II, 826.
of the six in the set (c.1710), with Babell inspired by Pepusch’s slightly unusual scoring of two recorders and two oboes? No. 6 ends the set as the only piece not written for a sixth flute(s); it is instead written for two ‘concert flutes’ (alto recorders).

A number of the slow movements in the set contain some written out ornamentation. For example, in the second movement Adagio of No. 1, bars 5–8 contain some rather sudden scalic ornaments, which embellish the spacious, lingering melody (Figure 3.4). This ornamentation is short lived, and the final 16 bars are completely unornamented.

![Figure 3.4: Babell, Concerto No. 1, ii, Adagio, bars 1-9](image)

The fact that this ornamentation is only included in 4 bars worth of music, and the final 16 bars are without any ornamentation whatsoever, suggests that Babell was perhaps giving the recorder player an example of possible ornamentation, and that the recorder player should therefore include some of their own additional ornamentation in the rest of the movement. Babell clearly appreciated ornamentation in his slow movements. In 1725, a year before the publication of this set of concertos, John Walsh published Babell’s ‘Twelve Sonatas for a Violin or Oboe...’. The title page to this publication
announces that the sonatas include ‘proper Graces adapted to each Adagio, by the Author.’ Some of the Adagios from this set are written with substantial ornamentation by Babell (for example, see Figure 3.5 below). This suggests that Babell would likely have wanted further ornamentation by the performer throughout the slow movements of his recorder concertos.

![Figure 3.5: Example of embellishments in slow movements of Babell’s ‘Twelve Sonatas for a Violin or Oboe…’ Sonata VIII, i, bars 1-6](image)

Throughout all of Babell’s four-movement concertos in this set, there is much similar step-wise passagework between the solo violin and recorder(s), and the use of a relatively limited harmonic language. The concertos are all well-formed, but lack variety. The similarity between all four of these concertos does give some weight to Burney’s criticism of Babell (‘without the assistance of taste, expression, harmony, or modulation’), though the three-movement concertos (No. 1 and No. 4) do somewhat restore Babell’s reputation.

**Robert Woodcock**

Until the fascinating and detailed research article of David Lasocki and Helen Neate, there was little concrete information regarding the life of Robert Woodcock. There is a very brief account of Woodcock from Hawkins’ *History of Music*, though unfortunately

---

23 Babell’s *Twelve Sonatas for a Violin or Oboe*... (Walsh & Hare, 1725)

for an entry under the name Robert Woodcock, it actually gives more information about Robert’s brother, Thomas:  

Robert Woodcock, a famous performer on the flute, composed twelve concertos, so contrived, as that flutes of various sizes, having the parts transposed, might play in concert with the other instruments. He had a brother named Thomas, who kept a coffee-house at Hereford, an excellent performer on the violin, and played the solos of Corelli with exquisite neatness and elegance. In that country his merits were not known, for his employment was playing country-dances, and his recreation angling. He died about the year 1750.

David Lasocki draws attention to a much more detailed account of Robert Woodcock, which survives within forty volumes of notes made by the engraver George Vertue (1684-1756). Vertue describes Woodcock as:

An ingenious gentleman lover of the arts of painting and music, and professor. In his youthful day he had a mighty inclination to drawing, particularly sea pieces... Besides this, his great genius to music which[he] studied at times so as to compose pieces of music of many parts for several instruments, that are well approved of by masters of music, playing a part himself. Still, painting had the greatest share of his affection, and about 1723 he took to practice in oil colours.

After Woodcock’s death, Vertue further added:

He was very skilful in music, had judgment and performed on the hautboy in a masterly manner, there being many pieces, some published, and much approved by skilful masters in that science.

The only surviving pieces of Woodcock today are the published concertos. This means, from Vertue’s notes, that there must be quite a few other pieces that do not survive today. Woodcock was also well-known as a painter, particularly as a marine painter, and several of his paintings survive today, many of which are housed at the National Maritime Museum, Greenwich.

---

25 Though it is worth noting here that this relationship could be misattributed by Hawkins: Robert Woodcock senior mentions only one son (Robert Woodcock junior) in his will of 1710.
26 Hawkins, A General History…, II, 826.
Vertue also leaves us with some further general biographical information regarding Woodcock. He was born in 1690, had ‘till lately a place or clerkship in the Government which he has left and now professes himself painter’, and died of gout ‘in the prime of his age (about 37), 10th April 1728, and buried at Chelsea’.29 He requested in his will that he be buried at Chelsea Old Church, ‘as near to my dear father there as may be.’30

Woodcock’s ‘Concertos in Eight Parts’

Robert Woodcock’s set of twelve concertos was published by Walsh in 1727, a year after Babell’s concertos. They are titled XII Concertos in Eight Parts, The first three for Violins and one small Flute. The second three for Violins and two small Flutes. The third three for Violins & one German Flute and the three last for Violins & one Hoboy. The proper Flute being nam’d to each Concerto. Compos’d by Robert Woodcock.31

There are therefore six concertos in the collection for one or two ‘small flutes’ (along with three flute concertos and three oboe concertos). The ‘small flute’ in question here is, like in Babell’s collection, also a ‘sixth flute’ (a solo sixth flute in the first three concertos, and two sixth flutes in the second set of three concertos). This is an important collection of English concertos for the woodwind player. Though it was the second set of solo recorder concertos published in England (the first being Babell’s), it was actually

---

28 Attributed to Robert Woodcock. Oil on canvas. Sold at auction at Christie’s in December 2013 (Sale 9726, Lot 478).
29 George Vertue, quoted in Lasocki and Neate, op. cit., 93.
30 Ibid., 95.
31 Woodcock’s XII Concertos in Eight Parts... (Walsh & Hare, 1727)
the first set of flute (transverse) concertos to be published in England, as well as the first oboe concertos to be published specifically by an English composer. As already mentioned, they were published by Walsh and Hare in 1727. Walsh presumably had at least some success with them over the next few years, because advertisements of Woodcock’s music appeared in newspaper advertisements on a number of occasions in the 1730s. Three newspaper advertisements placed by Walsh in 1731 mention Woodcock’s concertos being available to buy: the Grub Street Journal on 21 January 1731, as well as the Daily Journal on 10 February 1731 and February 24 1731. Later, in the Daily Post on 12 July 1732, Walsh included an advertisement which listed concertos available to purchase by ‘the following eminent Authors… Albinoni, Alberti, Babel, Correlli, Corbett, Geminiani, Handel, Schickard, Tessarius, Vivaldi, Woodcock.’ A final advertisement reference to Walsh’s publication of Woodcock occurs as late as 1738. In the London Daily Post on 10 August 1738, and again on 1 September 1738, there is an advertisement for ‘New Musick… Just Publish’d by John Walsh’, which, amongst a great long list of pieces, lists ‘Woodcock’s Concertos’. Here however, they are only listed under the general heading of violin concertos (the recorder is not mentioned at all).

At least one of the concertos (and probably all of them) was composed well before the publication date of 1727. An advertisement in the Daily Post on 12 March 1722 and the Daily Courant on 14 March for an ‘Entertainment of Musick’ at Drury Lane, mentions amongst several other pieces, ‘A New Concerto on the little Flute, compos’d by Mr. Woodcocke, and perform’d by Mr. John Baston.’ There are no further details regarding which specific concerto of Woodcock’s was performed by Baston. Woodcock’s recorder concertos also appear in an advertisement from 1734. At Goodman’s Fields Theatre on 8 May 1734, King Richard the Third was staged, with some additional music: "For the 2nd Musick, a Concerto of the late Mr Woodcock's on the little Flute. For the Third, the 8th Concerto of Corelli.”

32 Grub Street Journal – Issue 55. 21 January 1731.
33 Daily Journal – Issue 3165. 10 February 1731.
34 Daily Post – Issue 3994. 12 July 1732.
36 ‘Babell’s Concertos’ are also included in this advertisement.
Brian Priestman, in an article in 1954, suggested that Woodcock did not actually write the concertos himself. Priestman noted that, in the Brussels Conservatoire library, there are two concerto manuscripts under the authorship of J.B.Loeillet, copied from another manuscript in Rostock. These concertos are in fact duplicates of two of the twelve concerti by Woodcock (No. 3 for sixth flute, and No. 12 for the oboe). Priestman speculates, without much evidence, that ‘Woodcock, when travelling abroad, came across these concerti and brought them back to London and had them printed under his own name.’ Priestman further embellishes the point by asking whether any of the other concerti by Woodcock can also be ascribed to Loeillet, and concludes: ‘This is a problem which time will have to resolve: a thief’s sack may obviously contain items of value from several burgled premises.’

This debate of authorship has now firmly been resolved, in Woodcock’s favour. Lasocki notes that there is no evidence that Woodcock ever travelled abroad; and moreover, performances of individual concertos by Woodcock were advertised well before the publication of the set of concertos. A further point Lasocki mentions, which further discounts Loeillet’s authorship of the second manuscript concerto (the oboe concerto No. 12), is that this concerto also survives in three further manuscripts attributed to George Frideric Handel. This work is not accepted as authentic by Handel scholars, and it is not included in the new thematic index (HWV) of Handel’s works. The Handel scholar Anthony Hicks in his list of works by Handel for *The New Grove* accepts that the composer of this concerto is indeed Woodcock.

One point worth mentioning here is that the Rostock/Brussels Loeillet manuscript of No. 3 has a different slow movement to the printed concerto: the printed slow movement is a *Siciliana* in 12/8, and the manuscript slow movement is a *Grave* in common time. Edgar Hunt, in a letter to Lasocki, suggests that perhaps Loeillet actually had a copy of the Walsh publication of the Woodcock concertos, and though he liked No. 3 enough to give it attention, he substituted the slow movement for one of his own that he preferred. Hunt adds that if Loeillet played the concerto regularly ‘his name would become attached to it’. This leaves us with an output of twelve published concertos which are almost certainly composed by Woodcock, except for one

---

38 Priestman, ‘An Introduction to the Loeillets’, 26, [GL 1455].
39 Hicks, ‘Handel, George Friderich (Spurious Orchestral)’ *Grove Music Online*.
40 Macmillan, ‘A New Concerto, Compos’d by Mr. Woodcock’, [GL 2242].
miscellaneous slow movement from the Rostock/Brussells manuscript of No. 3, which could possibly have been composed by Loeillet, or indeed someone else altogether.

Out of the twelve concertos by Woodcock, Nos. 1 to 9 are all in three movements, whilst Nos. 10 to 12 are in four movements. Since the concertos for recorder make up the first six of the set, all of Woodcock’s recorder concertos are therefore only in three movements. Richard Maunder notes that concerto Nos. 4 - 6 (for two sixth flutes) ‘owe an obvious debt to Albinoni’s concertos for two oboes’. The six Woodcock concertos for the recorder, just like Babell’s collection of concertos, treat the sixth flute as a transposing instrument, with the part written a third higher. Hawkins, in his General History, suggests that this practice of writing parts for small recorders as transposing parts was in fact first introduced by both Woodcock and Babell. Hawkins writes, in a footnote to his chapter on the history of wind instruments, ‘…the method was to write the flute part in a key correspondent to its pitch; this practice was introduced by one Woodcock, a celebrated performer on this instrument, and by an ingenious young man, William Babell…’ It is also interesting to note that Hawkins here describes Woodcock as a ‘celebrated performer’ on the recorder.

The recorder writing in Woodcock’s concertos is certainly not virtuosic, and in the main relatively easy for the amateur enthusiast to play. The range of the recorder writing is interesting. Four of the concertos do not go above an E₆, apart from No. 3 which goes up to an F₆ and No. 1 which goes up to a G₆ (this is in terms of the sixth flute parts, rather than the actual pitch, which is a third lower). This last concerto (in E major, but written in G major in the recorder part) also includes an F#₆ in the ascending scale on the way up to the top G₆ (Figure 3.7). Much has been written about the problems of sounding an F#₆; however, there exist a number of eighteenth-century fingering charts which include a straightforward fingering for the note (indeed, Thomas Stanesby Jr.’s manual A new system of the flute a ’bec, or Common English Flute, published in London in 1732 includes a fingering for F#₆ - 0 13 457). High note fingerings on the recorder are discussed in more detail in Chapter 7.

42 Maunder, The Scoring of Baroque Concertos, 129, [GL 147].
44 Lasocki suggests that, since Woodcock was an amateur, he is the least likely candidate of the well-known recorder players of the time to first introduce this transposition (the other, probably more likely candidates, are Baston, Paisible and Babell). ‘The Life and Works of Robert Woodcock’, 100, [GL 1474].
45 No. 2 up to an E₆, No. 4 and No. 5 up to a D₇, and No. 6 up to an E-flat₆.
Concerto No. 4 is probably the most exciting of the six recorder concertos, with a dramatic, storm-like first movement, opening on repeated semi-quavers in the violins (see Figure 3.8). After 28 bars of turbulence, the two sixth flutes enter in thirds, and the weather seems to momentarily lift, before the repeated note string pattern eventually takes over again (see Figure 3.9).
Unlike some of the other concertos in the English recorder repertoire, the Woodcock concertos have rarely been recorded and performed today. To a certain extent this is understandable: the concertos are not quite as musically interesting, varied, or indeed as virtuosic as some of the other European recorder concertos in the repertoire. Woodcock’s concertos have occasionally received some criticism. Douglas Macmillan, for example, describes them as ‘harmonically, and often melodically… unadventurous.’ This is in part true, especially when compared with some of the more substantial woodwind concertos from Italy and Germany. However, I think when Woodcock’s concertos are considered against the other published wind concertos in England aimed at the amateur market, they stand up well. Woodcock’s concertos are generally very short, but there is much variety between them. They also show moments of great imagination, such as the drama of the opening movement of No. 4 and some of the slow movements in the set, which bring to mind some of the beautifully simple slow movements from Handel’s recorder sonatas (a good example would be Woodcock’s No. 6). It is testament to Woodcock’s skill as a composer that one of oboe concertos in the

---

46 Exceptions to this are the excellent recordings by Dan Laurin of Woodcock Nos. 2 and 3 (Entertainments for a Small Flute. BIS, 2000) and Michael Schneider’s recording of two of Woodcock’s recorder concertos – Nos. 4 and 5 – along with two of his flute concertos – Nos. 8 and 9 (CPO, 2015)

set (No. 12), falsely attributed in a manuscript elsewhere to Handel, was for a while actually considered as Handel’s. This is the same Woodcock who made a living at first from the civil service, and then as a painter (‘till lately a place or clerkship in the Government which he has left and now professes himself painter’). It is pleasing to imagine a cultured man like Woodcock attending the theatre, hearing James Paisible, John Baston and others performing recorder concertos, and deciding to write his own. For a man who was not a professional musician, they are an impressive set of concertos.

**John Baston**

For information on John Baston’s life, see ‘Performers of Recorder Concertos’ in Chapter 2.

**Baston’s ‘Six Concertos in Six Parts’**

John Baston’s set of six concertos, published in 1729, was the last of Walsh & Hare’s publications of recorder concertos. They are titled *Six Concertos in Six Parts for Violins and Flutes viz. a Fifth, Sixth and Consort Flute. The proper Flute being nam’d to each Concerto.*

Three different sizes of recorder are used in this set of concertos. Nos. 1 and 3 are written for ‘Consort Flute’ (alto recorder), Nos. 2, 4 and 5 are written for a sixth flute, and No. 6 is written for the fifth flute. The fifth and sixth flute parts are written as transposing parts (written a fourth higher and a third higher respectively). The ‘Consort Flute’ parts are written at pitch. Therefore, just like in Babell’s and Woodcock’s concerto, the alto fingering system is treated as standard. There are many mistakes throughout Walsh & Hare’s publication, and Richard Maunder thinks this ‘gives the impression that it was put together without the composer’s knowledge.’ Given Baston’s high profile as a performer, it seems unlikely that it was put together without Baston’s knowledge. Nevertheless, there are indeed many mistakes throughout the edition, and it does give the impression of being assembled very quickly. Perhaps this was simply Walsh hastily tapping into the market for recorder concertos, whilst it was

---

48 Maunder, *The Scoring of Baroque Concertos*, 122, [GL 147].

88
still there? As my survey of newspaper advertisements suggests (see Chapter 2), the recorder concerto had a brief resurgence of popularity between 1730 and 1732.

Baston of course appears in a large number of newspaper advertisements as a performer of recorder concertos (he is in fact the most often listed performer in Appendix A), but as early as 1716, he is also in advertisements as a composer. At Lincoln’s Inn Fields theatre on 7 May 1716, there was a ‘Concerto for the Violin and Flute, compos’d by Mr John Baston, and perform’d by him and his Brother…’ 49 Baston was listed as performing a concerto composed by himself a number of other times in 1717. Presumably this would not have been the same concerto every time, so it seems likely that a good number of the six concertos composed by Baston and published in 1729, had already been written by 1716/1717. It is notable that, after 1717, though Baston appears in newspaper advertisements on numerous occasions as a performer, there is only one other occasion where he is listed as specifically performing a concerto composed by himself. On 13 May 1724, at Drury Lane, there was a performance of ‘…a Comedy call’d The Lancashire Witches’, and at the end of the second act was ‘a Concerto on the Stage, composed and performed by Mr. John Baston on the sixth Flute…’ 50 Perhaps Baston’s concerto compositions were not a great success with audiences? If they were, you would expect Baston to have been more regularly advertised as playing his own compositions, particularly as he appeared in so many concerto advertisements as a performer.

Today, Baston’s concertos have received both positive and negative criticism. Richard Maunder wrote that ‘it is a great pity that these attractive concertos for various sizes of recorder were so ill-served by their publisher’. 51 On the other hand, Michael Schneider, in the liner notes to a recording which included Baston’s concerto No. 3, described Baston as lacking ‘the ability to put his musical thoughts into meaningful order’, and that he included the Baston concerto on the recording as a ‘sort of curiosity’. 52 Baston’s concertos themselves are musically the weakest of the English concertos; both clumsily written, and unimaginative. The six recorder concertos are all written in one of three major keys, and there is not even a contrasting concerto in a minor key.

49 The Daily Courant – Issue 4538. 7 May 1716.
50 The Daily Journal – Issue 1029. 8 May 1724.
51 Maunder, The Scoring of Baroque Concertos, 123, [GL 147].
52 Michael Schneider, The Virtuoso Recorder III (CPO, 2015), liner notes, 15.
key (unlike, for example, the E minor recorder concerto by Babell, and the excellent B minor recorder concerto by Woodcock).\(^{53}\)

The structure of several of the concertos in the set is also rather puzzling. Whilst Nos. 1 and 2 are three movement works, No. 4 sounds almost unfinished, in only two movements (a Siciliana followed by an Allegro). No. 3 also has only two movements written, but here a Da Capo is marked after the end of the Adagio second movement, and a pause sign is written at the end of the first movement. This is an indication to play the first movement again as a third movement. More confusingly, No. 5 also has a Da Capo marked, but this concerto is actually a three-movement work (Allegro, Andante, Presto) and the Da Capo is written at the end of the third movement. A pause sign is included at the end of the first movement. This suggests that Baston wants the performers to repeat the first movement again, but this time after the end of the third movement, which would make this concerto technically a four-movement work. The Da Capo marking in this concerto is only written in the Basso Continuo part, and it certainly sounds odd playing a first movement Allegro again after a third movement Presto. Possibly this is simply an editing mistake by Walsh & Hare? Finally, No. 6 is also a two movement concerto (like No. 3), but this time, ‘end with Allegro’ is marked after the end of the second movement, instead of Da Capo. This marking is missing from the recorder part. It is a pity that, for all of Baston’s presumably excellent skills as a performer, he did not combine it with compositional talent.

**Johann Christian Schickhardt**

One solo recorder concerto and one suite by Schickhardt are today found in the Universitetsbibliotek, Carolina Rediviva in Uppsala. Therefore, detailed bibliographical information on Schickhardt’s life is instead included in Chapter 10. Here, I will briefly discuss Schickhardt’s *Six Concertos for 4 Flutes, with a Through Bass for the Harpsichord or Bass Violin*, since they were published in London in 1719 by Walsh & Hare.

Schickhardt regularly moved from city to city, never quite attaining a permanent, prestigious musical position. His employment travels took him to numerous cities in Germany, the Netherlands, Scandinavia, and even London. He had arrived in London

---

\(^{53}\) Baston’s concerto No. 1 is in G major, No. 2 in D major, No. 3 in G major, No. 4 in A major, and Nos. 5 and 6 in D major.
by 1732, as on Friday 10 March 1732 there was a concert at the ‘Three Tuns Tavern’, advertised ‘For the Benefit of Mr. John Christian Schickhard, Lately arrived from Germany’. The concert consisted of ‘…Vocal and Instrumental Musick by the Best Masters’, with ‘…the whole Night’s Entertainment being his own Composition.’

**Schickhardt’s ‘Six Concertos for 4 Flutes’**

Schickhardt’s set of six concertos was first actually published in Amsterdam, by Roger in 1715. The Amsterdam publication is titled ‘*VI Concerts à Quatre Flutes & Basse Continue. Dediez à Monsieur de Brandt Chambellan & Directeur General de la Musique de Sa Majesté le Roy de Prusse*’. The set was published in London four years later by Walsh. Schickhardt’s *Six Concertos for 4 Flutes* are notable since they are part of a very small repertoire of concertos written for many recorders.

Schickhardt’s writing for the recorder in these six concertos is clearly aimed at the musician of relatively modest technical abilities. This is presumably why Walsh decided to publish these concertos in England, since there was a large market for amateur music making during this period. Schickhardt’s excellent knowledge of the recorder is shown by the technical modesty of this concerto. Schickhardt’s recorder writing avoids any keys, difficult leaps, or passagework that does not fit easily under the fingers. Numerous passages in the concertos involve quite a few bars of moving semiquavers, written generally around the easier notes in the ‘home’ keys of the alto recorder. This has the effect of both sounding quite impressive to the audience, but at the same time being relatively easy to play. The range of the recorder parts is also limited throughout the concertos, rarely utilising the very high or low registers of the recorder. The first recorder part only very occasionally rises above a D₆ and below an A₄.

Five of the six concertos are all written in keys with a maximum of one sharp or flat (*No. 1 – C major, No. 2 – F major, No. 3 – D minor, No. 4 – E minor, No. 5 – G major*). This is partly due to, as mentioned, the fingering of quicker passages being generally easier in these keys. But the second point to mention is that ensemble intonation between four recorders is also much easier in those keys. Four recorders playing together
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54 *The Daily Journal – Issue 3488. 9 March 1732.*
55 I have recently found two additional concertos to this repertoire in a collection once belonging to the Harrach family, today housed in the Österreichisches Staatsarchiv in Vienna (A-Wös AVA FA Harrach HS 266). For more information on these concertos, see Chapter 6.
(particularly if the players only have a modest level of technical skill) can produce very problematic intonation issues in keys with more sharps and flats. The one exception out of Schickhardt’s six concertos is No. 6, which is in C minor. This is, in principle, the more difficult concerto of the set, though apart from a tricky fourth movement Gigue, Schickhardt generally manages to avoid writing quicker passages with lots of difficult ‘forked’ fingerings.

Corelli’s (arranged) Op. 6 Concerti Grossi

Before moving on to the English manuscript concertos, it is worth briefly mentioning two further publications of concertos. Corelli never wrote any concertos for the recorder, but two arrangements of his very popular Op. 6 set of concerti grossi were made for the recorder, and published in London and Amsterdam. The first was an arrangement of six concertos (out of Corelli’s original twelve), for two recorders and continuo, by Schickhardt. The concerto arrangements for this set were done in quite an unusual way. Each of Schickhardt’s six concerto arrangements were formed by combining several movements from ten out of Corelli’s original twelve concertos. This was published in Amsterdam sometime towards the end of the 1710’s, and in London in 1720 (republished in 1730).56 A second arrangement of Op. 6 for recorder was made of all twelve concertos (with no rearranging of movements), ‘Transpos’d for Flutes, viz a Fifth, a Sixth, a Consort and Voice Flute; The proper Flute being nam’d to each Concerto and so adapted to the Parts that they perform in Consort with the Violins and other Instruments Throughout, the Whole being the first of this Kind yet Publish’d’. This is by an anonymous arranger, first published in London in 1725, and reissued again in 1730.57

Though concerto arrangements are technically beyond the scope of this thesis (which is limited to concertos written specifically for the recorder), it is worth making a brief exception here for a couple of reasons. The first is that a vogue for Corelli’s music took hold in England during the early eighteenth century, with his Op. 6 especially influential. The original concertos first appeared in England in 1715, and were reissued

56 Corelli, Six Concertos for Two Flutes and a Bass... (Walsh & Hare, 1720).
57 Corelli, XII Concertos, Transpos’d for Flutes... (Walsh & Hare, 1725). This publication was first advertised in The Daily Post on 22 December 1725.
numerous times after that. The second is that the 1725 arrangement of Corelli’s Op. 6 is an arrangement that utilises several different types of recorders (namely, fifth, sixth, ‘consort’ [alto] and voice flutes). The arrangement is really just for two recorders and continuo (the ‘in Consort with the Violins’ mentioned on the title page presumably means that the recorders play violin-esque parts, or even that violins can be added if desired), with concertos I through to VIII written for two alto recorders and continuo, concertos IX, X and XI for two sixth flutes (or voice flutes) and continuo, and concerto XII for two fifth flutes and continuo. It is a well-crafted arrangement of the Op. 6 concertos, with the recorders used effectively throughout; it is also, rather surprisingly, one that is not often performed today, and well worth more of an exploration by modern players. Though small recorders are only used in four out of the twelve concerto arrangements, it is also a useful addition to the small recorder repertoire. The arrangement agreeably combines two particularly popular musical tastes in England during the 1720s: small recorders, and Corelli.

**Recorder Concerto Manuscripts**

It is in the sources of manuscript recorder concertos, rather than the printed editions of Walsh & Hare, that we find the most interesting music in this repertoire. The concertos below (with the probable exception of the ‘Montanari’ concerto, discussed below) were all likely written in England during periods when the composers were working there.

**Giuseppe Sammartini**

The recorder concerto in F major by Giuseppe Sammartini is one of the finest in the whole recorder concerto repertoire; with the possible exception of some of Vivaldi’s concertos, it is likely the most well-known and often played of all recorder concertos today. The manuscript survives as a score in Stockholm, at the Musik- och
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58 For further information of Corelli’s music in England, Peter Allsop provides a useful overview in *Arcangelo Corelli: new Orpheus of our Times* (188-199).

59 The arrangement also happens to be one of the few surviving pieces in the eighteenth-century repertoire which specifically mentions the ‘voice flute’.
teaterbibliothek, and is titled ‘Concerto a piu Istromenti per la Fluta. Di Giusepò S. Martini’.60

Giuseppe Sammartini was born in Milan in 1695, and was the elder brother of composer Giovanni Battista Sammartini. Both Sammartini brothers were listed as oboists in the orchestra of the Regio Ducal Teatro in Milan, in 1720.61 Giuseppe left his brother in Italy, first moving to Brussels, and then eventually to London by 1729. He remained in London until his death in 1750. Giuseppe first appears in newspaper advertisements in London at a concert at Hickford’s Room on 21 May 1729 (‘several pieces on the hautboy by the famous Sig. St. Martini of Milan, just arrived from the court of Brussels’).62 He probably also visited London as early as 1723, because Burney notes that he was the unnamed ‘Italian Master lately arriv’d from Italy’ who played oboe at a concert at the New Theatre in the Haymarket.63 Sammartini played regularly on the oboe in London: in public concerts, and in the orchestra at the King’s Theatre. He also played for Handel, and Sammartini’s name is attached to many of the oboe solos in the opera autographs by Handel.64 Sammartini also became master of music, and oboe teacher to Augusta, Princess of Wales, and her children in 1736, a position he remained in for the rest of his life.65

Sammartini’s reputation as an exceptional player of the oboe grew and grew, and he became known to many as perhaps the best oboist of his day. Hawkins described him thusly:

As a performer on the hautboy… undoubtedly the greatest that the world has ever known. Before his time the tone of the instrument was rank, and, in the hands of ablest proficient, harsh and grating to the ear; by the greatest study and application, and by some peculiar management of the reed, he contrived to produce such a tone as approached the nearest to that of the human voice that we know of.66

Burney also agreed, describing him as ‘the celebrated San Martini’.67 On Sammartini’s death, a report appeared in the *Whitehall Evening Post* on 24 November 1750: ‘Last week died at his Royal Highness, the Prince of Wales, Signior S. Martini, Musick Master
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60 S-Skma (Musik- och teaterbibliothek) – FbO-R
61 Churgin, ‘Sammartini, Giuseppe’, *Grove Music Online*.
64 Churgin, *op. cit.*
to her Royal Highness and thought to be the finest performer on the hautboy in Europe.’

Giuseppe Sammartini was also a very active, and respected, composer. A large amount of his music survives today: RISM lists 241 results of surviving manuscripts and publications. It is predominantly his instrumental music that survives (his main output), but a small amount of vocal music also survives by him. A large number of sonatas for recorder and flute by Sammartini survive today, including seventeen recorder sonata manuscripts today preserved in the Biblioteca Palatina in Parma. Alongside this, there are four further sonatas for recorder(s) found in a collection of the Harrach family manuscripts, most of which is now housed in the New York Public Library (and the rest in the Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, in Vienna). There are six sonatas by a ‘Sammartini’ in the New York Public Library – in the NYPL listings, all six sonatas are actually listed as by G.B. Sammartini. However, this is a mistake, as only the first two of the six sonatas actually refer to Giovanni Battista in the title of the sonata, and the other four specifically mention ‘Giuseppe’ instead. Additionally, there are four manuscripts of Sammartini sonatas for two recorders (‘Sonata à due Flauti’) in the Henry Watson Music Library, in Manchester, which are also printed as flute sonatas in Sammartini’s XII Sonatas for two German Flutes or Violins with a Through Bass.

The majority of Giuseppe Sammartini’s recorder sonatas are very well structured, with moments of drama and expression, often involving quite virtuosic recorder writing. However, the sonatas, to a certain extent, also tend towards a stylistic and harmonic conservatism.

‘Concerto a più Istromenti per la Fluta’

Sammartini’s recorder concerto is almost in complete contrast to the stylistic and harmonic conservatism of his recorder sonatas. The concerto is a complicated and very sophisticated work, utilising a much greater harmonic vocabulary.

Richard McGowan notes that stylistic evidence suggests that some of the seventeen recorder sonatas in the Biblioteca Palatina in Parma date from Sammartini’s early years,
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68 Whitehall Evening Post, 24 November 1750.
70 Henry Watson Music Library (GB-Mp): Ms. 580Ct51 vv.10, 12
in the 1720s, before he left for London.\textsuperscript{71} This seems to be also the case for the four Giuseppe Sammartini sonatas in the Harrach collection – they are all cautious, four-movement works (perhaps even more so than the Parma manuscripts), and suggest Sammartini’s compositional early years. This also corresponds with the dating of the Harrach collection in general (for more detail, see Chapter 6). The recorder concerto, on the other hand, is clearly a much later work than his sonatas, and therefore probably corresponds to around the time of Sammartini’s move to London. As we mentioned earlier, his first appearance in a London concert was on 21 May 1729 (‘several pieces on the hautboy by the famous Sig. St. Martini of Milan, just arrived from the court of Brussels’).\textsuperscript{72}

From the results of my survey of newspaper advertisements, discussed in Chapter 2, we can see that the recorder concerto seemed to have a small resurgence of popularity in newspaper advertisements between 1730 and 1732. This period chimes very nicely with Sammartini’s first appearance on a London stage, in 1729. Perhaps Sammartini, on arriving in London and seeing the popularity of the recorder concerto, decided to write his own? Alternatively, perhaps Sammartini wrote this concerto in 1729 (or even brought it with him to London), and it was actually performances of this concerto itself that caused the recorder concerto to become briefly popular in the theatre and concerts again? We can only speculate, but the piece is of such high quality that it certainly seems possible (though you would expect that if Sammartini’s concerto did achieve great popularity, it would be specifically advertised as being performed in the newspaper advertisements, and it was not). Nevertheless, it does seem likely that Sammartini’s recorder concerto does correspond with the time of Sammartini’s move to London, or slightly after.

Written for a ‘fifth flute’ (descant in C), the concerto itself consists of an \textit{Allegro} first movement, an untitled second movement (really a \textit{Siciliano}), and ends with an \textit{Allegro assai}. The ritornello form first movement has a gallant mood to it, with initial short ritornello sections being replaced later in the movement by more extended, and even virtuosic, solo passages for the recorder. This gallant first movement is in complete contrast to the second movement, which is a movement of great poignancy and expression. The lilting melody of the first eight bars in the first violin is taken over by a

\textsuperscript{71} McGowan, ‘Italian Baroque Solo Sonatas for the Recorder and the Flute’, 356, [GL 1905].

\textsuperscript{72} The Daily Journal – Issue 2609. 19 May 1729.
decorated version of the same melody, in the recorder. This movement is a real high point of the whole repertoire, and perhaps even the best slow movement of all recorder concertos. The final Allegro assai is a spirited and energetic conclusion to the concerto; a gigue in 6/8, though the numerous rhythmic syncopations intentionally mask the gigue character throughout.

Though the concerto does not require the upper echelons of virtuosity that a few other recorder concertos require (such as by Vivaldi, Telemann or Fasch), the recorder line throughout Sammartini’s concerto is quietly virtuosic, and certainly requires a capable player who possesses an advanced technique. The range of the concerto stays generally within the comfortable range of the fifth flute (descant recorder range). It regularly utilises B♭ throughout the fast movements (in the key of the recorder part), but only reaches a C7 on three occasions (in bar 133 of the first movement, and bars 13 and 122 in the third movement). The slow movement generally has a deeper sonority, predominantly sitting within the first octave and a half of the instrument. The longer passagework in the recorder part of the two fast movements produces quite a few moments of fingering difficulty for the recorder player. For example, bars 135 to 154 in the first movement, and particularly also bars 141 to 144, require the possession of a fingering dexterity, to avoid stumbling over the notes there. The third movement especially requires an advanced recorder technique. Bars 45 to 48 (Figure 3.10), 61 to 64, and particularly, the solo passage in bars 100 to 109 (Figure 3.11), all involve sections of tricky fingerwork, making it difficult to play the section cleanly and neatly.

Figure 3.10: Sammartini, ‘Concerto… per la Fluta’, iii, Allegro assai, bars 45-48

Figure 3.11: Sammartini, ‘Concerto… per la Fluta’, iii, Allegro assai, bars 100-109
Apart from the difficult recorder part, what particularly stands out about this concerto is its subtle complexity. There are chromatic touches throughout the concerto, and there are also much bolder harmonic modulations, particularly when compared with the general conservatism and limited harmonic range of Sammartini’s recorder sonatas. The second movement, for example, moves through a range of keys, with even the first 8 bars producing some surprising harmonic progressions. Touches of chromaticism are again present in the final few bars of the recorder solo, before the conclusion in the strings.

![Musical notation](image)

**Figure 3.12: Sammartini, ‘Concerto… per la Fluta’, ii, chromaticism in bars 33-39**

This really is an exceptional concerto, and is a great example of Sammartini’s compositional progression and the development of his recorder writing, from his early sonatas. This progress continued into his concertos for other instruments. Sammartini’s Op. 2 and Op. 5 sets of *Concerti grossi*, first published in 1738 and 1747 (sadly largely neglected by modern performers) are also accomplished works, showing great imagination, and deserving of much wider recognition.
The manuscript of the concerto is currently in Stockholm, Sweden, in the Musik- och teaterbibliothek. Sweden may seem an odd place for the only surviving manuscript of a concerto by an Italian composer living in England. It is in fact part of the ‘Utile Dulci’ (‘Usefulness with pleasure’) collection, with ‘Utile Dulci’ the name of a literary and musical society, active in Sweden from 1766-1795. The exact provenance of this manuscript is not completely known, but in correspondence with the library, it was suggested that the manuscript was in all likelihood copied in England by a member of the Utile Dulci society, and brought across to Sweden with them. The recorder concerto repertoire of Sweden is discussed in detail in Chapter 10.

Out of musical interest, I have played the Sammartini concerto several times on an alto recorder (including twice in concert), rather than on a fifth flute. On an alto recorder, the concerto does not work nearly as well. Admittedly, I have heard and played the concerto for many years on a small recorder before this, so there is perhaps some subconscious bias regarding how I expect the piece to sound. But nevertheless, there seem to be elements of the concerto that are particularly emphasised when played on a small recorder. I think there are three features of small recorders that are key to this: first, it is easier to articulate and finger neatly and quickly on a small recorder (and the fastest top-end speed possible on a small recorder is quicker than on a larger recorder); secondly, air lasts longer on a small recorder (simply due to the size of the instrument), so longer phrases do not need to be broken up by breathing space quite as often; and thirdly, the higher pitch of the instrument makes it more audible to the audience above the strings, and more easily distinguishes it from other instruments in the ensemble. In this concerto, these advantages of small recorders are especially brought to the fore, with the piece being substantially more effective when performed on a smaller recorder than on a larger instrument. That is not to say that small recorders have no downsides over larger recorders (the biggest downside being the loss of the sonorous, vocal-like quality of the lower instruments). However, when the alto recorder is still dominant over other recorders (for reasons predominantly due to repertoire), it is worth emphasising to modern players the advantages that small recorders possess, so that these recorders may be used more often in other musical settings.
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Charles Dieupart

Charles Dieupart [François Dieupart] was born in Paris, possibly in 1667. Dieupart’s *Six suites de Clavessin* (famously copied out by Bach, and supposedly an influence on his English Suites) was published in Amsterdam in 1701, and dedicated to ‘Madame la Comtesse de Sandwich’ (Elizabeth Wilmot, the 3rd Countess of Sandwich, and daughter of John Wilmot, 2nd Earl of Rochester). Elizabeth Wilmot first set off for France in 1697, and it is presumably here that she made contact with Dieupart, likely as his harpsichord pupil. She was renowned for her intellect and learning, and was in contact with many of France’s great intellectual figures of the day. She would therefore have been a very useful contact for Dieupart to make, and perhaps Dieupart came with her on one of her return trips to England. Either way, by the early 1700s, Dieupart had certainly emigrated to London. He first appears in newspaper advertisements for a concert of music at Drury Lane on 11 February 1703, where ‘Visconti plays several of Corelli’s sonatas accompanied by ‘Monsieur Dupar’ [Dieupart]. Dieupart appeared in performances on the harpsichord with both Visconti, and the recorder virtuoso James Paisible. Dieupart and Paisible clearly became friends, because on Paisible’s death in 1721, Dieupart was requested to look after the will of Paisible in France, and collect any money due to Paisible there.

Dieupart worked at Drury Lane for a number of years, and obviously built some authority there, shown by his assistance to the singer Catherine Tofts in a dispute with Christopher Rich over pay and contractual conditions. In 1707, Dieupart was one of a number of musicians who were given leave to ‘perform in the Operas at the Queens Theatre in the Haymarkett’. In fact, Christopher Rich actually dismissed the musicians ‘upon suspicion of being concern’d in the Project of Acting Opera’s in the Haymarkett’. It patently took some effort for the musicians to be allowed to be employed by the Haymarket, because Dieupart wrote a long letter to the Vice
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75 He seemed to be generally known as Charles Dieupart, and Hawkins also refers to him so, though an autograph letter in French is signed as F. Dieupart (Fuller and Holman, ‘Dieupart, Charles’, Grove Music Online).
77 Eger, *Bluestockings Displayed*, 236.
78 *The Daily Courant*. 10 February 1703.
80 Milhous and Hume (ed.), *Vice Chamberlain Coke’s Theatrical Papers*, 29.
82 *Vice Chamberlain Coke’s Theatrical Papers*, 47.
Chamberlain, representing the other performers, complaining about Mr Rich and disputes of reimbursement, and asking that their agreements [to be allowed to join the Haymarket] ‘be made good’. By spring 1708, Dieupart appeared listed amongst the musicians employed at the Haymarket. Clearly the Haymarket was under serious financial strain, because in April 1708, John Vanbrugh sent a letter to the Vice Chamberlain asking for financial subsidy to the opera from the Queen. Vanbrugh also asked Dieupart, alongside two other musicians (Pepusch and Haym) to be paid via profit-shares, rather than by a salary, which the musicians declined. At this point, Dieupart’s salary, per day, was £1 and 5 shillings in early 1708, rising to £1 and 15 shillings per day by 1710. This was quite a far cry from Dieupart’s initial demand, when he asked for £3 per day to play at the Haymarket.

By 1711, Dieupart had left the Haymarket, and had stopped appearing on any roster lists there. He obviously left on bad terms, because on 26 December 1711, a fascinating article appeared in the Spectator, signed by ‘Your most humble Servants, Thomas Clayton. Nicolino Haym. Charles Dieupart’, in which they complained that they had been “all equally set aside in the present Opera”.

The article, which is well worth reading in full, covers a number of issues, but is essentially an attack on the opera they were dismissed from. According to the article, music should:

…aggravate what is intended by Poetry; it must always have some Passion or Sentiment to express, or else Violins, Voices, or any other Organs of Sound, afford an Entertainment very little above the Rattles of Children.

Instead, they thought music currently ran ‘to Ruine by the utmost Barbarism’. They also thought that:

…all Foreigners who pretend to succeed in England to learn the Language of it, as we our selves have done, and not be so insolent as to expect a whole Nation, a refined and learned Nation, should submit to learn them.

The summary of the article is essentially that Italian opera at the Haymarket is ruining music, and that foreign musicians should learn English. As a way to counteract this ‘Ruine’ of music ‘by the utmost Barbarism’, Dieupart and the other two musicians
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mention that they are setting up ‘Entertainments of Musick for the Future at Mr. Clayton’s House in York Buildings’. A follow-up article was published in the Spectator on 18 January 1712. In this article, Dieupart, Clayton and Haym complain that it had been ‘industriously insinuated that Our Intention is to destroy Operas in general’. Instead, their actual purpose was to simply improve ‘the Art which we profess’. They thought music was ‘utterly destroyed at present’, due to ‘the Songs of different Authors injudiciously put together, and a Foreign Tone and Manner which are expected in every Thing now performed…’, and that ‘the Ears of the People cannot now be entertained with any thing but what has an impertinent Gayety, without any just Spirt or a Languishment of Notes, without any Passion or common Sense.’ Their aim for their subscription concerts was not to be ‘for or against the Opera’, but instead to promote ‘their own Diversions in a more just and elegant Manner than has been hitherto performed’. According to Hawkins, these concerts continued for a short time, before Dieupart solely devoted himself to ‘teaching the harpsichord’, and since he was a master of the instrument, ‘had admission to some of the best families in the kingdom.’ Hawkins wrote that Dieupart died ‘far advanced in years, and in very necessitated circumstances, about the year 1740.

Dieupart was also a composer, with some compositions surviving today. He had an interest in the recorder, (or at least, an interest in the large market for recorder music in England during this period), as several of his works include the instrument. Dieupart’s Six suites de clavessin was published in Amsterdam by Roger in two versions: the first for harpsichord, and the second ‘Pour un Violon & flute avec une Basse de Viole & un Archilut’. Suite Nos. 1 – 4 are all intended for ‘flute de voix’ (voiceflute), and Nos. 5 and 6 for ‘flute du quatre’ (fourth flute). Additionally, a set of recorder sonatas by Dieupart (Six Sonatas for a Flute and a Through Bass), was published by Walsh & Hare in 1717.

89 Fuller and Holman, ‘Dieupart, Charles’, Grove Music Online.
90 It has been suggested, since Roger sold and advertised both versions together as ‘Mises in Concert’, that Dieupart actually intended the compositions to be performed on a harpsichord and a violin or recorder. (see: Fader, ‘Let the Buyer Beware - Dieupart’s Six suites de clavessin…’, [GL 2072]).
Dieupart’s ‘Flautino’ Concerto

Dieupart’s concerto for ‘Flautino’ survives in only one manuscript, located in the famous ‘Schrank II’ collection in the Sächsische Landesbibliothek, Dresden.91 It is one of five concertos by Dieupart that today survive in the same library, including a violin concerto in A major, a concerto for two violins in B-flat major, a concerto for trumpet and two oboes in B minor, and a ‘sonata’ in E minor in three ‘Choro’, for strings and two ‘Flauto’ (also discussed below).92

On the title page of the concerto is written (in a separate hand), ‘Flautino, et 4 Violons. Mons: Dieupart’. However, there are actually numerous parts included in the manuscript: two ‘Violino Prim’ parts, one ‘Violino Primo’ part, one ‘Violino I’mo’ part, two ‘Violino 2do’ parts, two ‘Viola’ parts, one ‘Violone grosso’ part, two ‘Cembalo’ parts, one ‘Hautbois Pr.’, one ‘Hautbois 2.’, two ‘Basson’ parts, alongside a ‘Flautino’ part. Additionally, there is also a part titled ‘Flauto o Hautbois’, which is a doubled version of the flautino part. In fact, all of the relevant parts are doubled in this set (for example, the ‘Violino Primo’ part is the same as the ‘Violino I’mo’ part), and the oboe parts are also simply doubled versions of the violin parts. This was very common in the Dresden Hofkapelle, which found fame across Europe for the size and skill of its orchestra.93

The flautino part, unlike the ‘Flauto o Hautbois’ part, is written in the French violin clef, and written a fourth higher. The flautino part was therefore intended for the ‘fifth flute’ (a soprano in C). Interestingly, the flautino part seems to be in a different hand to all of the other parts in the manuscript: the lettering of the part is not quite as florid, and the notes are not as clear (see Figure 3.13 and 3.14). It gives the impression that it was copied at a separate date to the other parts in the manuscript. Since the flautino part is the same music as the ‘Flauto o Hautbois’ part, perhaps the manuscript was originally intended as an alto recorder or oboe concerto, and someone decided at a later date that it would work well on a small recorder (and therefore copied out the part a fourth higher)?

91 Sächsische Landesbibliothek – Staats und Universitätsbibliothek, Dresden: Mus.2174-O-1
92 Mus.2174-O-1 to Mus.2174-O-5
The highlight of this extremely short, three-movement concerto is the sublime second movement. This starts with an unaccompanied flourish in the recorder part (which sounds improvisatory) alternating with staccato strings (and oboes), before ending with a long, sustained and rather mournful melody (Figure 3.15).
‘Sonata’ – ‘Flauti’

This piece has ‘Sonata’ written on the manuscript parts, though on the ‘Schränk II’ title page, it is marked as ‘Concerto. Violini, Flauti, Corni, Viola e Basso… del Sig’ Dieupart.’ There is actually a scoring mistake here, which has arisen from a misreading of the manuscript parts. Written on some of the parts is ‘Choro 1\textsuperscript{mo}’ or ‘Choro 2\textsuperscript{do}’ (for example, ‘Violino 1. Choro 1\textsuperscript{mo}’). This has clearly been misread by somebody as ‘Corno 1’ and ‘Corno 2’ (referring to horns). Therefore, the piece has been incorrectly labelled for ‘Violini, Flauti, Corni’. In fact, there are no horns at all in the piece, and instead, there is an unusual scoring. There are parts for strings in two ‘choirs’ (‘Choro 1\textsuperscript{mo}’ and ‘Choro 2\textsuperscript{do}’), as well as two ‘Flauto’ parts, along with a number of additional string parts. The scoring essentially corresponds to three groups of instruments: the first is for two (alto) recorders, with a cello and continuo; then, ‘Choro 1\textsuperscript{mo}’, with two violins, viola, cello, and continuo; and lastly ‘Choro 2\textsuperscript{do}’ with two violins, viola, violone and continuo. ‘Choro 2\textsuperscript{do}’ also includes two extra violin parts, and ‘Choro 1\textsuperscript{mo}’ includes an extra first violin part. This is a very large number of parts indeed, at seventeen in total.

Surprisingly, for large sections of the sonata (in five movements), all instruments play at the same time. The recorders, for instance, never play on their own in the sonata, but are in fact always doubled by violins from one or more of the ‘choirs’. The recorders are therefore not used as solo instruments here, but simply as extra colours and textures against the huge numbers of string and continuo parts.
It is not clear how both of these concertos by Dieupart, who seemingly spent all of his working life in England, ended up in Dresden. There are numerous references to performances of Dieupart’s concertos in English newspaper advertisements. For example, on 14 March 1722, there was an ‘Entertainment of Musick’ at Drury Lane, including a ‘Concerto with Two Hautboys and Two Flutes compos’d by Mr. Dieupart’.94 On 15 May 1723, there was a performance at Drury Lane, including a ‘Concerto, compos’d by Monsieur Dieupart for Hautboys, Flutes and Violins’.95 And on 11 May 1722, there was a ‘Concerto for the Little Flute composed by Monsieur Dieupart, and performed by Mr. Baston, and others’.96 This could possibly have been a performance of Dieupart’s flautino concerto in A minor discussed above, though the Dresden manuscript of the concerto seems to give the impression that it was originally intended for ‘Flauto o Hautbois’ and the flautino part was included later. Nevertheless, Dieupart’s concertos seem to have been performed a few times in concerts and at the theatre in the early-1720s. This suggests that the concertos in Dresden also date from a similar period, and that they were brought across to Dresden sometime after this; perhaps in the late 1720s?

**Georg Friedrich Handel / Antonio Montanari**

In the Universitätsbibliothek in Rostock, there is a manuscript of a concerto in B♭ major, titled: ‘Concerto à 4. Strom: Flautó Piccolo, 2. Violini e Violoncello. di Sig'Hendl.’ ‘Di: Hendel’ is also written on the ‘Flauto Piccolo’ part.97
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97 D-Rou Mus.Saec.XVIII:3310
A musical incipit of this same concerto also appears in the *Breitkopf* catalogues of 1763, but instead under the heading ‘di Montenari, a *Flaut picc*, 2 *Viol*, *Viola col Basso*.’

The concerto has been published by Carus-Verlag as a soprano recorder concerto by Handel,\(^98\) though it is not included in the HWV thematic catalogue. It was discounted from the HWV catalogue because the themes bore no relationship to any other melodies of Handel, and the scoring is completely out of character with Handel’s other

\(^{98}\) *Concerto in B* – *Georg Friedrich Händel* (Carus-Verlag, 1987, ed. Thailheimer)
instrumental compositions. However, Peter Thalheimer, in the Preface to his edition of the concerto, notes that:

…there are several factors which lend weight to the claim for Handel’s authorship: the scoring and structure clearly share an affinity with the English concertos for “small flute”… The omission of the viola and the voice-leading of violin 2 are strikingly characteristic of English-music of that time.

Thalheimer also argues that ‘the range and writing correspond on the whole to the flauto piccolo parts in Handel’s operas Ricardo I, Rinaldo and Acis and Galathea’.

The concerto has been included in this chapter due to one piece of additional information that Thalheimer does not mention in his Preface. An English newspaper advertisement from 16 May 1718 for a performance at Drury Lane included the intriguing sentence: ‘A Concerto upon the Little Flute by Mr. Paisible, and one intirely new, compos'd by Mr Hendel.’ As I mentioned in Chapter 2, there are two readings of this advertisement: the first is that the performance consisted of a concerto on the little flute performed by Paisible and one entirely new concerto (on any instrument), composed by Handel; and the second is that the performance consisted of a little flute concerto, composed by Paisible, followed by one entirely new concerto also on the little flute, composed by Handel.

So the question remains: is this a concerto by Handel (and potentially composed in England), or instead by ‘Montenari’ (and composed elsewhere)? The advertisement above is too ambiguous to be able to draw any conclusions from. We therefore must look elsewhere. A basic but important thing to mention about Handel is that he generally showed very little interest in the three-movement solo concerto. Handel’s concertos usually consisted of anything from two to six movements, and many of his concertos (particularly his later ones, such as the much-loved Op.6) show an obvious Corellian influence. One of the very few three-movement solo concertos by Handel is his solo violin concerto, HWV 288, likely written in Rome in the early 1700s.

‘Montenari’, mentioned in the Breitkopf catalogue, could refer to one of two people: ‘Francesco Montenaro’, or ‘Antonio Montanari’. There has been some debate as to whether these two people were the same person, though Michael Talbot has suggested
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100 Ibid.
101 The Daily Courant – Issue 5169. 16 May 1718.
102 See, for example: Dunning, ‘Montanari, Antonio’, Grove Music Online.
that the weight of primary documentary evidence for Antonio Montanari along with a number of musical differences between the two, suggests they are different people. Either way, how does this concerto compare with the compositional output of (either) Montanari? Since Francesco Montenaro only has one surviving set of violin sonatas and no concertos, and Antonio Montenari has a number of surviving concertos, we will focus on him. The first point to mention is that though Antonio Montanari’s thirteen surviving solo concertos are predominantly written in a four-movement structure (Montanari was one of the leading violinists working in Rome), three of them are in three-movements. Additionally, Michael Talbot identifies a number of musical features common to many of Antonio Montanari’s sonatas and concertos: ‘a love of high positions [on the violin] and of sequences… and a tendency to keep the bass very simple or to omit it altogether’. In the disputed Handel/Montanari manuscript, we see numerous examples of these last two stylistic features. There are several melodic sequences used in the concerto, particularly in the first movement (for example, Figure 3.18). The bass part is kept extremely simple throughout the whole concerto, generally only utilising crotchets and quavers (apart from the occasional semiquaver passing note); for example, see Figure 3.19. Furthermore, the bass drops out on numerous occasions (in the first movement, bars 23–36 and 61–65; in the second movement, bars 18–24; in the third movement, bars 57–66 and 116–128).

Figure 3.18: Handel/Montanari concerto, i, bars 47-49
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103 Talbot, ‘A successor of Corelli – Antonio Montenari and his sonatas’, 230-245
104 No. 5 from his published Op. 1 set; ‘Sonata a tre’ (GB-Mp, Ms. 580Ct51 vv.7-9, 11-13); and a concerto in Dresden (D-Dl Mus.2767-O-1)
105 Talbot, op. cit., 228.
These very clear stylistic features of Montanari, combined with both a lack of any noticeable Handellian features, along with Handel’s lack of interest in the three-movement solo concerto suggests that the Breitkopf catalogue gave the correct attribution, and this is a work by Antonio Montanari. This work is therefore not an ‘English’ concerto.

The ‘Little Flute’ Concerto

The most significant feature of the English recorder concerto repertoire is its absolute focus on concertos for ‘little flutes’. Nearly all the concertos discussed in this chapter were written for a small recorder, with the only exceptions being two of Baston’s six concertos (for alto recorder), Schickhardt’s Six Concertos (for four alto recorders), and Dieupart’s ‘Sonata’ in E minor (which includes two alto recorders alongside numerous string parts). Why was England seemingly so obsessed with small recorders? To answer this question, we must turn back to the theatre.

Uniquely in England, theatres and theatre musicians had quickly come to rely on audiences to survive. Although members of the upper classes would still often act as ‘patrons’ to the theatre houses, the English theatre orchestras were not actually owned by these patrons. In effect, this meant that theatres survived predominantly through public interest in them, and the money raised from ticket sales. This new, commercial arrangement also had the effect of empowering theatre audiences. The theatre-going
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106 Spitzer and Zaslav, *The Birth of the Orchestra*, 264-265, [GL 150].
audience quickly realised just how important they were to the survival of the theatres, and acted accordingly, happily letting the actors and musicians know when something displeased them. The members of the gallery would often call out for their favourite pieces of music, and occasionally, if the orchestra did not oblige, a particularly boisterous audience was known to throw food and other items towards the orchestra.\footnote{Spitzer and Zaslaw, \textit{The Birth of the Orchestra}, 279.}

English theatres in the eighteenth century were therefore filled with noise. The audience chatted, sang, and occasionally even fought. If a particular piece of music or theatre did not grab them, they were all too happy to entertain themselves by other means. James Boswell, an eighteenth-century biographer and diarist, waiting with a Scottish friend for a Drury Lane performance to begin, wrote that he ‘entertained the audience prodigiously by imitating the lowing of a cow’. The audience took such delight in this that ‘the universal cry of the galleries was “Encore the cow! Encore the cow!”’\footnote{Quoted in: Brewer, \textit{The Pleasures of the Imagination}, 327.}

As we saw in Chapter 2, the recorder concerto was deeply connected to the theatre. Out of the 64 distinct newspaper advertisements for performances of a recorder concerto, 45 were for performances at plays. In 1716 and 1717, when performances of recorder concertos first became popular, all 13 newspaper advertisements were for performances at Drury Lane or Lincoln’s Inn Fields. As mentioned earlier, the little flute has many advantages. It is easier to play long, extended passages without requiring a breath; it is usually easier to play very quickly; and, most importantly of all, its higher pitch means it is much more audible. When trying to be heard over a noisy audience, this is vital, and the higher frequencies of the little flute would have been perfect at carrying over the ranges of chattering human voices. It was this success of the instrument at noisy theatres, combined with the particularly English association as the instrument of ‘gentlemen’, that meant the little flute maintained a presence in English musical life for many years. Even as late as 1753, there was a subscription concert at Five Bells in the Strand, which included, amongst many other things, a ‘Solo on the little Flute by Master Hallet…’\footnote{Public Advertiser – Issue 5943. 12 November 1753.}

The popularity of little flute concertos in England also seems to have had some influence on similar concertos in Sweden: as already mentioned, the surviving manuscript of Sammartini’s concerto seems to have been copied by a member of the Swedish ‘Utile Dulci’ society. Sweden’s interest in little flute concertos is discussed in Chapter 10.
Part II

Italy
The Recorder Concertos of Antonio Vivaldi

The Italian Concerto

A relatively common criticism of the early eighteenth-century Italian solo concerto is that it is a repertoire of music that can often be musically similar, and formally homogenous. A very important study of this repertoire by McVeigh and Hirshberg (The Italian Solo Concerto, 1700-1760) [GL 2234] debunked this idea. From a very extensive sample of the music (over 800 concerto first-movements for one or two solo instruments), they reveal the extraordinary diversity of styles and strategies in these concertos, and attractively describe the early eighteenth-century Italian concerto as ‘not a single river with a number of more or less significant tributaries and backwaters, but a richly varied delta with numerous streams leading off in all kinds of unexpected directions.’

It is generally agreed amongst music historians that the concerto in Italy, as we think of it today, had particular roots in Northern Italy; and in Bologna specifically, where around 1660, composers began writing sonatas (or sinfonias) for one or more trumpets and multiple strings for services in the church of San Petronio. These pieces avoided complex counterpoint, and instead relied on the concertato idea of a musical call-and-response between the trumpet and the strings, bringing both groups together at climatic moments. Perhaps the most important composer of these trumpet and string pieces was Giuseppe Torelli (1658-1709), who went on to compose similar pieces for strings and continuo alone. His Op. 5 collection, ‘Sinfonie à tre e concerti à quattro’, published in Bologna in 1692, seems to be the earliest examples of concertos for strings and continuo to appear in print. Michael Talbot notes that Torelli is therefore the probable ‘…inventor of the concerto’, identified as such by Quantz, and with scholars failing to find any prints or manuscripts of concertos that predate Torelli’s Op. 5 in 1692. Torelli also has an
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1 McVeigh and Hirshberg, The Italian Solo Concerto, 1700-1760, 310, [GL 2234].
2 Talbot, ‘The Italian concerto in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries’, 36.
3 Talbot, ‘Some Little-Known Compositions of Torelli in the British Library’, 344.
interesting connection to the recorder concerto. In Lund’s Universitetsbiblioteket in Sweden, there survives a manuscript of an arrangement of ‘Sonates ou Concerts’, by ‘…Bernardi, Torelli & autres fameux Auteurs…’ into concertos for the ‘Little Flaut’. These are discussed in Chapter 10.

In Rome, a very different but equally important musical evolution also started producing ‘concertos’. Roman orchestras often consisted of a ‘core’ group of four players: two violinists, a cellist and a keyboard player (the forces required for a trio sonata). These instrumentalists combined to form the concerto grosso, and all the other musicians in the orchestra formed the concerto grosso. Here we have, in principle, the concertato exchanges that we saw in the trumpet sonatas of Bologna, but within a very different sound world of a concerto grosso and ripieno group. Corelli’s famous set of Op. 6 concerti grossi was published posthumously in 1714, though Corelli composed these concertos earlier than 1712. There is even some suggestion that some were composed as early as 1682, when Georg Muffat reported that he had heard some of Corelli’s concertos performed in Rome. Corelli’s concertos were certainly well received in mainland Europe, though this was often more of a stylistic appreciation. However, as mentioned in Chapter 3, it was particularly in England that a vogue for Corelli’s music really took hold. His Op. 6 was especially influential, first appearing in England in 1715, and reissued numerous times after that.

We turn now to Vivaldi’s concerto output for recorder, which includes two flauto solo concertos and three flautino solo concertos (with an additional few bars of a fourth flautino concerto). Alongside this, the recorder also appears in several ‘chamber’ concertos, as well as many ‘ensemble’ concertos for multiple soloists. Though compared to the much larger output of Vivaldi’s solo flute concertos, which numbered sixteen concertos (although two of these are lost) and also included an entire published collection devoted to the flute concerto (Op. 10), the two flauto and three flautino concertos seem to be a rather small repertoire. However, they are actually a very important repertoire for the recorder player, on account of both their musical substance, and their virtuosity. There has obviously been a vast amount of scholarship on Vivaldi’s music, and Federico Maria Sardelli’s study Vivaldi’s Music for Flute and Recorder.
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particularly provides a thorough examination of Vivaldi’s flute and recorder repertoire. This chapter is therefore simply intended to offer a broad overview of current research into Vivaldi’s recorder concertos, as well as some additional thoughts as a performer of the concertos.\footnote{For further reading on Vivaldi, see [GL 2212] through to [GL 2238] for useful references.}

Vivaldi’s Solo ‘Flauto’ Concertos

The two flauto solo concertos are RV 441 in C minor, and RV 442 in F major, both for alto recorder and strings.\footnote{RV441: I-Tn, Giordano.31, 374-85; RV 442: I-Tn, Giordano.31, 347-52} RV 442 survives in the form of an autograph score, and Vivaldi later rearranged this concerto as the flute concerto RV 434, the fifth out of six flute concertos in the Op.10 collection. As Sardelli notes in Vivaldi’s Music for Flute and Recorder, each of RV 442’s three movements uses themes that are taken from earlier operatic arias written by Vivaldi.\footnote{Sardelli, Vivaldi’s Music for Flute and Recorder, 163, [GL 2231].} The first movement is based on the aria ‘Ti sento, sì, ti sento’ which is originally from the opera La costanza trionfante degli amori e de gl’odii, RV 706 (though the aria is also used in the operas Il Tuezzone, RV 736 and in Ercole su’l Termodonte, RV 740). The second movement takes themes from the aria ‘Se lascio d’adorare’ (from the opera La virtù trionfante dell’amore e dell’odio, RV 740).\footnote{This aria also exists separately as RV 749.24, in a manuscript in Paris, with a text that begins ‘Se lascio di sperare’.} And the third movement uses material from four different arias: ‘Sentire che nel sen’ (from Orlando finto pazzo, RV 727); ‘Così sol nell’aurora’ (from the serenata La Sena festeggiant, RV 693); ‘Ognor colmi d’estrema dolcezza’ (from the Wedding Serenata (Gloria e Himeneo), RV 687); and ‘Si loqueris ad cor’ (from the motet Vestro principi divino, RV 633). Sardelli notes that the manuscript of the second movement seems to be a transposed version of the aria ‘Se lascio d’adorare’ (rather than the other way round). This would date the recorder concerto from sometime after 1724, when the opera La virtù trionfante, which included the original aria, was staged in Rome. The rearrangement of the recorder concerto into the flute concerto RV 434 must have happened some time before 1728-29, when Vivaldi’s famous set of six flute concertos, Op. 10, (which included RV 434) was published in Amsterdam by Michel-Charles Le
Cène. Therefore, the recorder concerto RV 442 must have been written sometime between 1724 and 1728.\(^{11}\)

The C minor flauto concerto, RV 441, is one of the better recorder concertos in the whole repertoire, comparable to the best of Vivaldi’s flute and violin concertos. This work is closely linked to the violin concerto RV 202, with RV 441 often embellishing the original RV 202 lines. Sardelli again makes it obvious, through a comparison between RV 202 and RV 441, that the solo episodes of the recorder concerto 441 are revisions and embellishments of those from RV 202.\(^{12}\) RV 441 is a very difficult concerto for the recorder player, particularly because Vivaldi chose to write a virtuosic concerto filled with fast passagework in the tricky key of C minor. This key is particularly worrying for the recorder player mainly due to the abundance of Eb\(^\#\)s and Bb\(^\#\)s, which involve cumbersome forked fingerings. This key makes fast arpeggiated sections, alongside numerous melodic leaps, very difficult to play. Even though the concerto requires a very advanced technique from the performer, throughout the concerto we still see examples in Vivaldi’s recorder writing of his excellent knowledge of the instrument. This is shown in Vivaldi’s obvious knowledge of certain ‘alternative’ fingerings for particular notes on the recorder. For example, in bars 85-86 of the third movement, Vivaldi writes a tricky passage that quickly jumps down to an Eb\(^\#\) and an F\(^\#\). This passage can really only be performed crisply at high speed when the performer has knowledge of an alternative fingering for F\(^\#\) (034, as opposed to the normal fingering of 02). This means that an Eb\(^\#\) to an F\(^\#\), using the alternative fingering, requires just the lifting of the first finger (0134 to 034), and the passage becomes much cleaner. In the hands of another composer, some of these very difficult passages in C minor would perhaps be unintentionally written in such a way as to make them almost impossible. Vivaldi’s recorder writing in this concerto never strays past this point.

The earliest version of the violin concerto RV 202 appeared in 1728, in the La cetra manuscript which was dedicated to Charles VI. A year later in 1729 it was published by Le Cène in the Op. 11 collection. Therefore, since RV 441 includes much embellishment of material from RV 202, it must have presumably been written sometime after 1728. There is a substantial musical and technical gap between the earlier composed RV 442 recorder concerto, and this work. Although RV 442 is challenging in places, it does not

\(^{11}\) Sardelli, op. cit., 163.
\(^{12}\) Ibid., 167.
present anywhere near the same level of difficulty as this concerto. This therefore suggests that the concerto must have been written for a very capable musician indeed, and perhaps someone whom Vivaldi did not have access to until the early 1730s. Sardelli even suggests that Vivaldi’s compositions with the most technically challenging material for the recorder player (this recorder concerto, the recorder sonata RV 86 and the three flautino concertos discussed below), ‘invite the conclusion that they form a single repertory intended for a single, exceptional performer’.  

Though only two flauto concertos survive today, there could potentially have been more. There are a number of concertos for ‘Flauto’ by Vivaldi listed in the catalogue of Nicolas Selhof. Selhof was a Dutch bookseller who lived from 1680 – 1758. In 1759, a catalogue of Selhof’s ‘music library, instruments and other property’ was sold in The Hague. In this catalogue, there contained the titles of a number of concertos:

- La Francia ‘Concerto a Flauto, 2 Violini, Alto & Basso’
- Il Gran Mogol
- La Spagna
- L’Inghilterro
- La Francia
- II. Concerto
- Concerto a Flauto, 2 Violini, Alto, Violoncello & Basso

The terminology of ‘Flauto’ initially suggests they are for recorder, and if so, this would have added an extra seven or eight additional concertos to Vivaldi’s solo recorder concerto output. However, in 2010, the ‘Il Gran Mogol’ concerto for ‘Flauto Traversio’ was famously discovered among the family papers of the Marquesses of Lothian in the National Archives of Scotland. This could mean that the other concertos listed in the Selhof catalogue were also all for the transverse flute, though this is by no means certain.

Lastly, in Chapter 6 of this thesis (on the ‘Harrach’ recorder concertos), I draw attention to one particular item in an auction of Harrach manuscripts by Karl & Faber in December 1956. The work listed is a ‘Concerto con Flauto obligato, due Violini e Basso’ by Vivaldi, and was bought by an unidentified individual. The auction book information
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mentions that the piece is in C major, and with the following movements: ‘1. Allegro 4/4, 2. Adagio 3/4, 3. Presto 2/4’. This is very surprising, because there survives no recorder (or flute) concertos by Vivaldi with a combination of the scoring ‘due Violini e Basso’, in those particular movements and time signatures, and in C major. This auction and title is discussed in detail in Chapter 6. There, I point out that this could either be a completely additional concerto to the repertoire, previously unknown, or that there is simply a mistake in the auction listing and it could potentially correspond to an existing Vivaldi concerto (possibly the flautino concerto, RV 444).

**Vivaldi’s Solo ‘Flautino’ Concertos**

Alongside the two flauto solo concertos, Vivaldi also produced three solo concertos for flautino: RV 443 in C major; RV 444 also in C major; and RV 445 in A minor.\(^\text{15}\) Additionally, Vivaldi also clearly started writing a fourth flautino concerto on the manuscript of RV 312, before stopping and instead writing the concerto for a violin.

Concertos for various sizes of small recorders are a common theme throughout this thesis. They had a popular vogue in London (see Chapter 2, and Appendix A), and there are also a surprising number of concertos involving small recorders in various cities of Sweden (see Chapter 10). There has been some controversy regarding the term flautino, with a great amount of ink spilled by researchers on the subject. Numerous ideas have been put forward. Dale Higbee, in 1964, suggests that the flautino was actually a piccolo transverse flute, mainly because, he thought ‘some passages of these concerti are impossible on the recorder or flageolet - but possible, though very difficult, on the one-key (octave) transverse flute’.\(^\text{16}\) Hans-Martin Linde argued that the flautino was in fact a sixth flute (a descant recorder in D).\(^\text{17}\) In 1998, two further theories were put forward in the journal *Tibia*. The first was by Winfried Michel who, after noticing the directions for transposition in two of three flautino concerto manuscripts, argued that the fifth flute
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\(^{16}\) Higbee, ‘Michel Corrette on the Piccolo and Speculations Regarding Vivaldi’s “Flautino”’, 115-116, [GL 2212].

\(^{17}\) Linde, Preface to *Vivaldi - Konzert* (Schott: Mainz, 1968). Though it should be noted that, seemingly for practical reasons, Linde actually performed this concerto using a sopranino recorder.
(the descant recorder in C) was the intended instrument. And conversely, Peter Thalheimer, argued that the *flautino* was not actually a recorder or a flute at all, but in fact, a flageolet.

Sardelli notes that there is little evidence showing the regular use of the flageolet in Italy, which is 'shown by both the paucity of surviving instruments and the rarity of testimony to its use'. Out of the three *flautino* concertos, two contain autograph instructions for transposition (RV 443 and 445), with the words: ‘Gl’Istrom: trasportati alla 4:°’ in RV 443, and ‘Gl’Istromen: alla 4° Bassa’ in RV 445. This was an instruction for Vivaldi’s copyist, requesting the accompanying string parts transposed down a fourth, leaving the *flautino* line untransposed. Just like the various other concertos for small recorder across Europe, this would have the effect of allowing the performer to play on a fifth flute (a descant recorder in C), whilst still using the fingering system of a treble recorder. The sounding pitch of the recorder line would therefore be a fourth lower than written, hence the transposition of the string parts. It should be noted that the other *flautino* concerto, RV 444, does not include instructions for transposition. This brings us to the most likely conclusion, that the *flautino*, rather than being one very specific instrument or even a specific recorder, is actually a term that simply encompasses the group of smaller, high-pitched recorders. It is a broad term, that corresponds to the use of ‘little flute’ in England; referring to a number of small recorders at various pitches.

The lack of transposition in the actual *flautino* line makes the sopranino recorder (an octave recorder in F) a performing option, and the instruction ‘Gl’Istrom: trasportati alla 4:°’ in RV 443 and 445, allows the performer to also play those concertos on a fifth flute. Perhaps Vivaldi simply wrote the option in depending on what particular instruments the performers had available on the day?

The three *flautino* concertos are all extremely challenging. The highlight of RV 443, though it has dazzling first and last movements with brilliant passagework throughout, is the expressive *Largo* second movement, written in the surprising key of E minor (the first and last movements are in C major). This beautifully lilting movement, filled with Vivaldi’s embellishments, is one of the most sublime slow movements in the recorder concerto repertoire. The third movement ends with an extremely difficult and long
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passage of triplet semi-quavers. The problem arises from the tempo of the Allegro molto: a suitably quick and lively tempo is required to carry the character and brightness of the rest of the movement, which therefore means the long passage of triplet-semiquavers has to be played very quickly indeed. As always, Vivaldi has a clear insight into the possibilities of the recorder, and never quite strays into the realms of the impossible. Even some of the trickier bars in the long passage of triplet-semiquavers in the last movement fit under the fingers relatively comfortably; for example, the middle finger of the right-hand acts as a useful pivot point in bars 63-66 of the last movement.

![Figure 4.1: Vivaldi, Flautino Concerto RV 443, iii, bars 63-66](image)

The concerto as a whole is an excellent example of the particular advantages of small recorders, and, along with the Sammartini concerto mentioned in Chapter 3, emphasises the advantages that a small recorder has over bigger recorders. The extreme virtuosity in all of the flautino concertos is made slightly easier by the smaller recorder – the fingers literally have to move and stretch slightly less on a smaller instrument, and therefore can move quicker through finger patterns. Additionally, the slow movement is a good example of the possibility of playing longer phrases on a smaller instrument. The movement is based on long, flowing melodies, that leave no obvious place for a breath. This can be seen throughout the Largo, but particularly in the opening section:

![Figure 4.2: Vivaldi, Flautino Concerto RV 443, ii, bars 1-5](image)
It is writing that is clearly intended to be played freely, and it often feels as a performer in this movement that a breath detracts from the long, flowing melody. On an alto recorder, it is very much a struggle to get to the double bar lines at the end of bar 5 without a breath. On a smaller recorder, it is much more possible.

Concertos RV 444 and RV 445 are in many ways even more challenging than RV 443, and are possibly the most difficult recorder concertos written in the eighteenth century. The first and last movements of both concertos are based completely around long solo sections in the recorder part, with a relatively small amount of short ritornello sections. Not only is it very difficult to achieve tidy articulation and fingering at the speeds required, but harder still is the breath support and tone control necessary to perform the very long solo passages in both concertos. As an example, towards the end of the first movement of RV 445 (in A minor) is a passage of thirteen bars of constant triplet-semiquavers, which tests the performers articulation, dexterity, breath control, tuning and stamina all in one go (see Figure 4.3). Again, we see here writing that showcases the advantages and qualities of small recorders.

![Flautino Concerto RV 445, i, bars 73-85](image)

The choice of which recorder to use for the *flautino* is an interesting one for the modern performer. As you will remember, RV 443 and RV 445 both contain references to the
transposition down a fourth of the accompanying parts, which would therefore require
the recorder player to use a fifth flute. RV 444 contains no such information. So, the
question for the modern performer is whether RV 443 and RV 445 work better on a fifth
flute (soprano recorder in C), or a soprano recorder? The recorder player Pamela
Thorby has suggested that by following the transposition and using a fifth flute, the
string parts play in a lower tessitura, which therefore produces a richer and more rounded
ensemble sound. Additionally, she suggests that the fifth flute, rather than the soprano
recorder, can help to bring out some of the mellower qualities found in certain sections of
the A minor RV 445.21 These suggestions are emphasised in her excellent and very
convincing recording of the lower, transposed RV 443 on a soprano recorder (released
in 2004).22 What is perhaps lost by the lower recorder is some of the brightness (and
maybe even energy) that can be obtained from playing in the higher registers of a
soprano recorder. Certainly, for the first and last movements of RV 443, this brightness can
really help convey the spirit of the movements. The answer, of course, lies with the
individual performer, and which particular characteristics of the music they want to
emphasise.

There was nearly a fourth Vivaldi flautino concerto, which never quite
materialised.23 In the autograph manuscript of RV 312, the word ‘Flautino’ can be seen
in the title of the piece, through several crossings out. Vivaldi clearly started writing a
flautino part for the first movement, with very idiomatic writing for the flautino similar
to the openings of the other three concertos. Suddenly, at bar 62, Vivaldi crosses out the
end of the passage, and all signs of flautino disappear. After this, Vivaldi obviously
decided the whole thing would work better as a violin concerto. Due to the existence of
a small section of a fourth flautino concerto, there has been interest in forming a
completed fourth concerto, using the finished violin concerto as a reference. Jean
Cassignol has produced a ‘reconstruction’ of this concerto,24 and it was given its
premiere in 1999 by Il Giardino Armonico.

As in this chapter, Vivaldi’s recorder concertos are often considered by players and
researchers in terms of their technical challenges and virtuosity. One aspect that is not
usually mentioned within this context is what virtuosity actually ‘feels’ like for the

21 Pamela Thorby – private correspondence.
22 Thorby, with Sonnerie: Baroque Recorder Concertos (Linn Records, CKD 217: 2004)
23 Tarasov, ‘A New Flautino Recorder by Vivaldi?’; 12-14, [GL 2227].
24 Concerto D-Dur (RV 312R) für Flautino..., Wilhelmshaven Notetzel, 2009 (ed. Cassignol)
recorder performer. This is not as trivial as it first sounds. What are the technical challenges faced by a recorder player that, combined, make up ‘virtuosity’? The first, and most obvious, is fast passagework, requiring both finger and tongue coordination and dexterity. Sometimes these passages can be made easier by utilising some ‘alternative’ fingerings (as mentioned above in RV 441), but in principle, they require an extremely neat and proficient technique to be performed effectively. Furthermore, variations in articulation and tonguing syllables are often used by advanced performers in these passages to add additional colour and variety; again, this requires a consummate tonguing technique to achieve effectively. ‘Forked’ fingerings (fingerings such as 0 123 467) and large leaps in quick succession within these quick passages (such as seen throughout the Vivaldi recorder concertos) amplifies their difficulty. Genuine virtuosity here not only manages to achieve the notes, but manages to achieve them ‘cleanly’ – that is, with rhythmic regularity, and without noisy, stumbling fingers and tongue. I have spent many hours over the years on my own technique trying to ‘neaten’ my fingers and tongue, by minimising the distance that the fingers move on the instrument and the tongue moves in the mouth (and therefore eliminating as much as possible any secondary ‘noise’ and clumsiness).

Playing at speed is not the only aspect of ‘virtuosity’. Very long and slow passages can also present substantial technical challenges, requiring strong breath and diaphragm support, large lung capacity, and the ability to consistently take ‘calm’, deep breaths in performance. In the middle of a long, challenging piece, breathing in less advanced players can become loud and uncontrolled. Intonation in these passages presents even further difficulties (this being the ability to tune the instrument effectively within different temperaments, and to ensembles employing various different instruments). Intonation in slow passages can be very challenging simply because any tuning discrepancies are more detectable in long, held notes. Additionally, intonation in the upper registers of the instrument can also present further challenges – fingerling of some of these notes often requires the placement or leaking of additional half-holes for intonation purposes, and the tuning in this register often varies more dramatically from instrument to instrument and maker to maker. Lastly, virtuosity also resides within ‘ensemble’ technique – that is, for the recorder player to be able to effectively listen and respond to the rest of the ensemble, and to be able to neatly slot together with the ensemble in the trickier corners. All of these technical challenges are prominently visible.
in Vivaldi’s recorder concertos, and this is why the concertos are often talked about in such ‘virtuosic’ terms. These areas of ‘virtuosity’ are also useful reference points for other ‘virtuosic’ concertos mentioned later in this thesis.

**Vivaldi’s ‘Chamber’ Concertos**

The term ‘chamber’ concerto in modern literature generally refers to concertos written for a small group of *concertante* instruments with continuo, but without orchestral accompaniment. There is a point of terminology here. In some eighteenth-century sources, a ‘concerto di camera’ [chamber concerto] referred to a solo concerto with reduced orchestral forces (for instance, Telemann’s ‘Concerto di Camera’ [TWV 43:g3] for recorder, two violins and harpsichord). Additionally, sometimes the term was also used in the eighteenth century simply to refer to any solo concerto, in order to distinguish it from a ‘concerto grosso’. For instance, Quantz writes:

> Concertos with one concertante instrument, or so called *chamber concertos*, are also of two classes. Some demand a large accompanying body… others demand a small one.  

Here, I use the term ‘chamber’ concerto in the contemporary sense, to refer to concertos for a small group of *concertante* instruments, with continuo, but without orchestral accompaniment. A ‘chamber’ concerto is therefore distinct from both a concerto for one or more soloists with orchestral accompaniment, and a concerto grosso. Chamber concertos are concertos in the sense that they very often replicate the formal structures of the solo concerto, and that they also regularly include virtuosic writing for the instruments involved.

There are nine chamber concertos by Vivaldi which include the recorder. As a comparison, thirteen of Vivaldi’s chamber concertos involve the flute. The recorder here therefore appears proportionally more often than in Vivaldi’s solo concertos for both instruments (there are only five solo concertos for *flauto* and *flautino*, versus sixteen for the transverse flute). Interestingly, in Vivaldi’s numerous chamber concertos, the recorder makes its first appearance only around the mid-1720s - the flute was used in Vivaldi’s chamber concertos well before this. This date correlates with Vivaldi’s apparent late interest in recorder concerto writing: as mentioned, the solo concertos for

---

the recorder all seem to have been written from the late 1720s to early 1730s. Though often challenging, Vivaldi’s recorder writing in the chamber concertos never reaches the difficulty of RV 441, or the three *flautino* concertos.

We can be quite precise regarding how many pieces Vivaldi wrote specifically for the flute and for the recorder, because he was very reliable in the terms he designated for each instrument. The flute was always written as ‘Flauto Traversier’. Only one chamber concerto, RV 90 and RV 90a, exists in two different manuscripts for both the flute and the recorder. Two chamber concertos involving the recorder are given descriptive names by Vivaldi: the first, RV 90a is titled ‘*Del gardellino*’ [The goldfinch]; and the second, RV 95 is titled ‘*La pastorella*’ [The shepherdess]. These two ‘rural’ concertos are both in D major, and filled with much melodic imitation of birdsong and the countryside. Modern recordings and performances of these concertos often take slight liberties with the source material; for example, occasionally (and unnecessarily) using smaller, chirpy recorders to imitate a goldfinch in RV 90a, or even adding instruments such as the hurdy gurdy to the pastoral RV 95. These additions are completely unnecessary: the clever melodic writing in both of these concertos perfectly evocates country scenes, without the need to rather unsubtly emphasise this. RV 90a and RV 95 also share very similar slow movements, particularly in the opening few bars of each (see Figure 4.4 and Figure 4.5).

26 RV 90 is scored for flute, oboe, violin, bassoon and continuo; RV 90a is scored for recorder, oboe or violin, violin, bassoon and continuo.
27 RV 95 is scored for recorder or violins, oboe or violin, violin, bassoon, continuo.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RV</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Recorder, oboe, two violins and basso continuo</td>
<td>C major</td>
<td>I-Tn Giordano.31, 404-411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90a</td>
<td>Recorder, oboe or violin, violin, bassoon and basso continuo</td>
<td>D major</td>
<td>GB-Mp Ms. 580 Ct. 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Recorder, violin and bassoon</td>
<td>D major</td>
<td>I-Tn Giordano.30, 41-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Recorder, oboe, violin, bassoon and basso continuo</td>
<td>D major</td>
<td>I-Tn Giordano.31, 412-419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Recorder, oboe, violin, bassoon, and basso continuo</td>
<td>D major</td>
<td>GB-Mp Ms. 580 Ct. 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Recorder, oboe, violin, bassoon and basso continuo</td>
<td>G major</td>
<td>I-Tn Giordano.31, 308-313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Recorder, oboe and bassoon</td>
<td>G minor</td>
<td>I-Tn Giordano.31, 228-234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Recorder, oboe, violin, bassoon and basso continuo</td>
<td>G minor</td>
<td>I-Tn Giordano.31, 302-307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Recorder, two violins and basso continuo</td>
<td>A minor</td>
<td>I-Tn Giordano.31, 220-227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: List of Vivaldi’s ‘chamber’ concertos involving the recorder

**Vivaldi’s ‘Ensemble’ Concertos**

Ten works employ the flute or recorder in what is known in Italian as ‘concerti con molti istromenti’, and in modern terminology is often referred to as an ‘ensemble’ concerto. These are concertos for multiple soloists (often many unusual combinations of instruments) with string accompaniment. Eight out of ten of Vivaldi’s ensemble concertos for multiple solo instruments use the recorder (or recorders), with the other two instead employing flutes.
Among the earliest ‘ensemble’ concertos with recorders is RV 585 in A major. It is titled ‘Conc’o in Due Cori con Flauti obligati’, and it was written by Vivaldi for the Pietà. The instrumentation includes parts for four recorders, and four solo violins, divided into two cori, with an obligato organ assigned to the second coro, and a theorbo and organ assigned to the first coro for the accompaniment of the second movement. Throughout RV 585, the recorders are only rarely given completely solo passages (once in the first movement, and three times in the last movement). Instead, they are predominantly used to add colour to the overall sound, with unison trills being used in the third movement to give an unusual contrast to the arpeggiated figures of the strings underneath. RV 585 was composed for the Pietà, and its manuscript is today found in Dresden, as part of the famous ‘Schrank II’ collection. Sardelli, through some clever detective work, uses the servicing arrangements of the organ at the Pietà to date the first performance of RV 585, narrowing it down to between 2 September 1708, and 24 February 1709.

The much later work RV 558, also written for the Pietà, can be securely dated as being performed on the 21 March 1740. It was performed as part of a celebration for the visit to Venice of Friedrich Christian, the Prince of Saxony. After the performance, the scores of Vivaldi’s music (RV 558, 149, 540 and 552) were presented in a volume to the prince, who took them with him when he travelled to Dresden, where they remain to this day. The concerto RV 558 is scored for a varied and unusual set of instruments. The intention, presumably, was to impress the Prince through the use of the rarer instruments housed at the Pietà. The title page of the concerto reads: ‘Concerto con Due Flauti, Due Tiorbe, Due Mandolini, Due Salmò, Due Violini in Tromba Marina et un Violoncello’.

---

28 D-DI Mus.2389-O-77
29 It was taken to Dresden by Johann Pisendel in 1717.
30 Sardelli, op. cit., 211-213.
31 D-DI Mus.2389-O-4(1)
32 The ‘violino in tromba marina’ has been confused with both a trumpet and a normal violin; it is in fact a completely different instrument altogether. It is a large, triangular bowed instrument with a single string, and played using natural harmonics instead of by stopping the string. It has a vibrating bridge, which produces a brassy buzz when combined with the harmonics. Hence it acquired the name ‘tromba marina’. (see: Adkins, ‘Trumpet Marine’, Grove Music Online).
All of the above ‘ensemble’ concertos in Table 4.2 utilise recorders in pairs, along with various other combinations of instruments. Vivaldi uses the recorders generally in quite a basic way in his ensemble concertos: very often in thirds, and often used to either simply colour the sound, or occasionally, to decorate a line, adding little melodic comments here and there. Actual solo material of some prominence for the recorder here is very limited.

**Summary**

With regard to the many different types of concerto considered in this chapter, we can see progressions in Vivaldi’s use of the recorder. Many of the ‘ensemble’ concertos were written in the first ten to twenty years of the 1700s, all involving quite basic recorder
writing, where pairs of recorders would often play in thirds. By the 1720s, Vivaldi had started to write ‘chamber’ concertos for the recorder (before this, Vivaldi had used the flute in his chamber concertos, rather than the recorder). Sometime between 1724 and 1728, Vivaldi composed his first recorder concerto, RV 442, and after this (possibly in the late 1720s or early 1730s) he composed (in no obvious order), the extremely virtuosic recorder concerto RV 441, and three extremely difficult flautino concertos, RV 443, 444 and 445. These concertos exemplify the musical qualities possessed by small recorders, and are good examples of music that display the performing advantages small recorders can have over larger instruments. These qualities were also noted in the English little flute repertoire (see Chapter 3).

Though Vivaldi was still also using the recorder as tonal colouring in ‘ensemble’ concertos by this point (such as RV 558, performed in 1740), he had also composed probably the most technically difficult couple of recorder concertos ever written in the eighteenth century. It seems likely that this change in his treatment of the instrument was caused by Vivaldi encountering a recorder player capable of such virtuosity. Sadly, this virtuoso has not yet been identified. Vivaldi’s recorder concerto legacy has also been very important for the recorder in the modern era, after the revival of the instrument. The performance of recorder concertos with such extreme technical demands greatly assisted in gaining respect and recognition for the instrument as a virtuosic and challenging instrument in its own right.
5

The Concerti di Flauto of Naples

The recorder music of Naples has attracted interest over recent years from both performers and researchers alike. Many of the recorder concertos and sonatas from Naples now thankfully appear in a number of recordings, making this wonderful recorder repertoire available to a wider audience. Additionally, Inês de Avena Braga’s 2015 dissertation ‘Dolce Napoli: approaches for performance – Recorders for the Neapolitan Baroque repertoire, 1695-1759’ is a detailed study, providing insights into, particularly, the instruments that may have been used to perform this repertoire. Though all of the Neapolitan recorder concertos are included in Avena Braga’s study, simply due to the scope and focus of her thesis, the concertos are not examined in great detail. This chapter therefore aims to provide additional insights into both the Neapolitan recorder concerto repertoire, particularly from the perspective of a performer, and also, why it is that there is such a substantial number of recorder concertos of Neapolitan origin.

Manoscritto di Napoli 1725

A very important manuscript for recorder players, dated 1725, is today kept in the library of the Conservatorio di Musica San Pietro a Majella, in Naples, with the title: ‘Concerti di Flauto, Violini, Violetta e Basso, di Diversi Autori’. It will be referred to here as the Manoscritto di Napoli 1725. This manuscript consists of a set of twenty-four recorder concertos by various authors (‘Diversi Autori’): there are twelve concertos by Francesco

---

1 Chapter 5 focuses on all sources of Neapolitan recorder concertos apart from those found in the Harrach family collection. The Neapolitan recorder concertos which became part of the Harrach collection are discussed separately in Chapter 6.

2 See, for example: Bart Coen’s recording of a number of concertos from the Manoscritti di Napoli, 1725 (Sony, 2010); Maurice Steger’s recording Una Follia di Napoli (Harmonia Mundi, 2012); and Collegium Pro Musica’s recording of Nicolò Fiorenza’s five recorder concertos (Brilliant Classics, 2010)


4 I-Nc M.S.34-39
Mancini; seven concertos by Alessandro Scarlatti; and one concerto each by ‘Roberto Valentini’ (the English-born composer Robert Valentine), Giovanni Battista Mele, Domenico Sarri (also known as Domenico Sarro) and Francesco Barbella. There is also an anonymous concerto (which has sometimes also been attributed to Barbella). This is a very extensive and important collection of concerto manuscripts for the recorder, containing some concertos of real quality. There exists no other collection which contains so many different recorder concertos by so many different authors. These concertos are all in four or five movements, with the large majority also containing a Fuga movement. There is a wide variety of keys chosen throughout the twenty-four concertos.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concerto</th>
<th>Composer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Sonata Prima</strong> (C minor) Moderato – Grave – Moderato – Allegro</td>
<td>Francesco Mancini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Sonata Seconda</strong> (B flat major) Adagio – Allegro – Adagio – Allegro</td>
<td>Roberto Valentino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Sonata Terza</strong> (C major) Amoroso – Allegro – Adagio (<em>flauto solo</em>) – Allegro</td>
<td>Francesco Barbella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Sonata Quarta</strong> (C major) Largo – Allegro – Largo (<em>flauto tacet</em>) – Allegro</td>
<td>No composer named</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Sonata Quinta</strong> (G major) Allegro – Largo – Fuga: Allegro – Larghetto – Allegro</td>
<td>Francesco Mancini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>Sonata Sesta</strong> (D minor) Amoroso – Allegro – Largo – Allegro</td>
<td>Francesco Mancini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <strong>Sonata Settima</strong> (D major) Allegro – Adagio – Fuga – Largo – Allegro</td>
<td>Alessandro Scarlatti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. <strong>Sonata Ottava</strong> (C minor) Vivace – Andante staccato – Fuga: Allegro – Largo – Allegro</td>
<td>Francesco Mancini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. <strong>Sonata Nona</strong> (A minor) Allegro – Largo – Fuga – Largo e piano (<em>flauto e violini soli</em>) – Allegro</td>
<td>Alessandro Scarlatti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. <strong>Sonata Decima</strong> (B flat major) Larghetto – Allegro – Largo – Allegro (Only violoncello part – no separate continuo part).</td>
<td>Francesco Mancini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. <strong>Sonata Undecima</strong> (A minor) Largo – Allegro – Larghetto – Spirito</td>
<td>Domenico Sarri</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Ut Orpheus has published all twenty-four concertos from the *Manoscritto di Napoli 1725* (1996-1998)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Movement Details</th>
<th>Composer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td><em>Sonata Decima Quinta</em></td>
<td>(F major) Andante – Allegro – Adagio – Allegro</td>
<td>Giovanni Battista Mele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td><em>Sonata Decima Sesta</em></td>
<td>(F major) Affetuoso – Fuga – Un poco andante – Allegro</td>
<td>Francesco Mancini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td><em>Sonata Decima Ottava</em></td>
<td>(F major) Largo – Fuga – A tempo giusto – Allegro</td>
<td>Francesco Mancini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td><em>Sonata Vigesima Seconda</em></td>
<td>Allegro – Fuga – Adagio (continuo and cello parts tacet) – Andante</td>
<td>Alessandro Scarlatti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td><em>Sonata Vigesima Terza</em></td>
<td>(C major) Adagio – Fuga – Adagio – Allegro</td>
<td>Alessandro Scarlatti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td><em>Sonata Vigesima Quarta</em></td>
<td>(G minor) Allegro – Fuga – Largo (flauto solo, continuo tacet) – Allegro</td>
<td>Alessandro Scarlatti</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.1: List of concertos in the Manoscritto di Napoli 1725**

Although the decorative title page classifies the pieces as ‘Concerti di Flauto…’, as can be seen from Table 5.1, the parts themselves are actually labelled as ‘Sonata’ (there are numerous examples of this dual concerto / sonata terminology throughout the early eighteenth century). All except three of the twenty-four concertos are scored for recorder, two violins and bass, without a viola. The other three concertos do in fact
include a viola part (*violetta*); these are *Sonata Decima* and *Sonata Decima Quarta* by Mancini, and *Sonata Undecima* by Sarro. The scoring of two violins and a bass, with an absent viola part, is a distinctly Neapolitan concerto characteristic; ‘Venetian’ concertos would very often include a viola part (and sometimes two).⁶ This practice of reduced viola input also became popular in Rome, and this trend is particularly shown by the sharp drop in the manufacturing of violas across the country.⁷

There are six composers in total included in the *Manoscritto di Napoli 1725*, though the vast majority of the 24 concertos come from just two composers: Francesco Mancini (twelve concertos in the collection), and Alessandro Scarlatti (seven concertos). Out of the six composers included in this collection, three of them became *maestro di cappella* at the Neapolitan court. Scarlatti, Mancini and Sarro (*Sarri*) were all *maestro di cappella* for quite long periods of time, where they took over the roles from each other. Scarlatti was director first, with Mancini taking over as *maestro di cappella* from Scarlatti during Scarlatti’s first absence from Naples. Scarlatti returned, but Mancini again took over the role officially on Scarlatti’s death. Sarro lastly took over the role after Mancini’s death. These composers were very important figures in Neapolitan musical life during this period and represent a chronological development in the musical activities of Naples.

We will look at Scarlatti and Mancini’s output in more detail, considering they produced the large majority of concertos in this collection, but first we will touch upon the five other concertos in the collection. These are: *Sonata Seconda* by Roberto Valentini (*Robert Valentine*), *Sonata Terza* by Francesco Barbella, *Sonata Undecima* by Domenico Sarri (*Domenico Sarro*), and *Sonata Decima Quinta* by Giovanni Battista Mele. We will also address the anonymous concerto, *Sonata Quarta*, which in some modern sources is also attributed to Francesco Barbella.

*Robert Valentine (1673-1747)*

Robert Valentine was born in 1673, and died in Rome in 1747. He was initially based in the English town of Leicester, but eventually moved to Rome where he garnered a modest reputation as a composer, flautist and oboist.⁸ It is not known exactly when he

---

⁶ Aquilina, *Benigno Zerafa (1726-1804) and the Neapolitan Galant Style*, 166.
⁸ Medforth, ‘Valentine, Robert’, *Grove Music Online*. 
moved to Rome, though Martin Medforth has noted that Valentine (under the name Valentini) was active as a performer in Rome’s Ruspoli court, a very prestigious musical establishment, by 1707. Medforth suggests that Valentine would likely have had to have lived in Rome for a while before he would have been fully assimilated into Rome’s Ruspoli court. Valentine is a composer who has had relatively little modern academic interest, though in 1994, J. Bradford Young published *A Thematic Catalog of the Works of Robert Valentine*. According to this catalogue, Valentine composed over 180 works—a solely instrumental output, with the vast majority of his compositions being sonatas for recorder, flute, oboe and violin. Valentine composed extensively for the recorder. Out of his fourteen surviving collections of published works, the recorder features in eight of them. These are collections of sonatas for one recorder (Op. 2, Op. 3, Op. 5 and Op. 11) and for two recorders (Op.7, Op.8, Op. 9 and Op. 10). Valentine’s Op. 3 collection of twelve recorder sonatas was first published in Rome in 1710, dedicated to ‘il Sig[no] Giouanni Fleetwood Console Britanico in Napoli’. John Fleetwood (who died in 1725) was the British Consul to Naples during the reigns of Queen Anne and George I. In *Magnae Britanniae notitia: or, the Present State of Great Britain*, published in 1723, ‘John Fleetwood Esq.’ is included under ‘A List of his Majesty’s Consuls Abroad’ as ‘Consul at Naples’. Fleetwood was a keen musician, and could well have been a recorder player: as well as Valentine’s dedication in his recorder sonatas mentioned above, Francesco Mancini also dedicated his collection of twelve recorder sonatas to Fleetwood. Fleetwood is Valentine’s connection to Naples, and Valentine was possibly active in Naples by the time of the publication of his Op. 3 sonatas.

Alongside the recorder concerto in the *Manoscritto di Napoli 1725*, a small selection of concertos for other instruments by Valentine also survives today. The first are five concerti grossi for violins and continuo housed in Uppsala. There are also two further surviving woodwind concertos: an oboe concerto, and a transverse flute concerto.

---

11 It was published in London by Walsh & Hare in 1721.
13 Published in London by Walsh in 1724.
14 S-Uu: Instr. mus. i hs. 61:2a-f
15 S-L: Saml.Engelhart 184
16 S-L: Saml.Engelhart 184
Valentine’s recorder concerto (*Sonata Seconda*) is in the key of B-flat major, which, due to the abundance of forked fingerings for the recorder player in this key, can often cause difficulties. However, Valentine seems to have almost intentionally simplified his writing in this concerto, to avoid many of the potential challenges associated with flat keys for the recorder. There are certainly no long passages of notes that do not sit easily under the fingers, and the concerto provides very little technical demands. From his vast published recorder sonata output, aimed at the amateur market, Valentine clearly had a good grasp of the instrument, and was able to avoid many of the pitfalls that can unintentionally make a piece difficult for the recorder player. Valentine seems to have aimed this concerto at a similar technical level. The concerto itself suffers from weaker *Allegro* movements, with the two *Adagios* in the concerto noticeably much more elaborate and inventive than the quick movements. This is particularly the case in the melodically unusual and interesting *Adagio* third movement. Here, the violin starts with thirteen bars of relatively static material, before the recorder enters with a restless melody that never seems to be quite sure where it is heading. The second entry of the recorder, after more stationary material from the violins, is even more restless than the first. This entry initially seems to want to comment on the first entry, before giving up and moving into unrelated triplet material. The slow movements of this concerto stand out amongst Valentine’s extensive recorder output, with his published sonatas often musically straightforward and technically limited.

**Francesco Barbella (d. 1732)**

Francesco Barbella died in Naples in 1732, and spent a large portion of his musical life as the *maestro di violino* at the Conservatorio di S. Maria di Loreto. He taught his son, Emanuele Barbella, to play the violin, and Emanuele went on to become a relatively well-known and respected violinist. Emanuele also became a friend of Charles Burney, and Burney relied on him for quite a lot of his information about Neapolitan music.  


Once Burney had returned to London, he remained in regular correspondence with Emanuele Barbella regarding the musical world of Naples. Burney asked Emanuele to give an account of his own musical education, of which Emanuele stated that ‘Emanuele Barbella had the violin placed in his hand when he was only six and a half years old, by his father, Francesco Barbella.’ Emanuele humorously concludes his account of his own musical development by stating that ‘…notwithstanding these advantages, Barbella is a mere ass, who knows nothing.’
There is certainly one concerto by Barbella in the *Manoscritto di Napoli 1725 (Sonata Terza)*, and some have also attributed *Sonata Quarta* to Barbella. For example, Ut Orpheus has published ‘Concerto No. 4 from the 24 Concertos in the Naples manuscript’ under Francesco Barbella.\(^{18}\) The confusion arises from a lack of a composer attribution on the manuscript of *Sonata Quarta*. *Sonata Terza* is signed as ‘Franc. Barbella’, whereas the next concerto in the manuscript, *Sonata Quarta*, does not have any composer marked at all. It is the only concerto in the whole collection that does not have a composer named. In this concerto, the composer is left blank in all manuscript parts (including the *flauto* part). This is particularly unusual because every other concerto in the collection has the composer named (using the terms *Del Sig*”) on every single instrumental part. At first glance, it would seem that a composer was not written on *Sonata Quarta* because it was by the same composer as the previous concerto (and therefore, by Barbella). Perhaps the copyist simply wanted to save time? However, when looked at in the context of the rest of the manuscript, this does not seem correct. The next two concertos in the collection, *Sonata Quinta* and *Sonata Sesta*, are both by Mancini, and ‘*Del Sig*” Franc. Mancini’ is named on every single manuscript part of both concertos. Indeed, the five concertos in order from *Sonata Decima Sesta* to *Sonata Vigesima* are all individually named as Francesco Mancini, as are the final four concertos in the collection, which are all individually named as Alessandro Scarlatti.

Does the internal evidence of *Sonata Terza* and *Sonata Quarta* provide any further insight as to whether Barbella composed *Sonata Quarta*? Though arguments of authorship through internal evidence can be notoriously ambiguous, there do seem to be some large differences between the two concertos. The recorder writing in *Sonata Terza* is much more florid, with a first movement filled with alternate sections of strings and solo recorder. This florid writing is particularly shown in the third movement, an *Adagio* for *flauto solo* and continuo, which is filled with ornamented runs (see Figure 5.1). There is also much harmonic movement in this movement, with the parts progressing through a number of keys, before ending in G major.

\(^{18}\) ‘Concerto No. 4 from the 24 Concertos in the Naples Manuscript’ (Ut Orpheus, ed. Bornstein and Corini, 1996)
The compositional quality of *Sonata Quarta* is generally weaker. For example, the first movement *Largo*, also written for just recorder and bass (violins *tacet*), is harmonically limited and melodically quite awkward. Four bars before the end of the movement, almost out of nowhere, the recorder is asked to play quick C major and G major arpeggios, which are not melodically in character with the rest of the movement (see Figure 5.2).
Figure 5.2: Sonata Quarta, i, Largo (full movement)

The two violin parts in both concertos are also treated completely differently. In Sonata Terza, in the first and fourth movements, the violins generally start sections in unison, but then develop into independent parts. And in the vaguely fugal second movement, the two violins have completely separate parts. However, in Sonata Quarta, the violins play totally in unison throughout the second and fourth movements (they have separate parts in the third movement, but it is only eight bars long, and they are tacet in the first movement). This suggests that Sonata Quarta is by a different composer to Sonata Terza, and therefore not composed by Francesco Barbell. Since the copyist of the Manoscritto di Napoli 1725 named the composer on all parts of every other concerto in the manuscript, it suggests that the copyist did not know who composed this concerto.
**Domenico Sarro (1679-1774)**

As already mentioned, Domenico Sarro (Sarri) was the third composer out of the ‘Diversi Autori’ to be appointed as *maestro di cappella* to the Neapolitan court. He first took over the duties as *maestro* when Mancini became ill in 1735, and was officially appointed as *maestro* when Mancini died in 1737. Sarro remained in this post until his death in Naples in 1744. Charles Burney described Sarro as someone who ‘flourished [in Naples] from the year 1725 to 1734.’ It is interesting that according to Burney, the period in which Sarro ‘flourished’ was before he became appointed *maestro* to the Neapolitan court. His surviving output seems to attest to Burney’s idea: though nearly 300 works by Sarro survive today, there are very few extant works written after 1730. Burney also mentioned that Sarro was ‘...one of the early reformers who, like [Leonardo] Vinci, simplified harmony and polished melody...’

There is a certain elegance to the Sarro concerto, *Sonata Undecima*, in the *Manoscritto di Napoli 1725*. The opening *Largo* is based around an attractive dolce melody over staccato strings, before a contrasting *Allegro* fugal movement, which has much arpeggiated and quick string writing throughout. There is a particularly limited range to the recorder writing in this concerto. The recorder never goes below an A₄ and never above a D₆ (a tiny range of an eleventh). For a whole solo concerto to utilise such a limited range of an instrument is very surprising.

There is a further recorder concerto by Domenico Sarro that survives today, found in a collection of manuscripts once belonging to the Austrian ‘Harrach’ family. The Harrach collection of music has a particularly strong connection to Naples, since Count Alois Thomas Raimund von Harrach served as Viceroy of Naples between 1728 and 1733. Sarro’s music actually features a number of times in the Harrach collection: alongside the recorder concerto, there is also a recorder sonata in F major, as well as a (short) oratorio - ‘Sant Ermenegildo’. Written on the manuscript of the oratorio is ‘Del Sigr. Domco. Sarro. Napolitano in Roma 1725’, suggesting that either this piece was simply performed in Rome in 1725, or that Sarro was actually in Rome in 1725. Sarro’s second recorder concerto (which has many similarities to the concerto here, including
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21 US-NYp (ZB-4354) Vol. 31, No. 2
22 US-NYp (ZB-4354) Vol. 17, No. 15
23 US-NYp (ZB-4354) Vol. 8
its very limited recorder range), and the recorder music in the Harrach collection generally, are discussed in detail in Chapter 6.

**Giovanni Battista Mele (b. 1693/1694 – d. after 1752)**

Mele declared himself, in an affidavit in Spain from 1750, to be 56 years old, placing his date of birth in 1693 or 1694. He entered the Neapolitan Conservatorio dei Poveri di Gesù Cristo in 1710, where he stayed for over ten years. He eventually moved to Madrid by 1735, where he was active in the court of Philip V, predominantly as an opera composer. In 1752, Mele asked for permission to return to Naples, which was granted. There are no records of Mele found after 1752. Perhaps he never managed the return journey to Naples?

Mele’s concerto is one of the more progressive concertos in the collection. Mele has a particular fondness for triplets in the concerto, acting as a rhythmic focus throughout both the first and last movements (see Figure 5.3 and Figure 5.4). The numerous triplet semiquavers (with additional grace notes) in the final movement also involve some quite tricky arpeggiated passagework, making this movement one of the more difficult movements to play in the whole collection. Mele’s progressive attitude in this concerto is presumably explained by Mele likely being the youngest composer of the collection.

---
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We now turn to the two composers in the Manoscritto di Napoli 1725 manuscript with the most concertos in the collection: Alessandro Scarlatti (seven concertos) and Francesco Mancini (twelve concertos). It is worth first giving a brief overview of their musical lives, and their important influence on Neapolitan music.
**Alessandro Scarlatti (1660-1725)**

Alessandro Scarlatti, father of Domenico, produced a very large compositional output. The majority of this output consisted of vocal music, composing over eight hundred cantatas, and well over a hundred operas.\(^{25}\) On the title page of the autograph manuscript to his 1721 opera *Giselda*, it is stated that this is Scarlatti’s 114\(^{th}\) opera.\(^{26}\) Scarlatti first made his name in Rome, where his music became in high demand, before eventually moving to Naples. There is some speculation and possible scandal surrounding the reasons for Scarlatti’s move away from Rome. There was a growing attitude of opposition to the theatre amongst the Catholic Church, and the popes in particular, which eventually resulted in the closing of the Roman public theatres. For a composer such as Scarlatti with a strong output of operas, this was discouraging. Furthermore, there was speculation that one of Scarlatti’s sisters (possibly Anna Maria Scarlatti) had ‘seduced’ and eventually married a priest. In an *Avvisi di Roma*, it is noted that Scarlatti ‘…is in bad odour with the Court of the Vicar on account of the secret marriage of his sister with an ecclesiastic.’\(^{27}\) A certain Neapolitan nobleman, Domenico Marzio Carafa, Ducca di Maddaloni, heard a Scarlatti opera (*Gli equivoci nel sembiante*) when it was first performed in Rome, and thereafter recommended Scarlatti to his friend the Marchese del Carpio, who eventually became the Viceroy of Naples. Scarlatti became the *maestro di cappella* of the Real Cappella of Naples in 1684, succeeding the previous incumbent P.A. Ziani on his death. Scarlatti remained as the *maestro* in Naples until 1702. By the end of the 1690s, Scarlatti was encountering difficulties with the Real Cappella. His salary was not being paid regularly, and in 1699 he presented a formal petition for payment of arrears.\(^{28}\) In 1702, Scarlatti applied for a leave of absence, initially for four months, but which ended up lasting over 6 years.\(^{29}\) He returned to Rome, later travelling to Venice and Urbino. Following these years of absence (when Francesco Mancini acted
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\(^{25}\) Edwin Hanley’s thematic catalogue of Alessandro Scarlatti’s cantatas (*Alessandro Scarlatti’s cantate de camera: a bibliographical study* (Ph.D diss., 1963) lists 783 cantatas as extant. A small number of additional cantatas have been attributed to Scarlatti since Hanley’s 1963 catalogue, including two cantatas sold at auction at Sotheby’s in 2014 for £45,000, well over the initial estimate. Also see: Müller-Busch, ‘Alessandro Scarlattis Kantaten mit obligaten Block-flöten’, [GL 2179].

\(^{26}\) Grout, *Alessandro Scarlatti: An Introduction to His Operas*, 3.


Scandal and gossip continued to follow the Scarlatti family, even once they had moved to Naples. It was alleged that Scarlatti owed his appointment due to the supposed liaison between Scarlatti’s sisters and two court officials. The Scarlatti sisters were eventually sent to a convent. (see: Grout, ‘Alessandro Scarlatti’ (in: *Italian Baroque Masters*, 213).


\(^{29}\) Ibid. 65.
as maestro of the chapel), Scarlatti moved back to Naples, where he regained his position of maestro di cappella, and, apart from one further leave of absence to Rome in 1718, remained in Naples until his death in 1725.

Alessandro Scarlatti was a prolific composer, and one who enjoyed great respect and influence during his lifetime. It is therefore surprising that Alessandro was largely ignored after his death, particularly in the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century literature, and it is only in the twentieth century that a certain revival of his works has taken place. Even so, today Alessandro is still much lesser known and heard than his son, Domenico. Modern Scarlatti scholarship began with Edward J. Dent’s wonderful book Alessandro Scarlatti: His Life and Works, first published in 1905. The preface to this book notes that ‘considering the celebrity which Alessandro Scarlatti enjoyed during his lifetime, and the important position which he occupies in the history of music, it is strange that so little attention has been paid to him.’ Scarlatti had a particularly large impact on the music of Naples, and especially on the so-called Neapolitan school of opera, which had such an important influence on the direction and development of early opera.

Scarlatti’s surviving output of instrumental music is relatively small, and it is evidently a type of music that he showed little interest in. According to Burney, the German composer, Johann Adolph Hasse, arranged a meeting between Scarlatti and Hasse’s fellow-countryman, the virtuoso flautist Quantz. Burney reports that Scarlatti said in advance of this meeting: ‘I hate wind instruments, they are never in tune!’ Burney arrived in Naples in 1770, and returned to London in 1771, with a large collection of music by Neapolitan composers. Even with Scarlatti’s supposed low view of wind instruments, and a very limited instrumental output in general, it is notable that Scarlatti clearly held the flute (both the recorder, and the transverse variety) with some regard, composing a number of works for it.

---

30 Dent, Alessandro Scarlatti, ix.
31 A particularly fine study into Scarlatti’s operas is Donald Jay Grout’s Alessandro Scarlatti: An Introduction to his Operas, first published in 1979.
32 Burney, Present State of Music in Germany (1773), II, 184.
34 A number of Scarlatti’s works for recorder are listed in a brief article by Edwin H. Alton, though he actually misses out the ‘Sinfonia… di Concerto Grosso’. Alton, ‘The recorder music of Alessandro Scarlatti (1660-1725)’, 199-200, [GL 2178].
### Manoscritto di Napoli: ‘Concerti di Flauto’ (1725)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sonata Settima</th>
<th>D major</th>
<th>I-Nc M.S.34-39</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sonata Nona</td>
<td>A minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonata Duodecima</td>
<td>C minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonata Vigesima Prima</td>
<td>A minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonata Vigesima Seconda</td>
<td>A major</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonata Vigesima Terza</td>
<td>C major</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonata Vigesima Quarta</td>
<td>G minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ‘Sinfonia… di Concerto Grosso…’ (1715)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sinfonia Prima</th>
<th>F major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Sinfonia Seconda] ‘Concertate Con li ripieni’</td>
<td>D major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Sinfonia Terza]</td>
<td>D minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Sinfonia Quarta]</td>
<td>E minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Sinfonia Quinta]</td>
<td>D minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Sinfonia Settima]</td>
<td>G minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Sinfonia Ottava]</td>
<td>G major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Sinfonia Nona]</td>
<td>G minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Sinfonia Decima]</td>
<td>A minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Sinfonia Undecima]</td>
<td>C major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Sinfonia Duodecima]</td>
<td>C minor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ‘Santini’ collection, Münster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Sonata con Flauto, due Violini, e Basso’</th>
<th>F major</th>
<th>D-MÜs SANT Hs3957b (Nr.5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Sonata a due Flauti, due Violini e Violoncello’</td>
<td>A major</td>
<td>(Nr. 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Sonata a 3. Flauti e Violoncello’</td>
<td>F major</td>
<td>(Nr. 6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2: List of Alessandro Scarlatti’s extant recorder concertos
Table 5.2 includes Scarlatti’s seven concertos from the *Manoscritto di Napoli 1725*, the twelve ‘*Sinfonie di Concerto Grosso*’, as well as three ‘sonatas’ from the Santini collection in Münster. These last three manuscripts are another example of the ambiguous sonata / concerto terminology often used during this period. All three ‘sonatas’ are in three movements, and the sonatas in F major and A major are written as a solo recorder and a double recorder concerto, with Neapolitan concerto scoring (two violins, and no viola). Even the ‘Sonata a 3. Flauti e Violoncello’, though certainly less of an out-and-out concerto, still includes some concerto features: it is in three movements, with *concertante* writing between the three recorder parts. The famous ‘Santini’ collection is today housed at the Diözesanbibliothek in Münster, and was first collected by the priest and musician Abate Fortunato Santini (1778 -1861). The collection contains an enormous amount of Italian music manuscripts (c. 4500 manuscripts and c. 1200 prints); predominantly vocal and sacred music, though also a small amount of instrumental music.\(^{35}\) It is difficult to trace the geographical origins of Scarlatti’s ‘Santini’ concertos: they could have been composed in Naples, or they could have originated on one of Scarlatti’s various travels elsewhere.

**Scarlatti’s ‘Sinfonia... di concerto grosso’**

The twelve *Sinfonia* survive today in two manuscripts in the British Library. The first manuscript is an autograph score, and the second is a set of seven parts.\(^{36}\) On the score, the first of the twelve is titled as ‘Sinfonia Prima, di Concerto Grosso, con due Flauti’, with the second marked as ‘Concertate Con li ripieni’. The other ten compositions in the set are all without a title on the score. The recorder is the focal point of all twelve pieces, with the recorder being included in all works in the set. Eight of the twelve are simply solo recorder concertos (in a very similar fashion to the seven solo concertos by Scarlatti in the *Manoscritto di Napoli 1725*). The other four compositions in the set at first glance are seemingly double concertos: *No. 1* and *No. 5* for two recorders, *No. 2* for recorder and trumpet, and *No. 4* for recorder and oboe. However, included in the parts is also a concertino cello part, separate from the basso continuo part. Therefore, these four

---


\(^{36}\) The score of all 12 concerti grossi is under the British Library shelfmark R.M.21.b.14, and the separate parts for all 12 concerti are under the British Library shelfmark R.M.21.b.15
concertos are really concerto grosso for a concertino group of three instruments. In the collection of parts, the whole collection is titled in the finding aid as ‘12 Sinfonias & Concertos’. The words ‘con li ripieni’ in the second composition, for recorder and trumpet (with a concertino cello line), are instructions that the concerto grosso parts should be doubled where possible. The first sinfonia in the set also includes relatively sporadic markings of solo and tutti. Though the concertos themselves are relatively brief, they contain a number of movements. Nine out of the twelve compositions in the set are five movement works; No.7 and No. 12 are four movement works; and No. 9 (with a concluding Menuet) is actually in six movements.

The score is marked with the words: ‘Cominciate al P° Giugno 1715 (‘started on 1 June, 1715’). The twelve pieces were therefore written whilst Scarlatti was in Naples, only ten years before his death in 1725. Why then do these concertos appear in two manuscripts in the British Library? One answer is that perhaps Scarlatti was hoping to get these pieces published in England. There was a real popularity for both Italian music and the recorder in England around 1715, and Scarlatti could well have been trying to tap into this market towards the end of his life. This would also explain why the recorder is featured so heavily in the set, and also why the recorder writing in the works is of a very modest standard, playable by the keen amateur. This technical modesty is shared with Scarlatti’s recorder concertos in both the Manoscritto di Napoli 1725, and the ‘Santini’ collection. This is emphasised by the limited range of the recorder line in Scarlatti’s concertos. The vast majority of the concertos only go up to a D₆. One out of the seven Scarlatti concertos in the Manoscritto di Napoli 1725 rises a semitone higher to an Eb₆ (Sonata Duodecima), and five out of the twelve ‘Sinfonia... di concerto grosso’ very occasionally use an E₆. Scarlatti’s concertos were certainly not aimed at the virtuoso performer.

*Francesco Mancini (1672–1737)*

Unlike the often-restless Scarlatti, Francesco Mancini remained in Naples throughout his life. Mancini was born in 1672, and died in 1737. During Alessandro Scarlatti’s absence from the Real Cappella between 1702 and 1708, Mancini was appointed as maestro di capella. He was also appointed as the principal organist of the chapel in 1704. This first period as maestro was brief: on Scarlatti’s return, Mancini was demoted to his deputy and Scarlatti once again took over as maestro. In 1720, Mancini became the
director of the Conservatorio di S Maria di Loreto, and in 1725, after Scarlatti’s death, Mancini once again took over the role as maestro di capella. Mancini remained in this role until his own death in 1737. Sadly, two years before his death, Mancini suffered a serious stroke which had caused partial paralysis, and Domenico Sarro had therefore already unofficially assumed Mancini’s duties. Charles Burney described Mancini (specifically regarding Mancini as an opera composer) as someone who ‘flourished from 1700 to 1731, and produced several operas and intermezzi that were much esteemed by the first professors of the time, particularly Geminiani and Hasse, who always spoke of him as a very able master.’

The twelve Mancini concertos in the Manoscritto di Napoli 1725 make up half of all the concertos in the collection. Mancini also had a collection of very accomplished recorder sonatas, XII Solos for a Violin or Flute with a Thorough Bass, published in London in 1724. These sonatas regularly appear in concerts today. One feature of Mancini’s recorder concertos, and indeed really all of the concertos in the Manoscritto di Napoli, is that their stylistic outlook is very much based on the ‘early’ Italian concerto (with influences also from the Roman concerto). The Vivaldian concerto revolution, which swept across Europe throughout the 1710s and the early 1720s, did not have a big impact on Naples until the 1730s. The concertos in the Manoscritto di Napoli 1725 generally employ fast movements either in a fugal structure, or in early ritornello form. The tonal schemes of these ritornello movements are generally more closely associated with what McVeigh and Hirschberg describe as ‘Albinoni’s Pendulum’, rather than ‘Vivaldi’s Circuit’. This ‘pendulum’ model refers to a movement with at least one intermediate reiteration of the tonic (to maintain tonal unity, and ensure the tonic never gets ‘lost’); whereas the ‘circuit’ model of Vivaldi’s concertos instead progress through various related keys, creating anticipation in the listener via the pull of the final tonic.

The fourth movement (Spiritoso) from Mancini’s Sonata Decima Terza in the Manoscritto di Napoli 1725 is a good example of a ritornello movement from the collection using the ‘pendulum’ tonal scheme, rather than Vivaldi’s ‘circuit’. It is in G

39 All twelve Mancini recorder concertos from the Manoscritto di Napoli 1725 have recently been recorded in a two-volume CD by Corina Marti and the Capella Tiberina (Brilliant Classics, 2012)
40 These sonatas were ‘carefully Revis’d and Corrected by Mr. Geminiani’ and reissued in 1727.
41 McVeigh and Hirschberg, The Italian Solo Concerto, 1700-1760, 13-18, [GL 2234].
minor, and has a number of reiterations of the tonic throughout the movement. This ‘pendulum’ scheme is shown in Table 5.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bars</th>
<th>1 - 8</th>
<th>9 - 16</th>
<th>17 - 30</th>
<th>30 - 35</th>
<th>36 - 37</th>
<th>38 - 39</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ritornello / Solo</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i →</td>
<td>V →</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bars</th>
<th>40 - 59</th>
<th>60 - 63</th>
<th>63 - 76</th>
<th>77 - 84</th>
<th>85 - 88</th>
<th>89 - 102</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ritornello / Solo</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>i → v</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>v (→ V)</td>
<td>i → V</td>
<td>V →</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3: Timeline of Mancini’s fourth movement from *Sonata Decima Terza*

**The Concerto(s) of Nicolò Fiorenza and Leonardo Vinci**

Outside of the *Manoscritto di Napoli 1725*, there are two other important sources of Neapolitan recorder concertos: a concerto by Leonardo Vinci, and four concertos by Nicolò Fiorenza.

**Nicolò Fiorenza (c.1700 – 1764)**

Fiorenza was born in Naples around the turn of the eighteenth century, where he remained until his death in 1764. He was a well-known violinist, composer and teacher. Fiorenza was employed as a violinist in the Real Cappella in 1726, and from 1743 until 1762, Fiorenza taught violin at the music conservatory S. Maria di Loreto. He was elected to the post of violin teacher there in a very unusual way: five candidates applied for the role, and the governors were unable to decide between the five, so elected one by lot – Fiorenza was the candidate fortunate enough to win. Fiorenza was hired to lead the
string teaching, and specifically also teach the ‘violoncello, violin and doublebass’. Fiorenza taught in this post until he was eventually asked to resign following repeated complaints concerning the maltreatment of his students. Additionally, Fiorenza was also a violinist in the chapel of Naples, where in 1758 he succeeded Domenico de Matteis as first violinist. There survive four recorder concertos by Fiorenza, today housed in the library of the Conservatorio di Musica San Pietro a Majella.

| ‘Sinfonia a ‘Flauto solo, con VV[V]: e Basso’ | G minor | I-Nc Ms 2258-2262 |
| ‘Sinfonia per due Flauti, 2 Violini’ [and continuo] | A minor | I-Nc Ms 2210-2217 |
| Concerto [‘Flauto, 3 Violini, Violetta e Basso’] | C minor | I-Nc Ms 2263-2268 |
| Concerto ‘Di Flauto, Violini e Violetta, Violoncello, Basson’ | F minor | I-Nc Ms 2293-2297 |

Table 5.4: List of Nicolò Fiorenza’s recorder concertos

Fiorenza’s concertos are a clear stylistic progression from the other Neapolitan concertos so far mentioned. They were seemingly all written between 1726-1728. The G minor manuscript has 1726 written on the title page, and the A minor concerto also has 1726 written on the manuscript, though this time on the ‘Controbasso, o Cembalo’ part. The F minor manuscript has 1728 written on the title page. The progression of style from the earlier Neapolitan concertos is obvious just from the scoring of Fiorenza’s concertos. Only the A minor concerto uses the ‘Neapolitan’ scoring of two violins and a bass. The concerto in G minor uses three violins (though the third violin often doubles the first), and the C minor and F minor concertos both include a ‘violetta’. Fiorenza’s concertos still show a Corellian influence, particularly in some of the first movements, but they also show the initial influences of the Vivaldian concerto in Naples. This is shown also by the more developed tonal schemes of Fiorenza’s concertos.

---

Table 5.5: Timeline of Fiorenza’s Allegro fourth movement from ‘Sinfonia’ (A minor)

Though this movement is still technically within the ‘pendulum’ tonal scheme (due to the intermediate reiteration of the tonic in bars 71–77), it is clear that it is a move away from the constant reiteration of the tonic that we see in (for example) Mancini’s concerto in Table 5.3. We can also see more modulatory progressions through this movement, and a sense of ‘delaying’ the reiteration of the tonic (until bar 71).

The manuscript for Fiorenza’s F minor concerto seems to have a solo violin part missing. In the first movement of the concerto, the parts are written in two staves, with each part having their own line, as well as the recorder line. However, in the recorder part, the second stave is a line that does not correspond to any of the other parts in the manuscript, implying that a part is missing from the manuscript. An edition of this concerto has been published in 2011 with a ‘reconstructed’ solo violin part for the other movements (though most of the material can be put together from the recorder and other violin parts).  

Fiorenza’s F minor concerto is the more musically substantial of his four concertos, and also the most difficult. The key of F minor, with its numerous cross-fingerings, always presents difficulties for the recorder player. Here, however, the difficulty is partially minimised by Fiorenza’s carefully formed melodic patterns, which sit well under the fingers (particularly with the aid of some alternative fingerings). For example, this can be seen in Figure 5.5, where an alternative $A_5$ can be used in bar 26 and bar 30 ($\Theta 123467$), an alternative $F_5$ can also be used in bar 26 ($0346$), and an alternative $E_5$ can be used in bar 28 and 29 ($023$), making the passage more comfortable to play.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bars</th>
<th>1 - 18</th>
<th>19- 40</th>
<th>41 - 54</th>
<th>55 - 70</th>
<th>71 - 77</th>
<th>78 - 90</th>
<th>91 - 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ritornello / Solo</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i $\rightarrow$</td>
<td>C $\rightarrow$ G</td>
<td>V$^7$ $\rightarrow$ v</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>iv $\rightarrow$ i</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^{43}$ “Fiorenza Concerto f-Moll” (Girolamo Musikverlag, ed. Bellanova and Thieme, 2011)
The concerto is serious, and substantial. The first movement opens with a dramatic, dotted motif in the strings, which then alternates with contemplative, unaccompanied runs on the recorder. The third movement is serene, and beautiful. The full weight of the key of F minor on the recorder is brought to the fore in this movement, with the numerous cross-fingerings (and therefore also ‘alternative’ cross-fingerings) allowing the recorder player to add expression through ‘colouring’ the notes.\textsuperscript{44} It is an excellent work, and perhaps one of the more interesting in the entire repertoire. It deserves to be far better known than it is today.\textsuperscript{45}

\textit{Leonardo Vinci (c.1696–1730)}

David Lasocki identified and published Vinci’s recorder concerto in A minor for the first time, in 2011.\textsuperscript{46} The manuscript of the concerto is to be found in the music library of the University of North Carolina, along with two other recorder sonatas by Vinci.\textsuperscript{47} The concerto is written for recorder, two violins and a bass, though the violins play in unison throughout. The work is short, and requires only a modest technique, though it is also a piece of elegant charm, and interesting rhythmic variation. The recorder part has a range from G\textsubscript{4} to E\textsubscript{6}, though this is slightly deceptive because G\textsubscript{4} only appears once in

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fiorenza_fminor_concerto_bars_26-30.png}
\caption{Fiorenza, \textit{F minor recorder concerto}, ii, bars 26-30.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{44} The technique here being the intentional choice of ‘alternative’ cross-fingerings (which are slightly higher or lower in pitch than the ‘normal’ fingerings) in order to manipulate the tuning and ‘colouring’ of a particular note, for expressive purposes.

\textsuperscript{45} The concerto appears in a 2010 recording by Collegium Pro Musica (Stefano Bagliano) of recorder concertos by Fiorenza and Mele (Brilliant Classics, 2010).

\textsuperscript{46} \textit{Concerto in A minor... by Leonardo Vinci}, ed. Lasocki (Instant Harmony, 2011)

[www.instantharmony.net]

\textsuperscript{47} US-CHH (no shelfmark)
the concerto (in the third movement), and $E_6$ also only appears once (in the first movement). Vinci became associated with the galant style, and in the Preface to his edition of the concerto, Lasocki notes that we can see some of these galant features in his recorder concerto: long, developed melodic lines replaced instead by shorter, more direct phrases; slower harmonic progressions; and the use of much unpredictable rhythmic variation.  

**A Notable Number of Neapolitan Recorder Concertos?**

The Neapolitan recorder concertos mentioned above were all composed between 1715 and 1728; from Alessandro Scarlatti’s ‘Sinfonia... di concerto grosso’ written in Naples in 1715 (though the manuscript survives in London), via the *Manoscritti di Napoli* 1725, through to Fiorenza’s last F minor recorder concerto, composed in 1728. Additionally, in the Naples library today, there also survives a ‘Concertino con Flauto solo, Violini Obligato’ by the Venetian composer ‘Sigf Giuseppe Tartini’. It is interesting that this work is in the ‘reduced’ Neapolitan scoring of two violins, without viola. Tartini’s numerous violin concertos all contain a viola part. Presumably it was entitled ‘Concertino’ due to this reduced scoring. It is not obvious how this Venetian concerto ended up in Naples; perhaps it was an attempt by Tartini to garner some interest in Naples, once the Venetian style had started to gain some influence there in the late 1720s? Further to these numerous concertos, there also exists a significant amount of Neapolitan recorder music in the collection of manuscripts once belonging to the Austrian ‘Harrach’ family. The main connection of the family to Naples is through Count Alois Thomas Raimund von Harrach, who served as the Viceroy of Naples between 1728 and 1733. The ‘Harrach’ collection is a substantial collection of music (including a number of recorder concertos), and it is discussed in detail in Chapter 6.

Why then are there so many surviving recorder concertos of Neapolitan origin? To answer this question, we must first gain an impression of the musical life of Naples during this period. Naples itself was an important city in the history of early modern Europe. It was under Spanish rule for over two centuries, from the beginning of the sixteenth century, to the start of the eighteenth. By the beginning of the eighteenth
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48 Lasocki, ‘Preface’, *Concerto in A minor... by Leonardo Vinci*
49 I-Nc M.s. 9936-9939
century, Naples had become the most populous city in Italy, and possibly even the second most populous in all of Europe (after Paris). Music had always been a major element of the Neapolitan identity; it became known as a ‘city of music’ in part due to the interest in a particular myth of Greek mythology. In this myth, Parthenope, a singing siren, committed suicide in desperation after not being able to seduce Ulysses with her voice, and her body washed ashore in Naples.\(^{50}\) Much has been written on the importance and influence of eighteenth-century Neapolitan music, particularly on both opera and sacred music. An especially large influence on the Neapolitan musical identity came from the four prestigious music conservatories in Naples, which over many years trained a large group of Neapolitan composers. The conservatorii originally started out in the sixteenth century as charitable institutions, generally for poor orphans. Some of these conservatories started to teach music (the earliest being the Conservatorio di Santa Maria di Loreto), which soon completely changed the makeup of these institutions: instead of only accepting orphaned boys, they started to accept paying students who were sent there by their families in the hope of forging a musical career.\(^{51}\) Four conservatories gained a particular reputation for music teaching: the Conservatorio di Santa Maria di Loreto, the Conservatorio di S. Onofrio, the Conservatorio della Pietà dei Turchini, and the Conservatorio dei Poveri di Gesù Cristo.\(^{52}\) Additionally, there were other more minor conservatories (including female only conservatories) that also organised music teaching in the city. In the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, the four music conservatories generally employed an overall maestro, alongside a string and a wind teacher to cover all of the instruments within that group. To give two examples, Pietro Manto was employed at the Conservatorio della Pietà dei Turchini as the maestro of wind instruments between 1675 and his death in 1701.\(^{53}\) And in 1727 until 1748, the Conservatorio di S. Maria di Loreto employed Paolo Pierre as a teacher of the oboe, recorder (flauto and flautino were both listed), transverse flute, hunting trumpet, trombone and ‘every other required wind instrument’ (‘qualsiva altro instromento di fiato’).\(^{54}\)


\(^{51}\) Ibid., 25.

\(^{52}\) Ibid., 27.

\(^{53}\) Ibid., 93.

Charles Burney, writing about his visit to Naples in 1770, described the conservatoires of Naples, though he noted only three of them (‘…their names were *S. Onofrio*, *La Pietà* and *Santa Maria di Loreto*’). The average period of study for the boys was, according to Burney, ten to twelve years (‘…the boys are admitted from eight or ten, to twenty years of age’). The conservatoires each had a number of pupils: ‘…the number of scholars in the first Conservatorio [S. Onofrio] is about ninety, in the second [La Pietà] about hundred and twenty, and in the other [Santa Maria di Loreto], about two hundred.’ In the early 1700s there seem to have been a similar number of pupils. The Conservatorio di S. Maria di Loreto had around 150 boys in 1696. In 1702, due to financial difficulties, the Governors of the conservatoire instead tried to fix the maximum number of boys at 100. However, by 1711, the numbers were back up to 142. Naples, in the eighteenth century, was therefore a city with four very active music conservatoires, each with consistently around 100-150 students in any year. This therefore means that Naples was a city where many people had a thorough musical education.

For professional musicians in Naples, the conservatoires were very important sources of employment. Out of the numerous Neapolitan composers of recorder concertos mentioned in this chapter, all but Robert Valentine studied at one of the four conservatoires. Most of the composers mentioned also at some point gained employment at one of the conservatoires, and more often than not at the Conservatorio di Santa Maria di Loreto. Domenico Sarro studied at the Conservatorio di S. Onofrio, and Giovanni Mele studied for around ten years at the Conservatorio dei Poveri di Gesù Cristo. Francesco Barbella was employed as the string teacher at the S. Maria di Loreto, between 1722 and 1733. Alessandro Scarlatti was appointed as the *maestro di cappella* at S. Maria di Loreto in 1689. Francesco Mancini studied at the Conservatorio della Pietà dei Turchini, first studying in 1688 as an organ student, and within six years, being employed as the organist there. In 1720, Mancini became *maestro* of the S. Maria di Loreto. Nicolò Fiorenza was employed at the same conservatoire, between 1743 and 1762, as a string teacher (before being dismissed for his harsh treatment of students). Leonardo Vinci studied for about ten years at the Conservatorio dei Poveri di Gesù
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56 Ibid., 311.
57 Robinson, *op. cit.*, 59.
Cristo, first starting in 1708. He served as the *maestro* of Poveri di Gesù Cristo during the summer of 1728.

There are some surviving accounts of the duties of instrumental teachers and musical directors at the Neapolitan conservatoires. Charles Burney wrote that each of the conservatoires had ‘two principal *Maestri di Capella*, the first of whom superintends and corrects the compositions of the students; the second the singing, and gives lessons.’ Burney also mentions that there were assistant ‘*Maestri-Secolari’s*’, who were the instrumental teachers of the conservatoire.\(^{58}\) In “The Governor’s Minutes of… S. Maria di Loreto”, Michael Robinson reports the terms of employment given to Cherubino Corena, who was hired at the S. Maria di Loreto in 1748 as a wind teacher. Corena’s duties included teaching for two hours every morning, as well as composing any music required for his students to perform. Robinson also notes that Corena must have been in direct control of the music concerts at the conservatoire, which he will have also composed music for.\(^{59}\) The instrumental *maestros* generally used their teaching time on the more advanced pupils in the conservatoires, who were then responsible for teaching and passing on their knowledge to the younger children.\(^{60}\)

According to a well-known account by Burney, the standard of performance by the conservatoire students (in 1770) was generally poor. On Friday 19 October, Burney wrote:

> This evening I went a third time to the church of San Francesco, and heard the performance of the scholars of another Conservatorio, *Santa Maria di Loreto*. They appeared all in white uniform, with a black kind of sash. The singing was a little better than the day before, but the instruments were hardly so good…\(^{61}\)

And the second, by a different conservatoire, on Saturday 20 October:

> This morning I heard, at the same church, the boys of the Conservatorio of *St. Onofrio*, who wear a white uniform. The performance was much the same as the other two.

---


\(^{59}\) Robinson, *op. cit.*, 50.


Burney, however, does concede that the poor standard of performance in the year he attended does not necessarily reflect badly on previous or future years:

> These seminaries, which have heretofore produced such great professors, seem at present to be low in genius. However, since these institutions, as well as others, are subject to fluctuations, after being languid for some time, like their neighbour Mount Vesuvius, they will, perhaps, blaze out again with new vigour.\(^6^2\)

How does all of this information relate to why there are so many surviving recorder concertos of Neapolitan origin? The answer lies with the musical conservatoires. First, as we have already noted, many of the composers mentioned in this chapter found employment at some point or other in one of the conservatories. Secondly, the conservatoires each had a substantial number of students. Thirdly, as is shown by the employment terms given to Cherubino Corena in 1748, music teachers at the conservatoire were expected to compose music for their students and performances. Lastly, according to Burney, the musical standard of the conservatoires was limited. Even if, as Burney suggests, previous years were better, it still seems likely that ensembles made up of children and young musicians would generally require compositions of a more modest technical standard.

Apart from Fiorenza’s four recorder concertos, the rest of the Neapolitan recorder concerto repertoire fits this profile very well. Fiorenza’s concertos have the dates 1726 and 1728 written on the manuscript, when Fiorenza was employed as a violinist at the *Real Cappella*. Presumably these four, more difficult concertos were therefore written for the musicians of the chapel. However, the concertos in the *Manoscritto di Napoli 1725*, are generally more technically modest works, requiring no great dexterity of fingering or articulation. In short, they would be excellent concertos for a developing recorder student to learn. It seems very possible that, for example, Mancini’s twelve concertos in the collection could have been composed for the students of the Conservatorio di Santa Maria di Loreto, when Mancini was employed as *maestro* of the S. Maria di Loreto in 1720. Similarly, Francesco Barbella’s concerto in the collection could also have been composed for the students of the S. Maria di Loreto, when Barbella was first employed as a string teacher there in 1722. Possibly other concertos in the
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62 Burney, *op. cit.*, 320.
collection were also written for, or played by, conservatoire students? Though there is certainly a substantial number of surviving Neapolitan recorder concertos, there are also many surviving Neapolitan concertos for other instruments (particularly the violin and cello). With four very active music conservatoires, each with around 100 to 150 boys ever year (and sometimes even up to 200 boys), there was a great need for new compositions. A number of the recorder (and other instrumental) concertos surviving today in Naples could well have been written for this purpose.
Part III

Austria
The ‘Harrach’ Concertos

Introduction

The Harrach family are of Bohemian and Austrian descent, and became one of the more prominent Austrian families within the Hapsburg Empire. The family put together a large music collection, consisting of many works by numerous eighteenth-century composers (particularly numerous works of Neapolitan and German origin). This collection was for a long time housed in the family castle at Rohrau (just outside Vienna), though a large portion of the collection was sold at auction in 1956, with many lots bought by the New York Public Library. Additionally, there are a number of music and family archival manuscripts still in the possession of the Harrach family, but today housed in the Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, in Vienna (as part of the Allgemeines Verwaltungsarchiv). The Harrach music collection seems to have been predominantly collected by Count Alois Thomas Raimund von Harrach (1669–1742), who became the Viceroy of Naples between 1728 and 1733, though other members of the Harrach family, including his son Ferdinand Bonaventura II (1708–1778) also had musical interests. These two members of the Harrach family are discussed later in this chapter.

Within the Harrach music collection, in both the New York Public Library (hereafter, NYPL), and the Österreichisches Staatsarchiv (hereafter, Staatsarchiv), there is a significant amount of music for the recorder. Recently, there have been some small explorations of the Harrach collection, and in 2010 two recorder concertos were discovered in the NYPL collection by Johannes Pausch and Steffen Voss. The two recorder concertos are by the German composers Johann Friedrich Fasch and Matthäus Nikolaus Stulick. These concertos were given a world premiere recording by Michael
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1 Chapter 6 focuses on the Harrach family, an Austrian noble family based in Rohrau, just outside Vienna. Music of the Austrian realm (or what was at this time the Habsburg realm) more broadly is not considered in this chapter. The manuscripts in the Harrach music collection are predominantly of German and Italian (particularly Neapolitan) origin.

Schneider and the Cappella Academica Frankfurt in 2010. Additionally, a recorder concerto attributed to Telemann was found in 2008 in the Harrach family archive (the manuscript is now in the Staatsarchiv). An edition of this concerto was produced in 2008 by Reinhard Goebel, and published by Edition Walhall. The authorship of the concerto has been disputed on stylistic grounds, though in the Preface to his edition, Gobel rules out ‘style criticism’, and assigns it to the ’master’s oeuvre until scientifically credible proof of the contrary can be provided. Later in this chapter, I argue that a case can be made for the concerto sharing similarities with Telemann’s other solo writing for the recorder, though I also show that the copyist of the concerto is a very unreliable source.

In addition to the three recorder concertos mentioned above, the Harrach collection actually contains a number of other recorder concertos, not known until now. In the NYPL collection, there are two further recorder concertos – an anonymous concerto in C major per ‘flauto, due violini, violette, e basso’, and a ‘Concerto con VV: e flauto e basso’ by Domenico Sarro. This last manuscript also includes an anonymous sonata for ‘flauto solo e basso’. Additionally, in the Staatsarchiv in Vienna, along with the ‘Telemann’ concerto manuscript mentioned above, there is a further manuscript which contains two other recorder concertos (both for multiple recorders): one anonymous, and one by ‘G: C: Alludemori’. These concertos are completely new works, and a nice addition to the small repertoire of concertos for multiple recorders.

The music collection of the Harrach family, in both the NYPL and the Staatsarchiv, is therefore a very important collection for the recorder concerto, and recorder music generally. At the beginning of 2016, I undertook a study of the Harrach family music and archival manuscripts in the Staatsarchiv. Additionally, I received scanned copies of the Harrach collection from the NYPL. This has allowed me to complete an extensive study of the recorder music and particularly the recorder concertos found in the Harrach collection.
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3 ‘The Virtuoso Recorder’ Schneider/Cappella Academica Frankfurt (2010)
4 A-Wös AT-OeSta / AVA FA Harrach HS 258
6 Ibid., ‘Preface’.
7 US-NYp JOG 72-29, Vol. 22
8 US-NYp JOG 72-29, Vol. 31
9 I would particularly like to thank both the Staatsarchiv and the NYPL for assisting me in my research. I would also like to send my thanks to Count Ernst Harrach, who kindly gave me permission to view the Harrach manuscripts in the Staatsarchiv, and include them within my thesis.

160
This chapter has a number of aims and focuses. The first is to examine the recorder repertoire of the Harrach collection in detail, drawing particular attention to the recorder concertos (as well as an anonymous suite and some additional recorder sonatas) newly discovered through my studies. I also provide information about the copyist of the ‘Teleman’ concerto in the Staatsarchiv, who is also the copyist of the ‘G: C: Alludemori’ discovered in the same collection, as well as the Fasch and Stulick recorder concertos in the NYPL collection. I subsequently show him to be an unreliable source. Secondly, I will provide information about the two eighteenth-century members of the Harrach family with known musical interests. It seems likely that the majority of the collection was gathered by Alois Thomas Raimund Harrach, though I also draw attention to evidence of Ferdinand Bonaventura [II] Harrach’s interest in music. Thirdly, the Harrach collection has an interesting custodial history, with a large number of works bought at auction in 1956 by the NYPL. My research shows that there were several works for recorder sold at this auction by the Harrach family which were not bought by the NYPL. These works include several Italian recorder sonatas not currently known today; as well as the slight possibility of an additional recorder concerto by Vivaldi. This leaves the tantalising prospect that these works currently reside today in a private collection somewhere.

**Harrach Family**

As already mentioned, the Harrach’s were of Bohemian and Austrian origin, and rose to prominence as an important noble family. Members of the family over the centuries have included important diplomats, ambassadors, archbishops, cardinals and even the bodyguard to Archduke Franz Ferdinand at the time of his assassination (Lieutenant Colonel Franz von Harrach). Alongside an interest in music, many members of the Harrach family clearly also had a love of art. The Harrach art collection consists of many great European masters, and is today one of the more important private art collections in Europe. The collection is housed in Schloss Rohrau, situated twenty-five miles east of Vienna, and open to public viewing. The art collection includes works from a wide variety of periods and countries. The collection seems to have first started with Count Ferdinand Bonaventura [I] (1637–1706), who acquired many seventeenth-century paintings by Spanish masters whilst in his post as Ambassador to Madrid. Count Alois Thomas Raimund (1669–1742) acquired a collection of Neopolitan eighteenth-century
artworks, as well as commissioning a number of works by contemporary artists. Finally, Count Ernst Guido (1732–1783) collected many fine artworks from Roman masters.  

Within the Staatsarchiv, there are a large number of manuscripts from the Harrach family archives which provide many details about the Harrach family over the centuries (manuscripts in this collection date from the sixteenth century through to the twentieth century). Many of these manuscripts are beautifully presented and pristinely preserved. For example, one of the eighteenth-century Harrach manuscripts is bound in velvet and kept in a large wooden box. These manuscripts certainly give the impression of a family of great wealth and importance, who became one of the relatively few families in Austria with real political significance. A list of these important Austrian families of 
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11 A-Wös AT-OeSta / AVA FA Harrach HS 2
the period is shown in a manuscript (HS 9) from 1738, which includes the various coats of arms of ‘Oberösterreich’ nobility. The Harrach family coat of arms appears on the first page (middle of the bottom row) (Figure 6.2).

Figure 6.2: List of familial coat of arms (A-Wös, FA Harrach HS 9). Harrach coat of arms middle of bottom row.
The Harrach coat of arms also appears in the middle of an embellished painting at the front of manuscript HS 2,\textsuperscript{12} which gives information about the Counts of Harrach and their various offspring (Figure 6.3). It was commissioned by ‘Raymundo Thomo Aloysio’ [Alois Thomas Raimund] Harrach, and written by Johan Joachim von Aichen, an ‘Untermarschall’ of Lower Austria. Once again, the power and prestige of the Harrach family at this time comes to the fore.

\textsuperscript{12} AT-OeSta / AVA FA Harrach HS 2

Figure 6.3: A-Wös, FA Harrach HS 2
Count Alois Thomas Raimund von Harrach (1669–1742)

Alois Thomas Raimund von Harrach was born in 1669, and became a high-ranking member of the Austrian foreign service, during the reigns of the Holy Roman Emperors Leopold VI, Joseph I, and particularly Charles VI (who was also Charles III, Archduke of Austria). Harrach served right across Europe, and this makes him a particularly fascinating figure in this trans-European thesis. He served as a diplomat in Dresden and Spain, and he eventually became an Imperial Ambassador, first to Berlin, and then to Hanover. From 1715 until his death in 1742, he also acted as a Landmarschall of Lower Austria. His most prestigious title was gained when he became the Viceroy of Naples, between 1728 and 1733. In 1707, two hundred years of Spanish rule in Naples ended and an Austrian regime took control. For the next twenty-seven years, Naples was governed by a series of Austrian Viceroyos, and Count Alois Thomas Raimund von Harrach was the second last Austrian Viceroy, before the Austrians themselves ceded control of Naples back to Spain in 1734. The painting of Harrach by Johann-Gottfried Auerbach above is from Harach’s period as the Viceroy of Naples, under Emperor Charles VI. Thomas Raimund was also a member of the prestigious Order of the Golden Fleece, a catholic order of chivalry. He married three times, producing thirteen
children. The manuscript HS 4 (*Historico-Chronologico-Genealogica Deductio Heroum, ac Proccrum S:R: Comitum ab Harrach in Rohrau*), written in 1764, is a systematic outline of the various Counts of Harrach in Rohrau through seventeen generations. Family trees are included throughout the manuscript, and included below (Figure 6.5) is the family tree from HS 4 of Alois Thomas Raimund.

\[\text{AT-OeSta / AVA FA Harrach HS 4}\]
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13 He first married Countess Maria Barbara Holicka in 1691, having three children with her. His second marriage, to Countess Anna Maria Elisabeth von Thannhausen in 1695, produced a total of nine children. And his third and final marriage, to Maria Ernestina von Dietrichstein in 1721, up to Harrach’s death in 1742, produced only one child.

14 AT-OeSta / AVA FA Harrach HS 4
Figure 6.5: Historico-Chronologico-Genealogica Deductio Heroum, ac Procrum S:R: Comitum ab Harrach in Rohrau (HS 4). Family tree of Count Alois Thomas Raimund.
Alois Thomas Raimund had an interest in the arts. As already mentioned, he collected several Neapolitan paintings in the Harrach art collection. Furthermore, he obviously also had an interest in music. This is shown by two pieces of evidence. The first is a document found in the Harrach archive (in the Staatsarchiv), which shows payments to a number of musicians in April 1732 for the performance of *Il Giasone* by Nicola Porpora.\(^\text{15}\) Secondly, the Harrach music collection contains a significant number of works by Neapolitan composers who were all working in Naples during Alois Thomas Raimund’s period as Viceroy of Naples (1728–1733). These include works by Domenico Sarro (alongside the recorder concerto and sonatas in the NYPL collection, there is also an ‘Oratorio… *Sant Ermenegildo*’),\(^\text{16}\) a cantata by Leonardo Vinci (titled ‘*Gesang mit Begleitung*’, though the work is in Italian),\(^\text{17}\) vocal music and three cello sonatas by Nicolò Porpora,\(^\text{18}\) along with Neapolitan recorder sonatas by Nicolò Fiorenza, Leonardo Leo, Franco Sarti, and Giovanni Antonio Piani.\(^\text{19}\) There is also a recorder ‘Cantata’ in the Harrach collection, from the important German-born opera composer Johan Adolf Hasse, who lived for a number of years in Naples. Hasse’s time in Naples overlapped very closely with Alois Thomas Raimund’s period there as Viceroy of Naples. In the libretto of his opera *Il Tigrane*, which was first performed at the *Teatro San Bartolomeo* in Naples in 1729 (one year after the start of Alois Thomas Raimund’s time there) Hasse was listed as a supernumerary *maestro* of the Chapel Royal of Naples.\(^\text{20}\) These Neapolitan works therefore all seem very likely to have arrived in the Harrach collection via Alois Thomas Raimund’s period of office as Viceroy of Naples. Perhaps the works were given to Harrach by the composers themselves, who surely would have wanted to gain favour with the governor of Naples?

*\textit{Alois Thomas Raimund, the recorder player?}*

There are three types of music which occur throughout the Harrach music collection. First, there is a substantial amount of vocal music; secondly, there is a sizeable amount of lute music; and thirdly, as already mentioned, there are a large number of pieces for

\(^{15}\) A-Wös AT-OeStA/AVA FA Harrach Fam. in spec. 125.1  
\(^{17}\) Ibid., Vol. 9.  
\(^{18}\) Ibid., Vol. 10 and Vol. 29.  
\(^{19}\) These Neapolitan recorder sonatas are briefly discussed in Avena Braga’s thesis ‘Dolce Napoli: approaches for performance’  
the recorder. The Harrach lute music includes four bundles of eighteenth-century works in the NYPL, and additionally, within the library at Schloss Rohrau, two large volumes of music in lute tablature were discovered in 2004 by the administrator of the Harrach art collection. This last find contains music for the eleven- and thirteen-course lute, with some of the pieces even labelled as ‘Concerto’. The lute music in the collection is often technically very challenging. In respect of the numerous pieces for recorder in the collection, Tommaso Rossi, in the liner notes to his world première recording of Leonardo Leo’s seven recorder sonatas, asks: ‘Was he himself [Alois Thomas Raimund] a recorder player? Or did a family member play the recorder?’ This is an interesting possibility, though as will be seen from our discussions of the recorder music below, some of the concertos and sonatas in the collection (particularly Fasch’s recorder concerto) would have required this person to be a technically accomplished player of the instrument. As yet, there exists no actual documentation which shows that Alois Thomas Raimund played the recorder (or indeed, that he was a musician at all). At this point, I would also like to draw the reader’s attention to another member of the Harrach family with an interest in music.

**Ferdinand Bonaventura [II] (1708–1778)**

Ferdinand Bonaventura von Harrach, born in 1708, was Alois Thomas Raimund’s twelfth child (named in the family tree of Alois Thomas Raimund, shown in Figure 6.5 as ‘Ferdinandus V Bonaventura’). Ferdinand Bonaventura was an industrialist, and like his father, he also worked in the Austrian foreign service, eventually becoming *Landmarschall* of Lower Austria. Ferdinand Bonaventura’s interest in music is shown by the appearance of his name in Vol. 1 of the NYPL Harrach collection. This volume consists of a number of songs, some anonymous, and some by the composers Lelio Colista, Clemente, and Zanni. In the NYPL information of this volume, Ferdinand

---

21 Freimuth and Crawford, ‘Unknown lute music by S. L. Weiss discovered in an Austrian Castle’. The lute music in the Harrach collection is further explored in Crawford’s article ‘The Harrach Lute Manuscripts and the Complete Works of S. L. Weiss’.
23 Ferdinand Bonaventura has an odd connection to Naples. In 1721, Alois Thomas Raimund married his third wife, Maria Ernestina von Dietrichstein. In 1733, in the last year of Alois Thomas Raimund’s period as Viceroy of Naples, Ferdinand Bonaventura married Maria Ernestine, who happened to be the daughter of Maria Ernestina von Dietrichstein from a previous marriage. In essence, Ferdinand Bonaventura married his Neapolitan step-sister.
24 US-NYp JOG 72-29, Vol. 1
Bonaventura is mistakenly listed as a composer. In fact, rather than being the composer, Ferdinand Bonaventura seems instead to be the copyist of a number of songs in the volume (Figure 6.6).

Perhaps some of the manuscripts within the Harrach collection were therefore collected by Ferdinand Bonaventura? Perhaps it was Ferdinand Bonaventura, rather than Alois Thomas Raimund, who was the keen recorder player in the family? And perhaps therefore Alois Thomas Raimund collected the numerous Neapolitan recorder pieces for his son to play? This is of course complete speculation, though Ferdinand Bonaventura is the only member of the Harrach family during this period where there is actual evidence of (at least some) musical training. Of course, the other option is that the numerous works for recorder (and lute) in the Harrach collection are simply a reflection of the musical tastes of the time, particularly during Alois Thomas Raimund’s time as Viceroy of Naples. The recorder was clearly popular in Naples then, and the lute also has a long and prominent musical history in Naples, being ‘widely played among the upper echelons of Neapolitan society’.25

25 Griffiths and Fabris (eds.), Neapolitan Lute Music, ix.
**Recorder Concertos in the NYPL ‘Harrach’ Collection**

We now turn to the specific musical sources of the Harrach collection, starting with the NYPL collection. The full 32 volumes of music obtained by the NYPL are listed in Table 6.1 below, along with some information about the contents of each volume. The information is predominantly taken from the NYPL collection listing, though I have also included several corrections and additional information of my own. Any volumes including recorder are listed in bold.26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Collection of mainly anonymous songs, though some by Leilo Colista, Clemente and Zanni. Copyist seems to be Ferdinand Bonaventura [II] von Harrach (45 leaves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Collection of songs in French, Italian, German (14 leaves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>French chansons, a few songs in Italian and some unaccompanied dance tunes (45 leaves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Continuo parts to a small number of operatic performances at Graz. (5 leaves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Giovanni Battista Costanzi: Soprano aria – ‘Sente il suono’ (19 leaves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Reinhard Keiser: Collection of his compositions, including a suite for harpsichord (55 leaves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>‘Quam latus’ – unaccompanied work for eight voices (9 leaves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Vocal works by Giuseppe Amadori, Caminelli [?], Giovanni Costanzi, Johann Hasse and Nicolò Porpora (38 leaves in total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>‘Lauten-Musik mit Begleitung.’ [Lute music]. Composers unidentified. (53 leaves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Four pieces by Gleitsmann, Jacobi, Meusel and Weichenberg [Lute Music]. (19 leaves)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Composition</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>3 pieces by August Kühnel, 1 piece by Lauffensteiner [Lute music].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td><em>Franz Anton Hoffmeister</em>: III Sonaten (Sonatas 4, 5, 6) (23 leaves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td><em>Franz Anton Hoffmeister</em>: Six sonatas (flute part only) (15 leaves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Recorder sonatas by Alberti, Hasse (‘Cantata per flauto’), Fedrici, Fiorenza, Leo (seven sonatas), Piani, Porsile, Reutter, G. B. Sammartini, Giuseppe Sammartini, Sarro, Sarti (109 leaves) *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>‘Musik: Violin omit Basso’ (6 leaves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Violin and violoncello parts for unidentified concertos (7 leaves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Work by unidentified composer (Violin I and II, Viola, contino) (8 leaves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Concerto in F major by unidentified composer (4 violins, violoncello and cembalo) (12 leaves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td><em>Anonymous</em>: ‘Concerto per flauto, due violini, violetta, e basso’ in C major. (14 leaves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Harpsichord concerto (group of four parts) (6 leaves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td><em>Matthäus Nikolaus Stulick</em>: Concerto for recorder and bassoon in C major. (16 leaves) **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td><em>Anonymous</em>: Suite for flute, violin and bassoon (5 leaves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>‘Sinfonia a due violini e basso’ (6 leaves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>‘Sonata di violoncello solo e basso’. Four sonatas. Fragment of an aria for soprano (23 leaves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td><em>Wenceslzo Reymundo Pirck</em>: ‘Concerto per il clavicembalo’ (harpsicord part) (8 leaves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td><em>Nicolo Porpora</em>: Three sonatas for violoncello (22 leaves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td><em>Johann Friedrich Fasch</em>: Recorder concerto in F major (10 leaves) ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Three concertos:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1) ‘Concertino per cammera, con arciliuto obligato, violini e basso’ (4 leaves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) <em>Giovanni Platz</em>: ‘Concerto con cembalo obligato’ (6 leaves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) <em>Domenico Sarri</em>: ‘Concerto con violin e flauto e basso’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is also an anonymous sonata included in this manuscript for ‘flauto solo e basso’ (12 leaves in total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>‘Musik Theorie und Uebungen’ (11 leaves)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1: Complete NYPL ‘Harrach’ collection (US-NYp JOG 72-29)
* The NYPL has misidentified all the Sammartini recorder sonatas as by Giovanni Battista Sammartini, when in fact only two out of the seven ‘Sammartini’ sonatas are marked as Giovanni Battista, and the other five are actually marked as Giuseppe Sammartini.

** The NYPL lists this as a concerto ‘possibly named Hulick’. Corrected to Stulick.

***The NYPL lists this as a concerto by ‘Rasch’. Corrected to Fasch.

**Custodial History of the NYPL Collection**

As already mentioned, the complete Harrach music collection was originally preserved in Schloss Rohrau, the Harrach family castle. In December 1956, the Harrach family put most of the music collection there up for auction. This auction was run by Karl & Faber, in Munich. The auction book includes information about the various lots. In total, 58 lots of manuscripts (lots 450 – 508) were put up for auction by the Harrach family (though the family are described in the auction book only as ‘ein österreichischen Fürstenhaus’ [an Austrian princely house]. A substantial portion of these lots were acquired by the NYPL. These form the 32 volumes in total that make up the Harrach collection at the NYPL (see Table 6.1). Some, though certainly not all, of the NYPL collection can be cross-referenced with the 58 lots in the Karl & Faber auction book. There is some confusion here, because the order of the NYPL Harrach collection does not in any way match the order of the auction book, and many of the lots seem to have been collated into different volumes in the NYPL. To give two examples, the various pieces of vocal music of Constanzi, Hasse and others (lots 461 to 466) seem likely to correspond with Vol. 5, Vol. 10, and possibly other lots in the collection. Lot 466 (‘Hoffmeister…Six Sonates…’) corresponds to Vol. 16, and possibly also Vol. 15. There are, however, a large number of pieces in the auction lots which do not appear in the NYPL collection (and therefore, these works were not bought by the NYPL). Tantalisingly, this includes numerous additional pieces of recorder music, some of which are not known today.

27 A copy of the original auction book was kindly sent to me by Karl & Faber. *Catalogue Karl & Faber* (Auktion 57. 6. – 7. Dez., 1956)
**Additional recorder music Lots from ‘Karl & Faber, Auktion 57. 6.–7. Dez., 1956’**

**Lot 454**: ‘Bioni (Ant.)’ [Antonio Bioni] – ‘Sonata per il Flauto (con Basso)’

**Lot 455**: ‘Cabellone (Mich.)’ [Michele Cabellone] – ‘Sonata à Flauto Solo e Basso’

**Lot 459**: ‘Coradini, (Franc.)’ [Francesco Corradini] – ‘Sonata à Flauto Solo (u. Continuo)’

**Lot 460**: ‘Coradini, (Franc.)’ – ‘Sonata à Flauto Solo (u. Continuo)’

**Lot 485**: ‘Porpora (Nicolo)’ [Nicola Porpora] – ‘Sinfonia à Flauto e Basso’

**Lot 486**: ‘Porpora (Nicolo)’ – ‘Sonata à Flauto e Basso’

The above recorder sonata manuscripts were not bought by the NYPL. As far as I am aware, they are not currently known, and do not survive in any other library.

**Lot 495**: ‘Simon (Martin.)’ [Martin Simon] – ‘Concert f. 2 Flöten, Oboe, Cello u. Continuo’

Lot 495 was also not bought by the NYPL, but it possibly survives in another library. Nine movements are mentioned in the auction book’s information about this manuscript. Unless Simon wrote a number of similar concertos, this seems likely to be the same concerto as a manuscript in the ‘Wenster’ collection in Lund, Sweden with nine movements for two recorders and an oboe.\(^{28}\) This concerto is included in Chapter 10 of this thesis.

**Lot 496**: ‘Telemann (G. Ph.)’ – ‘Sonata für Flauto, Oboe, Violino, Violoncello u. Cembalo’


**Lot 498**: ‘Telemann (G. Ph.)’ – ‘Concerto für Flauto I u. II, Oboe I u. II, Violnio I u. Continuo’

The three pieces by Telemann above were not bought by the NYPL, but seem to correspond to already existing manuscripts. Lot 496 could well be TWV 43:G6.\(^{29}\) Lot 497 (‘Concerto f.’) is likely to be the F-major recorder concerto, TWV 51:F1.\(^{30}\) Lot 498 is likely to be Telemann’s ‘ensemble’ concerto for two recorders and two oboes, TWV

---


\(^{29}\) D-DS Mus.ms. 1033/5 and 1042/88

\(^{30}\) D-DS Mus.ms. 1033/34
44:42 (since the auction book information mentions that the concerto is in A-minor, and in four movements).  

Lot 503: ‘Vivaldi (Ant.)’ – ‘Sonata à Flauto solo u Basso’
Lot 504: ‘Vivaldi (Ant.)’ – ‘Concerto con Flauto obligato, due Violini e Basso’
Lot 505: ‘Vivaldi (Ant.)’ – ‘Sonata à Flauto solo (u. Baß)’
Lot 506: ‘Vivaldi (Ant.)’ – ‘Sonata à Flauto solo (u. Baß)’
Lot 507: ‘Vivaldi (Ant.)’ – ‘Sonata à Flauto solo (u. Baß)’
Lot 508: ‘Vivaldi (Ant.)’ – ‘Concerto con Flauto, Oboè, Violino, Violoncello e Basso’

Lastly, there are the above six works with recorder (or possibly flute) by Vivaldi listed in the auction book. It is difficult to know whether all or any of these Lots correspond to currently existing sonatas and concertos, particularly since there could be some confusion in the listings between recorder and flute terminology. The information for Lot 508 is described in the auction details as in F major, and in three movements (Allegro, Largo, Allegro). This corresponds roughly to RV 99, which is a ‘chamber’ concerto with (transverse) flute, though the original has a bassoon instead of a cello. Rather surprisingly, the information for Lot 504 – ‘Concerto con Flauto obligato, due Violini e Basso’ – mentions that the piece is in C major, and with the following movements: ‘1. Allegro 4/4, 2. Adagio 3/4, 3. Presto 2/4’. This is very surprising, because there survives no recorder or flute concertos by Vivaldi with the scoring ‘due Violini e Basso’, in those particular movements and time signatures, and in C major. There are no (transverse) flute concertos in C major by Vivaldi, apart from the ‘chamber’ concerto RV 88, though this concerto is scored for flute, oboe, violin and bassoon and does not correspond to the above time signatures. Two of Vivaldi’s existing flautino concertos have parts written in C major (though RV 443 does include the words ‘Gl’Istrom: trasportati alla 4:’), but they both have different time signatures to the concerto in the auction book, and also include a viola part.

Is there a possibility that this is a completely new Vivaldi recorder (or flute) concerto, currently unknown? One option is that there is simply a mistake in the listing. If the second movement was actually in 4/4 rather than the 3/4 written in the auction book, then the concerto could potentially correspond to the flautino concerto RV 444 in C major.
major. However, this would mean that the viola part would have been missed in the auction listing as well (or that the concerto manuscript did not contain the viola part).

All of the additional auction lots mentioned above may have been bought by private individuals. Unfortunately, the auction book does not provide information regarding the specific names of these buyers.\textsuperscript{32} What the auction book does instead provide is the price of purchase. All the Vivaldi sonatas and concertos listed above were bought well above the estimated price (for instance, Lot 504 had a hammer price of 135 DM, when the estimated price was only 100 DM). Clearly buyers were very keen to purchase these items. Since the above lots were all purchased by someone, it holds out hope that the recorder sonatas listed of Bioni, Cabellone, Coradini and Porpora will one day turn up. It also leaves the possibility that there exists a further Vivaldi recorder concerto in a private collection somewhere in the world. The Harrach music collection has previous form in revealing newly discovered works by Vivaldi. An oboe concerto in G minor by Vivaldi (RV 812) was discovered in Schloss Rohrau, along with an alternative manuscript of the violin sonata RV 35a. Of course, the auction listing could simply be a mistake, and the concerto could correspond to one of the current Vivaldi concerto manuscripts (possibly RV 444). We will have to wait and see.

**NYPL Recorder Music**

**Sonatas (Vol. 17 and Vol. 31)**

The number of recorder sonatas in the collection is substantial (twenty-nine in total, though a few seem to be intended for transverse flute, rather than the recorder), and from a wide variety of composers. There are single sonatas by Giuseppe Matteo Alberti, Giovanni Antonio Pianni, Baldisar Fedrici, Nicola Fiorenza, Johann Adolf Hasse (titled ‘cantata per flauto’), Karl Georg Reutter, Francesco Sarti and Domenico Sarro. There is also a collection of seven sonatas by Leonardo Leo, and two sonatas by Giovanni Battista Sammartini and five sonatas by his brother Giuseppe Sammartini (with two of these sonatas being for two recorders and continuo). The recorder sonatas in the Harrach

\textsuperscript{32} No other records of the buyers seem to exist. Karl & Faber noted in private correspondence that the auction book is the only document surviving, and they have no further information on the buyers at the auction.
collection have a predominantly Neapolitan origin, and most of them were presumably collected by Harrach during his time as Viceroy of Naples.

The seven sonatas by Leonardo Leo are a particularly interesting find, since Leo is mainly known as an opera composer. Leo moved from San Vito dei Normanni to Naples in 1709, where he remained until his death in 1744. He studied at the Conservatorio S Maria della Pietà dei Turchini, and after the death of Alessandro Scarlatti in 1725, Leo became first organist of the royal chapel. In 1737, after the death of Mancini, he became vicemaestro of the royal chapel. During this period, he became well known and respected for his teaching, and held a number of positions at the various Neapolitan conservatories. Leo’s compositional output is large, and he became one of the more important of the Neapolitan opera composers. His work includes over forty serious and comic operas, alongside a substantial amount of sacred vocal music. His surviving instrumental music is limited, consisting of some keyboard music, as well as an interest in the cello (a set of six cello concertos by Leo survive today). A number of sinfonia by Leo also survive today in the library of the Musik- och Teaterbiblioteket in Stockholm (the library houses eleven manuscripts of Leo’s sinfonia). The seven recorder sonatas by Leo in the Harrach collection are titled as ‘Le Sonate per flauto e Basso continuo’, and include three sonatas in F major (sonatas I, IV and V), two sonatas in D minor (sonatas III and VII), one sonata in C major (sonata II), and one sonata in G minor (sonata VI). As Avena Braga points out, the Leo sonatas in the Harrach collection are interesting, not particularly because of their musical content (which is often limited and repetitive), but because it shows the importance of the recorder in Naples during this time, and ‘confirms the involvement of thriving opera composers in the creation of this humble, chamber repertoire’.

Of the many other recorder sonatas in this collection, there are two that particularly stand out for both their musical interest, and their technical difficulty. The first is the ‘Sonata à Flauto solo Del. Sig. Fiorenza’, found in Vol. 17 of the collection. This four movement sonata in A minor (Amoroso e Largo, Allegro, Largo, Allegro), involves a second movement with a relatively high tessitura, and much fiddly fingering passages. Figure 6.7 gives an example of one of these passages, involving several F6’s.

---

33 S-Skma O-R
34 All seven sonatas by Leonardo Leo were recorded in a world première recording released in 2015 by Tommaso Rossi - (Ensemble Barocco di Napoli): L. Leo - Recorder Sonatas (Stradivarius: Naples, 2013).
The second sonata worth drawing attention to here is the final sonata in the Vol. 17 set: ‘Suonata à Solo per il Flauto di Franco Sarti’ [Francesco Sarti]. Very little is known about Francesco Sarti, and only one other work by him survives – an overture for strings and two oboes, today housed in the music library of ‘Kloster Einsiedeln’, an Abbey in Switzerland.\(^{36}\) His sonata in this collection is in G minor, and is a concise and interesting piece for someone so unknown. The slow movements are charming, very well formed, and slightly ornamented. The sonata ends with a difficult fourth movement Allegro, involving some tricky fingerwork (the key of G minor naturally makes the fingering more difficult).

\(^{36}\) CH-E 13,9 (Ms. 1799). RISM no.: 400013054
Anonymous - Suite of dances for ‘Violino Solo’, ‘Flauto’ and ‘Fagotto’ (Vol. 25)

This manuscript, unknown until this study, consists of three parts: ‘Violino Solo’, ‘Flauto’ and ‘Fagotto’. Interestingly, the music also contains markings throughout each movement of ‘R:’, which seem to be ‘ripieno’ markings. In which case, you could almost classify this piece within the broad category of a concerto-suite: that is, an orchestral suite with two solo instruments (violin and recorder). However, the ripieno markings are rather sporadic throughout the suite, and though they often correspond between the parts, they seem musically quite odd. For example, in the first movement ‘Entrée’, the ripieno markings in the recorder and bassoon parts only occur eight bars before the end of the movement, and then again four bars before the end (confusingly, in the ‘Violino Solo’ part, eight bars and three bars before the end). In the second movement ‘Menuett’ and ‘Trio’, in the recorder part there is only one ‘R:’ marking, eight bars before the end of the Menuett; in the violin part, there is also only one ‘R:’ marking, but this time it is four bars before the end of the Trio (with nothing in the Menuett). In the bassoon part of the same movement, the ‘R:’ marking is not used at all, and instead the Trio has piano and forte markings. These unusual markings continue throughout the other movements (the movements of the suite are: Entrée, Menuett and Trio, Sarabande, Menuett, Capriccio, Gigue), generally occurring in the final four or eight bars of a movement. In the Capriccio, we see the only ‘S:’ marking, in the final four bars of the violin part. Before this, there is an ‘R:’ marking in this part eight bars before the end of the movement. Oddly, in the recorder and bassoon parts, there are ‘R:’ markings eight bars and four bars before the end of the movement, but no solo markings anywhere (though piano and forte markings also occur in the recorder part earlier in the movement). See Figure’s 6.9, 6.10 and 6.11.

![Figure 6.9](image)
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Consequently, if played with ripienists, and with the markings followed exactly, there is an unusual overall musical effect produced, with the additional instruments only playing in the last few bars of each movement. Perhaps, as Richard Maunder often argues in *The Scoring of Baroque Concertos*, the markings do not refer to ‘ripieno’ markings at all, but simply show when an instrumentalist has a passage with solo material? However, this does not quite seem to follow in this piece, since the rest of the suite also involves soloistic passages, meaning there would be no point marking only those near the end of a movement. A more likely option seems to be that the various markings (usually ‘R:’, one ‘S:’, and occasional *piano* and *fortes*) were written in haphazardly, and there are simply markings missing and sometimes put in the wrong place. The more interesting option is that the composer of this suite specifically intended the rather unusual musical effect of extra instrumentalists emphasising only the final few bars of each movement in the suite. This seems odd, but perhaps not completely implausible as a novelty musical effect.

There are four recorder concertos in the Harrach collection in the New York Public Library. As already mentioned, two of these were rediscovered in 2010 by Johannes Pausch and Steffen Voss, with Michael Schneider and the Cappella Academic Frankfurt giving a world premiere recording of these two concertos in the same year.\(^{38}\)

Interestingly however, there are two further recorder concertos in the NYPL Harrach collection which were not mentioned by Schneider. The first is an anonymous recorder concerto in C major (Vol. 22), and the second is a ‘Concerto con VV: e flauto e basso’ by Domenico Sarro (Vol. 31). The manuscript for this last concerto also contains an extra anonymous sonata for ‘flauto solo e basso’. All four recorder concertos will be examined in detail, starting with the two concertos already discovered.

**Johann Friedrich Fasch - Recorder concerto in F major (Vol. 30)**

Johann Friedrich Fasch became the *Kappelmeister* in Zerbst in 1722, a position he (somewhat reluctantly) remained in for the rest of his life. While there, his time was primarily occupied with the composition of church cantatas and music for festivals for the court. He had a close relationship to Dresden and the *Hofkapelle* there, where the *Kapellmeister* Pisendel would often perform many of Fasch’s concertos. Fasch also had close connections to Heinichen. Fasch’s concertos, of which 64 are extant, are often described as being situated within the transitional Baroque to early-Classical style. Fasch is also notable for his treatment of the wind instruments in his larger instrumental works, where he would often employ unusual combinations of instruments.

The Fasch concerto from the Harrach collection is in F major, although it is actually listed in the NYPL finding aid as a Concerto in D minor by ‘Rasch’.\(^{39}\) On a number of pages of the manuscript parts, ‘Rasch’ is actually written at the top of the page, so the mistake on the NYPL information is a reasonable one to make. The ‘Rasch’ is perhaps written by a later hand, who has simply mistaken the name. On the last page of the Viola part, seemingly in the same hand as the rest of the manuscript, the words ‘Del. Sig. Fasch’ can just be recognised. The NYPL mistake of key is also a reasonable one to

---


\(^{39}\) US-NYp JOG 72-29, Vol. 30
make: due to the way the parts of the manuscript are bound, the first page of the collection is actually the second page of the Violin I part, which at that particular moment happens to be in D minor. However, once the parts are looked through more carefully, it can be seen that the concerto is actually in F major.

The concerto itself is an important find for the recorder player. It is a musically interesting work, but also extremely technically difficult, comparable to some of the more demanding works in the repertoire. The concerto is in three movements. The opening fast-movement, in 3/4, contains numerous demisemiquaver ‘divisions’, which involve very tricky fingerings for the recorder player. The second movement is written with a three-part ‘senza basso’ accompaniment. The final movement is in 12/8, and begins like a normal giga. This movement, like the first, again involves much fast and difficult passagework for the recorder. The Italian concerto clearly had a very important influence on Fasch, and this concerto certainly shows a very Italianate style throughout. There are numerous compositions by Italian composers listed in the Concert-Stube of Zerbst.\(^{40}\) Concertos are also a feature of the Concert-Stube, with 207 works listed in this inventory (the next most popular form were Overtures, of which 147 were recorded).\(^{41}\) Out of the 207 concertos in the Concert-Stube, Vivaldi was the most frequent composer listed.

Amongst Fasch’s numerous extant concertos, this is the only concerto for the recorder that survives. There is an incipit of a Fasch concerto in D minor for ‘Flauto Abec’ in the eighteenth-century music catalogue of the Court of Hohenlimburg. This ‘Catalogus Musicus’ was started in Limburg in 1750 by Johann Martin Dömming, who was the Kappellmeister there during this period. The catalogue resides today in the Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek, in Münster. The other many recorder concertos listed in this catalogue are discussed in Chapter 8, with the full list of incipits found in Appendix B.

\(^{40}\) Zerbst’s Concert-Stube is an inventory from 1743, of nearly 500 works that Fasch collected during the period from his appointment of Kapellmeister at Zerbst in 1722.  
\(^{41}\) Sheldon, Johann Friedrich Fasch: Problems in Style Classification, 95.
This Fasch concerto listed in Limburg’s ‘Catalogus Musicus’ (Figure 6.12) does not survive today. Even from just the first seven bars of the musical incipit, we can see that the two Fasch concertos would have been very different in character. Unlike the D minor incipit, the surviving F major concerto straight away launches into the quick semi-quaver passages that are a feature throughout the first movement (Figure 6.13).

There is an interesting comparison to be made between Fasch’s F major recorder concerto and his C major solo bassoon concerto. Both are virtuosic works, requiring a very advanced technique on either instrument to play. Fasch wrote a number of difficult bassoon parts in his compositional output (as well as the bassoon concerto, a number of quartets involving bassoon), and Fasch could well have been exposed to the virtuosic possibilities of the bassoon during his time in Prague, employed by Count Wenzel Morzin. Vivaldi, who also wrote difficult concertos for both the recorder and the bassoon, sent several his (difficult) bassoon concertos to Prague. Fasch’s bassoon concerto and his recorder concerto both open with a first movement that stays relatively rooted to its home key, and both also utilise numerous melodic sequences. In the second movement of both concertos we notice even greater similarities, with both movements employing a quasi-recitative solo line over the top of staccato, repeated quavers in the string parts.
When did Fasch write this recorder concerto, and when did the manuscript become part of the Harrach collection? As already mentioned, Alois Thomas Raimund von Harrach had a role in a number of cities and courts as a diplomat, and one of these courts was Dresden, probably in the early 1720s. Fasch had a connection to Dresden – it is at Dresden that the majority of Fasch’s extant works now survive, in the famous ‘Schrank II’ collection of the Dresden Hofkapelle (in total, over 200 of Fasch’s works survive today in the SLUB library of Dresden). It is also at Dresden that Fasch met his second wife, in 1726/27 at gatherings of Lutheran Pietists.\textsuperscript{42} It seems likely that Harrach was in Dresden sometime in the early 1720s, so presumably would have encountered many of Fasch’s works played at the Kapelle during that time. Perhaps it was here that Fasch’s recorder concerto was first heard by Harrach? Interestingly, Fasch mentions in a letter to Count Zinzendorf of Saxony in 1731 that his music was known in Vienna.\textsuperscript{43} However, so far, no actual musical or documentary evidence has been found of Fasch’s music in Vienna. Perhaps this concerto, and its connection to the important Harrach family, whose family castle was only twenty-five miles east of Vienna, is what Fasch was referring to when he said his music was known in Vienna?

\textit{Matthäus Nikolaus Stulick - Recorder and bassoon concerto in C major (Vol. 24)}

We know very little today about Stulick’s life. He was born around the turn of the eighteenth century, and died in 1732.\textsuperscript{44} He was active as a court violinist in Mannheim and Düsseldorf. In 1723, ‘Matthias Nicolas Stulick’ was listed as one of the violinists in the Court of Manheim (Elector Carl Philipp had relocated his court from Heidelberg to Mannheim in 1720). Here, Stulick was named as one of the musicians that had moved across from Düsseldorf, where Carl Philipp’s brother Johann Willhelm was based.\textsuperscript{45} Stulick was obviously active as a composer, though only a small number of pieces survive today. Alongside this recorder and bassoon concerto, there survives one suite for two violins,\textsuperscript{46} and three oboe concertos.\textsuperscript{47} The fact that this very small amount of composition is today found in three distinct places – Dresden, Schwerin, and Uppsala –

\textsuperscript{42} Reul, ““Dream Job: Next Exit?”: A Comparative Examination of Selected Career Choices by J.S. Bach and J. F. Fasch”, 22.
\textsuperscript{43} Ibid., 21.
\textsuperscript{44} According to a record in the Deutsche National Bibliothek – no. 121193071.
\textsuperscript{45} Pelker, (in: \textit{Music at German Courts, 1715-1760}), 157.
\textsuperscript{46} D-Dl Mus.2814-Q-1
\textsuperscript{47} D-SWI Mus.4337; D-Dl Mus.2814-Q-2; S-Uu Inst. mus. i. hs. 59:18.
shows that his music must have had at least some regard. The C-minor oboe concerto by Stulick in Schwerin has also been attributed to Handel, since a manuscript of the same concerto exists in Uppsala under the name ‘dell Sing. Hendell’, though the concerto does not seem obviously Handelian.

Stulick’s music also made its way elsewhere in Germany. Stulick, like Fasch, also appears in the ‘Catalogus Musicus’ of the Court of Hohenlimburg (Figure 6.14), although this concerto, like the Fasch concerto in the catalogue, also does not survive today. There is the possibility that Stulick had some connection to the Court of Hohenlimburg, since before he moved to Mannheim in 1723, he was based in Düsseldorf (only around 40 miles away from Limburg).

![Figure 6.14: Stulick recorder concerto incipit. ‘Catalogus Musicus’, Limburg.](image)

It is an odd coincidence that both Fasch and Stulick each have only one surviving recorder concerto in the Harrach collection, as well as one (not extant) recorder concerto listed in the ‘Catalogus Musicus’ of Hohenlimburg. Perhaps this coincidence actually gives some insight into the origins of the Fasch and Stulick recorder concertos within the Harrach collection? The Dresden Hofkapelle seems to be the most likely connection between all parties involved. Two of Stulick’s six current surviving works are from Dresden’s ‘Schrank II’ collection. As already mentioned, Alois Thomas Raimund von Harrach spent time in Dresden on diplomatic missions in the early 1720s, and it seems likely that it was here that he encountered the music of Stulick and Fasch.

Stulick’s concerto for recorder and bassoon is actually listed on the NYPL finding aid as a ‘Concerto for violin solo’, with the ‘author tentatively indicated as Hulick(?).’

This is simply a misreading of a slightly ambiguously written name. However, it is certainly Stulick, rather than Hulick:

---

The additional mislabelling by the library as a concerto for solo violin actually gives some insight into the piece itself. Though it is in fact a recorder and bassoon concerto, the ‘Violino Primo’ part has soloistic material throughout, and in reality, the violin acts as a third solo instrument throughout the first and third movements of the concerto. In the first movement, for example, between bars 36 and 40, the recorder and bassoon work in pairs, responding to the melodic motifs of the first violin. This is followed by the three solo instruments playing together, with the rest of the ensemble dropping out.
As a contrast, in the second movement, only the recorder and bassoon are used as solo parts, with the first violin joining the accompanying instruments:

The concerto ends with a rollicking third movement, where the first 11 bars of the movement are in complete unison throughout the parts. This same unison motif returns (this time in the dominant) in the middle of the movement. Just like the Fasch concerto from the Harrach collection, the Stulick concerto is very much rooted in the Italian style. The influence of Vivaldi is apparent, particularly in its melodic material, but also especially in its scoring of recorder, violin and bassoon as solo instruments - the most obvious comparison being Vivaldi’s chamber concerto, RV 92, for recorder, violin and bassoon (though several Vivaldi’s other chamber concertos also employ similar combinations).
It is certainly not as technically demanding for the recorder player as the Fasch concerto, although the Stulick concerto includes some quite demanding passages for the first violin. The range of the recorder part in the concerto is surprisingly limited, from G₄ to E₆. The fact that the concerto does not go above E₆, and has a tessitura that rarely goes above C₆, seems to be an intentional choice by Stulick to root the concerto at a more modest technical level. There are certain moments throughout the concerto where Stulick seems to choose a compositional route that avoids the recorder travelling higher than an E₆. To give one example, in the rising sequence starting in bar 47 of the first movement, the passage rises to a top E₆ in bar 50, before quickly descending down the scale again. This rising passage seems to be a moment where, were the concerto in the hands of say Vivaldi, Telemann, or even Fasch, the concerto would take off in the second half of bar 50 into the higher realms of the instrument. This slight tameness gives the Stulick recorder and bassoon concerto the overall effect of a concerto that is in some ways Vivaldian in style, but without replicating the excitement and energy of Vivaldi’s concertos (and particularly Vivaldi’s chamber concertos for recorder and bassoon).

Anonymous - ‘Concerto per Flauto, Due Violini, Violetta e Basso’ (Vol. 22)

This concerto is completely unknown today. At first glance, and very intriguingly, it seems quite similar to the listing of the Vivaldi concerto in Lot 504 of the Karl & Faber auction book. The concerto is in three movements, in C major, and with movement time-signatures that correspond exactly to the Vivaldi concerto in Lot 504 (4/4, 3/4, 2/4). However, on closer inspection, it is obvious that these works could not be the same piece. Not only do the concertos share different movement titles (Allegro, Grave, Allegro, rather than Allegro, Adagio, Presto), but also, the concerto does not fit within the style or the recorder writing of Vivaldi’s concertos.

The concerto is really a concerto grosso, in three movements. There are a three concertino parts: ‘Flauto’, ‘Violino primo del Concertino’, ‘Violino secondo del Concertino’, as well as a number of ripieno parts ‘Violino primo’, ‘Violino secondo’, ‘Violetta in Violino’, ‘Violoncello’, and ‘Cembalo’. The ripieno violin parts double the concertino parts in the tutti sections. A noticeable feature of the concerto is both its

use of rhythmic variation, particularly the utilisation of off-beat patterns, as well as the inclusion of numerous trills in the recorder part (for example, see Figure 6.18).

![Figure 6.18: Anonymous, ‘Concerto per Flauto…’, ii, Grave, bars 38-40.](image)

**Domenico Sarro - ‘Concerto con VV: e Flauto e Basso’ (Vol. 31)**

For information on Domenico Sarro’s life, see Chapter 5.

This concerto is one of four works within Vol. 31 of the NYPL collection. There also two keyboard concertos in Vol. 31 (one anonymous and one by Giovanni Platz), as well as an extra recorder sonata attached at the end of the concerto: ‘Sonata à Flauto Solo è Basso’, in a different copyist’s hand to the concerto. Sarro’s recorder concerto is in D minor, and includes four manuscript parts: ‘Flauto’, Violino Pmo, ‘Violino 2.0’, and ‘Basso’. They are actually bound in the wrong order in the volume, and so it takes a little time to work out which pages of the concerto actually go where.

There survives one more recorder concerto by Sarro, mentioned in the previous chapter of this thesis (Sonata Undecima from the Manoscritto di Napoli 1725). There are a number of differences between the two Sarro recorder concertos. First, the Harrach concerto is in three movements (Amoroso, Adagio and Allegro), whereas the Napoli concerto is in four (Largo, Allegro, Larghetto, Spiritoso); secondly, the scoring is different – the Harrach concerto only includes accompaniment parts for two violins and a bass, whereas Sonata Undecima also includes a part for viola. This is slightly unusual in that only two other concertos (out of twenty-four) in the Manoscritto di Napoli include a viola part. What both of Sarro’s concertos do share consistently is extremely simple recorder writing, and the utilisation of a very limited range of the instrument. Sonata

50 US-Nyp JOG 72-29, Vol. 31
51 These are Sonata Decima and Sonata Decima Quarta, by Francesco Mancini.
*Undecima* never descends below an A₄, and only on two occasions reaches up to an E₆ (and even then, only in passing). The large majority of the concerto stays below a D₆. This is a small range for a four movement solo concerto. Sarro’s Harrach concerto is perhaps even more limited. It only reaches an E₆ once in the concerto (in bar 37), but otherwise keeps in the extremely comfortable range of D₆ and below. The concerto also only gets down to an A₄ on two occasions in the first movement, and on three occasions in the last movement. Apart from this, all three movements of the concerto are predominantly kept within the one octave range on an alto recorder of D₅ to D₆ (completely so in the second movement). For a whole solo concerto to consistently use a one octave range is rather surprising, and naturally limits the piece musically.

No composer is mentioned on the pages of the ‘Sonata à Flauto Solo è Basso’ manuscript, attached at the end of Sarro’s concerto. Since it is included at the end of the Sarro concerto, it seems plausible to assume that the sonata is also by Sarro. However, the sonata is in a completely different (and much messier) copyist’s hand to that of the concerto. It is, in fact, in the same hand as some of the anonymous sonatas at the beginning of Vol. 17 in the Harrach collection, alongside (it seems) the sonata by Nicola Fiorenza, some of the Sammartini sonatas, and the seven sonatas by Leonardo Leo. This particular copyist is very specific in naming composers – Fiorenza, Sammartini, and Leo are mentioned each time, for each separate sonata. When the composer is not known, the copyist simply writes ‘Sonata a Flauto Solo e Basso’. Therefore, we can assume that the sonata occurring after the Sarro concerto is of the same system, and should really be included amongst the anonymous sonatas of Vol. 17, rather than in with Sarro’s concerto. Possibly, like some other pages in the volumes of the NYPL Harrach collection, the sonata was simply misplaced.

**Recorder Concertos in the Staatsarchiv ‘Harrach’ Collection**

Alongside the substantial NYPL collection, there are other manuscripts still in possession of the Harrach family, but currently housed in Vienna’s Staatsarchiv (under AT-OeSta / AVA FA Harrach). Though the number of music manuscripts in this collection is relatively small (see Table 6.2), the archive does also include a large amount of family archival manuscripts, from the sixteenth century all the way through to the twentieth century. Additionally, as already mentioned, in 2004, two more volumes of
lute music were discovered in Schloss Rohrau by the administrator of the Harrach art collection. Furthermore, an oboe concerto in G minor by Vivaldi (RV 812) was also recently discovered in Rohrau, along with a different manuscript of the violin sonata RV 35a. This leaves open the possibility that further music manuscripts will be discovered in Schloss Rohrau.

The music manuscripts now in the Staatsarchiv are listed in Table 6.2 below. There are also two pieces of music which are listed in the catalogue of the Staatsarchiv Harrach manuscripts, but which are not currently to be found in the Staatsarchiv. These are listed in italics in the table below. Recorder music is listed in bold.52

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS 121</td>
<td>Tomaso Albinoni: ‘Sinfonie con trombe, oboe, violini e viola, 1726’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| HS 125     | 1. Cantata a piu voci a servizio di tavola nella festivita del di natalizio dell’Imperatrice Claudia  
2. L’ossequio della Gratie cantata per tre… 1673  
3. Il Tedeum cantato in Vienna… 1669 |
| HS 258     | ‘Teleman’: Konzertmusik (Recorder, two violins, viola, violoncello) |
| HS 266     | 1. *Anonymous*: ‘Concerto per il flauto e basso’  
2. ‘Concerto di Signore G.C.Alludemori |
| HS 301     | Overture des Symphonies de Thésée, du Triomphe de l’Amour, de Phaëton, de Amadis, de Proserpine, de Roland, du Temple de la paix. |
| HS 405     | Mouret: *Airs sérieux et à boire*, 1719 |
| HS 406     | *Arcangelo Corelli*: Sonata a tre, doi violini et violino o arcilento col basso per l’organo. |
| HS 639     | Il primo libro dello sonata di ghittara spagnola di Michele Platano, 1671 |

Table 6.2: ‘Harrach’ collection in the Staatsarchiv (A-Wös AT-OeSta / AVA FA Harrach)

---

52 Permission to view and include extracts from these manuscripts in my thesis has kindly been given to me by the Harrach family.
As we can see from Table 6.2, there are therefore two manuscripts within the collection in Vienna that include recorder concertos (listed in the archive as AT-OeSta / AVA FA Harrach HS 258 and HS 266).

‘Teleman’ Concerto (HS 258)

As already mentioned, HS 258 was discovered by Reinhard Goebel in 2008, with an edition appearing in the same year (published by Edition Walhall).\textsuperscript{53} Dorothee Oberlinger recorded the concerto with Ensemble 1700, which is directed by Reinhard Goebel, and this CD was released in 2009.\textsuperscript{54} Edition Walhall published the concerto as Konzert g-Moll ‘Harrach-Konzert’ by Georg Philipp Telemann. Before the publication of this edition, Telemann’s authorship of this concerto was quickly disputed, predominantly on stylistic grounds. Reinhard Goebel, in the Preface to his edition of the concerto, makes a strong attack on authorship “style criticism” in general:

\begin{quote}
…the garrulous “style criticism” must be ruled out in principle, having made a fool of itself over and over again during the last two centuries of musicology thanks to its gut-based misjudgements. In particular in the case of Telemann who… had at least three “manners” or stylistic levels he could draw upon, such a would-be science is simply condemned to total failure. If, for example, the breathtakingly grotesque violin concerto in A major [TWV 51:A4] had come down on us without the name of its author – nobody would ever have had the idea of attributing it to Telemann. However, it is exactly this composition that… may serve to prove that Telemann had an excellent knowledge and understanding of the Italian style and that he knew how to make use of its stylistic means – provided that this is what was asked for, of course.\textsuperscript{55}
\end{quote}

This is a reasonable position to take, particularly in relation to Telemann and his many styles. There are three initial pieces of evidence here which support the idea of Telemann’s authorship of this concerto. The first is that Telemann’s name actually appears in the manuscript (though in a different hand to the music). Secondly, no incipit of or information on this concerto exists in any eighteenth-century catalogue (providing no other potential name for the composer). Finally, as Goebel notes, it is very difficult...

\textsuperscript{54} Blockflötenkonzerte, Dorothee Oberlinger, Ensemble 1700 (Sony Music – DHM, 2009)
\textsuperscript{55} Goebel, Konzert g-Moll “Harrach-Konzert” für Blockflöte, 2 Violinen, Viola & B.c (Edition Walhall, 2008)
to pin down an exact Telemann ‘style’, even in his concerto writing, and use this to easily reject the attribution of this concerto to Telemann. Furthermore, I think there is an additional point, which has not been particularly discussed, but which also lends further argument to Telemann’s authorship of the concerto. This is that the recorder writing in this concerto fits well within Telemann’s other output for the instrument, and particularly in his other authentic solo recorder concertos. I shall first briefly describe the Harrach concerto, before comparing it to some of Telemann’s other recorder writing.

The manuscript of the concerto in HS 258 contains a title-page of the concerto, in a different (presumably later) hand to the rest of the concerto. It is titled: ‘Telemann / Concert-Musik: flauto, cembalo, violino 1., violino 2, violoncello, Viola’. The concerto is in three movements (Allegro, Adagio, Allegro), and very much rooted in the Italian style. In fact, it is this Italian style which has mainly led to doubts about its authenticity as a concerto by Telemann. Telemann’s current surviving concertos are nearly always, with only a very small number of exceptions, in four movements rather than the three that we see in this concerto.56

The first movement of the Harrach concerto is in ritornello form, with a very long introductory string tutti of 42 bars opening the piece, before the recorder finally enters with the initial ritornello theme. The solo passages are filled with \textit{Italianate} arpeggiated passagework, with the final recorder solo in particular filled with an extremely long arpeggiated semi-quaver section with very little break for the soloist at all. The second movement is lyrical, but short – at only twenty bars, and it frequently utilises the top range of the recorder. The third and final movement \textit{Allegro} is in many ways a \textit{Minuet}, albeit with rather unusual phrasing. This movement is creatively and musically very limited; an uninspiring initial theme is followed by long passages of arpeggiated semi-quavers with no melodic direction, before reaching a surprisingly lacklustre conclusion (considering Telemann’s concertos often end with energy). If this concerto is indeed by Telemann, I think this movement could be classed amongst some of his weaker compositions.

From the perspective of a recorder player, what is instantly noticeable about this concerto is, like Telemann’s other solo recorder concertos, it utilises the higher realms

---

56 The exceptions being a fascinating three-movement violin concerto in A major ‘Die Relinge’ (The Toads) [TWV 51:A4]; a concerto for three violins [TWV 53:F1]; and the ‘Concerto’ (Quartet) for recorder, violin, viola and continuo [TWV 43:g4]
of the instrument, as well as including some technically difficult moments of fingering. To give just one example, the inverted E-flat major arpeggio starting on a G₆ in bar 209 of the first movement produces a cumbersome finger pattern, requiring a player with good dexterity (Figure 6.19).

![Figure 6.19: ‘Teleman’ (disputed), ‘Harrach’ concerto, i, Allegro, bars 208-211](image)

This high range, and particularly the regular use of the note G₆ (and sometimes above), is very idiomatic of Telemann’s other solo recorder concertos, and his solo recorder writing in general (Telemann’s other solo recorder concertos are discussed in Chapter 7). Two out of three of Telemann’s authentic solo recorder concertos⁵⁷ use the higher register of the recorder even more extensively than the Harrach concerto. The C major recorder concerto, TWV 51:C1, has long passages reaching up to G₆. TWV 51:F3 goes even further, using notes G♯₆, A₆, and even one C₇. Similarly, Telemann’s recorder sonatas also often use the high registers of the instrument, and again particularly the note G₆. For example, the sonata in C from Essercii musici, TWV 41:C5 ascends up to a G₆ within the first bar of the piece; with the majority of Telemann’s solo recorder sonatas using a G₆ somewhere within the work. Though G₆’s are not particularly difficult notes to play (in fact, on a good recorder, a G₆ is usually a very comfortable note), and though other composers of recorder concertos do sometimes use G₆’s in their recorder writing, they are in the minority, with the majority of recorder concerto composers treating the alto recorder as having an upper limit of F₆.⁵⁸ Thus, the numerous uses of G₆ within the ‘Telemann’ Harrach concerto is very much in keeping with Telemann’s recorder writing in general, and does provide some additional support to the claims of Telemann-authorship. For further discussion of Telemann’s use of high notes, see Chapter 7.

⁵⁷ TWV 51:C1, TWV 51:F3, and the ‘Concerto di camera’ TWV 43:g3.
⁵⁸ Most obviously, the high recorder parts in Brandenburg Concerto No. 2 and No. 4 regularly use G₆; but also, for example, Vivaldi’s recorder concertos, and the Graupner overture-suite for recorder and strings, GWV 447.
Sonatas (HS 258)

Another particularly interesting feature of the manuscript HS 258 is that, after the disputed Telemann concerto, the manuscript also contains four additional complete sonatas for recorder and continuo, in the hand of the same copyist as the Telemann concerto. Two out of the four sonatas are written as a score, and both of these sonatas also have ‘Di Sig: Teleman’ written at the top of the page. The other two sonatas in the manuscript are in parts (‘Flauto Solo’ and ‘Cembalo’), with no composer mentioned. These last two sonatas were published by Brian Clark for Edition Walhall in 2010 and 2013 (as ‘Georg Philip Telemann (?) Harrach-Sonate Nr. 1’ and ‘Georg Philip Telemann (?) Harrach-Sonate Nr. 2’).\(^{59}\) There is also seemingly an additional fragment of a fifth sonata in the manuscript, though the pages are out of order and some pages also missing.

To add to the intrigue of this manuscript, Michael Schneider and Brian Clark have since identified the two sonatas in the set which are actually attributed on the score to Telemann (‘Di Sig: Teleman’) as two sonatas from Johann Christian Pepusch’s printed first set of solo recorder sonatas (Six Sonatas or Solos for the Flute with a Through Bass...).\(^{60}\) The first of these two sonatas is actually Sonata No. 6 from the printed set, and the second sonata attributed to Telemann is actually Sonata No. 1 from the same set of Pepusch. The other two sonatas (which were published by Brian Clark), have not been identified, and do not come from any other Pepusch recorder sonata.

The first sonata in the manuscript – actually Sonata No. 6 by Pepusch – has some differences between the Harrach manuscript and the printed source.\(^{61}\) The movements have different headings in the manuscript source (the second movement is a Gavotte rather than an Allegro, the third movement is a Grave rather than an Adagio, and there is a Menuet fourth movement, rather than Allegro). Moreover, the printed set ends after four movements, whereas the Harrach manuscript has a completely additional fifth movement Presto.

The other sonata wrongly attributed to Telemann in the manuscript – actually Sonata No. 1 by Pepusch – presents some further difficulties. The first two movements

\(^{59}\) Sonata c-Moll “Harrach-Sonate Nr. 1” and Sonatina a-Moll “Harrach-Sonate Nr. 2” (Edition Walhall, 2013, ed. Brian Clark). Copies of these editions were kindly sent to me by Brian Clark.

\(^{60}\) Brian Clark – private correspondence.

\(^{61}\) Six Sonatas for the Flute with a Through Bass for the Harpsichord, Composed by M’ Pepusch (Walsh & Hare, 1707).
are the same across both the Harrach manuscript and the printed set. However, the third movement in the manuscript source has a substantial copyist error in bars 2 – 5. Clearly the copyist forgot they were writing the recorder part in treble clef, rather than French violin clef, as bars 2 – 5 are written a third lower than they should be. The next few pages of the manuscript source present some further difficulties. The 6/8 Gigue which ends the printed sonata also ends the Harrach manuscript, but before we get to that movement, in the manuscript there is a total of three additional movements. There is an Adagio, which turns into a Presto, followed by a Gigue in 12/8. These three additional movements then finish with the 6/8 Allegro of the printed set.

The copyist of both the concerto and the sonatas in HS 258 has a couple of identifying features. The first is that each of the inner movements of a sonata end with three dots after the final barline:

![Figure 6.20: Harrach HS 258 copyist, ‘Flauto Dolce’ part](image)

The second trademark is a particular flourish which happens only at the end of the final movement of a sonata:

![Figure 6.21: Harrach HS 258 copyist, ‘Flauto Dolce’ part](image)
It is interesting to note that the additional 12/8 Gigue (appearing in HS 258 immediately before the confirmed Pepusch 6/8 Gigue) has the flourish at the end of the movement, but also, the words ‘Volti’ underneath.

![Image of music notation]

**Figure 6.22: Harrach HS 258, ‘Flauto Dolce’ part**

This suggests that the additional three movements could well be from a completely different sonata (which would have originally ended with the 12/8 Gigue). The ‘flourish’ would usually indicate the end of the sonata. However, ‘Volti’ obviously means to turn over and continue. It seems likely that the copyist decided to expand the Pepusch sonata, and inserted some extra material into the sonata from another piece altogether. This would explain why the third movement Adagio which has 6/8 written at the end of it (indicating the next movement will be in 6/8) is actually followed instead by three additional movements, starting with an Adagio in 3/4 (rather than 6/8). This would also explain why ‘Volti’ is written at the end of the 12/8 Gigue, even though the copyist’s usual ending flourish is also written. Presumably ‘Volti’ was written after the copyist decided to insert the extra pages into the sonata.

**The copyist of Harrach manuscript HS 258**

Interestingly, the copyist of HS 258 is also the same copyist as two of the recorder concertos in the NYPL Harrach collection: the concerto by Fasch (Vol. 30), and the concerto by Stulick (Vol. 24). Additionally, it is also the same copyist as the recorder concerto by ‘G.C:Alludemori’, discovered by myself in HS 266 (discussed below). Brian Clark, in private correspondence, comments that he recognises the copyist from
certain Fasch manuscripts in the Uppsala library. One of these manuscripts is a concerto by Fasch in Uppsala for oboe and violin (FaWV L:d4). This Fasch concerto also survives in autograph parts in Darmstadt. Interestingly, Clark mentions that there are also discrepancies between the Uppsala manuscript (by the same copyist as above) and Fasch’s autograph manuscript. This includes the rearrangement of some of the solo material in the first movement, and a deleted measure in the third movement.

These examples all therefore show a copyist who was very happy to alter source material, sometimes even including the addition of a number of completely separate movements from other works. Furthermore, two of the sonatas attributed to ‘Di Sig: Teleman’ in HS 258, are actually two published recorder sonatas by Pepusch. This makes the copyist a very untrustworthy source. Though I have noted that the recorder writing of the concerto in HS 258 fits well within Telemann’s solo recorder writing in general (particularly the high tessitura), the manuscript is from a copyist that has been shown to be very unreliable. This justifies large doubts regarding Telemann’s authorship of the Harrach concerto, though we await further evidence before this dispute can be conclusively settled.

**Harrach HS 266**

During my research, it became apparent that there also exists another manuscript for recorder in the Staatsarchiv, alongside manuscript HS 258. This is manuscript HS 266, which is an interesting find because it adds two more concertos to the small repertoire of concertos scored for multiple recorders. Like other concerto manuscripts in the Harrach collection, it also contains an additional, anonymous recorder sonata in the manuscript.

The title page of the manuscript reads: ‘Concerto per il flauto e basso’, followed by ‘Concerto vom G:C: Alludemori’. The copyist of the ‘Alludemori’ concerto is the same unreliable copyist mentioned above (though the first recorder concerto in HS 266 seems

---

63 S-Uu: Instr. mus. i hs. 15:3
64 D-DS: Mus. ms. 290/6
65 AT-OeSta / AVA FA Harrach HS 266
66 Other concertos in this small repertoire include Schickhardt’s Six Concertos for 4 Flutes; Heinichen’s ‘Concerto a 8’ for ‘Flaut. Conc., 3 Flaut. Ripien. 2 Violin, Viol e Cembalo’; and Marcello’s ‘Concerto di flauti’. 
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to be by a different copyist who does not use the identifying feature of three dots after the end of each movement).

*Anonymous ‘Concerto per il flauto e basso’ (HS 266)*

The first page of this concerto is actually titled ‘Solo per il Flauto & Basso. Fondamento’, and then ‘Sonata’ is written next to the initial clefs. This is therefore one of the many early eighteenth-century works that use a dual sonata / concerto terminology. The piece is in G major, and in three movements (*Adagio, Allegro, Allegro*). The scoring of the concerto is: ‘Flauto Concertino’, ‘Flautto Primo’, ‘Flautto Second’, ‘Basso’. The concerto is therefore in the ‘concerto di camera’ scoring (or indeed, the typically Neapolitan concerto scoring), of a solo instrument, two violins and a bass, but here with two violins actually replaced by two recorders.

Just like the suite for recorder, violin and bassoon in Vol. 25 of the NYPL Harrach collection, there also seem to be markings throughout this work for additional players. In the first movement, the terms ‘piano conc:’ and ‘forte’ are used in the ‘Flautto Primo’ and ‘Flautto Second’ parts. The second and third movements uses the term *piano*, as well as markings of ‘P:’ and ‘T:’ – presumably referring to solo and tutti sections. In the ‘Flauto Concertino’ part, markings of *solo* and *tutti* are used in the first movement, and thereafter ‘S:’ and ‘T:’. This presumably simply lets the soloist know the moments where the rest of the ensemble join in. These markings are similar to the markings in the suite for recorder, violin and bassoon in Vol. 25 of the NYPL Harrach collection, though the letter ‘R:’ was mainly used there. Could this mean that additional ripienists, also playing on recorders, were intended in this concerto? The alternative is that it was played one to a part, and these moments simply refer to where the concertino part has a ‘solo’. However, this does not seem to make sense when specific moments are examined in the concertino recorder part. For example, in bars 27 – 32 of the first movement, the solo recorder line alternates between ‘Tutti’ and ‘Solo’ every bar, yet the other parts play through these bars. Unless other players joined in at the ‘Tutti’ moments, the markings here would be completely pointless, and provide no useful information whatsoever.

Instead of additional ripienists joining in on recorders, could they instead simply have joined in on violins? This is of course possible, though with the ripieno recorder parts often playing quite low down on the instrument, any additional violins would
surely overpower an alto recorder. If this is indeed a concerto for three recorders and bass, with additional recorders joining in at certain moments, the musical effect would certainly be a novel one. Perhaps, like the unusual musical effect that may have been intended in the anonymous suite (Vol. 25) in the NYPL Harrach collection (where ripienists are seemingly asked to join in only in the final bars of each movement), this is simply another deliberate, novel musical effect?

Anonymous ‘Solo Per il Flauto & Basso’ (HS 266)

A sonata follows the concerto, and, like the concerto before it, no composer’s name is mentioned. The sonata is in D minor, in four movements (Adagio, Capricio allegro, Aria Cantabile, Allegro) and it is a mature and technically difficult work for recorder. The second movement, Capricio allegro, is particularly demanding for the performer, with constant demisemiquavers throughout the short movement (for example, Figure 6.23).

Figure 6.23: Anonymous, ‘Solo Per il Flauto & Basso’, ii, Capricio allegro, bars 16-19

‘Concerto vom G: C: Alludemori’ (HS 266)

This is the final piece discovered in the HS 266 manuscript, and like the first concerto in the manuscript, it is also unusually scored. It is a concerto for multiple recorders, with bassoon and continuo. There are six parts in the manuscript, namely: ‘Flauto Pmo 1: Principale’, ‘Flauto Secondo’, ‘Flauto Pmo Rinforzo’, ‘Flauto Secondo Rinforzo’, ‘Bassono’ and ‘Cembalo’. The concerto is in essence a solo recorder concerto, accompanied by three further recorders, a bassoon, and continuo.\textsuperscript{67} As already

\textsuperscript{67} It is of interest that there are several parts for the bassoon amongst the Harrach manuscripts. Alongside the accompanying bassoon part included in this concerto, there is also a solo bassoon part in the suite for violin and flute (Vol. 25, NYPL) and an obligato solo bassoon line in Stulick’s concerto (Vol. 24, NYPL). It is not common to see bassoon parts included with recorder concertos (partly because it is easy for a bassoon on the bass line to overpower an alto recorder in its lower register), and it is surprising to see, in just one family collection, a bassoon included in two recorder concertos as well as in a suite for violin and recorder.
mentioned, the copyist of this concerto is the same as the copyist in HS 258, as well as the Fasch and Stulick concertos in the NYPL Harrach collection, with the same three-dot calling-card included at the end of movements.

The first page of the ‘Cembalo’ part includes the words: ‘Di Sig: G: C: Alludemori’. No specific information regarding ‘Alludemori’ has yet been found. The only related record I could find was a Neapolitan noble family with the name ‘Aldemori’, who can be traced to at least the end of the seventeenth century. Since the Harrach collection consists of a large amount of Neapolitan music, perhaps the composer of this concerto was some relation to this noble family?

The pages of the concerto in the manuscript are somewhat out of order, which leads to some confusion regarding which page belongs to which part. The concerto is in B-flat major, and in three movements, though the second movement alternates between slow and quick sections (Allegro, Grave - which is broken up with a Presto and later a Prestissimo - followed by an Allegro). The bassoon only plays in the tutti sections of the first and third movement, and is tacet in the second movement. In fact, all parts are actually tacet in the second movement, apart from ‘Flauto Pmo 1: Principale’ and ‘Cembalo’. Apart from the unusual scoring, the concerto itself has influences of Vivaldi; both in its well-formed structure, and in its recorder writing. The second movement, in G minor, is the most musically interesting movement of the three. A beautiful and lingering melody is soon replaced by a furious Presto section, where the recorder plays demisemiquaver arpeggios over a B-flat pedal note in the continuo. The Grave melody returns for another four bars, before fury takes over once again – this time even quicker than before, with Prestissimo demisemiquavers over a D pedal note, and ending on the dominant (see Figure 6.24). A lilting Adagio finally finishes a very effective movement.

---

68 Memorie historiche di diverse famiglie nobili, così napolitane... (1691), 104.
The ‘Flauto: Principale’ and ‘Cembalo’ parts have ‘Tutti’ and ‘Solo’ markings throughout, but this is presumably just so those players know when the other parts are playing, or when it is only recorder and harpsichord. The two ‘Rinforzo’ recorder parts play relatively sparingly, often just providing quaver accompaniment. The concerto is unusual, exciting, and technically difficult for the recorder player; its non-conventional scoring will perhaps not lend itself easily to concert performances, but it certainly deserves to be explored by performers.

**Summary**

We can see from this chapter that the Harrach collection has a vast amount of recorder music, including several recorder concertos, some of which were completely unknown before this study. I have provided bibliographical and archival information about the Harrach family, which illustrates the wealth and power of the family. As well as Alois Thomas Raimund von Harrach, I have also drawn attention to Ferdinand Bonaventura von Harrach (1708-1778), noting that he was the copyist of a number of songs in Vol. 1.
of the NYPL Harrach collection. This therefore makes him, so far, the only member of the Harrach family during the eighteenth century where there is actual evidence of (at least some) musical training. The research in this chapter also provides clarity regarding the size and locations of manuscripts in the Harrach collection, and the recorder concertos within it. Furthermore, my research into the custodial history of the collection, and specifically the auction by Karl & Faber in 1956, shows there to be several other pieces for recorder from the original Harrach collection which were not bought by the NYPL. These works were purchased by other buyers, and include a number of currently unknown sonatas for recorder, as well as what could even be an additional unknown recorder concerto by Vivaldi. All of these manuscripts could currently be in private collection(s) somewhere, giving the prospect that they will one day come to light.

In this chapter, I also provided information on the copyist of several works for recorder within the Harrach collection (and particularly the concerto by ‘Telemann’), and show the copyist to be an unreliable source, making the attribution to Telemann a dubious one. Finally, I undertook a detailed examination of the recorder concertos (and other selected recorder music) in the Harrach collection. This includes an analysis of the technical levels of the concertos, as well as my reflections on the ambiguous and haphazard solo and tutti markings found throughout the collection.
Part IV

Germany
7

Recorder Concertos by Telemann and the Hesse-Darmstadt Hofkapelle

Germany during the eighteenth century consisted of a number of different independent states and territories. In 1658, after the end of the Thirty Years Wars many regions were left completely devastated, with vast losses in population and wealth. In the years after the war, within the Holy Roman Empire, authority became greatly decentralised and territories were given much greater independence. This feudal fragmentation produced several virtually sovereign German-speaking regions. These areas were ruled by different ranks and types of ruler, forming various political systems (grand duchies, duchies, kingdoms, principalities, free cities etc.). These numerous territories greatly differed in terms of size, wealth and religion, and were, throughout the eighteenth century, often subject to changes of boundaries and allegiances. Music at these courts also differed greatly, often depending on the court’s wealth and prestige, and the ruler’s interest in music. Some court Hofkapelle throughout Germany were sizeable and well-funded; others were less so.¹

This chapter focuses on the solo recorder concertos (and concertouverturen) of Telemann, as well as, more broadly, the recorder concertos of the Hesse-Darmstadt Hofkapelle. This study was completed after a research trip to the Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek in Darmstadt, where the manuscripts are today housed. The recorder had a prominent and active role for a period of time in the Hesse-Darmstadt Hofkapelle, with a number of surviving recorder concertos from the court. Telemann’s recorder concertos are a substantial repertoire for the recorder player, and include some of Telemann’s best instrumental writing (as well as some of the more challenging concertos in the recorder repertoire). Much excellent scholarship has already been devoted to the concertos of Telemann, with the work of Steven Zohn particularly providing significant understanding of Telemann’s instrumental music.² Here, I aim to provide some

¹ Hofkapelle literally means the court chapel, though it came to refer to the musicians who performed music in the chapel.
² In particular, see Zohn’s Music for a Mixed Taste (2008) which provides a thorough examination of Telemann’s sonatas, concertos and suites, [GL 2208].
additional insights into Telemann’s concertos and the recorder concertos in Hesse-Darmstadt more generally, using my knowledge as a performer of the recorder. I also provide some examples of the very late use of the recorder in Hesse-Darmstadt. As I mentioned in the Introduction to this thesis, two notable concertos have not been included in this or other chapters on German recorder concertos. These are Bach’s two Brandenburg concertos involving recorder (No. 2 and No 4), which have already been subject to an exhaustive amount of scholarship (particularly the fiauti d’echo controversy of No. 4). Griscom and Lasocki’s guide provides a full list of all current research on the use of recorder in these concertos [G&L 2020 through to 2043].

The German Taste

The Italian concerto made its way north into German-speaking countries predominantly through travelling musicians and published music. Many Northern European composers had been trained to a large extent in the French style, and this, combined with the new influence of the Italian concerto style, caused an interesting hybrid style to emerge.³ This cosmopolitan nature of German music resulted in a style that became to be known as the ‘mixed taste’. This ‘taste’ was particularly associated with Telemann. In the libretto to Telemann’s lost cantata Wie? Ruhet ihr, versteckte Saiten? [TWV 20:13], Telemann described the nature of German (and his own) music in a recitative:

The flattery of Italy’s pieces  
The unrestrained liveliness  
That flows from French songs;  
Britain’s leaping, obliging nature;  
Yes, Sarmatia’s exquisite pleasure,  
To which the notes’ jesting is devoted  
German diligence combines all this  
To the honour of its country,  
All the more to please the listener here  
Through pen, mouth, and hand.⁴

Telemann’s synthesis of musical tastes has been used by scholars both as a compliment and a criticism of his music. On the one hand, Telemann has been praised for his extensive knowledge of music and the ease with which he writes in a vast array of

³ Maunder, The Scoring of Baroque Concertos, 86, [GL 147].
⁴ Zohn, Music for a Mixed Taste, 4, [GL 2208].
European musical idioms. On the other hand, he has also been criticised, particularly in the early twentieth century, for his overuse of musical synthesis. For example, Hans Graeser, in 1925, wrote that Telemann merely reflected and amalgamated the styles of his day, and therefore he could not be viewed as an ‘original artist’.\(^5\) By the second half of the twentieth century, this picture of Telemann had changed, and the large performance interest in Telemann’s instrumental music in particular has reclaimed a large portion of his reputation. Telemann’s mastery of styles is now apparent to most, and in fact Telemann himself thought that such mastery was vital to musical ‘invention’. Telemann, in his autobiography, writes:

I thus became acquainted with the French style..., with the Italian and theatrical styles..., and from both I learned the diverse natures of various instruments, which I spared no effort to master myself. To this day I am still learning how necessary and beneficial it is to be able to differentiate the essential elements of these styles, and I believe that no one can be fluent and felicitous in invention without it.\(^6\)

Telemann produced a vast amount of instrumental music. Telemann’s extant instrumental compositions consist of around 125 overture-suites, well over 100 concertos, 50 sonatas, 130 trios, 90 solos and 95 works for one or more instruments without basso continuo.\(^7\) Telemann’s writing for the recorder forms a significant part of this large output. The recorder is prominent in numerous sonatas, trios, sinfonias, overture-suites, vocal cantatas, and of course, concertos.


\(^6\) Zohn, *Music for a Mixed Taste*, 15, [GL 2208].

\(^7\) Ibid., xi.
Telemann’s Solo Recorder Concertos (and Concertouverturen)\(^8\)

There are three authenticated solo recorder concertos written by Telemann that survive today (including the ‘Concerto di Camera’, TWV 43:G3). There is also one overture-suite for solo recorder and strings (concert en ouverture), discussed separately below. Additionally, there is a disputed concerto attributed to Telemann and found in a collection of manuscripts of the Harrach family in Vienna’s Österreichisches Staatsarchiv. This disputed concerto is discussed in detail in Chapter 6, where I argue that, though there are similarities in the recorder writing of this concerto to Telemann’s other solo recorder concertos, the copyist of the source is unreliable. Other manuscripts in the copyist’s hand include additional or rearranged material, and two of the sonatas attributed to Telemann in the same source are actually by Pepusch. Telemann’s authorship for this concerto is therefore dubious.

Concerto in F major (TWV 51:F1) and Concerto in C major (TWV 51:C1)

In this section, I turn first to Telemann’s two solo recorder concertos with two violins, viola and cello. These are TWV 51:F1 (F major), and TWV 51:C1 (C major). Both of these concertos were very likely written during Telemann’s period at Frankfurt, sometime between 1716 and 1721.\(^9\) TWV 51:F1 survives in two forms, both housed today in Darmstadt’s Universitäts und Landesbibliothek. The first manuscript is a score in the hand of the Darmstadt Vice-Kappelmeister J.S. Endler, and the second manuscript, with six instrumental parts, is in the hand of Darmstadt’s Kappelmeister Christoph Graupner.\(^10\) Telemann has a strong connection to both Graupner, as well as Darmstadt

\(^8\) As well as the ‘solo’ recorder concertos, there are also five ‘double’ concertos penned by Telemann that involve the recorder. Two of these concertos are scored for two recorders (concertos in A minor and Bflat major – TWV 52:a2 and 52:B1); alongside this, there is a concerto in E minor for recorder and flute – TWV 52:e1; a concerto in A minor for recorder and viola da gamba – TWV 52:a1; and a concerto in F-major for recorder and bassoon – TWV 52:F1. Finally, there is also a work titled ‘Sinfonia’ – TWV 50:3, scored for recorder and viola da gamba, with string accompaniment, along with additional parts for cornetto, two oboes, and three trombones, doubling the strings. The inclusion of these particular instruments suggests that this work was possibly conceived with an ecclesiastical setting in mind.

Separately, there are a number of works by Telemann with recorder which come under the broad category of sonata auf concertenart. This is a genre that speaks in both the tongues of the sonata and the concerto, where the scoring of the sonata (either solo, trios or quartets) is crossed with the styles and structures associated with the concerto. A good example of the sonata auf concertenart is TWV 43:g4, which survives as a ‘Trio’ in Dresden for recorder, violin and viola.

\(^9\) Zohn, Music for a Mixed Taste, 171, [GL 2208].

\(^10\) D-Ds Mus.ms. 1033/34a (Endler) and Mus.ms. 1033/34b (Graupner). The six parts in 1033/34b are: ‘Violoncello obl.’, ‘Flauto à bec Concertanto,’ ‘Violino Primi’, ‘Violino 2do’, ‘Viola’ and ‘Cembalo’.
and its Hofkapelle. Telemann moved to Frankfurt in 1712, the same year that the Landgrave of Hesse-Darmstadt appointed Graupner as Hofkapellmeister of the Hesse-Darmstadt court. Telemann and Graupner had close contact during these years – Telemann would often borrow musicians from Darmstadt when he needed extra musicians for specific occasions (the Darmstadt court orchestra, certainly in the years following Graupner’s appointment, was well-known for having a large orchestra with many musicians available to it). Telemann’s ties with Graupner and Darmstadt remained for the rest of his life; as late as 1765, Telemann composed an overture for the court in Darmstadt.\(^{11}\) The Darmstadt library today contains around 350 manuscripts of instrumental music by Telemann.

The recorder concerto TWV 51:F1 consists of four movements. An opening *Affetuoso* moves into a vigorous *Allegro* in binary form. This is followed by an *Adagio*, involving some interesting workings of the ostinato-bass; and ending with a pair of minuets. For the recorder player, the most notable feature of this concerto is its extremely high range. Within the first eight bars of the opening *Affetuoso*, the recorder ascends up to an A\(_6\). In the first movement alone, there are two A\(_6\)’s, one G\(\#_6\), and eight G\(_6\)’s, in what is quite a short movement of only 34 bars. This is an unusually large focus on what are often quite rare notes on the recorder, certainly during the eighteenth century. The second movement *Allegro* goes even higher: in bar 58 of the movement, the recorder melody leaps to a crotchet C\(_7\) (Figure 7.1). This is, as far as existing sources go, the highest note written in the whole of the eighteenth-century recorder concerto repertoire.

![Figure 7.1: Telemann, TWV 51:F1, ii, Allegro, bars 57-59](image)

F major is the ‘home key’ of the alto recorder, and therefore many of the quick passages in the *Allegro* fit comfortably under the fingers, though there are still a number of moments that require reasonable finger dexterity and neatness. Though the notes of the

\(^{11}\) TWV 55:D21 D-De Mus.ms. 1034/45.
third octave were used only occasionally in the eighteenth-century repertoire, they appeared in a number of eighteenth-century fingering charts, and would have been known to good players (high-note fingerings are discussed in more detail below). What makes this concerto tricky for the recorder performer is not actually the high-notes themselves, but the fact that they often appear within long phrases that require good breath support. For example, in the first movement, a flowing phrase starting in bar 15 gradually descends over two bars before leaping to a G#₆ at the start of bar 17 (see Figure 7.2). Though this is only two bars, for it to be performed effectively (and without performing the movement too quickly), the breath needs to be controlled throughout this phrase so that the unexpected G#₆ (an implied diminished chord against a D in the bass) at the end of the section can be played as a powerful and stable note (perhaps even with a slight pause to emphasise this cadence even further).

![Figure 7.2: Telemann, TWV 51:F1, i, Affettuoso, bars 14-17](image)

A similar example occurs in the third movement Adagio, where the melody again reaches the note G#₆ in bar 11, leading onto an A₆ (Figure 7.3).

![Figure 7.3: Telemann, TWV 51:F1, iii, Adagio, bars 6-11](image)

The difficulty for the performer here is again the limited space to take a breath, and maintaining diaphragm and air support throughout. There is a clear moment for a breath before the last quaver E₆ in bar 8, but from here the line should ideally be played without
a further breath until after the cadence in bar 11. This requires the performer to maintain good support, and to be able to have enough breath left to be able to play the cadential figure in a controlled fashion.

The C major concerto, TWV 51:C1 also survives in two manuscripts from the Hesse-Darmstadt collection. The first is a score in the hand of an unidentified copyist (likely another member of the Darmstadt Hofkapelle). The second is also a score, and like the F major concerto, in the hand of Graupner (though this particular manuscript is not up to the usual copying quality for which Graupner was well-known).12 The C major recorder concerto has some similarities to the F major concerto, though it also appears to be more stylistically developed than the F major concerto (and therefore could have been composed after the F major concerto).13 The C major concerto shares some unusual third-movement chromaticism with the third movement of the F major concerto, and it also shares the use of a high tessitura for the recorder part. Although the C major concerto does not include the top C7, or even an A6, it does regularly use the notes F#6 and G6. The high recorder writing in both concertos manages to overcome one common problem for recorder players, and for alto recorder concertos in particular: that of the instrument being overpowered by the rest of the ensemble. The higher recorder is obviously more audible, but this is particularly the case when considering concertos, where the higher range of the recorder distinguishes it to a greater extent from the sound and tessitura of the strings. Alto recorder concertos in general can often encounter problems of balance – that is, the middle and lower ranges of the alto recorder are easily overpowered by strings (and especially string playing that is not completely sympathetic to the recorder’s limitations). The use of a slightly higher tessitura therefore somewhat reduces the issue of balance for the recorder player.

12 D-De Mus.ms 1033/23a and 1033/23b.
13 Steven Zohn has reasonably suggested that, considering the challenging difficulty of these concertos, and since they were most likely both written during Telemann’s Frankfurt years, they could have been written for the woodwind virtuoso, and musician greatly admired by Telemann, Johann Michael Böhm (Zohn, Music for a Mixed Taste, 171). Böhm first performed with the Darmstadt Hofkapelle in 1711, and was the Konzertmeister there from at least 1715 (and possibly earlier) until 1729. As already mentioned, during Telemann’s years in Frankfurt (and actually for many years after), Telemann had close connections to the Darmstadt musicians, often borrowing them for specific concerts and events. Böhm would therefore have performed regularly for Telemann in Frankfurt during these years. Notably, Böhm also became Telemann’s brother-in-law in 1714. For further reading on the size and various members of the Darmstadt Hofkapelle, see: Biermann, 'Die Darmstädtische Hofkapelle unter Christoph Graupner, 1709-1760'.
High note fingerings

An important topic to raise at this point is that of high note fingerings for the recorder. Though the vast majority of eighteenth-century recorder concerto output does not stray past an F_6, alongside Telemann’s output, there are other concertos in the repertoire that utilise a higher range (Vivaldi’s recorder concertos, and famously, Bach’s Brandenburg concertos No. 2 and No. 4 are the most notable examples; and in Chapter 10 I also discuss a concerto for two flautinos by ‘Förster’ that has a similarly high tessitura).\footnote{Telemann also regularly uses third octave notes in his non-concerto recorder writing, and particularly in his solo recorder sonatas.}

High notes are an important topic to discuss because they, and the F#_6 in particular, have had much written about them, and are notes that have caused problems for the modern recorder player. I know from my own students that the third octave can cause real consternation (usually due to the worry of the notes ‘cracking’ in a performance). These issues are partly due to students playing on recorders with a ‘modern’ fingering system. This ‘modern’ fingering system (as opposed to various historical fingering systems) is often referred to as the ‘English’ or the ‘Dolmetsch’ fingering system: a system partially developed by Dolmetsch(s) (along with other instrument makers) during the revival of the recorder.\footnote{The modern ‘English’ system is also in contrast to the modern ‘German’ fingering system, which simplifies the ‘forked’ F (0123 467) with an easier fingering (0123 4). In reality, the ‘German’ system is rarely used in modern recorder making, as it has some issues of tuning and also gives more complicated fingerings further up the instrument.} This ‘English’ system is used for all major mass produced modern recorders, and is the basis of modern recorder teaching.

The ‘English’ fingering system is a reasonably successful one, giving the capability to play most semitones on the instrument without having to half-hole. However, it does come with some drawbacks, one of which being a lack of ease in sounding some of the notes in the third octave of the instrument. In the modern system, some of these third-octave notes are usually played by stopping the bell of the recorder with the knee (a technique that has, on at least two occasions, caused me pain when a clumsily misplaced knee jolted the end of the instrument). Though the bell-technique is not necessarily required on all modern instruments, (sometimes variations of the ‘historical’ fingerings - examples given below - can produce a stable note on modern instruments), it is still a method that is found in all contemporary recorder technique manuals, and is a technique...
taught to all advanced students today. One by-product of the prevalence of this ‘modern’ fingering system is that any recorder music (eighteenth century or otherwise) with quick passagework which includes lots of third octave notes also involves the performer employing complicated and physically demanding recorder-to-leg movements to obtain these notes (this is not helped by the relatively limited knowledge of alternative high-note fingerings amongst many modern players). The bell-stopping technique is a very difficult technique to master, and my own recorder training involved much laborious practice on this technique to try and achieve neatness and dexterity in some of these tricky passages.

In fact, this bell-stopping technique is a completely modern technique, and one that would have been alien to eighteenth-century recorder players. There are several ‘historical’ high-note fingering systems that give relatively straightforward fingerings for third-octave notes (with no bell-stopping required). A thorough examination into historical fingerings is beyond the scope of this thesis, but below I include some examples of various eighteenth-century high-note fingerings (Table 7.1). This is certainly not an exhaustive list of eighteenth-century fingering charts, but provides a useful sample.

---

16 The bell-stopping technique is generally taught in one of two ways: by either placing the foot across the opposite leg for support and balance and then stopping the bell of the recorder with the inner thigh; or by using a stool or other object to support the raised leg. For additional information on the leg stopping technique, along with a discussion on the ‘bell’ key (developed as an alternative to stopping with the leg), see Andrew Robinson’s article ‘Leg Technique’ in Recorder Magazine [GL 1335].

17 For further reading on the subject of historical fingerings, see in particular Alan Davis’s article ‘Playing Baroque Recorders with Original Fingering’, Recorder Magazine, Vol. 12, 1992, [GL 1224] and Ilona Manning’s ‘Die dritte Oktave der Altblockflöte-altes Neuland’, Windkanal, 3, 1998, [GL 1225]. Griscom and Lasocki’s guide recommends other useful articles for further reading (see GL 1219 to GL 1228). The topic of high-note fingerings also relates to the issue of Bach’s Brandenburg No. 4, and the instrumentation controversy. Griscom and Lasocki’s guide again provides many recommendations for further reading on this subject (see GL 2024 to GL 2043).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hotteterre (1707)&lt;sup&gt;18&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Stanesby (1732)&lt;sup&gt;19&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Majer (1732)&lt;sup&gt;20&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Anon. (c.1750) ‘Schaalle voor de Beckfluit’&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Minguet (1754)&lt;sup&gt;22&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F&lt;sub&gt;##&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>θ 13 457</td>
<td>θ 13 457</td>
<td>θ 13 457</td>
<td>θ 13 457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;&lt;sub&gt;6&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>θ 13 467</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>θ 13 457</td>
<td>θ 13 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G&lt;sub&gt;6&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>θ 13 467</td>
<td>θ 13 466</td>
<td>θ 13 466</td>
<td>θ 13 466</td>
<td>θ 13 466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G&lt;sub&gt;#&lt;/sub&gt;&lt;sub&gt;6&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>θ 13 67</td>
<td>θ 13 67</td>
<td>θ 42 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;&lt;sub&gt;6&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>θ 13 67</td>
<td>θ 13 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&lt;sub&gt;6&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>θ 12</td>
<td>θ 12</td>
<td>θ 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&lt;sub&gt;#&lt;/sub&gt;&lt;sub&gt;6&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>θ 12 67</td>
<td>θ 423 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;&lt;sub&gt;6&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>θ 12 67</td>
<td>θ 12 67</td>
<td>θ 423 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&lt;sub&gt;6&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>θ 12 45</td>
<td>θ 12 45</td>
<td>θ 42 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&lt;sub&gt;7&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>θ 45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7.1: Sample of eighteenth-century recorder fingering charts, F<sub>##</sub> to C<sub>7</sub>**

As can be seen, there are many examples of historical high-note fingerings, showing conclusively that these notes would have been known to eighteenth-century players, and that they would not have used bell-stopping.<sup>23</sup> This is an important point to cover, and

---


<sup>19</sup> Stanesby Jr., *A new system of the flute a’bec, or common English Flute* (London, 1732).

<sup>20</sup> Majer, *Museum Musicum Theoretico Practicum* (Schwäbisch Hall, 1732).

<sup>21</sup> From an unseen original source. Included in Dale Higbee’s article ‘Third-Octave Fingerings in Eighteenth-Century Recorder Charts’, [GL 1226].

<sup>22</sup> From an unseen original source. Included in Ilona Manning’s article ‘Die dritte Oktave der Altblockflöte-altes Neuland’. It is an anonymous Dutch fingering chart from c.1750 (the original source is today in the Gemeentemuseum in The Hague).

<sup>23</sup> This high-note capability was certainly not a new development exclusive to ‘baroque’ recorders, with ‘Ganassi’ including fingerings (in *Opera intitulata Fontegara*, 1535) for notes all the way up to D<sub>7</sub> (θ 13 5, θ 1, and θ 13 567 – though this is not a note I have managed to convincingly achieve on my own ‘Ganassi’ instrument).
one that is still surprising to some modern players. The various passages filled with third octave writing (and particularly those involving F#6) that can still fill modern players with dread, (Vivaldi’s *flautino* concertos spring to mind), are often quite possible, using one of the fingerings mentioned above, on an instrument that produces a stable third-octave note (even if the note is not perfectly in tune). For the modern player, it is still worth experimenting with some of these high-note fingering variations on their own instruments. Taking F#6 as an example, from my own collection of alto recorders with ‘modern’ fingerings, on two instruments I found a ‘historical’ fingering that worked convincingly, and on two other instruments I found no ‘historical’ fingering that produced a suitable F#6.24 It is perhaps one of the downsides to the developments in modern recorder design: the powerful and rich sounds often produced by instruments today could be at the expense of some high-note dexterity.

One eighteenth-century recorder (and woodwind) maker that, from surviving instruments, we know to have made alto recorders with strong high registers, was Jacob Denner (1681–1735). Denner was from a family of woodwind makers, and based in Nuremberg.25 A biographical note on Jacob Denner by Johann Gabriel Doppelmayer (a mathematician in Nuremburg who knew Denner personally), includes interesting information about Denner’s travels:

As the fame of his artistry and skill was spread about within our city, so too [did it reach] beyond its bounds; different neighbouring princely courts – Ansbach, Bayreuth, Sulzbach, Hildburghausen – have been thus entertained by his great talent; some of these having summoned him, some being destinations of his own delectation, but all sending him forth with an assurance of princely favour.26

Denner was in fact particularly highly rated in Frankfurt, and he seemed to have travelled there frequently:

The famous imperial and commercial city of Frankfurt could not rate him [Denner] highly enough when hither he was sent for many years in office determined by a highly commendable magistrate: each time he returned [he
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24 Other fingerings that are worth trying on modern recorders for F#6 are ↓1234567, ↓1234567 and even ↓1234567. These fingerings are obviously a little cumbersome, and if they are required on your instrument, you may find bell-stopping to be easier anyway.

25 Many of his original instruments survive today in Nuremberg, although there are also notable Denner originals elsewhere, including at the Royal College of Music. Perhaps the best surviving recorder of Denner’s is today found in the Musikhistorisk Museum, in Copenhagen. Many modern recorder makers base their own ‘Denner’ design on this instrument.

was showered with great praise and fame arising from his personal bearing and beautiful artistry.  

As mentioned earlier, the two Telemann recorder concertos (F major and C major) discussed above were likely written during Telemann’s period at Frankfurt (sometime between 1716 and 1721). It is possible therefore that Telemann’s recorder concertos would have been performed by a musician playing on a Denner instrument (though it is also worth noting that many other surviving eighteenth-century models from other makers exist with strong upper registers).

**Concero in G minor (TWV 43:g3)**

The ‘Concerto di Camera del Sign. Telemann’ is from a manuscript in Darmstadt, scored for ‘Flauto a bec’, ‘Viol: Primo’, ‘Viol: 2do’ and ‘Cembalo’. Though this piece is listed under the TWV category of ‘Quartet’ (three instruments with continuo), it is here included as a solo recorder concerto since it is marked on the score as a ‘Concerto di Camera’. The ‘Concerto di Camera’ is written as a ‘suite’ of movements, with a first movement (actually in ritornello form), a Siciliana second movement, a Bouré third movement, and ending with a ‘Menuet’ and ‘Trio’. For much of the concerto, the two violin parts play in unison, meaning that most of the concerto is texturally a trio. Unlike the two solo recorder concertos discussed above, the recorder is treated very differently here. The recorder part in this concerto has a two-octave range, from F₄ only up to F₆. The note G₆ is not used, which is slightly surprising since the concerto is in G minor, and Telemann saw this note as part of the ‘normal’ range of the instrument (as mentioned earlier, it appears frequently in his other two recorder concertos, and in many of his solo recorder sonatas). The ‘di Camera’ in the title refers to the ‘reduced’ concerto scoring. We have seen a similar scoring before in the Neapolitan concertos also with ‘reduced’ scoring (usually with no viola part), though unlike this concerto, the Neapolitan concerto scoring also includes a part for cello. This is the only piece in the extant Telemann sources that is specifically given the title “Concerto di Camera”.
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27 Kirnbauer and Thaiheimer, *op. cit.*, 86.
Overture-suite in A minor (Concertouverture) (TWV 55:a2)

We end our look at Telemann’s solo recorder concertos with a piece that was not labelled as a concerto at all, but instead as an ‘Ouverture’.

TWV 55:a2 is essentially a concert-suite hybrid (sometimes referred to in the eighteenth-century literature as Concertouverturen), for solo recorder and strings. It is today probably the most widely played of all of Telemann’s overture-suites.

In total, there are around 130 extant overture-suites by Telemann. Telemann himself suggested that by 1718 he had already produced as many as 200 overture-suites. This presumably means, when we consider that many more would have been written after 1718, (Telemann stopped composing overture-suites in the late 1730s or early 1740s), that there are a great number of overture-suites lost to us today.

The overture-suite was an instrumental genre, French in origin, which was strictly governed by convention. The overture and the accompanying dances all generally followed strict forms and conventions. One aspect where Telemann often departed from convention in his overture-suites is in the variations of his scoring. Nearly half of the overture-suites are scored for strings alone; but there are also many scored for a single soloist with strings, two soloists and strings (sometimes expanded to a wind trio when a bassoon is added), as well as for multiple concertante soloists and strings (usually between three and six concertante parts). Telemann’s amalgamation of national styles (the ‘mixed taste’) can be seen very clearly in his overture-suites for one soloist and strings. Here we see the incorporation of Italian concerto ideas of the solo concerto into the French overture, and such pieces really do become concerto-suite hybrids.

TWV 55:a2 is today deservedly a popular suite amongst both performers and audience alike. The opening overture is followed by a number of different, very characterful dance movements. The manuscript is a score by an unidentified copyist in Darmstadt (though it certainly has similarities to manuscripts in Graupner’s hand), from around the 1720-1730 period. It is titled: ‘Ouverture. a Flute Conc: 2. Dessus, Viole e Basse / Telemann’. Just like the ‘Concerto di Camera’, the range of the recorder writing in this overture-suite is certainly not as extended as the two solo concertos: the recorder
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30 Zohn, Music for a Mixed Taste, 56, [GL 2208].
only moves above an F₆ on one occasion, when a held G₆ appears in bars 21-23 of the Rêjouissance. TWV 55:a2 commences with an opening overture, followed by a substantial overture-Allegro section that is essentially a concerto ritornello first movement all by itself. Even with the influence of obviously Italianate concerto writing here, Telemann avoids completely overelaborating the recorder line so that the overture styling is not completely lost. Les Plaisirs is a bourrée, in which the bass is assigned to the two violin parts (‘2. V. V.’ is marked in the manuscript on top of the bass line, with ‘Viole et Basse tac.’ marked underneath). The Air à l’Italien is a very serious, very beautiful movement: returning ritornello string sections are broken up by spacious recorder melodies. The reflective mood is interrupted briefly by a quick Allegro passage, before we return to the Air via a da capo. This of course is Telemann’s nod to (Italian) da capo arias. TWV 55:a2 is certainly not an early work of Telemann’s, and Concertouverturen for a solo instrument in general tended to date from around the 1720s, becoming out of fashion by the 1730s. Though the work is not an extreme technical challenge for the recorder player, it is still a difficult work, not least because of the range of characters and styles of each of the movements. The performer has to be well versed in the different characters and traditions of the dances, and possess the ability to showcase the wide expressive potential of the recorder in this suite. Articulation is the key technical challenge in this suite: an effective performance requires the employment of a wide variety of articulations throughout the suite, and in particular, requires the performer to be able to articulate with excellent clarity and precision. There are a number of moments in the suite where the recorder is required to play a crisp melody over staccato accompaniment, notably in Menuet 2, Rejouissance, and the Allegro passage in the Air à l’Italien (see Figure 7.4).
It is also very long in duration, with a full performance of the work running to nearly 30 minutes. This requires a performer of stamina, and with a good technique. This could therefore be another recorder work which was composed for Telemann’s favourite wind player of the time, Johann Michael Böhm. Telemann left Frankfurt in 1721, but as mentioned earlier, maintained connections there. Böhm remained in Darmstadt until 1729.

**Overture-suite in E-flat major (Concertouverture) (TWV 55:Es2)**

There survives one more *Concertouverturen* potentially for solo recorder. The solo instrument in this overture-suite is actually titled ‘Flûte Pastorelle’, and the manuscript is again from Darmstadt. Just like Vivaldi’s *flautino*, there has been some debate (although to a much lesser extent than the *flautino*) about what instrument is meant by a ‘Flûte Pastorelle’. Christopher Addington, in his article ‘In Search of the Baroque Flute…’, states, with no evidence provided whatsoever, that the ‘flute pastourelle’, was another name for the ‘flute d’amour’. Edgar Hunt, in his two-page article ‘Fitting the
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Instrument to the Music’, instead suggests that the ‘flute pastorelle’ could actually be a panpipe.\textsuperscript{33} As evidence for this, he notes that the whole of the overture-suite (which is written in E-flat major) is completely diatonic throughout (and the ‘pipes of Pan are both diatonic and pastoral’).\textsuperscript{34} The ‘Flûte Pastorelle’ part is a very simple part, consisting of limited material, usually playing either stepwise notes, or in an inversion of an E-flat or B-flat major arpeggio (for example, see Figure 7.5 below – the first half of Bourée II).

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure7.5.png}
\caption{Telemann, TWV 55:Es2, vi, Bourée II, bars 1-22}
\end{figure}

The range of the part is small: from an \textit{Eb}_4 to an \textit{C}_6, with the majority of the piece written between the one octave range of \textit{G}_4 and \textit{G}_5. It seems that this alone is a very strong argument for the ‘Flûte Pastorelle’ being an instrument other than the recorder. Telemann’s solo recorder writing is often extended and virtuosic, with occasional chromatic moments, and harmonic movement away from the tonic. A large range is also utilised in these works, with all other examples using notes well above a \textit{C}_6. Telemann also included ‘Flauto pastorelle’ in another piece of music – a very brief piece in E major from \textit{Der getreue Music-Meister} (1728-9), written for ‘Flauto pastorale, ò altri

\textsuperscript{33} The ‘flute pastorelle’ is also defined as a panpipe in the \textit{New Grove Dictionary of Musical Instruments} (Vol. 1, 788).

\textsuperscript{34} Hunt, ‘Fitting the Instrument to the Music’, 228, [GL 273].
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stromenti’ (see Figure 7.6 below for the complete movement). Like the overture-suite, the piece is diatonic (this time in E major throughout, rather than E-flat major) and very simple (the range of the ‘Flauto pastorale’ line is only E₄ to G₅). Hunt suggests that: ‘alti stromenti seems to anticipate that there might not have been many players of the Pan’s pipes in Telemann’s circle.’³⁵

A further point of evidence that the ‘Flûte Pastorelle’ is not a recorder, (not mentioned by Hunt) is that the ‘Flûte Pastorelle’ part is written in treble clef. All other recorder parts from copyists in Darmstadt (including the previous overture-suite in A minor for recorder) are written in French violin clef.

There survives one more piece of music which seems to give further evidence that the ‘Flûte Pastorelle’ is not a recorder, and yet, confusingly, appears also to name the recorder in the instrumentation of the piece. In the Landesbibliothek Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, in Schwerin, I found a partita there in E major composed by Adolph Carl Kunzen (1720-1781). The piece is again simple and diatonic. The solo instrument here is actually labelled ‘Flaute à becco pastorelle’. ‘Flûte à bec’ is a French term for the recorder (literally, ‘sweet flute’); as is the Italian variation ‘flauto a becco’. It is

³⁵ Hunt, op. cit., 228.
noteworthy that there is an additional, alternative part in this work, transposed into F-major, written in French violin clef, and titled ‘Flauto octavo’. This alternative part, particularly since it is written in French violin clef, suggests a recorder (probably a soprano). The inclusion of an alternative part clearly intended for the recorder, seems to confirm the suggestion that the ‘Flûte Pastorelle’ is not a recorder. However, the untransposed part in E major is called a ‘Flaute a’becco pastorelle’. Why is there a part here for a ‘shepherd’s recorder’ as well as, seemingly, a transposed part for an actual recorder? These dual parts lead us to consider another possible instrument for the ‘Flûte Pastorelle’. Although Hunt’s suggestion of a panpipe is certainly plausible, perhaps the instrument could instead have been an instrument closer in design to the recorder than the panpipes – maybe a simple, diatonic end-blown flute or pipe, with fingerholes? Very simple end-blown flutes often appear in sixteenth- to eighteenth-century ‘shepherd’ iconography. Either way, it seems clear that Telemann’s overture-suite for ‘Flûte Pastorelle’ is not for a recorder.

One final point of evidence, from the Duchy of Mecklenburg-Schwerin, is an instrument collection (listed in 1778) belonging to Prince Ludwig of Mecklenburg-Schwerin. This collection contained four instruments marked as flauto ‘pastorelle’. These four instruments were listed completely separately to transverse flutes, small transverse flutes, recorders, and small recorders. This again shows that the ‘Flûte Pastorelle’ was a separate instrument to the recorder.

The Recorder Concerto in the Hesse-Darmstadt Hofkapelle

Apart from the disputed Harrach concerto, all of Telemann’s solo recorder concertos, (and concertouverturen) are today housed in the Darmstadt Universitäts und Landesbibliothek. Some, if not all, were perhaps written for the woodwind virtuoso Johan Michael Böhm, based at the time in the court of Hesse-Darmstadt. There are several other recorder concertos that survive today in the Darmstadt library. These numerous surviving concertos, again from the collection of the court of Hesse-
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36 The musical instrument inventory of Prince Ludwig is listed in Meyer, Geschichte..., 51-52. Prince Ludwig’s musical instrument collection also included a number of recorders. The recorder in Mecklenburg-Schwerin is discussed in Chapter 9.
Darmstadt, show that the recorder was used regularly in performances at the Darmstadt court during this period.

The court of Hesse-Darmstadt in the period from 1710 onwards was dominated by two musical figures. The first, and most prominent, is Christoph Graupner. Graupner was appointed as the Hofkapellmeister in 1712, succeeding W.C. Briegel; a position he served in up to his death in 1760. The second important musical figure in the Hesse-Darmstadt court during this period was Johann Samuel Endler. Sometime between 1735 and 1740, Endler was appointed as concertmaster of the Hofkapelle, and in 1744 was promoted again, this time to Vice-Kapellmeister. After Graupner’s death in 1760, Endler was finally promoted to Hofkapellmeister, but he himself died soon after, in 1762. During this period, the Hofkapelle was maintained by two Landgraves of Hessen – Ernst Ludwig (1667-1739) and following his death in 1739, his son Ludwig VIII (1691-1768).

It was under Graupner that the Darmstadt Hofkapelle thrived, and particularly in the few years after Graupner’s appointment as Kapellmeister, the Darmstadt court had a very large number of musicians on its books. The Landgrave Ernst Ludwig was obviously very interested in music. He received musical training from Wolfgang Carl Briegel, Darmstadt’s previous Kapellmeister, and he also planned to build a new opera house for the Darmstadt court, though this was later vetoed by the court treasury. Ernst Ludwig played the keyboard and the flute, and he was also a composer: today, over 20 of his compositions survive. He was keen to expand the musical life of the Darmstadt court, and he clearly also had high hopes for Graupner; within twelve months of Graupner’s appointment as Kapellmeister, seventeen new musicians were appointed to the court.

Graupner himself had a very prolific compositional output, producing over 1,400 vocal works, 300 instrumental works, and 10 operas. After 1720, when the Hofkapelle once again became reduced in size, Graupner switched his focus from opera to cantatas and various instrumental forms. Graupner was also very active as a copyist, with many of the works in the Darmstadt library in Graupner’s hand, including a significant proportion of Telemann’s music. Graupner himself performed Telemann’s music very frequently throughout the 1720s and 1730s – the earliest sources of Telemann’s work in

37 Kramer, (in *Music at German Courts 1715-1760*), 334.
Darmstadt seem to date from before 1720, when Telemann possibly sent across several manuscripts during his time working in Frankfurt.

Out of Graupner’s 300 instrumental works, 50 are concertos. These were all written between 1724 and 1745. The concertos are extremely varied in colour and, particularly, in their use of instrumentation. Graupner very often makes use of woodwind instruments, and he had a particularly fondness for both the chalumeau and the bassoon. Despite his significant instrumental output, Graupner himself seem to have had very little interest in writing for the recorder, though he did act as the copyist for a substantial number of manuscripts containing significant recorder material from other composers.

Only two of Graupner’s large output of cantatas contain significant recorder parts: *Freue dich und sei fröhlich du Tochter Zion* (GWV 1101/20) includes instrumental parts of two recorders alongside strings; and *Sehet welche eine Liebe hat uns der Vater erzeigt* (GWV 1116/40) includes one recorder part alongside strings. Further to these two pieces, there survive only three instrumental pieces by Graupner written specifically for the recorder: a canonic sonata for two recorders (GWV 216); an overture-suite for recorder and strings (GWV 447), and a solo recorder concerto (GWV 323).38

**Graupner’s solo recorder concerto (GWV 323)**

Graupner’s only solo recorder concerto in F major survives in the form of an autograph score. It is a three-movement concerto, with melodic passagework showing Vivaldian influences. The title of the score is ‘Concerto a Flute a bec, 2 Violis, Viola e Cembalo’. As with other recorder concertos in Darmstadt, the recorder part is written in French violin clef. The writing for the recorder is well-constructed throughout, though technically it is not a particularly challenging work for the recorder player, requiring a much less developed technique than that needed for Telemann’s solo recorder concertos. The more challenging aspect of the concerto is one of ensemble, including several moments where the soloist and strings are required to ‘lock’ interweaving parts together. Communication between ensemble members is key to performing this concerto.
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38 Sonata (canonic) in g-minor – *D-Ds Mus.ms. 408*; ‘Ouverture’ in F – *D-Ds Mus.ms 464/65*; Concerto in F – *D-Ds Mus.ms.311/32*.
Graupner’s *Concertouverture* for recorder (GWV 447)

The only overture-suite by Graupner for recorder and strings, GWV 447, also survives in Darmstadt as an autograph score. There are over 80 overture-suites by Graupner that survive today. Some of these overtures are for strings alone; but, continuing a theme amongst his instrumental output in general, often more unusual instruments were also included - chalumeaux were regularly used, as were viola d’amore, oboe d’amore and flute d’amore. In the 1740s, the Darmstadt Hofkapelle had once again recovered to a substantial size, allowing Graupner to utilise more unusual instruments. Graupner clearly had some of Telemann’s unusual scorings in mind when composing some of these overtures, and the combination of forces and scoring of these instruments occasionally matches some of Telemann’s more experimental overture scorings (for example, Graupner’s overture-suite GWV 451, for ‘Flaut. Trav., Viola d’Amore, 2 Chalumeaux, Corno di Selv.’ as well as strings and continuo).

GWV 447 is titled as ‘Ouverture a Flute a bec, 2 Violis, Viola a Cembalo’. This overture-suite is a much more substantial and creative work than Graupner’s solo recorder concerto. The work is in six movements, with a running time of just under 30 minutes. It is another idiomatic example of the German ‘taste’ for many different styles and influences. The second section *Allegro* of the initial overture incorporates elements of ritornello form, with the other movements very much in the style of a French suite, although here again, there are elements of concerto-writing throughout – e.g. the triplet demisemiquaver passages in the rather beautiful *La Speranza* movement (see Figure 7.7).
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39 For the list of musicians employed at the Hesse-Darmstadt court in 1715, 1730 and 1745, see pp. 356-363 of Ursula Kramer’s chapter in *Music at German Courts*. 42 musicians were employed in total in 1715; this was reduced to 27 musicians in 1730; and a more sizeable 34 musicians in 1745.
Figure 7.7: Graupner, GWV 447, ii, ‘La Speranza’, bars 5-8

It is clearly a work in which Graupner has decided to pose for the performer some challenges of musical technique and musical substance (the La Speranza movement, for example, has passagework requiring consummate fingerwork). However, though GWV 447 contains elements of concerto writing, it does not go quite as far in the implied tension between concerto and suite as some of Telemann’s overture-suites, and particularly Telemann’s Concertouverture for recorder and strings (TWV 55:a2, discussed above). GWV 447 commences with an overture with a quick Allegro second section, which, although in ritornello form and involving quite soloistic recorder writing, is still relatively brief. On the other hand, TWV 55:a2 commences with a much more substantial overture Allegro section that basically becomes a full-blown concerto-allegro movement in itself. This naturally produces a very interesting tension between the ideas of concerto versus suite, and ‘Italianate’ virtuosity against French style. Graupner’s recorder overture also achieves this to a certain extent, but in a much more limited way than Telemann’s Concertouverturen. There are also a number of similarities between the two works. Like Telemann’s 55:a2, Graupner’s work also displays the recorder soloist in every movement. The Minuet opens with the recorder almost acting as an accompanying instrument, before moving into more soloistic material. The Air has quite
a serious character – a character only matched elsewhere in the overture by La Speranza. The strings here set the tone with the recorder again acting initially as an accompanying instrument, before it becomes more prominent in the second section, starting with a long held C₆ (bb. 32-33). Throughout the overture-suite, Graupner often utilises long notes in the recorder line, particularly in the upper registers (for example, a D₆ held for five bars in the Air en Gavotte - bb. 48-52 - followed by an even more sustained section later in the movement - bb. 76-92) [Figure 7.8].

![Figure 7.8: Graupner, GWV 447, ‘Air en Gavotte’, bars 76-92.](image)

We can be sure Graupner’s overture-suite for recorder was written well before the mid-1740s – the form had moved out of fashion, and Graupner, like other composers, had stopped composing overtures by this point. Quantz, in his Versuch (first published in 1752) noted that ‘Since the overture produces such a good effect… it is a pity that it is no longer in vogue in Germany’. ⁴⁰

Who were Graupner’s recorder concerto and overture-suite written for? Compared to Telemann’s recorder concertos, which were likely written for Johann Michael Böhm, Graupner’s recorder concerto and overture-suite are less technically challenging. Perhaps Graupner therefore composed his works for a player of lesser calibre than
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⁴⁰ Zohn, Music for a Mixed Taste, 13, [GL 2208].
Böhm? Since much of Graupner’s other solo instrumental output is often technically challenging, it is possible that if Graupner had access to Böhm when he decided to compose these two works, then he would have written more difficult material. Böhm left Darmstadt in 1729, so perhaps Graupner’s two works were composed in the 1730s? Johann Ludwig Brauer was second bassoon at the Darmstadt court from 1715 to 1760, and was also known to play other woodwind instruments, including chalumeau and oboe. Therefore, it is likely that he also played the recorder, and his consistent second bassoon status throughout his time in the orchestra would also suggest that he was not of the same calibre as Böhm. Since Graupner’s concerto and overture-suite are not particularly technically sophisticated, perhaps Brauer was one of the early performers of these works.

**Heinichens’s ‘Concerto à 2 Violini ò Flauti…’**

Johann David Heinichen was employed as Kapellmeister to the court of Dresden in 1717, and retained this position all his life (sharing the duties as Kapellmeister with Johann Cristoph Schmidt). The Dresden orchestra was renowned throughout Europe: during Heinichen’s time there, the orchestra was filled with some of the greatest instrumentalists of the day (to name just a few, the violinists Pisendel and Veracini, and the flautists Buffardin and Quantz). Fasch, Telemann and Vivaldi all composed concertos for the Dresden orchestra. In Darmstadt’s library, seventeen manuscripts survive by Heinichen (twelve of which are concertos), and most of these are in the hand of Graupner. Two of these Darmstadt manuscripts are concertos that include recorder.

The first is ‘Concerto à 2 Violini ò Flauti, 2 Oboe, 2 Viole a Basso del Sigre Heinichen’. The title mentions ‘Violini ò Flauti’, but there are actually markings of ‘Flauti’ in sections on the violin parts throughout the score. There are also markings of ‘Bass de Flauti’ in the bass part, when ‘Flauti’ is marked in the violin parts (and likewise, ‘Basson’ is often marked when the two oboe parts have solo material). This is therefore a concerto that at first glance is scored relatively conventionally, and yet when the markings in the score are followed exactly, produces a rather unusual effect of three instrumental groups working both together and against each other. The first is the whole
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ensemble as one group; the second is an alto recorder(s) and bass recorder trio; and the third is a double reed trio of two oboes and a bassoon. This scoring emphasises the duality of the concerto terminology: on the one hand, a competition between soloists and the ensemble, and on the other, cooperation and incorporation of contrasting musical ideas and textures. The alternation of the three different groups is particularly shown in the fourth movement *Vivace*, where two bars of ‘flauti’ are alternated with two bars of oboes and bassoon, before violins are added again, followed by more flutes etc. (see Figure 7.9 below). These competing and sometimes cooperating groups continue throughout the whole of the movement.

![Figure 7.9: Heinichen, ‘Concerto à 2 Violini ò Flauti…’, iv, Vivace, bars 26-38](image-url)
Heinichens’s ‘Concerto a 8…’

There also survives a second concerto in the Darmstadt collection by Heinichen, scored for multiple recorders and strings. It is ‘Concerto a 8’ for ‘Flaut. Conc., 3 Flaut. Ripien. 2 Violin, Viol e Cembalo’. It is again in the hand of Graupner, and as usual for Graupner’s scores, the recorder parts are all written in French violin clef. The concerto is one of the few works in the concerto repertoire for multiple recorders. Unlike the Schikhardt concertos discussed in Chapter 3, and the concertos found in the Harrach collection discussed in Chapter 6, this concerto does not just replace the accompanying violin parts with recorders, but instead includes string accompaniment as well as the ripieno recorder parts. This concerto is important, not because of its musical content, but because the very fact that a manuscript concerto for four recorders appeared in Darmstadt, shows that there were presumably a number of reasonable recorder players in the Hesse-Darmstadt Hofkapelle.

Graun’s ‘Flauto Dolce & Violino…’ concerto

The large majority of Johann Gottlieb Graun’s surviving compositions are instrumental works (unlike those of his brother, Carl Heinrich Graun, who focused on opera). Johann Gottlieb was an excellent violinist, and he studied in Dresden from around 1721 onwards with the Dresden Konzertmeister J.G.Pisendel, and later, with Giuseppe Tartini in Padua. In 1726 he became the Konzertdirektor in Merseburg, where he taught the violin to J.S. Bach’s eldest son, Wilhelm Friedemann. Graun remained at Merseburg until his death in 1771. The majority of J.G Graun’s manuscripts now survive in Berlin’s Staatsbibliothek. However, over 100 manuscripts also survive in Darmstadt. With one exception, these manuscripts are all instrumental: sinfonia, sonatas, triosonatas, quartets and eight concertos. Out of these eight concertos, seven are solo concertos: one for flute, one for bassoon, one for violin, and four for viola da gamba. There is also one double concerto, which is of interest to us, as it is written for recorder and violin.

---

43 D-Ds Mus.ms 240/3
44 In fact, for the first two lines of the score, the third ripieno recorder is written in treble clef, but this is corrected for the rest of the concerto.
45 D-Ds Mus.ms. 353/2
The concerto’s title page states that it is a Concerto for ‘Flauto Dolce/Violino Concert./ 2 Violini / Viola / et / Cembalo/ di Graun.’ There are eight parts included in the manuscript: ‘Flauto abec’ and ‘Violino Concertato, alongside ‘Violino Primo’, ‘Violino Secundo’, ‘Violetta’, ‘Viola’, ‘Violone’ and ‘Basson’. The copyist is unknown, although its format looks remarkably similar to the way Endler (the Vice-Kappelmeister at Darmstadt) would set out his parts. It also has a very similar title-page to Endler’s manuscript copies. The manuscript is however missing some of Endler’s noticeable handwriting features (for example, the unusual way Endler writes repeat signs). The copyist of the concerto is likely therefore to be one of the other members of the Darmstadt Hofkapelle, perhaps with help from Endler himself. There is another interesting copyist feature of this manuscript. On the back of the second page of the bassoon part, there is a scrawl of sixteen bars worth of musical material, in French violin clef (Figure 7.10 below). It is in the key of B-flat major, and the clef and the writing implies that it is material intended for the recorder. Whoever copied Graun’s concerto obviously had their own idea for a piece for recorder writing, and the arpeggiated passagework that starts in bar nine looks very much like possible concerto material.

![Figure 7.10: Sixteen bars in French violin clef, written on the back of the ‘Basson’ part](image)

The Graun concerto for recorder and violin, like the previous Graupner solo recorder concerto, is in the three-movement format. Between the returning ritornello sections, the recorder and violin have long solo passages of often quite complicated arpeggio leaps. For example, in bar 54, the recorder often jumps between the higher range of the instrument, especially making use of G₆’s. The recorder is also used by Graun to

---

46 It is worth nothing that the title page only states that it is by ‘Graun’. Its attribution to JG Graun (rather than CH Graun) is not certain.
decorate the harmony, for example, in bars 27-34 of the second movement *Adagio*, where Italianate semiquaver decoration is used to emphasise the underlying chord progression (Figure 7.11).

![Figure 7.11: Graun, Concerto ‘Flauto Dolce & Violino…’, ii, bars 22-38](image)

The second movement (C minor, in contrast to the rest of the concerto in C major) is a subtle and delicate slow movement, which leads in to a sprightly and exciting *Allegro* third movement. It is a concerto that employs both soloists very effectively, and one that deserves to be explored more by modern performers and ensembles.

**Endler’s ‘Pieces’**

There is one other important composer at Hesse-Darmstadt who is worth mentioning for his recorder writing (even though none of it is concerto-writing). After Graupner’s death in 1760, Johann Samuel Endler took over the duties as *Kappelmeister* of the Darmstadt orchestra for two years, until his own death in 1762. Before this promotion, Endler was a long serving member of the Darmstadt orchestra, acting as both *Konzertmeister* and *Vice-Kappelmeister*. Endler has 45 autograph manuscripts that survive in the Darmstadt Universitäts und Landesbibliothek collection (apart from three cantatas, this collection consists solely of instrumental music, including seven ‘Ouvertüre’, 31 ‘Sinfonia’, and two manuscripts that are simply titled ‘Pieces’). He is, apart from Graupner, one of the few members of the Darmstadt Hofkapelle during this period with music that survives today. Endler’s overtures and sinfonia often make use of brass instruments – five out of the seven overture contain trumpets or ‘cornes de chasse’, and all but four of Endler’s sinfonia contain brass instruments. Unfortunately, no concertos of Endler survive today.
Endler’s two manuscripts entitled ‘Pieces’ are both autograph part manuscripts, in G major. The first was written in 1755 (as stated on the title-page), and is scored for two horns, two violins and oboes, viola and continuo. The second contains nine instrumental parts: ‘2 Flûtes, 2 Flutes travers. 2 Violons, Viole et Basse’. There are two title-pages to this manuscript, with the second written upside down on the back of the first title page, with the following additional note: ‘Münschbruch, den 6. November 1759’.

It is of interest that the work contains parts for both two recorders and two flutes. The recorder parts are written a fourth higher than the transverse parts (in C major, rather than in G major), and they are also written in French violin clef (the usual practice for the recorder parts in Darmstadt). This therefore means that Endler intended his recorder parts to be played on ‘fifth flutes’ (descant recorders in C). The two transverse flute parts are written at pitch, in G major and in treble clef. The recorder writing is simple, with the instruments used for musical colouring, rather than for any notable solo material.

The work itself is also stylistically limited, consisting simply of four binary-form dance movements. However, it is a piece that is included here for one simple reason: it was first performed in 1759 (as clearly shown by the note on the underside of the title page in Endler’s hand). This is a very late date for the recorder to be still in use. It is also unusual in its scoring; as mentioned elsewhere in this thesis, the combination of recorder and flute together was rare, with composers generally opting for one instrument or the other. It is a useful work within the history of the recorder, because it shows that recorders were still being used in performance in Darmstadt right up until at least 1759.

**Endler’s ‘Sinfonia’**

Additionally, two of Endler’s numerous ‘Sinfonia’ include parts for ‘flauti piccolo’ (a Sinfonia in D and a Sinfonia in E-flat).

A large proportion of Endler’s numerous sinfonia were written specifically for particular festivities, and all were performed between 1748 and 1761 at Hesse-Darmstadt Landgrave’s hunting castle, Kranichstein. The ‘flauti piccoli’ seem to be parts for recorder rather than the piccolo flute: just like the recorder parts in Endler’s ‘Pieces’, the parts for “flauti piccolo” are written a fourth higher, and in French violin clef. This suggests the parts are again written for the ‘fifth flute’. The ‘flauti piccoli’ material here is again very limited – in both sinfonia it occurs

---

47 Sinfonia in D, *D-Ds Mus.ms. 1213/17*; Sinfonia in E-flat, *D-Ds Mus.ms. 1213/20*. 
in only two movements, and only to double the transverse flutes. The performance of the second sinfonia is dated: ‘Crannigstein, den. 1 Januarii, 1757’. These works show that the use of recorders in the performance of ‘Pieces’ in 1759 was not a one-off, and that recorders were still being used in Hesse-Darmsradt (albeit in a limited fashion) until the end of the 1750s.

Summary

The recorder concerto, and the recorder in general, clearly had a prominent role in the Hesse-Darmstadt Hofkapelle, and the instrument remained in use by the orchestra over a long period of time. Telemann’s two virtuosic solo concertos (not including the ‘Concerto di Camera’ or the disputed ‘Harrach’ concerto) were likely written for the virtuoso Johann Michael Böhm, during Telemann’s years in Frankfurt (before 1721). Both of these concertos use the extreme ranges of the alto recorder. Plain fingerings for third octave notes would have been known to good players across Europe, as shown by numerous surviving eighteenth-century fingering charts which include third octave fingerings. Modern players should ensure they acquaint themselves with these various historical fingerings, and attempt them on their own instruments. They may well find that they provide fingering solutions for the performance of these concertos (and other eighteenth-century repertoire which strays into the third octave). Telemann’s Concertouverture for recorder and strings (TWV 55:a2) is probably a later work, but could also have been written for Böhm once Telemann had left Frankfurt, and before Böhm left Darmstadt in 1729. Telemann’s ‘Flûte Pastorelle’ is almost certainly not a recorder: the panpipes are a possibility, as is the suggestion that it is a simple, diatonic ‘end-blown flute’ with fingerholes. Graupner’s concerto and Concertouverture for recorder do not seem to have been written for a virtuoso of Böhm’s standard – instead, the works were possibly composed once Böhm had left the Hesse-Darmstadt court (I have suggested the second bassoonist Johann Ludwig Brauer as a potential performer, though other members of the Hofkapelle are also possible). The recorder was clearly used professionally at Hesse-Darmstadt for many years. Endler’s ‘Sinfonia’ date from the late-1740s and 1750s, and his composition ‘Pieces’, with two orchestral recorders, has a performance date of 1759.
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The Court of Hohenlimburg (and the House of Bentheim-Tecklenburg-Rheda)

Chapter 8 focuses on the court of Hohenlimburg and its ruling House of Bentheim-Tecklenburg-Rheda. This is an important and very much underexplored case-study for recorder concerto scholarship since a substantial catalogue of music (‘Catalogus Musicus’) from the court survives, with 27 listings of recorder concertos (including musical incipits). Apart from the two recorder concertos by Telemann listed in the catalogue, none of these concertos survive today. I will explore the reasons for the obvious interest in the recorder concerto in the court of Hohenlimburg (and its Kapellmeister Johann Martin Dömming); the reasons why the recorder concertos do not survive today; and the potential dates of interest in recorder concertos at the court. This chapter was completed after a research trip to the Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek in Münster, where the ‘Catalogus Musicus’ and the Bentheim-Tecklenburg-Rheda music collection is to be found today.

Bentheim-Tecklenburg

Bentheim-Tecklenburg was a medieval county and House, which is today located in the North Rhine-Westphalia region of Germany. The lordship of Rheda was given to the house of Tecklenburg (via marriage to Count Otto V) in 1364, and this was annexed into the house of Bentheim-Tecklenburg in 1606 by Count Arnold von Bentheim (1554–1606). During the late seventeenth century, Count Arnold also unified the territory of Hohenlimburg into this House. The acquisition of these numerous territories made the Bentheim-Tecklenburg House a significant political player during the seventeenth, and early eighteenth, centuries. Following these territorial gains, the family home and court of the Counts of Bentheim-Tecklenburg alternated, from time to time, between the castles at Rheda and Hohenlimburg. The family are still in possession of both of these castles today. A large music collection of the Bentheim-Tecklenburg family was first put together by Count Moritz Casimir I (who ruled from 1710–1768) at Hohenlimburg, and
this collection was later added to by his son Count Moritz Casimir II (who ruled from 1768–1805), and Emil zu Bentheim-Tecklenburg (who ruled from 1805–1837). The music collection was moved across from Hohenlimburg to the family castle at Rheda, most likely in 1756, when the court, and particularly the music Kappelmeister Johann Martin Dömming moved across to Rheda. The music collection remained there until 1966, when the family offered the collection on loan to the Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek in Münster. The whole collection consists of 985 manuscripts, and 1053 music prints, making it one of the larger private music collections from the North-Rhine Westphalia region. The original collection of Count Moritz Casimir I in Hohenlimburg (not including the music from Moritz Casimir II and Emil zu Bentheim-Tecklenburg), mainly features manuscripts, along with some prints from the Amsterdam music publisher, Roger-le Céne.

**Count Moritz Casimir I (1701–1768)**

Count Moritz Casimir ruled the territories of Bentheim-Tecklenburg-Rheda from 1710, until his death in 1768. He married twice, with his first marriage to Albertine Henriette producing five children, including his son Moritz Casimir II, who continued to add to the music collection following his father’s death. Even though Count Moritz Casimir I ruled during a politically volatile time, he was nevertheless an important figure from a cultural and musical point of view. According to Burkard Rosenberger, the head of the Musiksammlung at the Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek in Münster, Moritz Casimir I was a keen musician, who played both the flute and the cello. An account of the musical life of the court under Moritz Casimir I was given by the German law lecturer Johan Stephan Pütter (1725–1807), who studied privately with a priest in Hohenlimburg between 1735 to 1738:

> Unter andern war hier, wie an mehreren kleinen Höfen nicht ungewöhnlich ist, eine solche Einrichtung mit den Bedienten, daß die meisten zugleich musikalisch waren. Der Graf spielte das Violoncell, und widmete meist täglich eine Stunde einem kleinen Concerte, das er kurz vor der Tafel zu

---

1. In correspondence with Burkard Rosenberger, head of Musiksammlung in the Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek, Münster.
2. Count Moritz Casimir I, ruled during the period of Prussian strength, when Tecklenburg was occupied and eventually sold to Prussia, with the family relinquishing all claims to Tecklenburg in a Treaty with Prussia of 1729, signed in Berlin.

[Amongst other things it was established, as was not unusual in many small courts, that the servants were also mostly musical. The Count played the cello and most days dedicated an hour to a small concert, which he would play before sitting down to dinner. I had made a small beginning at home on the keyboard. As continuation, I spent an hour in the morning every day with one of the Count’s musical servants. Through this, I acquired an increasing taste for musical art, to which I was not naturally disposed [...] sometimes the Count kept me at his concerts and gave me the small task of turning pages when it was necessary.]

We can see from this insightful account of Count Moritz Casimir I’s court that music was a very important aspect of both his life and of the court itself, with concerts taking place ‘most days’.

**Johann Martin Dömming (1703–1760)**

The early life of Dömming [also, Doemming] is relatively unknown, though we do know he was born in Milz in Thuringia, in 1703. In 1731, Dömming was appointed as ‘Director Musices’ of the Hofkapelle of the Bentheim-Tecklenburg-Rheda court, a position he remained in until his death in 1760. It seems that before this, Dömming was predominantly employed by the court as an administrative clerk, though presumably he would also have been active as a musician before being employed as Kappelmeister. The court, and Dömming, were first based at Hohenlimburg, before the house was officially moved across in 1756, during the Seven Years War, to the family castle at Rheda, sixty miles away from Hohenlimburg. A few years before the start of this war, the family had extended the castle at Rheda into a residency by building an extra baroque wing on the castle. It appears that Dömming spent some of his official time at Rheda

---

4 Original quoted in Rosenburger, ‘Die Musiksammlung…’, 4. I would like to thank Andrew Miles for the translation.
5 Ibid.
before this period anyway: the manuscript of Dömming’s extant bass cantata ‘Die Verlorenen und wiedergefundenen Gedanken’ is signed with the words ‘Rheda 1734’.

Dömming was an active composer, though many of his works are not extant. Today, thirty-one manuscripts survive by Dömming, including a small amount of vocal music, but predominantly concertos (twenty-seven of Dömming’s surviving manuscripts are concertos). A few of these concertos are scored for strings, but a substantial number (eighteen in total) utilise wind instruments (see Table 8.1 below). Horns feature prominently, as does the transverse flute and, more unusually, several concertos involving the oboe d’amour.

| Concerto (in F): ‘Cornu da caccia, 2 violini concertini, 2 violini ripieni, violon cello & cembalo’ | D-RH Ms 149 |
| Concerto (in D): ‘Cornu de chasse solo, violino concertato, violino secundo, violino ripieno, viola, violon cello & bass continuo’ | D-RH Ms 150 |
| Concerto (in D): ‘Corno da caccia primo, corno da caccia secundo, violino primo conc., violino secundo conc., viola, violon-cello & basso’ | D-RH Ms 151 |
| Concerto (in F): ‘2 cornu de chasse, 2 hautbois, viola & basso continuo’ | D-RH Ms 152 |
| Concerto (in D): ‘Concerto à 4: Flaute traversière, violino, viola, violoncello, basso cembalo’ | D-RH Ms 153 |
| Concerto (in G): ‘Flaute traversiere, violino primo, violino secundo, basso continuo’ | D-RH Ms 154 |
| Concerto (in G): ‘Flaute traversiere, violino primo, violino secundo, basso continuo’ | D-RH Ms 155 |
| Concerto (in G): ‘Hautbois d’amore, flaute traversiere, violino, viola, violon-cello et basso cembalo’ | D-RH Ms 156 |
| Concerto (in D): ‘Hautbois d’amoure, flauto traversiere, violino primo, violino secundo, alto viola et basso primo et secundo’ | D-RH Ms 159 |

\[^{6}\text{D-Rh Ms 146}\]
Concerto (in G): ‘Hautbois d’amour, violino primo, violino 2.do, viola, violon cello & basso cembalo’  

Concerto (in D): ‘Hautbois d’amoure, flaute traversiere, violino et basso cembalo’

Concerto (in G): ‘Hautbois d’amour, flauto travers., flauto travers: repienno, violino 1.mo, violino 2.do, basso cembalo’

Concerto (in A): ‘Hautbois d’amoure, flaute traversiere, violino, viola & basso violoncello’

Concerto (in D): ‘Flute traversiere, violino & viola concertanz. cornu da caccia, basso continuo’

Concerto (in G): ‘Cornu da caccia primo, cornu da caccia secundo, violino primo, violino secundo, violino-cello, basso cembalo’

Concerto (in D): ‘Cornu da caccia primo, cornu da caccia secundo, violino primo, violino secundo, alto viola, violon-cello & basso-cembalo’

Concerto (in E-minor): ‘Flaute travers: primo, flaute travers secundo, violino primo, violino secundo e basso-cembalo’

Table 8.1: Dömming’s extant concertos for wind instruments

Eleven of Dömming’s manuscripts have a date signed on the front. All of these dates were after Dömming’s appointment to Kappelmeister in 1731. The earliest is a violin concerto (Ms 172), which is marked as ‘Limburg 1733’. The last is a cantata ‘Erschallet ihr Hügel’ (Ms 147), which is marked as ‘Limburg 1755’. All other dates of manuscript are between 1736 and 1741.

‘Catalogus Musicus’

An important element of the music collection of the Bentheim-Tecklenburg-Rheda family is a music catalogue, started by Dömming, in 1750. The catalogue – entitled the ‘Catalogus Musicus’ – is in two volumes, with the first volume corresponding to instrumental music, and the second volume corresponding to vocal music. At the bottom of the inside cover of the first volume is written ‘Limburg 22ten Novembr. 1750’. The second volume of the catalogue relating to vocal music has been badly damaged due to
fire, with much of the information inside lost. The catalogue was first written in 1750, although clearly supplementary items have been included in the catalogue after this date. Around half of the manuscripts listed in the catalogue today survive in the Rheda music collection in the Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek, in Münster.

On the inside of the catalogue is a contents page (‘Catalogi musici’), which divides the catalogue into both instruments and types of piece, and also lists how many manuscripts are in each section (Figure 8.1).
Figure 8.1: ‘Catalogus Musicus’, Limburg, 1750. Contents page.
From Figure 8.1, we can see that the catalogue therefore includes:

1. Waldhorn Concerta (61 manuscripts); 2. Violin Concerta (108 manuscripts); 3. Flaut Trav: et Flaut Abec Concert. (84 manuscripts); 4. Hautbois Concerta (38 manuscripts)’. This is a total (‘in Summa’) of 291 concerto manuscripts listed in the catalogue (not including ‘Clavecin obligato’ concertos). Below this, there is: ‘5. Clavecin obligato Concerta (24 manuscripts); 6. Violin und Flute Trio (34 manuscripts); 7. Violoncello Trio und Duette (11 manuscripts); 8. Violin und Flute Trav: Solo (15 manuscripts).

The instrumental catalogue is listed as having, in total (‘Summa Summarum’) 364 manuscripts. However, this figure was presumably only correct when the catalogue was first written, without any of the additional manuscripts. The number does not include the corrected total on the ‘Waldhorn’ and ‘Violin’ concerto sections, which have clearly been overwritten; and it does not include the extra manuscripts in the transverse flute and recorder concerto section, which total 110 manuscripts (not including the concerto incipits which have been crossed out; presumably they disappeared from the music collection). The correct total of pieces listed in the catalogue is actually well over 400 pieces.

The violin features prominently throughout this catalogue, as does the horn. Out of the (actual figure) of 110 incipits in the transverse flute and recorder concerto section, 27 are for recorder(s). Considering this catalogue was put together in 1750, when across Europe the transverse flute was dominant and the recorder’s prominence had hugely diminished, (almost vanished in many places), this is a sizeable number of concertos listed for the recorder.

Dömming himself also features prominently throughout the catalogue, as would be expected of the Kappelmeister, appearing in all sections of the first volume of the ‘Catalogus Musicus’. Dömming, and the musicians of the court, clearly had an affinity for concertos – the large majority of the instrumental music in the catalogue are concertos, and Dömming is listed as composing concertos for all instruments in the catalogue. In, ‘Flaut Trav: et Flaut Abec Concert.’ Dömming composed 23 concertos for the two instruments, with the large majority – fifteen concertos – being composed for recorder(s). Again, considering this catalogue was first compiled in 1750, this is a substantial list of recorder concertos. Clearly the recorder was an important instrument
for Dömming – shown by both his interest in writing music for the instrument, and also his interest in compiling a substantial collection of music for the instrument as Kappelmeister, even though the recorders prominence was fading across Europe. In the ‘Catalogus Musicus’, there are 27 concertos listed for recorder in total, and 15 of them were written by Dömming himself.

It is unfortunate that none of the concertos for recorder listed in the ‘Catalogus Musicus’ survive in the ‘Rheda’ collection today (in Münster’s Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek). The only two recorder concertos listed in the ‘Catalogus Musicus’ that do survive today are the two by Telemann, the manuscripts of which survive in other libraries. The first is Telemann’s concerto in G minor for ‘Flauto, Violino, Viola e Basso’ (TWV 43:g4), with surviving manuscripts in Dresden’s famous ‘Schrank II’ collection; and the second is Telemann’s Overture-suite in A minor for recorder and strings (TWV 55:a2), with surviving manuscripts in Darmstadt (both works are discussed in the previous chapter).

It is odd that none of the above-mentioned recorder concertos survive in the ‘Rheda’ collection. As already noted, around half of the total pieces listed in the catalogue do survive today. At a similar ratio, you would expect that, out of the 27 concertos for recorder listed in the catalogue, around 10-13 would survive. Furthermore, as can be seen from Table 8.1 above, a number of Dömming’s concertos for transverse flute, horn and oboe (and violin) also survive today. And yet, none of Dömming’s 15 concertos for the recorder survive. This is clearly not just a random loss of concertos through displacement and damage over the years, but instead a more systematic removal of all recorder manuscripts in the collection. Considering Dömming’s obvious affinity for the recorder, presumably this happened sometime after the death of Dömming, in 1760. Perhaps, after this, the recorder was simply not used in performances anymore, and they decided to remove all manuscripts that came into disuse?

7 D-DI Mus.2392-Q-42 and D-DI Mus.2392-Q-82
8 D-DS Mus.ms 1034/5
9 Burkard Rosenberger, in private correspondence, agrees this is the most likely possibility, but also suggests that perhaps the recorder manuscripts were simply removed sometime after 1750 by a musician with a particular interest in the recorder.
‘Flauto’ terminology in the Catalogue

With some minor ambiguities, the terminology regarding which particular flute is intended is generally quite specific in the catalogue. Throughout the catalogue, the transverse flute is normally written as ‘Flaut. Trav’ (or similar), and the recorder is normally written as ‘Flaute Abec’ (or similar). There are a couple of exceptions to this terminology. In the section containing Dömming’s flute and recorder concertos, the first recorder is listed as ‘Flute a bec’, and the rest of the recorder concertos are listed as either ‘Flute Dolce’, or ‘Flaute Quart.’ According to David Lasocki, the ‘Quartflöte’ (‘Flaute Quart.’), is a fourth flute that, in Germanic countries, applied to both the tenor recorder in C (a fourth being measured down from a treble recorder in F), and also a descant recorder in C (a fourth being measured up from a treble recorder in G).\(^\text{10}\) Charles Dieupart used the term flûte du quatre in suite Nos. 5 and 6, in an edition of his Six suites de clavessin ‘Pour un Violin & flute avec une Basse de Viole & un Archilute’, though here he was actually referring to a descant in B-flat, a fourth up from a treble recorder in F.\(^\text{11}\) There are five concertos listed in the catalogue for one or two ‘Flauti Quart’, all by Dömming. It seems more likely that the intended instrument for these five concertos was the higher ‘Flaute Quart’ (i.e. the descant recorder in C). A tenor recorder concerto would be easily overpowered by string accompaniment; and, musically the concerto incipits indicate bright and energetic openings to the pieces, possibly suggesting a higher and ‘brighter’ instrument.

Occasionally the slightly ambiguous term ‘Flauto’ or ‘Flauti’ is used (for example, in some of the concertos by Klöffler, and in the concerto by ‘St.Martini’ [Sammartini]). As we have seen in other chapters, very often ‘flauto’ on its own suggests a recorder rather than a flute. However, here, ‘flauto’ suggests the transverse flute. All incipits that use the term ‘Flauto’, rather than ‘Flaut Trav.’ or ‘Flaut Abec’, are in a different (not quite as neat) hand to the rest of the catalogue, and presumably were included later on in the eighteenth century, when the term ‘flauto’ had become almost solely associated with the transverse variety. This is shown by two of the Klöffler ‘Flauto’ concertos listed in the catalogue (Figure 8.2 and 8.3 below), which survive in the ‘Rheda’ collection.

\(^\text{10}\) Lasocki, ‘Recorder “§I. 1.Nomenclature”’, Grove Music Online.
\(^\text{11}\) Dieupart actually treated this instrument as a transposing instrument in relation to the fingering system of the descant recorder, rather than the treble.
Manuscripts of both of these concertos survive in the collection, the first for ‘2 flauto traversiere, 3 violini, alto et basso’; and the second for ‘Flauto traverso, violino primo, violino secondo, alto, cembalo’. We can see therefore that the term ‘Flauto’ in this catalogue is used by a later eighteenth-century hand, solely as a shortening of ‘Flauto traverso’.

There are possibly two exceptions to this rule. Under the anonymous concertos in the catalogue, there is a concerto for ‘Due Flauti Conc, Due Flauti Gros.’. Separately, there is also a concerto for ‘Due Flauti’. It seems likely that these concertos refer to the recorder, rather than the flute. This is potentially an exception, because these two concertos are in the hand of Dömming, who otherwise uses the term ‘Flaut Traval’ very consistently. It also seems that Dömming has intentionally grouped these three anonymous ‘recorder’ concertos together (with a ‘Flaute a bec’ concerto in the middle).

**Recorder Concertos listed in the ‘Catalogus Musicus’**

In Appendix B, I have included all 27 musical incipits of recorder concertos listed in the ‘Catalogus Musicus’. Composers of recorder concertos in the catalogue include Albinoni, Dömming, Fasch, Graun, Magini, Stulick, Telemann, and Zobell, along with three anonymous recorder concertos. The recorder concerto repertoire listed is substantial, and it is a great shame that the manuscripts have not survived. It would have

---

12 D-RH Ms 445 and D-RH Ms 446
been a very useful addition to the recorder concerto repertoire. Of course, it also leaves open the tantalising prospect that perhaps some of these concertos will one day turn up elsewhere.

**Albinoni**

The ‘Albenoni’ [Tomaso Albinoni] concerto for recorder is a ‘concerto di camera’, in G major, with a scoring of ‘1 Flaute a bec, 2 Violini & Basso’ (Figure 8.4). Though, like all recorder concertos in the manuscript, it does not survive in the Rheda collection, a flute concerto by ‘Albenoni’, also in G major, does survive (Figure 8.5).

![Figure 8.4: ‘Albenoni’, Flaute a bec… Concerto, ‘Catalogus Musicus’](image1)

![Figure 8.5: ‘Albenoni’, Flauto Travers… Concerto, ‘Catalogus Musicus’. In ‘Rheda’ collection: D-RH Ms 9.](image2)

**Dömming**

In the section ‘Flaut Trav: et Flaut Abec Concert.’, Dömming has 23 concertos listed in total, with 15 written for recorder. Out of these 15 concertos for recorder, five were written for one recorder (‘Flaute a bec’, or ‘Flaute Dolce’), four were written for a ‘Flaute Quart’, two were written for two recorders (‘Due Flauti Dolce’), one concerto was written for either recorder or transverse flute (‘Flaute Dolce ou Trav.’), and three concertos were written for two recorders and two flutes (‘Due Flaute Dolce, Due Flaut Trav.’). With one exception, all of the 15 recorder concertos are scored in five parts. To be more specific, where there is a solo recorder, there are two violins, viola and a basso
part; where there are two recorders, the viola is dropped (the scoring is therefore ‘Due Violini & Basso’); where there are two recorders and two flutes, the violins and violas are dropped, leaving just the basso part. The only exception to this is one of the concertos for two recorders and two flutes (marked as No. 236 in the catalogue), which is scored for six parts: ‘Due Flauti Dolce, Due Flauti Trav., Violetta & Basso’ (therefore including an extra ‘Violetta’ part).

The three concertos for two recorders and two flutes would make an interesting addition to the very limited amount of music for both recorder and flute, a combination that was very rare in the eighteenth century. Concertos for both instruments are even rarer, with Telemann’s double concerto for recorder and flute being the most well-known (TWV 52:e1), along with a small number of concertos by Prowo and Linike, today found in the music collection at the libraries of Schwerin and Lund (see Chapter 9 and Chapter 10). These concertos by Dömming would have been a very useful addition to the repertoire.

Though all 15 of Dömming’s recorder concerto manuscripts listed in the catalogue do not survive in their original listing, one of the concertos does survive in a different version. Dömming’s concerto in G major for ‘2 Flauti Quarte, 2 Flauti Trav: Violon Cello’ (listed in the catalogue as No. 220) [Figure 8.7], seems to be an adapted version of Dömming’s concerto for ‘Due Flaute Trav: Due Violini & Basso’ (listed originally in the catalogue as No. 162, before being changed to No. 58) [Figure 8.6]. This survives in the ‘Rheda’ collection of music at Münster’s Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek.¹³

---

¹³ D-RH Ms 173
The incipits of the concertos are the same, apart from the last note of the third bar. In the concerto for two flutes and violins there is a minim C₃, and in the concerto for two recorders and two flutes, there is a crotchet F♯₃ and an E₅. This suggests that the version for recorders and flutes was perhaps a slightly more embellished version of the concerto for two flutes.

**Fasch and Stulick**

Recorder concertos by Fasch and Stulick have recently been found in a collection originally belonging to the Harrach family, and purchased by the New York Public Library in 1956. These two recorder concertos (the Stulick concerto is actually a concerto for recorder and bassoon) are examined in Chapter 6. The Fasch and Stulick recorder concerto incipits from the ‘Catalogus Musicus’ of Hohenlimburg and Rheda do not correspond to the ‘Harrach’ concertos, and therefore are completely separate concertos (see Appendix B for both incipits).

**Magini**

Francesco Magini was a composer active in Rome during the early eighteenth century. Just over 20 manuscripts by Magini survive today, including seven sonatas for cornetts and sackbuts as part of the ‘Santini’ collection in Münster.¹⁴ The listing of Magini’s recorder concerto in the ‘Catalogus Musicus’ seems to be the only surviving reference to a concerto by Magini.

---

¹⁴ D-Müs SANT Hs 2436 (Nr.1 to Nr. 7)
Graun

Two recorder concertos by a ‘Graun’ are listed in the catalogue: the first for ‘Flauto Abec, Violino 1\textsuperscript{mo}, Violino 2\textsuperscript{do}, Basso’; and the second for ‘Flauto Abec, Violino 1\textsuperscript{mo}, Basso’ (which is really a scoring of a trio, though listed under the concerto section, rather than the separate ‘Trio’ section of the catalogue). In Appendix B, the composer is listed as Johann Gottlieb Graun / Carl Heinrich Graun, since there is no definite information from the musical incipit that suggests one over the other. Johann Gottlieb Graun wrote a substantial amount of instrumental music, including a number of concertos. There are also two other surviving recorder concerto manuscripts from other libraries that seem to have been composed by Johann Gottlieb Graun.\footnote{D-DS Mus. ms 353/2 (discussed earlier in this chapter); and Mus. Hs. 181} This perhaps makes Johann Gottlieb the more likely composer of this incipit than Carl Heinrich.

Telemann

Two recorder concertos by ‘Telemann’ are listed in the ‘Catalogus Musicus’ (along with two transverse flute concertos). These concertos all survive in manuscripts from other libraries (and are discussed in Chapter 7). The first recorder concerto is in G minor, for ‘Flaute a bec, Violino, Viola & Basso’. It is in fact TWV 43:g4, a ‘Trio’ which survives in Dresden in two manuscripts, and a third manuscript in Poland.\footnote{D-Dl Mus.2392-Q-42; D-Dl Mus.2392-Q-82; PL-GD Ms 4177} The second concerto is in A minor, for ‘Flauto a bec, Due Violini, Viola & Basso’. From the few bars of the incipit, it is actually TWV 55:a2 – Telemann’s overture-suite for recorder and strings from Darmstadt.\footnote{D-DS Mus.ms 1034/5}

Zobell

‘Zobell’ is likely be Johann Kaspar Zobell, who has four manuscripts that survive today (all four are concertos for transverse flute, found today in Stockholm’s Musik- och teaterbiblioteket). There is very little information regarding Johann Kaspar Zobell, though RISM dates the four manuscripts of his surviving concertos as from the second half of the eighteenth century. ‘Zobell’ here could also be Johann Conrad Zobell: there
is a record of ‘Johann Conrad Zobel’, who played *Waldhorn* at the court of Württemberg-Stuttgart in 1745, and as late as 1760.\(^{18}\) It is also possible that they could even be the same person. Either way, ‘Zobell’ seems to have been active from the 1740s, and into the second half of the eighteenth century, making this a recorder concerto with potentially quite a late date of composition.

\[\text{Figure 8.8: Zobell, *Flaute Abec… Concerto*, ‘Catalogus Musicus’}\]

**Summary**

The ‘Catalogus Musicus’ of Bentheim-Tecklenburg-Rheda is an important resource, giving information and incipits about a large number of recorder concertos that do not survive today. The *Kappelmeister* of the court, Dömming, clearly had an interest in the recorder, including the instrument in several of his own works throughout the catalogue.

Out of 27 recorder concertos listed in the catalogue, 15 of those were composed by Dömming. None of the 27 manuscripts of these recorder concertos survive in the Rheda music collection in Münster. Since around half of the total manuscripts listed in the ‘Catalogus Musicus’ do survive today, this cannot be down to chance. Perhaps the recorder concertos were simply thrown away (or taken by someone) once recorder concertos had stopped being performed at the court? Since Dömming was clearly a fan of the instrument, it seems likely that this happened sometime after his death, in 1760.

What is particularly interesting about the collection, and the information it contains about the recorder at the court of Bentheim-Tecklenburg-Rheda, is that it seems to be a further example of a relatively late date for interest in the recorder and the recorder concerto. Firstly, Dömming was *Kappelmeister* from 1731 to 1760; and a number of his surviving concerto manuscripts have dates marked on them, all of which lie between the years 1731 and 1740. No manuscripts survive today from before Dömming’s period as

\(^{18}\) Owens, (in: *Music at German Courts, 1715-1760*), 189.
Kappelmeister. All 27 concerto incipits in the ‘Catalogus Musicus’ appear in Dömming’s hand, with no extra inclusions of recorder concertos in the catalogue by a later hand. Since the catalogue was first compiled by Dömming in 1750, and since no manuscripts by Dömming exist from before 1731, it seems likely that the recorder concerto manuscripts would have been copied in the 1730s. Although this period is not as late as the confirmed use of the recorder in the Hesse-Darmstadt court (1759), it still seems to show a relatively late interest in the recorder concerto. Speculatively, since Dömming clearly had an interest in composing for the instrument, it seems possible that the recorder would have continued to be used in performances by Dömming for several years, even into the 1740s and 1750s – the ‘Catalogus Musicus’ was first compiled in 1750, and Dömming died in 1760.
The Duchy of Mecklenburg-Schwerin

There are many concertos involving recorder which have survived at the Landesbibliothek Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, in Schwerin. Some of these concertos are known today, with a small number of the concertos having modern editions. However, there are a large number of other concertos involving recorder in this collection (often with relatively unusual scorings), which are vastly underexplored, and the composers not well-known. The recorder and the recorder concerto in Mecklenburg-Schwerin seems to have been of some interest to composers in the 1730s, and even the 1740s. Like the previous two chapters (the court of Hesse-Darmstadt and the court of Hohenlimburg), this is another example of the recorder becoming and remaining popular in Northern Germany, much later than in the generally accepted view of when the recorder became unfashionable across Europe.

The collection at the Landesbibliothek Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, in Schwerin, comes from the collection of music from the court of Mecklenburg-Schwerin, during the time of Duke Karl Leopold (who ruled between 1713-1747), and Christian Ludwig II (who ruled between 1747-1756). The collection, and the house of Mecklenburg-Schwerin, also has an interesting connection with Sweden, where several manuscripts of concertos with recorders, with the same slightly unusual scorings, also survive today at the Lund University Library. The Dukes of Mecklenburg had historical ties to Sweden, and the Swedish throne. The recorder concerto in Sweden is explored in Chapter 10.

Duchy of Mecklenburg-Schwerin

In 1701, through the Treaty of Hamburg, the territories of Mecklenburg were divided into those under the Duke of Mecklenburg-Schwerin, and those under the Duke of Mecklenburg-Strelitz. The Duchy of Mecklenburg-Schwerin held the large central and western parts of the Mecklenburg region, with two much smaller areas in the far east and far west of Mecklenburg ruled by the Duke of Mecklenburg-Strelitz. The Mecklenburg-Schwerin court had a long history of music: when the territories of
Mecklenburg were partitioned in 1701, a Hofkapelle of the Mecklenburg-Schwerin court was set up by Duke Friedrich Wilhelm I (who ruled between 1692-1713). This active musical tradition was continued by his successors, Duke Karl Leopold (1713-1728), and particularly, Duke Christian Ludwig II (1728-1756).\(^1\) The orchestra based in Schwerin today, the Mecklenburgische Staatskapelle, have an even longer history, back to 1563, when the Duke of Mecklenburg at the time, Johann Albrecht I, offered David Köler the position of Kapellmeister (the Mecklenburgische Staatskapelle at Schwerin celebrated their 450\(^{th}\) anniversary in 2013).

**Mecklenburg-Schwerin Hofkapelle**

The Mecklenburg-Schwerin Hofkapelle was first set up by Duke Friedrich Wilhelm I in 1701, with Johann Fischer employed as the first official Kapellmeister.\(^2\) There were however musicians employed by the court of Mecklenburg-Schwerin, even before this date, as trumpeters, pipers and drummers. Duke Friedrich Wilhelm was particularly keen on opera, visiting Hamburg in 1700. This had a lasting effect on him. At Hamburg, he met Reinhold Keiser, Johann Mattheson and Georg Friedrich Handel.\(^3\) A year later, in 1701, the Mecklenburg-Schwerin Hofkapelle was formed. After Duke Friedrich Wilhelm’s death in 1713, the Hofkapelle became a little less active, but music particularly gained importance once again at Mecklenburg-Schwerin under the relatively brief rule of Duke Christian Ludwig II (who ruled between 1747-1756). During this period, Christian Ludwig increased the size of the orchestra, and towards the end of the eighteenth century, it became known as an orchestra of substantial size and skill. Antonio Rosetti became the Kapellmeister of Mecklenburg-Schwerin in 1789.

**Recorder Concertos at Mecklenburg-Schwerin**

Today, in the Landesbibliothek Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, in Schwerin, there survive fourteen concertos which involve the recorder: twelve of these concertos are for multiple instruments with unusual scorings, and two of these concertos are solo recorder concertos with string accompaniment. These fourteen recorder concertos are from four

---


\(^3\) Ibid.
Table 9.1 lists all the extant concertos involving a recorder from the collection. The two solo recorder concertos are highlighted in bold.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Concerto</th>
<th>Shelfmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter Johann Fick</td>
<td>‘Concerto a 4’ (in A minor) ‘1 Flûte Traversier, 1 Flûte Abec, 1 Violin con Cembalo’</td>
<td>Mus.348/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Concerto a 5’ (in C major) ‘2 Violin, 2 Flut abec et Cembalo’</td>
<td>Mus.349/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Concerto a 6’ (in G major) ‘2 Flûte Abec, 2 Violin, Alto con Cembalo’</td>
<td>Mus.351a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Concerto a 7’ (in F major) ‘2 Corne de Chasse, 2 Oboen, 2 Flûte abec et Cembalo’</td>
<td>Mus.352a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Concerto a 7’ (in F major) ‘2 Flûte abec, 2 Oboes, 2 Corne de Chasse con Cembalo’</td>
<td>Mus.352b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Concerto a 8’ (in G major) ‘2 Corne de Chasse, 2 Flûte abec, 2 Oboes: 1 Bassong con Cembalo’</td>
<td>Mus.353a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Concerto a 6’ (in G major) ‘2 Flaute abec, 2 Oboe, 2 Bassong’</td>
<td>Mus.4314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Concerto a 6’ (in F major) ‘2 Flaute abec, 2 Oboe, 2 Bassong’</td>
<td>Mus.4315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre Prowo</td>
<td>‘Concerto a 6’ (in C major) ‘1 Flauto abec Primo, 1 Flauto abec Secundo, 1 Oboe Primo, 1 Oboe Secundo, 1 Bassong Primo, 1 Bassong Secundo’</td>
<td>Mus.4316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Concerto a 6’ (in F major) ‘2 Flaute abec, 2 Oboe, 2 Bassongs’</td>
<td>Mus.4317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Concerto a 6’ (in C major) ‘2 Flaute abec, 2 Oboes, 2 Bassong’</td>
<td>Mus.4318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Concerto a 6’ (in C major) ‘2 Flaute abec, 2 Oboes, 2 Bassong’</td>
<td>Mus.4319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Schultz’</td>
<td>‘Concerto â 5’ (in G major) ‘Flaute abec Concertato, Violino Primo, Violino Secundo, Viola, Basso ou Violoncello’</td>
<td>Mus.4967</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.1: Extant concertos with recorder from the Ducky of Mecklenburg-Schwerin
The concertos scored for multiple instruments by Fick and Prowo are clearly heavily influenced by one another. Though there are a number of solo concertos throughout the collection for the transverse flute, the flute is not used in the numerous ‘Concerto a 6’ (or 7, or 8), where the recorder is favoured (in pairs) instead. This suggests that, though the recorder was clearly popular and in favour, the flute was seen generally in the Mecklenburg-Schwerin as the more soloistic instrument. The popularity of these particular scorings of concertos (generally for combinations of wind instruments) evidently spread outside Mecklenburg, as there are a number of ‘a 6’ concertos for wind instruments also surviving today in the Lund University Library (see Chapter 10). We will first discuss the concertos for multiple instruments (in the Schwerin collection) by Prowo and Fick, which share several similarities, before discussing the two solo recorder concertos of Linike and ‘Schultz’.

**Peter Johann Fick [Peter Joachim Fick]**

Peter Johann Fick was born in 1708, in Altona (now in the state of Hamburg, though during Fick’s time under the Kingdom of Denmark-Norway). By 1730, Fick first appears in court documents at Schwerin as ‘Laquay Monsieur Fick’. In 1740, he appears in a document listing him as an organist at the ‘Schloss’. He died, and was buried in Schwerin, in 1743. Peter Johann Fick seems to have come from a whole family of musicians. Paul Fick, who is possibly the father of Peter Johann Fick, was a musician who played the oboe, and who lived from 1675-1723. Other Fick’s include Georg Wilhelm Fick (1703-1756), and Hans Adolph Fick (1702-1735) who were both employed as a ‘Stadtmusikant’ in Altona at the beginning of the eighteenth century. Finally, there was another (junior) Paul Fick, also employed as a musician in Altona, who lived from 1756-1782.

Peter Joachim Fick appears to have remained in regular employment at Altona during the mid-1730s. This is shown by a number of requests by himself and fellow musician Johann Matthias Vedde to a ‘Magistrat’ of Altona, regarding money, musical roles and services, and additional musicians. In 1736, Fick and Vedde requested a fixed salary, due to their difficult financial situations (and that of Altona musicians in general).

---

For this extra money, they suggested additional musical roles in services for themselves and the musicians of Altona at the church. Later requests suggested that they had too many roles to cover, and additional musicians would be required. The limits of the money available to the church, and more generally in Altona, seem to be a regular theme in the replies to Fick and Vedde’s requests.

A number of Fick’s compositions survive today. All extant manuscripts are instrumental music, most of which are concertos, along with some sinfonia, and a few other instrumental pieces. As well as several surviving compositions, Peter Johann Fick’s name also appears regularly as a copyist, on many different works. He copied several of Vivaldi’s compositions, including ten of Vivaldi’s concertos; and Fick was also the copyist of works by Schickhardt, Telemann, Marcello, Prowo and several other composers, all today found in Schwerin’s Landesbibliothek Mecklenburg-Vorpommern.

Pierre Prowo

Pierre Prowo clearly had a very close connection to Fick, musically and geographically. Prowo, like Fick, was born in Altona, in 1697. He, like Fick, was also an organist; though, unlike Fick, he seems to have been based throughout his life solely in Altona. Prowo did not gain employment at Schwerin, but was instead organist at the Reformed Church in Altona, certainly from 1736 onwards, although perhaps even earlier than this. Prowo died in Altona in 1757.

Prowo was an active composer, and fifty-three of his compositions survive today (fifty manuscripts at Schwerin, and three manuscripts at Lund). These are nearly all sonatas and concertos, though a substantial cantata also survives (‘Die Vereinigung der vie Temperamente’). This was performed in Altona on ‘16. Junius 1736’, and in the cantata’s title, Prowo is also specifically described as ‘Organiste bey der Reformirten Kirchen zu Altona’.

---

7 Ibid., 195-196.
8 All extant manuscripts of Fick today survive only at Schwerin’s Landesbibliothek Mecklenburg-Vorpommern. Thirty-six manuscripts by Fick survive in total, twenty-five of which are concertos.
11 D-SWI Mus.4311
The concertos of Fick and Prowo

A number of the concertos in the Schwerin collection have ‘P.J.Fick’ at the bottom right hand of the manuscript, indicating ownership of the manuscript by Fick. There are also a number of manuscripts in the collection, also in Fick’s hand, but which do not have ‘P.J.Fick’ written at the bottom. Those manuscripts with ‘P.J.Fick’ written at the bottom of the page likely originate from Fick’s own private collection, copied before Fick started work in Schwerin in the 1730s (and brought across with him). Other manuscripts in Fick’s hand, but without Fick’s ownership marking, may have simply been part of the Hofkapelle collection (rather than Fick’s own private collection of music). These manuscripts therefore may well have been copied once Fick had started employment in Schwerin.

Prowo’s concertos (Mus.4314-4319) are all in the hand of Prowo, but with ‘P.J.Fick’ marked at the bottom of the manuscript, indicating original ownership of the manuscript by Fick. This suggests that Prowo’s concertos were composed in Altona before 1730, and Fick brought them across from Altona when he started work in Schwerin. Conversely, as indicated above, all of Fick’s concertos involving the recorder (in Fick’s hand) do not have ‘P.J.Fick’ marked at the bottom of the manuscript, suggesting they were not part of his original pre-Schwerin collection, but were instead composed after he had moved to Schwerin. It cannot simply be the case that Fick did not bother to mark ownership of his own compositions, because other concertos by Fick do have ‘P.J.Fick’ at the bottom of the manuscript, as well as ‘di P.J.Fick’ under the instrumental information, indicating the composer. This can be seen in Figure 9.1.
Fick’s flute concerto here has both ‘di P.J.Fick’ marked, indicating the composer, and ‘P.J.Fick’ written at the bottom of the manuscript, indicating the owner (interestingly, ‘di P. Prowo’ is also erased in the middle of the manuscript). This implies the concerto was part of Fick’s pre-Schwerin collection of music, and composed before the 1730s.

The fact that all of Fick’s concertos for multiple instruments including recorder (listed in Table 9.1), only have ‘di P.J.Fick’ written under the instrument information, but do not have an owner marking at the bottom of the page, suggests they were composed by Fick in Schwerin, sometime in the 1730s (and certainly before Fick’s death in 1743). Prowo’s concertos involving recorder, on the other hand, all seem to come from Fick’s own private collection, and were therefore probably composed in Altona,
before 1730. Other concertos by Prowo in the Schwerin collection do not have Fick’s ownership marking, suggesting these were copied in Schwerin sometime after 1730.\footnote{Prowo’s concerto for flute (D-SWI Mus.4312), and his six ‘Concerto a 5’ for ‘3 Hautbois and 2 Bassong’ (D-SWI Mus.4313) do not have Fick’s ownership marking on the manuscripts.}

From Table 9.1, we can see that Fick’s concertos involving recorder in the collection have much more varied scorings than Prowo’s – from a ‘Concerto a 4’ for flute, recorder violin and cembalo, all the way up to a ‘Concerto a 8’ for two horns, two recorders, two oboes, a bassoon and cembalo. Indeed, there also survives a ‘Concerto a 9’ by Fick in the Schwerin collection, for ‘4 Corne de Chasse, 2 Violin, 2 Oboes, 1 Alto, 1 Bassong con Cembalo’.\footnote{D-SWI Mus.353b} The scoring of Prowo’s concertos, on the other hand, are generally more ‘standardised’ than Fick’s. There are six concertos (Mus.4314-4319) ‘a 6’, for two recorders, two oboes, and two bassoons. There are also six ‘Concerto a 5’ at Schwerin by Prowo, for three oboes and two bassoons (Mus.4313). Additionally, at Lund Library, there is another ‘Concerto a 5’ by Prowo for three oboes and two bassoons, though this concerto also has two violin parts later added.\footnote{S-L Saml.Engelhart 499} Finally, there are two more pieces by Prowo at Lund: a ‘Concerto a 6’ for two oboes, two horns, and two bassoons, and an ‘Intrada a 6’ for the same instruments. Fick’s scoring then is generally more varied than Prowo’s. The various combinations of wind instruments in Vivaldi’s concertos seem to be an obvious influence on both composers (and Fick clearly appreciated Vivaldi’s concertos in general, copying a number of them). Their compositions also seem to share some similarities with Telemann’s concertos for multiple soloists. Telemann in fact composed several concertos with very similar scorings to the concertos of Fick and Prowo in Table 9.1, such as TWV 44:15 for two recorders, two oboes and a bassoon; TWV 44:41 for two recorders, two oboes, two violins and continuo; and TWV 44:42 for the same scoring. Pepusch’s op. 8 concertos, published in Amsterdam in 1718, for four melody instruments grouped in pairs (recorders, flutes, oboes or violins) and continuo are also possible influences on Fick and Prowo’s concertos. The musicians in Schwerin clearly had some experience of Pepusch’s music, because there survives a ‘Concerto’ manuscript by him for three oboes, one violin and a bass in Schwerin, along with some prints of Pepusch’s sonatas, published by Roger in Amsterdam.\footnote{D-SWI Mus.4162}
The concertos of Fick and Prowo differ in structure, and to a certain extent, style. Prowo’s concertos involving recorder are, with one exception (Mus.4316), all in three movements and Italianate in style. Fick’s concertos involving recorder are, with one exception (Mus.353a) all four-movement concertos.

Fick often uses the recorder in a simplistic manner in his concertos, employing two recorders in pairs (each rarely having an independent entry), which quite often play in thirds. A good example of this can be seen in Fick’s ‘Concerto a 7’ in F major for two horns, two oboes and two recorders (Mus.352a), where the recorders are nearly always used together, and quite often in thirds throughout all four movements (see Figure 9.2 and 9.3).

16 This can give the impression in some of Fick’s concertos of an almost ‘pastoral’ nature, with pastoral scenes over this period historically often including recorders in thirds.
On the other hand, Prowo’s concertos involving two recorders have a different configuration, with the first instrumental parts taking more soloistic roles, and the second parts generally only accompanying. For example, in Prowo’s ‘Concerto a 6’ (in C major – Mus. 4319), the first recorder and first oboe take on solo roles throughout all three movements, with the second recorder and second oboe parts acting predominantly as harmonic accompaniment throughout (see Figure 9.4).

Figure 9.4: Prowo, ‘Concerto a 6’ (Mus.4319), ii, Allegro, bars 1-15
Prowo also utilises much *Italianate* passagework, and arpeggiated figures, which can present difficult fingering problems for the player to overcome (for example, see Figure 9.5, where bars 18-21 are easy to ‘stumble’ over and lose coordination between the fingers and tongue).

![Figure 9.5: Prowo, ‘Concerto a 6’ (Mus.4319), ii, Allegro, bars 19-28](image)

Prowo’s concertos utilise a limited range of the recorder, with only three out of the six concertos ascending above a D₆ (*Mus.4314, Mus. 4315* and *Mus. 4319*). In contrast, Fick’s concertos quite often stray into the higher notes of the instrument. For example, in Figure 9.6 below, the first recorder part reaches a G₆ within the first three bars. Here we can see a difference between Prowo and Fick’s treatment of the note G₆. Prowo clearly regarded the ‘normal’ range of the recorder as ending at F₆; and Fick instead at G₆. As noted in Chapter 7, G₆ is a stable note on a good instrument.
Out of a total of twelve concertos involving recorder by Prowo and Fick in the collection, perhaps the most interesting is Fick’s ‘Concerto a 4’ for transverse flute, recorder, violin and continuo (in A minor, Mus.348/9). This concerto, previously unknown, adds to the very small repertoire of eighteenth-century music which uses both the flute and the recorder in combination. The most significant work in this small repertoire is Telemann’s concerto for flute and recorder (see Chapter 7), though other notable examples include Fasch’s sonata for flute and two recorders (or two violins) and Quantz’s sonata for flute and recorder. There also survives a ‘Sonata a 3’ for flute, recorder and continuo by Pierre Prowo, and a concerto for two flutes and two recorders by Johann Georg Linike. Prowo’s sonata is found within Schwerin’s collection, and Linike’s concerto survives today in Lund’s Universitetsbibliotek (see Chapter 10 for

---

17 D-Ds Mus.ms 298/6
18 D-DI Ms. 2440 (from the Schrank II collection).
Other surviving examples for recorder and flute in combination include Loeillet’s sonata ‘a cinque’ (possibly misattributed), Paisabile’s sonata ‘a cinque’, Endler’s ‘Pieces’ (see Chapter 7), two Telemann ‘ouvertures’ and a sonata by Pepusch. Pepusch also composed six concertos for ‘2 Flûtes à bec; 2 Flûtes Traversières, Haubois ou Violons; Basse Contine…’, though the four solo parts are marked Flauto Primo and Secondo and Haubois Primo and Secondo. See David Lasocki’s article ‘Flute and Recorder in Combination’ [GL 1984] for a discussion of some of these works.

19 D-SWi Mus.4323/3
20 S-L: Saml.Kraus 136
discussion of the Swedish manuscripts). It is notable that, considering only a small number of pieces for flute and recorder survive today, Prowo, Fick and Linike all composed for this combination, and all three composers are associated with the Mecklenburg region.

There are a number of similarities between Prowo’s ‘Sonata a 3’, and Fick’s ‘Concerto a 4’. Both pieces have relatively simple flute and recorder parts, which generally avoid difficult cross-fingerings and complicated arpeggiated passages (although the key of C minor in Prowo’s sonata does produce one or two more challenging fingering patterns, particularly for the flautist). Equally, in both Prowo’s sonata and Fick’s concerto, the flute is generally kept below the recorder in pitch (presumably to avoid the flute overpowering the recorder in its upper registers), and only a small range of the flute is utilised (the flute part has a range from Eb4 to C6 in Prowo’s sonata, and from E4 to C6 in Fick’s concerto). Furthermore, Prowo’s sonata and Fick’s concerto are both harmonically and creatively quite limited, with each work having long periods of stasis, and an obsession with the tonic. However, both concertos do provide some melodic interest, and Fick’s concerto in particular demonstrates attractive and subtle interplay between the recorder and flute parts.

Fick’s concerto is in four movements, where an opening Andante sees the recorder, flute and violin alternating between melodic step-wise semi-quavers and accompanying quavers (see Figure 9.7 below for the full movement). As mentioned above, the flute is generally kept below the recorder, and the violin usually lower than the flute. Even though the parts are individually very simple, there is still a rhythmic ‘exactness’ to the solo parts, and care needs to be taken by the ensemble to move together with precision.
The final movement of Fick’s concerto is a lively, triple time Allegro where repeated, articulated semi-quavers in the recorder, flute and violin are used to give the movement energy and character (see Figure 9.8). Although Fick’s ‘Concerto a 4’ is a relatively simple work, both musically and technically, it is still a useful addition to the small repertoire of music for flute and recorder, and therefore deserving of further exploration by modern performers.
Johann Georg Linike [Linicke]

Linike was born in Hamburg around 1680, and died there in 1762. He was from a musical family, of which there are two other members that we know about. These were Ephraim Linike and Christian Bernard Linike, though their relationship with each other is not clear. Quite a few of Linike’s works survive today, predominantly in a few German libraries (with most manuscripts being in Schwerin), along with some further manuscripts in Swedish libraries.

As well as a composer, Linike was also a violinist, and was first employed as a violinist in court of Brandenburg-Prussia, in Berlin, between 1710 and 1712. In this post, Linike was employed as a second violinist (earning a salary of 200 Thaler). His family members, Ephraim Linike and Christian Bernard Linike were also employed at this court, though both on a higher salary than Johann Georg. Ephraim was employed at the court as a first violin, where he earned 300 Thaler, and Christian Bernard was employed as a cellist (also earning 300 Thaler). The following year, Johann Georg only earned

21 Oleskiewicz, (in: Music at German Courts, 1715-1760), 112.
100 Thaler, half of the previous year’s salary. This was presumably why Linike left the court in 1713 and instead took up employment as the concertmaster of the court of Weissenfels. Around 1720, Linike moved to London, and stayed there until sometime around 1725 or early 1726. He eventually returned to Germany, first finding employment as a violinist in the famous Hamburg opera orchestra. Finally, in 1728 he became Kappelmeister at the court of Mecklenburg-Strelitz (the smaller territories from the division of Mecklenburg, in 1701, into the Duchy of Mecklenburg-Schwerin and the Duchy of Mecklenburg-Strelitz). Linike remained in Strelitz until 1761, before returning to Hamburg, where he died a year later.

During Linike’s time in London, he appeared in a London newspaper advertisement for a benefit concert on his own behalf. On 27 March 1724, at the New Theatre in the Haymarket, a concert was advertised ‘For the Benefit of Mr. Linike’, which ‘will be perform’d, an Extraordinary Entertainment of Musick by the best Hands’. Two years later, on the 16 March 1726, after Johann Georg had left London for Hamburg, an advertisement appeared for a concert at ‘Mr. Hickford’s Great Room’, for the ‘Benefit of Widow Linike’. Unless Johann Georg married in London before leaving for Hamburg, and his unhappy wife decided to use the term ‘widow’, it seems that Johann Georg brought other Linike family members with him to London.

Linike was for several years the Kapellemeister of Mecklenburg-Strelitz, and over the last century, the various collections and archives of the Mecklenburg-Strelitz and Mecklenburg-Schwerin families have been combined into the various archives and libraries at Schwerin. It seems that Linike’s music was also played by the Mecklenburg-Schwerin Hofkapelle anyway. A manuscript for a violin concerto survives in Frankfurt, with ‘Mecklenb: L: Schwerin’ marked on the top right of the manuscript.

22 Oleskiewicz, op. cit., 117.
23 Ibid., 251.
25 The Duchy of Mecklenburg-Strelitz has another famous musical collection – Princess Sophia Charlotte of Mecklenburg-Strelitz became the wife of King George III, and Queen Consort of Great Britain and Ireland in 1761. She was a music connoisseur and patron, who chose Johann Christian Bach as her master of music (Gjerdingen, Music in the Galant Style, 5).
26 Rauterberg, ‘Johann Georg Linike’.
28 The Daily Courant – Issue 7617. 16 March 1726.
29 It could of course be a coincidence, but it does seem strange that a newspaper advertisement with such a rare name (‘Linike’) appears at the same time that Johann Georg Linike leaves London for Hamburg.
30 Private correspondence – Andreas Roloff
31 D-F Mus Hs 1270 (Universitätsbibliothek Frankfurt am Main)
At Schwerin, three concerto manuscripts by Linike survive today (a violin concerto, a transverse flute concerto, and a recorder concerto). Additionally, as mentioned earlier, there survives a concerto for two flutes and two recorders by Linike in the ‘Kraus’ collection of the Universitetsbiblioteket, Lund (see Chapter 10).

Linike’s recorder concerto in G major (Mus.3426) has ‘Flauto Dolce’ written on the title page, though on the instrumental part itself, there is also written, after the Basso part, ‘Flauto Dolce ô Flute Traversiere’. The recorder part in the concerto, like all the other recorder parts in the Schwerin collection, is written in French violin clef; therefore, we have to assume that the concerto is written specifically for the recorder, with the option for flute simply given as an additional possibility. Only one violin part is given in the manuscript, though presumably this is intended for more than one violin, as it is marked as ‘Violino unisoni’. The three-movement recorder concerto is, unfortunately, harmonically limited and musically banal. It is a concerto that very much roots itself to the home key of G major, with occasional departures into E minor; harmonically, little else happens throughout. The melodic writing is uninspired, and the concerto is clearly aimed at a musician with a basic technique: the recorder part is simple, predominantly based around the middle register of the instrument, and utilises a very limited range (G₄ to E₆, with the note E₆ only occurring twice – the concerto is very much based around the octave of D₅ to D₆). Figure 9.9 (below) shows the recorder part of the last movement, which is a good example of Linike’s simple and uninspiring writing in this concerto.
There exists one further solo recorder concerto in the Schwerin collection: ‘Concerto à 5’ (in G major) for ‘Flaute abec Concertato, Violino Primo, Violino Secundo, Viola & Basso ou Violoncello’, by ‘Mons. J. C. Schultz’.

An edition of this concerto has been published by Schott, with the composer listed as Johann Christoph Schultze.

---

32 D-SWi Mus.4967
33 Schulze Konzert für Altblockflöte, Streicher und Cembalo (Schott: Mainz, 1969)
Additionally in the Landesbibliothek Mecklenburg-Vorpommern collection, there are six suites for two recorders and continuo, also by a ‘J. C. Schultze’.  

There is something incongruous about the attribution to a Johann Christoph Schultz in the Schott edition of the concerto, which becomes obvious on reading the Preface to this edition. The editor (Karlheinz Schultz-Hauser) writes: ‘All that is known about the life of Johann Christoph Schultze (or Schultz) is that he was born in 1733, that he conducted at Doebbelin’s Theatre in Berlin from 1768, and that he died on 23 August 1813 in Berlin’. The incongruity here arises from the fact that this is a concerto for recorder. If this attribution is correct, it means the date of composition for this recorder concerto would be very late, possibly even well after 1750. It would also be composed by someone who lived into the nineteenth century. Furthermore, the concerto itself is a concerto that is stylistically firmly associated with the first-half of the eighteenth century, and not the second. Can this recorder concerto really be by this particular Johann Christoph Schultz?

As mentioned above, there exists a manuscript in the Schwerin library titled ‘Sonata a 3’ for recorder, flute and continuo by Pierre Prowo. This same trio sonata also appears in a different hand, in a manuscript in Brussels, but this time attributed to ‘Sigr: Schultze’. These two manuscripts are interesting, because the manuscript attributed to Prowo in Schwerin is an autograph manuscript and, as Lasocki indicates, the Brussels manuscript seems to have been altered, with some minor ornamentation added in. Therefore it seems more likely that the attribution of the sonata to Prowo is the earlier (and more likely) one. Hans Oskar Koch, the editor of the modern edition of Prowo’s trio sonata, suggested that this dual attribution had perhaps arisen due to a confusion regarding Prowo’s name, and that Prowo and ‘Schultze’ were in fact the same person. Koch explains that in Altona records, various members of Prowo’s family signed their name as ‘Prevost’, ‘Provest’ or ‘Prevot’, and that ‘Prévôt’ (or ‘Prévost’) is actually the old French terminology for a village mayor. In German, this translates as ‘Schultheiss’ or ‘Schulz(e)’, suggesting that ‘Prowo was sometimes known as Schulz or Schulze, or that this ‘translation’ was undertaken by a resourceful copyist. Lasocki goes on to
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34 D-SWl Mus.4968 – Mus.4973  
35 D-SWl Mus.4323/3  
36 B-Bc 7049  
37 Lasocki, ‘Flute and Recorder in Combination’, 394, [GL 1984].  
38 Lasocki’s translation of Koch’s preface: Ibid.
suggest that the Schwerin manuscripts with ‘J.G.Schultz’ on the title page could therefore in fact also be by Prowo.

Though an interesting theory, this seems a little implausible. Even if a copyist really did make such a presumptuous translation of a composer’s last name, it does not explain why the manuscripts in Schwerin have the attribution of ‘J. C. Schultz(e)’, rather than simply the translation of ‘Schultz’. The name ‘Schultz’ is a confusing name generally in the eighteenth century because it was apparently very common during this period, with several Schultz’s working as composers (most of whom seemed to work in and around Berlin). There are a number of concerto manuscripts from across the region which are simply attributed to a ‘Schultz’, with no further information. To give just a few examples, there are two transverse flute concerto manuscripts attributed to a ‘Del Sig: Schultz’ at a library in Regensburg;39 there is a flute concerto by ‘del Sigr. Schultz’ in Gdansk, Poland;40 and there is a violin concerto by ‘Del Sig’ Schultz’ in Dresden.41

There is a possible solution to the authorship question of the ‘Schultze’ recorder concerto. The modern Schott edition was correct to attribute the concerto to a Johann Christoph Schultze, but unfortunately they chose the wrong Schultze! There is another Johann Christoph Schultze. In Robert Eitner’s Biographisch-Bibliographisches Quellen Lexicon (1903), there are numerous Schultz(e)s listed. One of these is the Johann Christoph Schultze mentioned in the Schott edition, who was born in 1733 and died in 1813.42 However, before this, there is another Johann Christoph Schultze listed. Only a couple of lines of information is given about this particular Schultze: he worked in the Duchy of Württemberg, and in 1729, he had ‘6 Sonate à 2 fl. trav. senza basso’ published in Hamburg.43 Though it is difficult to say without knowing any more information about the date of birth or death of the older Johann Christoph Schultze, it seems possible that the older and younger Johann Christoph Schultze could be related. The older Johann Christoph Schultze clearly had some connection to the territories near Altona and Schwerin, since his six sonatas for two flutes was published in Hamburg. It therefore seems very reasonable to attribute the recorder concerto at Schwerin (Mus.4967,) and
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39 D-Rtt Schultz 1, and D-Rtt Schultz 2 (Fürst Thurn und Taxis Hofbibliothek und Zentralbibliothek)
40 PL-GD Ms Joh.407
41 D-DL Mus.2809-O-1
42 Eitner, Biographisch-Bibliographisches Quellen Lexicon, Vol. 9, 94.
43 These sonatas survive in manuscript (along with a chaconne) in Berlin (D-Bsa SA 4759). There also exists manuscripts of the same sonatas (wrongly) attributed to Handel in Karlsruhe.
the six suites for two recorders and continuo (\textit{Mus.4968} – \textit{Mus.4973}), both marked as ‘J.C’Schultz(e)’, to the older Johann Christoph Schultze.

One further name crops up on the manuscript of Schultze’s recorder concerto. On the bottom of the title page of the concerto, is written: ‘Possessor / Johann Matthias Vedde’. This name is familiar from earlier in this chapter (the section on Peter Johann Fick), in the requests Fick and Vedde sent on behalf of the musicians of Altona. Johann Matthias Vedde was born in 1677, and was employed in Altona as a ‘Stadtmusikant’ between 1705, and his death in Altona in 1756. Before his employment in Altona, Vedde worked at Krempe, Berlin and Hamburg.\footnote{Soll, \textit{Verrechtlichte Musik: Die Stadtmusikanten der Herzogtümer Schleswig und Holstein}, 460.} As well as the recorder concerto manuscript, several other concertos in Schwerin are also marked as ‘Possessor / Johann Matthias Vedde’. Presumably these manuscripts are from Vedde’s own private collection. Vedde seems to have owned, in particular, a number of oboe concertos, including Alessandro Marcello’s oboe concerto in C minor,\footnote{D-SWI Mus.3530} Telemann’s overture for two oboes\footnote{D-SWI Mus.5399/9}, and a Fasch concerto for oboe and flute.\footnote{D-SWI Mus.1795} Perhaps Vedde was an oboe (and recorder) player himself? Perhaps even, Schultze’s recorder concerto was specifically written for Vedde?

Schultze’s recorder concerto itself is in three movements, and much more technically demanding than the other recorder concertos in the Schwerin collection. Though the key of G major is a relatively comfortable one for the recorder player, the quick movements still require, in places, a good technique, with precise coordination of fingers and tongue, and the odd semi-quaver passage that does not sit easily under the fingers. For example, in bars 70 to 72 (see Figure 9.10) of the playful first movement \textit{Allegro}, the performer has to neatly move between the repeated upper notes and the repeated D’s, whilst ensuring crisp articulation. Similar passages occur throughout the first movement.
A beautiful and sombre Adagio second movement acts as a nice contrast between the two quick movements, before a lively Vivace ends the concerto. The difficulty in this movement lies not in the fingering patterns (the recorder-friendly key of G major helps here), but in the rhythmic unison between the recorder and two violin parts of the ‘ornamented’ Vivace melody, which reappears throughout the movement (see Figure 9.11). The Vivace, in less capable hands, can very quickly descend into messiness.
Although the Schultze concerto is, on occasion, performed today, it is not well known amongst recorder players and audiences. It is a lively and enjoyable work which also presents some technical difficulties (both for the recorder player and for the ensemble as a whole). It is therefore a concerto deserving of more attention by modern ensembles.

The Recorder in Mecklenburg-Schwerin

It appears that the recorder continued to be played in Mecklenburg-Schwerin for a number of years. Fick’s concertos for the recorder likely originate (or at least were copied by Fick) in the 1730s. Additionally, there survive two other manuscripts in Schwerin’s Landesbibliothek Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, from later composers, which seem to use the recorder. There is firstly a ‘Partita pro Flauto octavo’ in F major, by Johann Wilhelm Hertel (1727-1789).\(^{48}\) Hertel moved to Mecklenburg-Schwerin in 1753, becoming active as a composer and string player for the court. He remained at the court until his death in 1789. The ‘flauto octavo’ part in this piece is written in F major, and in French violin clef, suggesting a soprannino recorder. Additionally, there is also a ‘Partita pro Flute a’becco pastorelle’ in E major, composed by Adolph Carl Kunzen (1720-1781).\(^{49}\) This piece is discussed in Chapter 7 in relation to Telemann’s ‘Flüte Pastorelle’. Within this work, as well as the part for ‘Flaute a’becco pastorelle’, there is an additional part for ‘Flauto octavo’, which is transposed into F major, and written in French violin clef. This alternative ‘Flauto octavo’ part therefore also seems to be a soprannino recorder. Kunzen became Konzertmeister at Mecklenburg-Schwerin in 1749, during Christian Ludwig II’s rule.\(^{50}\) Since Kunzen appeared at Mecklenburg-Schwerin as late as 1749, and Hertel (who was born in 1727), did not appear there until 1753, we see here two very late examples of the recorder’s use (perhaps even as late as the mid-1750s).

Additionally, recorders were included in a musical instrument inventory on the death of Prince Ludwig of Mecklenburg-Schwerin in 1778. Prince Ludwig was the heir to the Duchy of Mecklenburg-Schwerin, and had a considerable interest in music. His instrument collection was extensive, and included a variety of different types of ‘flutes’. As well as several transverse flutes, he also possessed two alto recorders, four ‘Flaut.

\(^{48}\) D-SWl Mus.4583
\(^{49}\) D-SWl Mus.4583
\(^{50}\) Meyer, Geschichte der Mecklenburg-Schwerin Hofkapelle, 49.
quart.’, six small recorders, and two bass recorders.\footnote{The musical instrument inventory of Prince Ludwig is listed in Meyer, \textit{Geschichte...}, 51-52. Prince Ludwig’s musical instrument collection also included four ‘pastorelle’ flutes. See Chapter 7 for further discussion of this instrument.} This is a substantial number of recorders for what is quite a late collection of musical instruments.

**Summary**

There are several concertos involving recorder from the Duchy of Mecklenburg-Schwerin. Though the recorder parts in Prowo’s concertos, and Linike’s solo concerto are simple, the trickier recorder writing in parts of Fick’s concertos and Schultze’s solo concerto suggest that there were recorder players of a good standard around Mecklenburg-Schwerin. I have suggested that the recorder concerto by Johann Christoph Schultze is actually by an older Johann Christoph Schultze than the Schultze to which this concerto is attributed in the modern edition by Schott. The two examples of the ‘Flauto octavo’ (sopranino recorder) parts, from works likely composed and performed at Mecklenburg-Schwerin in the 1750s, suggests that the recorder maintained a presence there for a long period of time. This is also emphasised by the many recorders found in the instrument collection of Prince Ludwig of Mecklenburg-Schwerin.
Part V

Sweden
The Recorder Concerto in Sweden

Introduction

During the seventeenth century, Sweden and the Swedish empire expanded, and through military and diplomatic conquests, gained a number of territories in northern Germany and the Baltic region. This turned Sweden into an important European power during this period. At the beginning of the eighteenth century, and specifically after defeat in the Great Northern War (1700-1721), Sweden ceded several of its territories to Hanover, Prussia, Denmark and Russia. With this came both a great loss of influence for Sweden, but also a loss of wealth (particularly due to the high costs of the Great Northern War). However, one major effect on the country in the period following the war, was a change in the political and social makeup of the country. Political power moved away from the monarchy, and went instead to the Riksdag. This also diminished the influence of the court and nobility, and developed an increasingly influential middle class. This growth in the middle classes also saw the growth of concerts, musical societies and amateur orchestras throughout the country (particularly by the second half of the eighteenth century).

Today, there survive several recorder concerto manuscripts in the libraries at Stockholm (Musik- och teaterbibliothek), Uppsala (Universitetsbiblioteket, Carolina Rediviva), and at Lund (Universitetsbiblioteket). What is particularly interesting about the recorder concerto in Sweden is that it seems to combine both the slightly later compositional interest in recorder concertos that we saw in areas of northern Germany, with a particular interest in concertos for ‘little flutes’ that we saw in England. Indeed, there are clear connections between the recorder concerto in Sweden and both of these areas: the ‘Utile Dulci’ collection at Stockholm has a number of manuscripts that appear

1 Lindström and Norhem, Flattering Alliances, 149.
2 Smith, Nordic Art Music: From the Middle Ages to the Third Millennium, 14.
to have originated in England; and a number of the concertos in Lund also have clear stylistic connections with concertos from Mecklenburg-Schwerin.

**Musik- och teaterbibliothek - Stockholm**

‘Utile Dulci’

In Chapter 3, it was noted that the only surviving manuscript of the recorder concerto by Giuseppe Sammartini (probably the most played recorder concerto in contemporary performances) is today housed in Stockholm. The manuscript is part of the ‘Utile Dulci’ collection. The ‘Utile Dulci’ society was a literary and musical society, active in Sweden from 1766-1795. This society partially arose from amateur orchestras in the early 1730s in Sweden, and a large part of its activity involved professional musicians playing alongside aristocratic amateur instrumentalists and singers. It also regularly arranged public concerts, and music was often performed at meetings of the Utile Dulci society. It was active for nearly 30 years, and was one of the precursor societies to Sweden’s Royal Academy of Music. The society collected several prints and manuscripts when it was active, and its collection was given to Stockholm’s Musik- och teaterbibliothek in 1806. The collection today is made up of both manuscripts and prints, totalling over 1300 works.

A number of Giuseppe Sammartini’s manuscripts and prints were collected by the Utile Dulci society. The exact provenance of the manuscript of his recorder concerto is not completely known, but in correspondence with the library, it was suggested that the manuscript was likely copied in England by a member of the Utile Dulci society, who brought it across to Sweden. The Utile Dulci society were clearly interested in English musical life, as well as in the recorder. Alongside Sammartini’s concerto, there also exists another copy of the Walsh and Hare print of Babell’s *Concertos in 7 Parts*. Additionally, in the collection there exists manuscripts of two surprisingly lewd English theatre songs (the first being ‘Sung by M’ Excell, in Goodmans Fields’), both with recorder parts (marked as ‘The Flute’). The first song, *Bacchus Defeated*, is a tribute to
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1 S-Skma FbO-R
2 ‘Utile Dulci’ refers literally to ‘Usefulness with pleasure’.
3 Nationalencyklopedin, ‘Utile dulci’.
4 In private correspondence with Marina Deminan – Musik- och teaterbiblioteket
wine and all its merits (‘…make a new World, ye pow’rs divine, Stock it with nothing else but Wine…’), and the second song, The Free Mistress, is a tribute to pleasures of a more fleshly nature, with some particularly explicit (and amusing) lyrics. Possibly all of these manuscripts were brought across from England to Sweden by the same person.

‘Racemberger’ [Giorgio Ratzemberger (?)]

In the Uti le Dulci collection, there is also a concerto ‘per il Flauto Piccolo, Due Violini e Basso’ by the composer ‘Racemberger à Roma’. At the top of the ‘Violino Primo’ part is written ‘Concerto à: Violin: Flautino et Cembalo Del S’ Racemberger à Roma’. Unfortunately, the recorder part for this concerto has not survived. This is particularly surprising because the manuscript actually contains two sets of parts, in different hands, with both sets missing the recorder part. The concerto is Italian, in three movements (Allegro, Andante, Allegro), and is written in the ‘reduced’ concerto scoring of two violins and a bass (without viola).

Figure 10.1: ‘Racemberger’, Concerto, i, Allegro, bars 1-16 (recorder part missing)

---
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The composer, ‘Racemberger à Roma’ is likely to be Giorgio Ratzemberger. Very little is known about Ratzemberger, and if this concerto is indeed by him, it is his only surviving work. Ratzemberger was a virtuoso on the oboe and recorder, and for at least some of his life served as a musician at Guastalla in Italy. We know Ratzemberger was a very good oboe and recorder player, because Vivaldi wrote the oboe and flautino part in his opera *Tito Manlio* for him.8 *Tito Manlio* was written in 1719, during Vivaldi’s period in Mantua, which is 40 miles from Ratzemberger’s base in Guastalla. Presumably, like the Sammartini concerto, this was brought back to Sweden by a member of the ‘Utile Dulci’ society, returning from their travels to Italy.

What is particularly interesting about all the recorder music in the ‘Utile Dulci’ collection, is that it points to the recorder remaining in use in northern Europe well into the second half of the eighteenth century. As we saw in northern Germany, particularly in the courts of Hohenlimburg and Schwerin, the recorder, and the recorder concerto, remained popular and in use until much later than the generally accepted view of the recorder’s decline over this period. This seems to be even more so as we move ever further north, with the ‘Utile Dulci’ society operating from 1766 to 1795. The pieces were all obviously composed much earlier than this period: Babell’s set of concertos was published posthumously in 1726, Ratzemberger was active in 1719, and in Chapter 3, I suggest that the Sammartini recorder concerto was probably composed somewhere around 1729-1732. Whichever member of the ‘Utile Dulci’ society brought the manuscripts to Sweden from London, perhaps did so in the mid-1730s, and kept them in their own private collection before the ‘Utile Dulci’ society formed. Even if this is the case, it still means that whoever owned the manuscripts thought they were an interesting and useful addition to the collection of the society when it was formed in 1766.

---

The cities of Uppsala and Lund are linked through their historic orchestras, both of which were attached to the universities in the city: the Kungliga Akademiska Kapellet (Royal Academic Orchestra) of Uppsala University, and the Akademiska Kapellet of Lund University. They are particularly linked today, because a substantial collection of music at the Universitetsbiblioteket in Lund comes from the music of Uppsala’s Kungliga Akademiska Kapelle. There are also a number of collections at Lund University from its own Akademiska Kapellet. Additionally, at Uppsala’s library today, there also survives two concerto manuscripts involving recorder, by Johann Christian Schickhardt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universitetsbiblioteket, Carolina Rediviva – Uppsala</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ‘Concerto J. C. Schickhard’ (G minor) | S-Uu: Instr. mus. I hs. 58:5  
| ‘Concerto Johann Christian Schickhard’ (F major) | S-Uu: Instr. mus. I hs. 58:6  

Table 10.1: Recorder concertos at Universitetsbiblioteket, Carolina Rediviva - Uppsala

Johann Christian Schickhardt (c.1682-1762)

Although Schickhardt is not very well known to modern audiences and performers (apart from recorder players), he was actually quite a prolific composer, who found employment at a number of European cities and courts. David Lasocki, who has provided invaluable research regarding Schickhardt’s life and works, described him as a ‘… journeyman composer and performer, not fortunate enough to gain a position at an important court or in an important city. He constantly moved from one minor court or city to another dedicating numerous compositions to one prince or duke after another in
the hope of being employed…’ Schickhardt was born at Braunschweig, and throughout his life worked in the Netherlands, in numerous German cities, in Scandinavia, and even in London. On 10 March 1732, there was a concert at the ‘Three Tuns Tavern’, advertised ‘For the Benefit of Mr. John Christian Schickhard, Lately arrived from Germany’. The concert consisted of ‘…Vocal and Instrumental Musick by the Best Masters… the whole Night’s Entertainment being his own Composition.’ The advertisement included a running order of the concert (thirteen pieces in total), including ‘9. A Concerto for the small Flute, Violins, &c’, and ‘13. A Concerto for French Horns, small Flute, Hautboys, Violins, &c.’ None of Schickhardt’s surviving concertos match the scoring of the concertos advertised: though both recorder concerto manuscripts at Uppsala (discussed below) have oboes, neither have horns. Therefore, it seems that there are other recorder concertos composed by Schickhardt (and brought with him to London), which have not survived. Schickhardt also had several compositions published, including at least thirty-six sets of compositions by Roger in Amsterdam. Six sets of those were also published by Walsh and Hare in London.

Schickhardt seems to have played the recorder, flute, and oboe, and nearly all his compositions were written for those instruments. Alongside the two manuscripts of recorder concertos in Uppsala, Schickhardt also had published a set of six concertos for four recorders and continuo (Op. 19). They were first published in Amsterdam, c.1713-1715, and then in London in 1719. They were additionally reprinted in Amsterdam c.1723, and in London c.1730. These six concertos are some of the very few concertos for multiple recorders, and are discussed in more detail in Chapter 3.

‘Concerto J. C. Schickhard’ is in G minor, and found in Uppsala (Instr. mus. i hs. 58:5). The recorder concerto is a work of substantial length and instrumentation, with parts for recorder, two oboes, one ‘violino primo concertino’, one ‘violino seconda’, viola, ‘violoncello concertino’, ‘basso ripieno’, ‘basso contino’. The whole concerto is in six movements, with much varied scoring used throughout. It is a pity that the substantial scoring and structure of the work is not matched by musical invention: though there are some interesting moments, much of the passagework is without

10 The Daily Journal – Issue 3488. 9 March 1732.
11 Lasocki, op. cit., 37.
12 Ibid., 50.
13 Others include a concerto by Heinichen, and by Marcello. I have also found two further concertos for multiple recorders, in the ‘Harrach’ collection in Vienna (see Chapter 6).
direction. The recorder generally stays below an E₆, although one F₆ is used in the first bar of the second movement.

There also survives one more solo ‘concerto’ at Uppsala by Johann Christian Schickhardt, in F major (Instr. mus. i hs. 58:6). This piece is in fact really a suite (a concertouverture?) The piece is, like Schickhardt’s concert in G minor, scored for several instruments: a recorder, two oboes, ‘violino primo del concertino’, ‘violino primo’, ‘violone seconde’, ‘alto viola’, ‘violoncello concertino’, ‘basso ripienzo’, and ‘basso contino’. The concerto is therefore scored for a concertino group of recorder, violin and cello, accompanied by ripieno strings and oboes.

Both of Schickhardt’s recorder concertos are dedicated, separately, to the King and Queen of Sweden. The F major concerto-suite is dedicated to King Frederick I of Sweden, who ruled as King of Sweden from 1720 (after the Great Northern War), until his death in 1751. The concerto in G minor is a direct manuscript partner of the concerto-suite, and is dedicated to ‘Most powerful, most gracious Queen’, who is presumably Queen Ulrika Eleonora, the wife of Frederick I of Sweden. In the dedication to his F major concerto-suite, Schickhardt writes: ‘Most powerful, most gracious King: at His Majesty’s feet, an old servant of His… hereby dares to place in deepest submissiveness a composition albeit small, but one nevertheless dedicated to His Royal Majesty from a most devoted heart.’

Lasocki suggests that Schickhardt was possibly employed by Frederick (since Schickhardt refers to himself as ‘an old servant of His’) when Frederick was commanding the Netherlands cavalry in the War of the Spanish Succession. Lasocki also adds that Schickhardt’s fawning dedication to the King and Queen of Sweden was an attempt to seek employment from the new King, though there is no evidence that he was successful. If so, this may mean Schickhardt composed both works relatively near to the coronation of the new King, sometime around 1720.

---

15 Ibid.
**‘Engelhart’ Collection: Heinrich Christopher Engelhardt (1694-1765)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Manuscript Collection: ‘Engelhart’</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anonymous</strong></td>
<td>‘Concerto’ (in F major) ‘2 Corne de Chasse, 2 Violino, 2 Flauto è Basso per il Organo’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anonymous</strong></td>
<td>‘Concerto’ (in F major) ‘Hautbois Solo, 2 Flute Dous, 2 Corne de Chasse &amp; Basso’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.2: Recorder concertos at Universitetsbiblioteket, Lund (‘Engelhart collection’)

Heinrich Christopher Engelhardt was born in Karlsrona in 1694, before eventually moving to Uppsala, where he remained for the rest of his life. He was employed as the cathedral organist in Uppsala, before becoming the *Director musices* of Uppsala University, and its Akademiska Kapellet, from 1727 until his death in 1765.\(^\text{16}\) He was also active as a composer, with over twenty manuscripts of his compositions surviving today (with the exception of one violin sonata, these are all vocal works). As *Director musices* at Uppsala, he collected over 600 works used by the orchestra. These manuscripts were donated to the Akademiska Kapellet of Lund University and its musical director Christian Wenster, by Engelhardt’s son (who was not a musician, but a surgeon) in 1798. This manuscript collection was apparently not used by Wenster and the Lund orchestra, who considered the compositions outdated.\(^\text{17}\) There is an interesting musical connection here. The two concertos listed in Table 10.2 (*Saml.Engelhart 409* and *419*) are scored very similarly to the wind concertos from Mecklenburg-Schwerin (see Chapter 9). There are also several other concertos at Lund for the ‘Concerto a 6’ scoring of wind instruments that were very popular in Mecklenburg-Schwerin. For example, there are two anonymous concertos scored for two oboes, two horns and two bassoons.\(^\text{18}\) There are also two concertos and one ‘Intrada’ by Pierre Prowo, scored for various combinations of oboes, horns and bassoons, and a number of pieces by Johann Georg Linike. This shows a clear and substantial compositional connection to Mecklenburg, since Prowo and Linike were both based in Mecklenburg (Prowo was an
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\(^\text{16}\) *Levande Musikarv* (Swedish Musical Heritage), ‘Hinrich Christopher Engelhardt (1694-1765)’.

\(^\text{17}\) Andersson, ‘Musik av Johan Helmich Roman och hans samtida i Lunds universitetsbibliotek’, 9.

\(^\text{18}\) S-L: *Saml.Engelhart 415* and *Saml.Engelhart 436*

\(^\text{19}\) S-L: *Saml.Engelhart 433* and *Saml.Engelhart 499*
organist in Altona, and Linike became *Kappelmeister* at the court of Mecklenburg-Strelitz).

There is a political link between the territories of Mecklenburg, and Sweden. Gustav Adolf, the last Duke of Mecklenburg-Göstrow, married Magdalene Sibylle, a Duchess of Holstein-Gottorp. The house of Holstein-Gottorp (and therefore Mecklenburg-Göstrow) was allied to Sweden through various marriages. Magdalene Sibylle’s sister, Hedvig Eleonora, became Queen of Sweden through marriage to Charles X Gustav. When Gustav Adolf died in 1695, the male line of the house of Mecklenburg-Göstrow fell with him, and the Dukes of Mecklenburg-Schwerin and Mecklenburg-Strelitz both made a claim to its territories. After much diplomatic wrangling, the territory was eventually given to Mecklenburg-Schwerin through the Treaty of Hamburg in 1701. Sweden maintained regular diplomatic contact with the regions of Mecklenburg and Holstein well into the eighteenth century, and the house of Holstein-Gottorp actually ascended to the Swedish throne in 1751. Perhaps, since many Swedish diplomats would have visited Mecklenburg-Schwerin during the first half of the eighteenth century, music manuscripts were brought back to Sweden from Mecklenburg-Schwerin through returning diplomats? Or perhaps the manuscripts were even given as gifts from the house of Mecklenburg-Schwerin? Speculation of course; it is also perfectly possible that Swedish musicians in Uppsala and Lund simply heard and enjoyed the unusual wind concertos of Mecklenburg-Schwerin, and wanted to add them to the manuscript collections of Uppsala and Lund’s Akademiska Kapellet.

The anonymous concerto in F major (*Saml.Engelhart 409*) is a four-movement concerto, and the manuscript has some slightly puzzling parts. The title page of the concerto mentions ‘2 Corne de Chasse, 2 Violino, 2 Flauto è Basso per il Organo’. However, in the actual parts of the manuscript, there are parts for ‘Flaute’ (in all four movements), as well as ‘Flauto 2\textsuperscript{do}', and more surprisingly, ‘Flauto Traverso’ (these two parts are only included in the first movement). There is also a part for ‘Hautbois’, (included in all four movements), which is not mentioned on the title page. Part of the confusion arises from the fact that there are additional parts in the manuscript from a different copyist. The original parts, in the hand of Engelhardt, are: ‘Violino 1\textsuperscript{mo}', ‘Violino Secondo’, ‘Basso’, ‘Flaute’, ‘Flaute 2\textsuperscript{do}' (first movement only), ‘Hautbois’,

---

20 Lindström and Norrhem, *Flattering Alliances*, 237, n. 443
21 Ibid., 135.
‘Corne de Chasse 1\textsuperscript{mo}’ and ‘Corne de Chasse 2\textsuperscript{do}’. In a separate hand, there are three extra parts: a duplicate ‘Violino 1\textsuperscript{mo}’ part (all movements), a duplicate ‘Violino Secundo’ part (first movement only), and a ‘Flauto Traverso’ part (first movement only).

Even more confusion arises when examining the ‘Flauto’ parts. The ‘Flaute’ part is written in F major, in French violin clef. However, the ‘Flauto 2do’ part is written in French violin clef, and as a transposing instrument. The concerto is in F major, and the ‘Flauto 2do’ part is written in B-flat major. This transposition suggests that, just like Sammartini’s recorder concerto, a fifth flute (a descant recorder in C) is the intended recorder (reading in B-flat major and using treble recorder fingering on a fifth flute will produce the key of F major). However, the ‘Flaute’ part is not written as a transposing instrument, suggesting a normal alto recorder. Could the composer have intended a treble recorder to play throughout, with a small recorder (and, by a later copyist, also a transverse flute) added only for the first movement? There is a further point to consider here: the ‘Flaute’ part has a very low tessitura. Though the part does occasionally reach C\textsubscript{6} and D\textsubscript{6}, it spends quite a lot of time lower down on the instrument, including numerous bottom F’s on the recorder. Surely, a single treble recorder playing regularly in its lower registers, with numerous other instruments playing alongside it, would not be audible? This seems to suggest that the ‘Flaute’ part was also written for a small recorder. Since the part was not written as a transposing instrument, it would suggest that intended instrument was a sopranino recorder in F. The use of soprano recorder also has a connection to Mecklenburg-Schwerin: two partitas probably composed in the 1750s by Mecklenburg-Schwerin court composers Johann Wilhelm Hertel and Adolph Carl Kunzen include a part for a sopranino recorder (labelled as a ‘Flauto octavo’).

The second anonymous concerto in F major from the ‘Engelhart collection’ (Saml.Engelhart 419) is for ‘Hautbois Solo, 2 Flute Dous, 2 Corne de Chasse & Basso’, and marked as by ‘Del S’ I Taliano’. There is no confusion with the parts in this manuscript, and the pair of recorders are written in French violin clef, in the key of F, suggesting a pair of alto recorders. The marking of ‘Del S’ I Taliano’ is curious. There are, as far as I am aware, no composers with the unfortunate (or possibly fortunate) name of ‘I Taliano’. Instead, this marking seems like it could be a joke, perhaps even an ironic one (since the concerto has the relatively un-Italian four movement structure of Allegro, March, Adagio, Aria, though it does have some Italianate figuration).
‘Kraus’ Collection: Friedrich Kraus (1724-1780)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Johann Georg Linike</th>
<th>‘Concerto’ (in G major) ‘Flauto Traverso Primo, Flauto Traverso Secondo, Flaut abec Primo, Flaut abec Secondo, Basso’</th>
<th>Saml.Kraus 136</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert Woodcock</td>
<td>‘Concerto a 5’ (in D major) ‘Flauto Primo, Flauto Secondo, Violino Primo, Violino Secondo, Basso’</td>
<td>Saml.Kraus 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Förster’</td>
<td>‘Concerto a 6’ ‘Violino Primo, Violino Secondo, Flautino Primo, Flautino Secondo, Alto viola, Basso’</td>
<td>Saml.Kraus 156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.3: Recorder concertos at Universitetsbiblioteket, Lund (‘Kraus’ collection)

Friedrich Kraus (1724-1780) became the first Director musices of the Akademiska Kapellet at Lund, and was the first to build up the manuscript collections of the orchestra. Later musical directors followed Kraus’s lead, creating a substantial manuscript collection of Lund’s Akademiska Kapellet.²² The Akademiska Kapellet at Lund seems to have formed partially as a result of a group of student musicians at the university who assembled for the visit of Adolf Frederick (who later became King of Sweden in 1751) to Lund in 1744.²³ In 1745, the university decided to officially form an Akademiska Kapellet, with Uppsala’s orchestra used as a model. The formation of the orchestra occurred much later in Lund, partly due to financial troubles. In 1747, the university employed the organist Friedrich Kraus to purchase instruments and organise musicians. A year later he was employed as the concertmaster of the orchestra, and in 1755 he was officially employed as the Director musices.²⁴ In 1758, Kraus was also employed as the organist of the cathedral in Lund; therefore, as at Uppsala where Engelhardt was employed as both the Director musices and the cathedral organist, Lund had a combined post of both cathedral organist and orchestral director.

There are three recorder concertos from the ‘Kraus’ collection of manuscripts at Lund University (Table 10.3). The first is a manuscript of a concerto for two recorders by the English composer (and civil servant, and painter) Robert Woodcock.²⁵ It is

²² Åsa Sjöblom (Manuscripts and Special Collections librarian, Lund University), private correspondence
²³ Andersson, ‘Stadtmusikanter i stifts- och universitetsstaden Lund under 1600- och 1700-talet’, 58.
²⁴ Ibid., 59.
²⁵ S-L: Saml.Kraus 137
actually Concerto No. 6, for two sixth flutes, from Woodcock’s set of twelve concertos (‘XII Concertos in Eight Parts’) published in London by Walsh in 1727. The manuscript parts have very few differences from the printed concerto, except that the manuscript does not include an additional part for ‘Violoncello’. For more information on Woodcock’s set of concertos, see Chapter 3.

The second concerto in the ‘Kraus’ collection is a concerto for two flutes and two recorders, by Johann Georg Linike (first mentioned in Chapter 9).\(^{26}\) The scoring of this concerto is unusual, since only a small number of works in the eighteenth-century repertoire are written for both the flute and the recorder.\(^{27}\) The concerto is in four movements, and often uses pairs of recorders and flutes in call and response passages. The concerto is very simply written, and presumably intended for less advanced performers. To give some idea of this, both transverse flute parts are very often based in their first octave (D\(_4\) to D\(_5\)) and the parts do not reach higher than an A\(_5\). This is about an octave lower than the conventional upper limit of German transverse flutes during this period.\(^{28}\)

Both of these concertos in the ‘Kraus’ collection have an interesting feature. The concerto manuscripts have only one set of parts, but have two title pages by different copyists (with the same two copyists for both manuscripts). At the bottom of the first title page of both the Woodcock and Linike manuscripts is written ‘Academia Carolina’. This is interesting because ‘Academia Carolina’ is actually the main building of Uppsala University. On the bottom of the second title page of both concertos, in a different hand, is written ‘Ullrich Ekman’. This is the hand of the copyist of the rest of the manuscript (the other hand appearing only on the ‘Academia Carolina’ title page).

It has proven very difficult to find much information regarding ‘Ullrich Ekman’, but I have discovered that there was an Ullrich Ekman, who died in 1750, and who was employed as an oboist in the Stadt­musikan­ten of Malmö.\(^{29}\) Since Malmö is only twelve miles from Lund, and the dates add up, it seems that this is almost certainly the same


\(^{27}\) Continuing with the connection of these Swedish manuscripts to Mecklenburg, there is also a concerto for flute, recorder, violin and continuo by Peter Johann Fick, found in the Schwerin collection (D-SW1 Mus.348/9). See Chapter 9.

\(^{28}\) For example, in Quantz’s Versuch einer Anweisung die Flöte traversiere zu spielen (On Playing the Flute), there are fingerings shown up to the note A\(_6\). [GL 1156].

\(^{29}\) Dahlström, Stadt­musikan­ten, Organisten und Kantoren im Ostseeraum bis ca.1850, 265.
Ullrich Ekman as the original owner of the two concerto manuscripts in Lund. How then to explain the two different title pages of the concertos? It is possible that they simply had different provenances. When Kraus first helped to set up Lund’s Akademiska Kapellet, it was very much modelled on Uppsala’s – maybe Kraus obtained (or copied) some of the music from Uppsala’s Akademiska Kapellet to use at Lund? Separately, perhaps Ullrich Ekman also copied various concerto manuscripts, which he also brought across to Lund from Malmö? Since the music is in the same hand as the Eckman title page, perhaps these were clearer parts than the parts from Uppsala (which were instead discarded)? If so, this would mean that these concertos were played not only in Uppsala’s Akademiska Kapellet before 1745, but were also possibly played in Lund after 1745, (once Lund had set up its own Akademiska Kapellet).

The third and last recorder ‘concerto’ in the Kraus collection at Lund is a ‘Concerto a 6’ for two ‘flautinos’, two violins, a viola and bass. The title-page to this concerto describes the work as ‘par Anonymo’, though there is a partially surviving manuscript in Stockholm’s Musik- och teaterbibliothek with the same music. This Stockholm manuscript is by a ‘Förster’. This is likely to be the composer Christoph Förster (1693-1745), though other Försters were also active in the same period. What is notable about this three-movement concerto is its unusual, and exceptionally high flautino parts. The concerto is written in G major, and the flautino parts are (unusually) also written in G major. This means that the recorder intended is therefore presumably the sopranino recorder, since this uses the alto fingering system (and therefore is not written as a transposing instrument). Unfortunately, ink from another part has imprinted on the flautino parts, making them difficult to read (see Figure 10.2 below).

The first flautino part regularly uses F♯′s, G♭′s, and even a number of A♭′s. For example, within the first eight bars, the flautino ascends through an F♯′ to a G♭ (n.b., the recorder is marked to play up the octave in the first two bars).

Figure 10.2: Förster, ‘Concerto a 6’ (Saml.Kraus 156), i, Molto Allegro, bars 1-18
In the final bar of the second movement, the first *flautino* is asked to play $G_6-A_6-F#_6-G_6$:

![Figure 10.3: Förster, ‘Concerto a 6’ (Saml.Kraus 156), ii, final five bars.](image)

And in the third movement *Prestissimo*, the first recorder is asked to consistently play at the top of its range, such as in the last few bars of the first half:

![Figure 10.4: Förster, ‘Concerto a 6’ (Saml.Kraus 156), iii, Prestissimo, bars 21-34](image)

The recorder writing in this concerto by Förster is extremely high, fast, and very difficult to perform on the sopranino recorder. This focus on the highest notes of the instrument, along with the fact that the concerto is written in G major, suggests that this concerto could possibly have been written for sopranino recorders in G rather than in F. Michael Praetorious, in *Syntagma Musicum* (1619), refers to the smallest size of all recorders as a sopranino recorder in G. However, I do not know of any surviving examples of this size of recorder in northern Europe from the eighteenth century.

At the bottom of the title-page of the concerto is written ‘Academia Carolina’. As mentioned earlier, this refers to the main building of Uppsala University, and means this concerto was originally part of Uppsala’s Akademiska Kapellet (before being used at Lund). The extreme difficulty of this concerto suggests there must have been recorder
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players of a very high-standard in Uppsala’s Akademiska Kapellet (and possibly in Lund’s Akademiska Kapellet as well).

‘Family Wenster’ Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript Collection: ‘Wenster’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Martin Simon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Bernardi, e Torelli’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Concerto 1\textsuperscript{mos}’ (in A major) ‘Little Flaut, Due Violini, Alto e Basso’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Concerto 2\textsuperscript{mos}’ (in A major) ‘Little Flaut, Due Violini, Alto e Basso’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Concerto 3\textsuperscript{mos}’ (in D major) ‘Little Flaut, Due Violini, Alto e Basso’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Concerto 4\textsuperscript{mos}’ (in D major) ‘Little Flaut, Due Violini, Alto e Basso’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Concerto 5\textsuperscript{mos}’ (in A major) ‘Little Flaut, Due Violini, Alto e Basso’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Concerto 6\textsuperscript{mos}’ (in D major) ‘Little Flaut, Due Violini, Alto e Basso’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.4: Recorder concertos at Universitetsbiblioteket, Lund (‘Family Wenster’ collection)

Christian Wenster [Jr.] (1725-1823) succeeded Friedrich Kraus as the Director musices at Lund, after Kraus’s death in 1780. Wenster held this position until 1806, when his son Emmanuel Wenster (1785-1856) took over as the Director musices and cathedral organist at Lund.\footnote{Andersson, ‘Stadtmusikanter i stifts- och universitetsstaden Lund under 1600- och 1700-talet’, 50.} The collection of music belonging to the Wenster family (in the Universitetsbiblioteket directory, it is listed as ‘Family Wenster’) was first started by Christian Wenster’s father, who was also called Christian Wenster [Sr.] (1704-1779). The Wenster collection was then substantially added to by his son and grandson. The ‘Family Wenster’ collection was officially donated to Lund University by Emmanuel
Wenster in 1832. It is in essence also the music collection of Lund’s Akademiska Kapelle between 1780 and 1856 (the date of the death of Emmanuel Wenster), through the periods that Christian Wenster and Emmanuel Wenster were Director musices.

Within the ‘Wenster’ collection at Lund, there survives a concerto for oboe, two recorders and continuo by Martin Simon, as well as six solo concertos for the ‘Little Flaut’ by ‘Bernardi, e Torelli’ [Table 10.4]. Five out of six of these concertos are actually arrangements of other known works by ‘Mrs Bernardi, Torelli & autres fameux Autours’.

**Martin Simon**

There is very little information regarding the life of Martin Simon. In total, fifteen manuscripts by Simon survive today, including a few recorder sonatas (today housed in the archive of the Sing-Akademie zu Berlin). RISM lists Simon’s dates as 1715-1740, though this seems very unlikely, as the manuscript of the concerto for oboe and two recorders has the performance of the concerto marked at the top: ‘Carlsh: 2. Aug: 1728’. By the RISM dates, this would make Simon thirteen or younger when he composed this work. Unless Simon was a child prodigy on a Mozartian level, the substance of the concerto suggests an older and more mature composer. ‘Carlsh.’ refers to Karlshamn, an area of Sweden (a ‘locality’) around 80 miles to the east of Lund. Karlshamn was where Christian Wenster [Sr.] worked as an organist and town musician; records show him working at Karlshamn officially from 1741-1779. The manuscript is in a different hand to the hand of Christian Wenster [Sr.] (shown by the signing of his name on several manuscripts he possessed). Therefore, perhaps he simply obtained this concerto once he had officially started employment at Karlshamn, after 1741?

The concerto in C minor for oboe and two recorders (‘Concerto. Hautboi, 2 Flûte douce et Basso Continuo di Martin Simon’) is a rather surprising work, consisting of a grand total of nine movements. All four instruments play in the first two movements, and then the next seven movements all have instructions for different combinations of instruments. Simon seems keen to give all players a solo: movements 3 and 4 are for ‘Flute 1’ and ‘Basso Conti’; movements 5 and 6 are for ‘Hautboi’ and ‘Basso Cont’; and
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33 Andersson, *op. cit.*, 9.
movements 7 and 8 are actually for ‘Flute 2’ and ‘Continuo’. The final movement is for two recorders and bass (without the oboe). This structure gives the piece the odd effect (although certainly not an unpleasant one) of a number of solo mini-sonatas, one after another.

‘Bernardi, e Torelli’ – six ‘Little Flaut’ concertos

Figure 10.5: ‘Bernardi, a Torelli’, ‘Concerti à 5’ title page (Saml.Wenster D:1)
The six ‘Concerti à 5’ by ‘Bernardi, e Torelli’ are concertos for the ‘little flute’ that have completely escaped the attention of modern players and editors.\(^{35}\) The six concertos are therefore, to a certain extent, a very exciting addition to the recorder concerto (and particularly, the small recorder) repertoire. This excitement is slightly mitigated by the fact that five out of the six concertos in the set are actually arrangements of other instrumental concertos from ‘VI Sonates ou Concerts à 4, 5 & 6 parties composées par Mª Bernardi, Torelli & autres fameux Auteurs…Livre Premier’, and ‘VIII Sonatas ou Concerts… Bernardi, Torelli & autres fameux Auteurs…Livre Second’ (see Table 10.5 for comparison). These two sets were published by Roger, in Amsterdam, sometime around 1709-1712.\(^ {36}\) Roger dedicates the set to ‘Monsieur J. Van Der Cost, Grand Amateur de Musique à Delft.’\(^ {37}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concerto 1(^{\text{m}o})</td>
<td>‘Sonata III. à 2 Violons, Haute Contre &amp; Basse Continue’ (Livre Premier)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto 2(^{\text{d}o})</td>
<td>‘Sonata V. à 4 Violons, Haute Contre &amp; Basse Continue’ (Livre Premier)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto 3(^{\text{r}o})</td>
<td>‘Sonata IX. à 2 Violons, Haute Contre &amp; Basse Continue’ (Livre Second)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto 4(^{\text{t}o})</td>
<td>‘Sonata XIII. à 2 Violons &amp; Basse’ (Livre Second)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto 5(^{\text{t}o})</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto 6(^{\text{t}o})</td>
<td>‘Sonata VI. à 2 Violons, Trompette, Haute Contre &amp; Basse Continue’ (Livre Premier)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.5: ‘Little Flaut’ concertos, corresponding to ’14 Sonatas ou Concerts’
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\(^{35}\) The little flute intended in the ‘Bernardi, e Torelli’ concertos is a sixth flute (a descant recorder in D), shown by the recorder part being written in French violin clef, and a third higher than the other parts.


\(^{37}\) Jurrianus Van der Cost was a lawyer in Delft, who was a great lover of music and who owned a very large collection of music. He was presumably a very good customer of Roger. (see: Van der Aa, *Biographisch woordenboek der Nederlanden*, Vol. 1, 758).
Table 10.5 above shows which of the six ‘Little Flaut’ concertos correspond to which of the ‘Sonates ou Concerts’. It should be noted that the numbering of the pieces continues into *Livre Second* (i.e. the first piece of *Livre Second* is Sonata VII, and the final piece is Sonata XIV – fourteen in total throughout the two volumes).

Neither the ‘Little Flaut’ concertos, nor the fourteen ‘Sonates ou Concerts’ specify which particular concerto in the set is by which composer. The recorder concertos simply name ‘Bernardi, e Torelli’ on the title page, referring to Bartolomeo Bernardi (c.1670-1732) and Giuseppe Torelli (1658-1709). The ‘Sonates ou Concerts’ name ‘Bernardi, Torelli & autres fameux Auteurs’ on the title page, but again, do not specify which concerto is by which composer. The arrangement of the select ‘Sonates ou Concerts’ into little flute concertos was undertaken by an anonymous arranger and copyist. These arrangements, including the particular ‘Sonates ou Concerts’ selected for arrangement into little flute concertos, are musically puzzling. The arrangements themselves are generally uninspired, and sometimes even completely jarring, with the little flute often used more as an accompaniment to the first violin, rather than the other way round. The arrangements are somewhat saved by the quality of the original musical material. To make comparisons easier, the violin parts in the little flute concerto arrangements will be referred to here as ‘Violino Primo’ and ‘Violino Secondo’, and the violin parts from the original ‘Sonates ou Concerts’ will be referred to as ‘Violin I’ and ‘Violin 2’.

In *Concerto 1*°°, the ‘Little Flaut’ and ‘Violino Primo’ parts play in unison throughout all three movements, with both playing the ‘Violino I’ part from ‘Sonata III’. The only exception to this is in bars 11-14 of the first movement, where the little flute drops out, and the ‘Violino Primo’ part plays the original ‘Violin I’ part alone. This produces an odd effect, since it seems clearly to be a passage that would work well as a solo on the recorder (particularly since neither part plays a solo again throughout the rest of the piece). The constant unison between the first violin and the little flute throughout becomes stale very quickly. The only small additional material in the arrangement is the marking of some grace notes and trills on the little flute part.

*Concerto 2*° is an arrangement of ‘Sonata V. à 4 Violons, Hautre Contre & Basse Continue’, though the original parts of ‘Violino 3’ and ‘Violino 4’ are simply ripieno versions of ‘Violino 1’ and ‘Violino 2’. These parts only play in the *tutti* sections. Again,
the ‘Little Flaut’ part plays predominantly in unison with the ‘Violino Primo’ part (with both playing the original ‘Violino 1’), though in this concerto, the little flute drops out quite regularly, leaving many solos to the violin. This at least provides some more textural contrast.

In *Concerto 3* and *Concerto 4*, as always, the ‘Little Flaut’ part plays in unison with the ‘Violino Primo’ part. In *Concerto 3*, the ‘Little Flaut’ and ‘Violino Primo’ play in unison literally throughout the whole concerto (with a few additional trills added to the recorder part). In *Concerto 4*, the ‘Little Flaut’ and ‘Violino Primo’ play in unison throughout the first two movements, and then the recorder drops out a few times in the third movement. There is no viola part in this concerto, since the original sonata (‘Sonata XIII’) also has no viola part.

*Concerto 6* differs from the others, in that it is the only arrangement of a sonata from the set (‘Sonata VI’) which also includes a non-string instrument: a trumpet. This arrangement for little flute is particularly odd, because it is not actually an arrangement at all. It is simply a direct swap of a trumpet for a little flute (see Figure 10.6). This is musically a little awkward: a small recorder and a trumpet both have many strengths, but these strengths do not always overlap. In this *Concerto*, replacing a trumpet with a little flute does produce a peculiar and amusing effect, although it also results in a particularly unimaginative arrangement.

![Figure 10.6](image)

**Figure 10.6**: ‘Bernardi, a Torelli’, *Concerto 6*, i, *Allegro* (full movement). In the key of ‘Little Flaut’ part.³⁸

³⁸ The ‘Little Flaut’ part is written in C major; the other instrumental parts of *Concerto 6* are written in D major (hence, the concerto is written for a sixth flute).
Lastly, we end with *Concerto 5*ο, since it is the only concerto out of the six not to arise from the ‘Sonates ou Concerts’ set. If it is indeed an arrangement, I have not yet been able to identify the original piece. The ‘Little Flaut’ and ‘Violino Primo’ play in unison throughout, with a few minor trills added to the recorder part. Interestingly, this concerto also appears in another manuscript in a library outside of Lund. In the Bibliotheca Universitatis Hafniensis (The Library of the University of Copenhagen), there exists a manuscript of the original fourteen ‘Sonates ou Concerts’ (*Livre Premier* and *Livre Second*) by a copyist who produced scores out of the original published parts (this version is otherwise exactly the same as the original published parts, including the attribution to Estienne Roger, and the dedication to J. Van der Cost).\(^\text{39}\) At the end of these fourteen scores, there is also a copy (also written as a score) of *Concerto 5*ο for ‘Little Flaut, Due Violini, Alto e Basso’. Apart from being written as a score, this concerto is otherwise exactly the same as the parts in Lund (including the very specific grace notes and trills in the recorder part). This whole set of scores was clearly produced by a copyist who had access to both Roger’s original publication of the fourteen ‘Sonates ou Concerts’, and also the later arrangements for little flute. Presumably the copyist only bothered to include *Concerto 5*ο out of the set of six, because it is the only concerto with additional music not from the fourteen ‘Sonates ou Concerts’.

It is difficult to provide an estimate regarding the possible date of the ‘Bernardi, e Torelli’ little flute arrangements mentioned above. At the bottom of the title page of the little flute concertos, is written ‘Christian Wenster Senior’ (in a different hand to the copyist of the concertos). Wenster [Sr], as we have already noted, was the first Wenster to start the family manuscript collection. The fourteen ‘Sonates ou Concerts’ (*Livre Premier* and *Livre Second*) were published in Amsterdam sometime around 1709-1712. These concertos would then have had to arrive in Sweden, before being arranged into little flute concertos. This could obviously have been anytime from 1712 onwards. However, when considered in the broader context of the recorder concerto in Sweden, and Swedish music in general, a later date seems more likely.

\(^{39}\text{By the late eighteenth century, the ‘Great’ library at Copenhagen had become one of the most substantial and impressive libraries in Europe (see: Horne, An Introduction to the Study of Bibliography. Vol. II., 564).}\)
**Little Flutes**

Alongside a later interest in the recorder concerto, the other notable theme across many the recorder concertos in Swedish libraries is the prominence of the little flute. In the ‘Utile Dulci’ collection, the Sammartini manuscript and Babell concertos are written for small recorders, as were, from Uppsala and Lund, the Förster *flautino* concerto, the Woodcock concerto and the six concerto arrangements of ‘Bernardi, e Torelli’. Additionally, I have also suggested that one of the anonymous concertos in the Engelhardt collection at Lund (*Saml.Engelhart 409*) was also intended for a pair of small recorders. Since a number of pieces for recorder were likely brought back to Sweden from musicians visiting England, it could be that the popularity of little flute concertos there had some impact on the popularity of these concertos in Sweden.

**Summary**

Sweden during the first half of the eighteenth century was musically cosmopolitan, with musical influences from right across Europe.\(^{40}\) However, predominantly due to its geographical location, the popular musical trends across Europe tended to arrive in Sweden a little later than elsewhere. Concertos with a recorder all seemed to thrive at a later date in Sweden. From the ‘Utile Dulci’ collection (Musik- och teaterbibliothek, Stockholm), I have suggested that the Sammartini concerto for fifth flute was composed in England between 1729 and 1732, and therefore presumably arrived in Sweden sometime in the mid-1730s. Babell’s *Concertos in 7 Parts*, for sixth flutes, was published in London in 1726. The copy of the Walsh & Hare publication that is today found in the ‘Utile Dulci’ collection will also presumably have been brought across to Sweden sometime after 1726. Elsewhere, the ‘Engelhart’ collection at Lund (Universitetsbiblioteket) comes from Heinrich Christopher Engelhardt’s employment as the *Director musices* of Uppsala’s Akademiska Kapellet from 1727 until 1765. Therefore, the two anonymous concertos involving recorder in this collection will have been performed after 1727. From the ‘Kraus’ collection at Lund, we have a concerto manuscript by Robert Woodcock, from his *XII Concertos in Eight Parts*, published by Walsh in 1727. And lastly, Martin Simon’s concerto in the ‘Family Wenster’ collection

\(^{40}\) Nordenfelt-Åberg, ‘The harpsichord in 18\(^{th}\)-century Sweden’.
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has a performance date marked of August, 1728. The Akademiksa Kapellet of Lund was not even officially formed until 1745, so presumably some of these concertos could well have been performed at the Akademiska Kapellet, under the direction of Freidrich Kraus, in its early days.

In summary, the recorder concerto in Sweden, particularly for small recorders, seems to have been popular later into the eighteenth century; from the 1730’s onwards, and possibly at Lund even into the mid-1740’s, when Lund’s Akademiska Kapellet was first formed. This chapter has examined several little known or even unknown recorder concertos from three areas of Sweden: Stockholm, Uppsala and Lund. The concerto for two flautinos by Förster, originally from Uppsala’s Akademiska Kapellet (though today in Lund) suggests there were recorder players of a very high standard in Uppsala. Though the six concertos for little flute by ‘Bernardi, e Torelli’ are poor arrangements, they were at least popular enough to warrant the inclusion of one of the concertos in a manuscript today housed in Copenhagen. There is also a clear connection between some of the manuscripts at Lund and the important diplomatic territories for Sweden of Mecklenburg-Schwerin (and Mecklenburg-Strelitz). It is no coincidence that there are also several concertos involving recorder in the surviving music collections from Mecklenburg. It seems that the recorder concerto was popular in Northern Europe (from the north of Germany into Scandinavia) later in the eighteenth century than elsewhere in Europe. Additionally, the recorder was still being included in other (non-concerto) pieces of music from Northern Europe well into the 1740s, and even 1750s; indicating that, although there was certainly a decline of the instrument, it continued to be played for many years in important areas of Northern Europe.
Conclusions

This thesis provides the first English language survey and study of nearly all of the known eighteenth-century recorder concerto repertoire. It focuses on several areas and sources of concertos that players today have either substantially ignored or not known about; and provides signposts to this repertoire for further exploration. This thesis will hopefully encourage English-speaking players and ensembles to broaden their concerto horizons, and to consider some of these works in their future concert programming and recordings. Since this thesis covers such a wide area and a substantial number of sources, providing an overall conclusion poses a challenge. To do so, I will first restate the more general objectives of this thesis, followed by listing the more specific research findings and conclusions of the various chapters and case-studies within this thesis. Following this, I will turn to the broader connective themes of my research findings, as well as making some suggestions for further research in this area.

Overall objectives

This research project had three overall objectives. The first objective was to give a clearer picture of the advent of the recorder concerto, and its periods of popularity across Europe. I particularly wanted to focus on regions with substantial sources of recorder concertos, but which had had very little (or even no) academic investigation before this study. The second objective was to address the perceptible lack of knowledge regarding the nature and size of the recorder concerto repertory in several sources, as well as the range of technical complexity in these concertos. The third objective was to provide a detailed, overall examination of the eighteenth-century recorder concerto repertoire, including an analytical and technical examination of the recorder writing itself, and any underlining connections between the sources.

Chapter aims and research findings

Chapter 2 aimed to provide an overview of the current research into the recorder and recorder concertos in England, (most of which is attributable to David Lasocki who has
produced extensive and valuable research in this area). The chapter also focused on a survey of eighteenth-century newspaper advertisements which refer to a performance of a recorder concerto (see Appendix A), and analysed these results. This gives more information of the recorder concerto’s popularity in England amongst audiences and performers. From the survey, we can see that there was still an interest in England in recorder concertos as late as the early 1730s. Additionally, this chapter also provided some further information on the advertised performers of recorder concertos. Chapter 3 examined the English recorder concerto repertoire as a whole, and aimed to provide insights into the recorder writing of these concertos, as well as provide an answer as to why England was seemingly so interested in the little flute concerto. I have suggested that a reason for this could simply be the success of the instrument at rowdy theatres. Eighteenth-century theatres were raucous, and filled with noise; the high-pitched small recorder (unlike the alto recorder) could be heard relatively easily over this.

Recognising the vast amount of Vivaldi scholarship already out there, Chapter 4 simply focused on some further musical and technical insights into the recorder concertos of Vivaldi, especially from the perspective of a performer of the concertos. Chapter 5 concentrated on the recorder concertos of Naples (not including those from the ‘Harrach’ collection), including a technical analysis of the concertos and their intended audience. This chapter also considered the simple question of why there are so many Neapolitan recorder concertos, and who these concertos were written for. Regarding this last question, I have suggested that some of the concertos (particularly in the Manoscritto di Napoli 1725 collection) were possibly written for the students of the Neapolitan music conservatories.

Chapter 6 focuses on my research findings based on my in-depth explorations of the Harrach collection, both in Vienna and in the New York Public Library. This collection is a substantial and vastly underexplored collection of recorder music. I considered the Harrach family themselves, and the Harrach’s relationship to music. Alois Thomas Raimund von Harrach had a clear interest in music, and I provide evidence of Ferdinand Bonvantura von Harrach [II] having had musical training (he is the copyist of a number of songs in Vol. 1 of the Harrach collection in the New York Public Library). However, it is still not clear exactly who in the Harrach family was particularly interested in the recorder (and the lute). I then reflected on the size and scope of the collection, clarifying the quantity and varieties of recorder music it contains, and
the whereabouts of the Harrach manuscripts today. Additionally, I investigated the custodial history of the collection, and specifically the 1956 auction by Karl & Faber, showing there to be several other pieces for recorder from the original Harrach collection which were not bought by the New York Public Library. This auction listing includes a number of currently unknown recorder sonatas, and possibly even an additional unknown recorder concerto by Vivaldi (though there could simply be a mistake in the auction listing). I considered questions of authorship regarding the Harrach ‘Telemann’ concerto, noting that the virtuosity and tessitura in the concerto is in fitting with much of Telemann’s solo recorder writing, but that the copyist of the concerto is unreliable. With the assistance of information received from Brian Clark, I showed that the copyist often significantly rearranged and altered source material (and that two of the sonatas in the same manuscript attributed to ‘Teleman’ are in fact by Pepusch). I also draw attention to several pieces for recorder that were currently unknown before this study, including two concertos for multiple recorders in the Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, and an anonymous concerto and a suite in the New York Public Library collection.

Chapter 7 aimed to provide some further technical insights into the recorder concertos of Telemann (particularly in relation to Zohn’s research into Telemann’s instrumental music). Telemann’s *concertouverturen* for the recorder and for the ‘Flûte Pastorelle’ are also considered here. I consider Edgar Hunt’s suggestion that the ‘Flûte Pastorelle’ is not a recorder, and note there is additional evidence for his position, including the existence of an instrument collection (from 1778) from Mecklenburg-Schwerin, once belonging to Prince Ludwig of Mecklenburg-Schwerin. This collection contained four instruments marked as flauto ‘pastorelle’, and were listed completely separately to any recorders or transverse flutes. I also draw attention to a Partita by Adolph Carl Kunzen, with a solo instrument marked as ‘Flaute a’becco pastorelle’. From this, I provide an alternative suggestion to Hunt’s view that the ‘Flûte Pastorelle’ is a panpipe, instead proposing that the instrument could have been more like a recorder than a panpipe. Perhaps it was a simple, diatonic, end-blown flute or pipe with fingerholes; such simple end-blown flutes often appear in sixteenth- to eighteenth-century ‘shepherd’ iconography. Chapter 7 also explored the recorder concerto repertoire of Hesse-Darmstadt more generally, and drew attention to the fact that the recorder was still being included in works at Hesse-Darmstadt until the very end of the 1750s.
Chapter 8 explored why there was such an obvious interest in the recorder concerto in the court of Hohenlimburg (and its Kapellmeister Johann Martin Dömming). The ‘Catalogus Musicus’ from the court is an important and underexplored resource, giving information about many recorder concertos that do not survive today. Out of 27 recorder concertos listed in the catalogue, only two are extant (two recorder concertos by Telemann in Darmstadt). I aimed to investigate the potential date of these concertos, and why it is that practically all the concertos listed in the ‘Catalogus Musicus’ from the court do not survive today. There is little information about this, though in consultation with librarians from Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek in Münster (where the collection is housed today), I suggest that the recorder concertos were simply removed from the collection after they stopped being performed, sometime after the death of Johann Martin Dömming in 1760.

Chapter 9 investigated the underexplored concertos with recorder from Mecklenburg-Schwerin. I aimed to provide further bibliographical information about the composers of these concertos, which often include unusual scorings for multiple wind instruments (‘a 6’, ‘a 7’, and ‘a 8’). I showed links between these concertos, and the collections of manuscripts marked as belonging to ‘P.J.Fick’; through this, I also suggested possible dates of composition. Prowo’s concertos were possibly composed in Altona sometime before 1730, and Fick’s concertos were composed (or at least copied) in Schwerin after 1730 (and before Fick’s death in 1743). I also draw particular attention to Fick’s ‘Concerto a 4’ for flute, recorder, violin and continuo, which is a useful addition to the small repertoire of music written for the flute and recorder in combination. I also noted two examples of parts for ‘Flauto octavò’, which is very likely a sopranino recorder, in partitas by Johann Wilhelm Hertel and Adolph Carl Kunzen. Since Kunzen did not appear at Mecklenburg-Schwerin until 1749, and Hertel (who was born in 1727), did not appear there until 1753, we see here two very late examples of the recorder’s use, (perhaps even into the mid-1750s). These works, along with the numerous recorders found in the musical instrument collection (in 1778) of Prince Ludwig of Mecklenburg-Schwerin, suggests that the recorder maintained a presence in Mecklenburg-Schwerin for a long period of time. Lastly, I also explored the authorship of the ‘Schultz’ solo recorder concerto from Mecklenburg-Schwerin (attributed in the Schott edition to Johann Christoph Schultz (1733-1813). I note that this attribution seems wrong, and instead find evidence that there was another (older) Johann Christoph
Schultz. The older Johann Christoph Schultz clearly had some connection to the territories near Altona and Schwerin, since a set of six sonatas for two flutes by him was published in Hamburg in 1729.

Finally, Chapter 10 focused on the many recorder concertos from Swedish sources, exploring the connections between the recorder concertos from Sweden, and the sources from England and Mecklenburg-Schwerin. In correspondence with Stockholm’s Musik- och teaterbibliothek, it was suggested that Sammartini’s recorder concerto was probably copied in England by a member of the ‘Utile Dulci’ society, who brought it across to Sweden with them. This society clearly had some interest in English musical life, and the recorder: as well as Sammartini’s concerto, there also exists another copy of the Walsh and Hare print of Babell’s *Concertos in 7 Parts*, and two manuscripts of English theatre songs with parts for the recorder (‘Sung by M’ Excell, in Goodmans Fields’). The cities of Uppsala and Lund are linked through their historic orchestras, with both orchestras having had substantial music collections. At Lund’s Universitetsbiblioteket, there are several concertos by similar composers and in similar scorings to the concertos involving the recorder at Mecklenburg-Schwerin. Here, I draw attention to the substantial political and diplomatic links between Mecklenburg-Schwerin and Sweden. Also, from Lund’s library, I examine a manuscript of six ‘Concerti â 5’ by ‘Bernardi, e Torelli’, which are concerto arrangements for ‘Little Flaut’ of other instrumental concertos, (and which have escaped the attention of performers). Lastly, in this chapter I also analyse the technical recorder writing in a concerto with two ‘flautinos’ by ‘Förster’. I highlight the extremely difficult recorder writing in the concerto, and suggest this shows there were recorder players of a very high standard in Uppsala’s Akademiska Kapellet (where the manuscript was originally from). Sweden seemed to have a later interest in the recorder concerto (from the 1730’s onwards, and possibly at Lund even into the mid-1740’s, when Lund’s Akademiska Kapellet was first formed). There was also a large interest in concertos for the ‘little flute’ there, with Sweden having, outside of England, most sources of little flute concertos. The importance and popularity of little flutes (in Sweden, and elsewhere in Europe) is an important finding of this thesis, and is discussed in more detail below.
Broader themes

There are numerous research findings, and a large amount of information included in this thesis. To provide further clarity to the study, in addition to the specific chapter contents and conclusions listed above, I also want to draw attention to some broader connecting themes between the chapters.

The first theme throughout this study is the popularity of the recorder concerto across Europe. As mentioned in my Introduction, this thesis is, for the most part, structured chronologically in overlapping periods of apparent interest in the recorder concerto. The first real interest in the recorder concerto in England occurred in the mid-1710s (and, as shown by my survey in Chapter 2, as late as 1730-1732). In Naples, the recorder concerto was present throughout the early-eighteenth century. We can see this in Alessandro Scarlatti’s interest in the recorder before 1715 (his ‘Sinfonia… di Concerto Grosso’); the Manoscritto di Napoli from 1725; and even as late as 1728 (Nicolò Fiorenza’s recorder concertos). Vivaldi’s flauto and flautino concertos are later than this: possibly from the 1720s to early 1730s, and Vivaldi also generally seemed to begin using the recorder in his ‘chamber’ concertos from around the mid-1720s. The Neapolitan manuscripts in the ‘Harrach’ collection very likely date from Alois Thomas Raimund von Harrach’s period as Viceroy of Naples, between 1728 and 1733. The numerous German manuscripts in the collection possibly date from slightly earlier than this – from when Harrach was a diplomat and ambassador in various courts and cities in Germany (though some of the manuscripts could also have been collected by his son, Ferdinand Bonaventura von Harrach [II]). Telemann’s solo recorder concertos were possibly written before 1721, and his concertouverture for recorder possibly written in the mid-1720s. However, elsewhere interest in the recorder was much later. In Mecklenburg-Schwerin, several concertos with recorder seem to have been written (or copied) in the 1730s (after Fick had moved to Schwerin). In Hohenlimburg, numerous recorder concertos were still being listed in a ‘Catalogus Musicus’ that was compiled in 1750. And in Sweden, even later still: a number of the manuscripts which eventually became part of the ‘Utile Dulci’ society collection seem to have arrived in Sweden from England in the 1730s. The ‘Utile Dulci’ society was officially active from 1766-1795, so perhaps these pieces with recorder were even performed then? Though Schickhardt’s recorder concertos in Uppsala seem to date from the early 1720s (just after the coronation of King Frederick I in 1720), other concertos in the various collections at
Lund (‘Engelhart’, ‘Kraus’, ‘Family Wenster’) seem to date from much later (with some of these manuscripts originally from Uppsala). For example, the ‘Engelhart’ collection today at Lund’s Universitetsbiblioteket comes from Heinrich Christopher Engelhardt’s employment as the Director musices of Uppsala’s Akademiska Kapellet from 1727 until 1765. Lund’s Akademiska Kapellet was not even formed in 1745, so presumably some of these concertos could have been performed after this date. Additionally, there are several examples of the recorder being used in (non-concerto) works in Northern Europe as late as the 1740s and 1750s. At Hesse-Darmstadt, Endler’s ‘Sinfonia’ date from the late-1740s and 1750s, and his composition ‘Pieces’, with two orchestral recorders, has a performance date of 1759. At Mecklenburg-Schwerin, there are two examples of the ‘Flauto octavo’ (almost certainly the soprano recorder) appearing in works that were likely composed and performed at the court in the mid-1750s. This suggests that the recorder maintained at least a limited presence in professional performances for many years in Northern Europe, even as late as the 1750s. Many musicians today still hold the view that the recorder was played until the early eighteenth century, before essentially being replaced by the flute. The many examples in this thesis counter this view, showing that the recorder was active, even in professional settings, in many places around Europe until at least the mid-eighteenth century, if not slightly later.

A second theme throughout this thesis was a focus on the technical difficulties and levels of virtuosity in the recorder concerto repertoire. Within this broader theme, we find that few of the previously unknown recorder concertos are of real virtuosity (certainly at the level of virtuosity seen in some of the better-known concertos in the repertoire, such as Vivaldi’s flautino or Bach’s Brandenburg concertos). A small number of the recorder concertos found in the Harrach collection, and from Sweden, are exceptions to this. Instead, we find a substantial number of concertos which require a moderate technical proficiency, and others which require only the basics (such as some of the published English concertos, and some of the Neapolitan collection). This wide array of technical standards emphasises the different uses of the recorder in the eighteenth century: the virtuosi soloists capable of playing the recorder concertos of Vivaldi and others; the more moderate professional musicians who played the recorder occasionally as one of several wind instruments; and the enthusiastic and considerable amateur market.
Small recorders

An important finding of this thesis is that it demonstrates just how important and popular small recorders were to composers, performers and audiences across Europe throughout the whole of this period. Although performers today certainly do use small recorders, there is still a substantial focus on the alto recorder. In fact, this thesis shows that from England, to Italy, through to Northern Europe and particularly Sweden, the ‘little flute’ was extremely popular, was played very often, and survived for many years (even after the alto recorder had faded away). We see examples of small recorders, particularly in Northern Europe, being used as late as the 1740s and 1750s, and perhaps even later still. This is a noteworthy finding, and has significant consequences for performers today – modern, informed players should give much greater attention to smaller recorders and the substantial small recorder repertoire. Importantly, this also means modern players need to better equip themselves with suitable instruments – fifth flutes, sixth flutes and sopraninos are all required, and should be of the highest affordable quality. ‘Little flutes’ have many advantages, not least because they have their own distinctive character and sound, which is unlike any other instrument. Furthermore, small recorders do not have the same issues of balance that often cause problems for alto recorders – for example, the recorder line in a little flute concerto can nearly always be heard above the strings (even if they are doubled), whereas in an alto recorder concerto, this is not always the case. Further discussion of the advantages and limitations of small recorders is included in Chapter 3. With more attention paid to small recorders and the small recorder repertoire, the dominance of the alto recorder amongst soloists may lessen, and small recorders gain the recognition that their musical qualities deserve.

Other considerations and suggestions for further research

There is one notable European country missing from this thesis: France. The reason for this is simple – there are no surviving recorder concertos of French origin written specifically for the recorder. By this, I mean a concerto written only for the recorder.

1 Quite often, players seem happy to spend more money on an alto recorder of quality, but are willing to settle for much weaker (and cheaper) smaller recorders.

2 By recorder concertos of French origin, I specifically mean recorder concertos written by composers working and living in France. The Dieupart recorder concertos are not considered concertos of French origin here, since they were written by a composer working in England and who spent most of his life there.
and no other instrument. Instead, there are a number of concertos written by French composers where the recorder is sometimes listed amongst one of many possible instruments (for example, the concertos of Michel Corrette and Jacques Christoph Naudot, which include instrumentation possibilities of flute, recorder, oboe, musettes, ‘vièles’, etc.). In France, at the beginning of the eighteenth century, there was an extremely prominent and influential (transverse) flute culture. The French flautists travelled widely, and Quantz in particular praised the elegance and technical detail of the French flute school. The recorder had rapidly died out in France by the early eighteenth century, and only played a very minor role in French musical life from then on. There are, nevertheless, surviving works for recorder of French origin, and this is a repertoire that is deserving of further study (as are the reasons for why there was so little interest in the recorder in France).

There are of course some other smaller sources of recorder concertos which have not been included in this thesis. These examples can be seen in my catalogue of recorder concertos, in Appendix C. Such small sources of recorder concertos (usually a single recorder concerto manuscript) can be found today in Donaueschingen, Karlsruhe, Brussels, and even in several ‘ensemble’ concertos from Dresden. The nature of any musical catalogue is that it quickly becomes out-of-date. This is no bad thing, as it means that more sources of recorder concertos have been discovered.

There are further areas related to this study which are deserving of more research. The first is the scoring of eighteenth-century recorder concertos. Richard Maunder’s study The Scoring of Baroque Concertos argues, from analysing original performance materials, that it is:

...beyond reasonable doubt that – with a few well understood exceptions – concertos were normally played one-to-a-part until at least 1740. To perform one of them orchestrally, therefore, would be as historically inaccurate as would be the use of multiple strings in a Haydn quartet, or of a modern-style choir in a Bach cantata.

Maunder’s work is persuasive, although there has been much debate regarding his conclusions. It is worth mentioning here that the alto recorder does not necessarily have a ‘large’ sound, and as mentioned above, the recorder line can often become lost in a
concerto with string and continuo accompaniment. This is particularly the case when an ensemble decides to perform these concertos more than one-to-a-part. And yet, there are a number of examples throughout this thesis of recorder concertos which seem to show indications of orchestral doubling. To give just two examples: the manuscript of the anonymous recorder concerto in Lund discussed in Chapter 10 includes, in a different hand, an additional first violin part in all movements, and an additional second violin part in the first movement only;\(^5\) secondly, the manuscript of Fiorenza’s A minor recorder concerto from Naples includes an extra first violin part, and an extra basso part.\(^6\)

There are many further recorder concerto examples which also seem to indicate additional orchestral musicians. Would these alto recorder concertos really have been performed with some orchestra doubling? Further study is needed here, and also of the general performing challenge of trying to balance an alto recorder with orchestral accompaniment (as mentioned above, concertos for smaller recorders encounter fewer balance issues than alto recorder concertos).

Instrument-specific studies are a further area deserving of further research. Although there has been some excellent scholarship into eighteenth-century woodwind making, there have not been many studies which specifically connect instruments and instrument-makers to specific recorder repertoires (including the concerto repertoire). Inês de Avena Braga’s 2015 dissertation ‘Dolce Napoli: approaches for performance – Recorders for the Neapolitan Baroque repertoire, 1695-1759’ is a good example of a study which does attempt to do this, connecting Neapolitan recorders (and recorder makers) to the Neapolitan recorder repertoire. Many similar studies could be undertaken on some of the other regions included in this thesis.

\(^5\) S-L Saml.Engelhart 409
\(^6\) I-Ne Ms 2210-2217
Appendix A

Survey of Recorder Concerto Performances Advertised in English Newspapers, 1710-1735

The newspaper advertisements below are organised by the date of the original advertisement. Listed underneath the newspaper information is the place and date of the original performance referred to by the advertisement (for example: Hickford’s Room, 25th March). The quotes listed from the advertisements include only the information about the instrumental musical activities of the various concerts and performances (and if the performance is at the theatre, the play name as well). I have not included any of the additional information about actors, dancers, singers, or any other extra-musical activities. All references to the recorder concerto are highlighted in bold. Any information regarding repeated advertisements is included in square brackets below the item. Though the dates of the survey are from 1710 to 1735, I have also included the possible reference to a recorder concerto performance in 1709, and the additional reorder concerto advertisement from 1738.

(1709)

Wednesday 24 August. The Daily Courant - Issue 2444.

Stationer’s Hall, 25th August: ‘will be perform’d a Consort… the Vocal part consisting chiefly of Opera-Songs by Mr Laurence, Mr Cook, Mr Tenoe; a Solo by Mr Phillips, as also a Voluntary; some Lessons on the German Flute; a Concerto Grosso by Mr Baston's two Sons,* who perform'd the same lately with great Applause.’

*This is possibly a concerto for violin and recorder by Thomas and John Baston.
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Wednesday 25 March. The Guardian – Issue XII.

Hickford's Room, 25th March: ‘…a consort of Vocal and Instrumental Musick… a new Concerto on the Mandolin, being an Instrument admired in Rome, but never Publick here. A Solo on the Eccho Flute by Mr Peasible, accompanied by Mr. Babel, Jun. on the Harpsichord. With several new Concerto's for the Hautboy, Flute, German Flute, Trumpet, and other Instruments, Compos'd by Mr. Corbett, and perform'd by him, and the best Masters in the Opera…’

Tuesday 7 April. The Daily Courant – Issue 3582.

Hickford’s Dancing-Room, 9th April: ‘…will be a consort of Vocal and Instrumental Musick, performing several Songs out of the newest Opera's with One and Two Trumpets. With variety of New Concerto's for Flutes, German Flutes, Trumpets, Hautboys, and other Instruments. Compos'd by Mr Corbett, and Perform'd by him and others of the best Masters in the Opera'.

[Repeated in The Daily Courant, Wednesday 8 April]
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Drury Lane, 16th April: ‘…a Play call’d, The Maids Tragedy… To which will be added, a New Concerto by Mr. Paisible and others, never perform’d before.’


Lincoln’s Inn Fields, 25th April: ‘…the Second Part of The Comical History of Don Quixot… A new Concerto for the Flute to be perform’d by Mr. Bastion, Sen. Mr Bastion, Jun. and others…’

Lincoln’s Inn Fields, 7th May: ‘…a Comedy call’d, The City Wives Confederacy. With a Concerto for the Violin and Flute, compos'd by Mr John Baston, and perform'd by him and his Brother…’

Tuesday 29 May. The Daily Courant – Issue 4557.

Lincoln’s Inn Fields, 31st May: ‘will be presented a Comedy called Love's Last Shift; or, The Fool in Fashion. A Concerto for a Violin and Flute, compos'd by Mr. John Baston, and perform'd by him and his Brother.’
[Repeated in The Daily Courant, Wednesday 30 and Thursday 31 May]


Drury Lane, 31st May: '…will be presented a Comedy called The Rover', with 'a New Concerto for the Flute by Mr. Paisible.'


Drury Lane, 6th June: ‘For the Benefit of Mr. Castelman. And for the Entertainment of his Excellency Don Luis du Cunha, Ambassador Extraordinary from the King of Portugal… a Comedy call’d Love’s Last Shift… As also a New Concerto for the little-flute, perform’d, by Mr. Paisable and others.’

Wednesday 17 October. The Daily Courant – Issue 4678.

Lincoln’s Inn Fields, 17th October: ‘…a Play call’d, The Emperor of the Moon… A Concerto on the Violin and Flute compos'd by Mr. John Baston, and to be perform'd on the Stage by him and his Brother.’

Thursday 29 November. The Daily Courant – Issue 4715.

Drury Lane, 29th November: ‘…a Comedy call’d, Sir Courtly Nice…With a New Concerto by Mr. Paisible and others, never perform’d before…’
1717

Friday 1 March. The Daily Courant – Issue 4793.

Drury Lane, 1st March: ‘…a Comedy call’d Sir Courtly Nice… With a new Concerto by Paisible and others, never perform’d before.’

Friday 1 March. The Daily Courant – Issue 4793.

Lincoln’s Inn Fields: 1st March: ‘…The second part of the Comical History of Don Quixote. With a Concerto for the Violin and Flute, compos'd by Mr John Baston, and to be perform'd on the Stage by himself and his Brother.’

Thursday 16 May. The Daily Courant – Issue 4858.

Lincoln’s Inn Fields, 17th May: ‘…the last New Comedy, call’d The Artful Husband. With… a Concerto for a Violin and Flute, compos’d by Mr. John Baston, and to be perform’d by him and his Brother…’


Lincoln's Inn Fields, 11th November: '…presented a Comedy call’d Love Makes a Man… With a Concerto for Violin and Flute, compos'd by Mr. John Baston, and to be perform’d by him and his brother.'


Lincoln's Inn Fields, 28th December: ‘…will be reviv’d a Comedy call’d The Fair Quaker of Deal… With a Concerto for Violin and Flute, compos'd by Mr. John Baston, and to be perform’d by him and his brother.’

---

1 The Artful Husband was a new play, first performed on 11 February 1717 (Burling, A Checklist of New Plays and Entertainments on the London Stage, 1700-1737, 64).
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Friday 16 May. The Daily Courant – Issue 5169.

Drury Lane, May 16th: ‘… a Play call’d King Henry the IVth… A Concerto upon the Little Flute by Mr. Paisible, and one intirely new, compos'd by Mr Hendel.’

Tuesday 2 December. The Daily Courant - Issue 5340.

The Long Room, 4th December: ‘At the Long Room next to the King’s Theatre in the Hay-market… an Assembly of the best Masters of Vocal and Instrumental Musick, who never perform’d before in publick. All the Performers will appear in Masques; the order of the Performance will be as follows: A new Concerto grosso, a new Cantata, a Violin Solo, a new Concerto for the little Flute, Hautboys solo, Cantata Flute Solo, a piece with two Harpsicords, a Concerto German Flute Solo, Harp Solo, Cantata. All the Solo's will be plaid on a Throne built for that purpose; and after the Concert is performed, any Gentleman or Ladies may, appearing in a Masque, if they pleas, ascend the Throne, and call for any Instrument and play a Solo, &c. the Auditors only excepted.'  
[Repeated in The Daily Courant, Wednesday 3 and Thursday 4 December]

1719

Friday 2 January. The Daily Courant – Issue 5366.

Lincoln's Inn Fields, 2nd January: ‘…A Comedy, call’d The Jew of Venice… with 'a Concerto for Violin and little Flute' played by Mr Baston and his brother…’


Hickford's Room, 13th February: ‘…a consort of Vocal and Instrumental Musick, by the best Hands. A Concerto and a Solo for the Violin by Mr. Carbonelli, and Mr. Pipo, A Concerto and Solo for the Flute by Mr. Mercy, A Concerto and Solo for the Hautboy by Mr. Kytch, A Concerto and Solo for the German flute by Mr. Dahuron.’  
[Repeated in The Daily Courant, Friday 13 February]
Wednesday 6 May. The Daily Courant – Issue 5472.

Hickford's Room, 7th May: ‘…a Concert of Vocal and Instrumental Musick, by the best Hands… a Solo and Concerto on the German flute by Signor Dragon. And several new Solo’s and Concerto’s by Mr. Keitch, on the Hautboy and little Flute.’
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Lincoln’s Inn Fields, 5th May: ‘…the Comical History of Don Quixote. With a Concerto on the Sixth Flute by Mr. Baston, junior…’

[Repeated in The Daily Post, Thursday 5 May]


Lincoln’s Inn Fields, 12th May: ‘… a Comedy call’d The Amorous Widow. With a Concerto on the Sixth Flute by Mr. Baston Jr…’


Lincoln’s Inn Fields, 19th May: ‘…a play, call’d Oroonoko… With a Concerto on the Sixth Flute by Mr. John Baston…’

Friday 27 May. The Daily Post – Issue 204.

Lincoln’s Inn Fields, 27th May: ‘…will be presented a Comedy, call’d, The Committee. With a Concerto on the Sixth Flute by Mr. Baston…’
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Lincoln’s Inn Fields, 9th May: ‘A Play call’d Don Sebastian, King of Portugal… A Solo on the Hautboy and a Concerto on the Little Flute by Mr. Keitch.’
Drury Lane, 14th March: ‘An Entertainment of Musick. 1. Concerto with two Trumpets compos’d and perform’d by Mr. Grano; 2. A new Concerto just come over from Italy, compos’d by Sig. Albinoni; 3. A Song by Mrs Barbier; 4. A Concerto, compos’d by Sig. Carbonelli. Second Entertainment: 1. A Concerto with Two Hautboys and Two Flutes compos’d by Mr. Dieupart; 2. Concerto on Bass Violin, compos’d and perform’d by Sig. Pippo; 3. A Song by Mrs. Barbier; 4. The 8th Concerto of Arcangelo Corelli. Third Entertainment: 1. A Concerto compos’d by Sig. Carbonelli; 2. A Solo on Arch-Lute, compos’d and perform’d by Sig. Viebar; 3. A Song by Mrs. Barbier 4. A New Concerto on the Little Flute compos’d by Mr. Woodcocke and perform’d by Mr. John Baston; 5. A Solo by Sig. Carbonelli; 6. A Concerto with Two Trumpets by Mr. Grano.’ [Repeated in both The Daily Courant and The Daily Post on Tuesday 13 and Wednesday 14 March]

Great Room, Richmond, 14th May: ‘… is now made very commodious for the Reception of Gentleman and Ladies, and will be open’d on Monday next… with a good Sett of Musick Mornings and Evenings. On Monday’s will be a Concert of Musick by the Masters from the Opera, as perform’d last Year at the Wells, and on Monday next will be perform’d a Concerto on the Little Flute by Mr. John Baston.’ [Repeated in both The Daily Courant and The Daily Journal on Saturday 12 May. Repeated in The Daily Post, Monday 14 May]

Haymarket, 11th May: ‘… a Consort of Vocal and Instrumental Musick. A Trumpet Concerto by Mr. Grano, Singing by Mr. Legate, Two Concerto’s of Corelli’s, by the two first Violins in the Opera… A Concerto on the Little Flute by Mr. Grano… A Concerto for two Trumpets, and two French Horns.’ [Repeated in The Daily Courant, Friday 11 May]
Friday 11 May. The Daily Courant – Issue 6413.

Drury Lane, 11th May: ‘A Comedy call’d Sir Courtly Nice… with Select Pieces of Musick, between the Acts: particularly, a Concerto for the Little Flute composed by Monsieur Dieupart, and performed by Mr. Baston, and others.’


Great Room, Richmond, 21st May: ‘…On Monday’s will be a Concert of Musick by the Masters from the Opera, as perform’d last Year at the Wells, and on Monday next will be perform’d a Concerto on the Little Flute by Mr. John Baston.’

[Repeated in The Daily Post, Saturday 19 May]


Great Room, Richmond, 18th June: ‘…Open every Day, with a good Set of Musick Mornings and Evenings. N.B. On Monday next will be a Concert of extraordinary Musick, by the Masters from the Opera, in which Mr. Kytch will perform several Pieces on the Hautboy, and Mr. John Baston a Concerto on the Little Flute.’


Great Room, Richmond, 25th June: ‘…On Monday next will be a Concert of extraordinary Musick, by the Masters from the Opera, in which Mr. Kytch will perform several Pieces on the Hautboy and German Flute, and Mr. John Baston a Concerto on the Little Flute.’

Saturday 22 September. The Daily Post – Issue 931.

Great Room, Richmond, 24th September: ‘Consort of Musick, by the Masters from the Opera, in which Mr. Kytch will perform several Pieces on the German Flute and Hautboy, and Mr. John Baston a Concerto on the Little Flute.’
Thursday 2 May. The Daily Courant – Issue 6717.

Drury Lane, 2nd May: ‘…a Comedy call’d The Stratagem… with Entertainments of Dancing… and a Concerto on the Little Flute by Mr. Baston.’


Drury Lane, 15th May: ‘…a Comedy call’d The Plain Dealer… With select Pieces of Musick, and Entertainments of Dancing between the Acts. At the End of the First Act, a Concerto, compos’d by Monsieur Dieupart for Hautboys, Flutes and Violins… End of the Second Act, a Concerto Compos’d by Sig. Carbonelli… End of the Third Act, a Concerto Compos’d by Signor Albinoni… End of the Fourth Act, The Eighth Concerto of Signor Corelli…’

[Repeated in The Daily Post, Wednesday 15 May]

Tuesday 28 May. The Daily Courant – Issue 6739.

Drury Lane, 28th May: ‘The History of King Henry VIII. Written by Shakespear…With a Concerto on the Little Flute by Mr. Baston, and Entertainments of Dancing.’


Drury Lane, 25th June: ‘A Comedy of Three Acts, call’d A Duke and No Duke…and a Concerto on the Little Flute, by Mr. Baston…’

[Repeated in The Daily Post, Saturday 22 and Tuesday 25 June]


Drury Lane, 12th July: ‘A Comedy of Three Acts, call’d A Duke and No Duke…With a Concerto on the little Flute, by Mr. John Baston…’

Drury Lane, 19th July: ‘…a Farce call’d The Strolers… to which will be added, the entire Masque call’d Acis and Galatea. Set to Musick by Mr. Eccles. With Scenes, Machines, Dances, and all proper Decorations. With a Concerto on the Little Flute by Mr. John Baston.’


Drury Lane, 23rd July: ‘…several Entertainments viz. The Strolers… The Tricks of Harlequin… a Passacale, a Night Scene… A Concerto on the Little Flute by Mr. John Baston. The Entire Masque of Acis and Galatea. Set to Musick by Mr. Eccles. With Scenes, Machines, Dances, and all proper Decorations.’

[Repeated in The Daily Courant, Tuesday 23 July]


Drury Lane, 6th August: ‘A Comedy of Three Acts, call’d, A Duke and No Duke… with A Concerto on the Little Flute by Mr. John Baston…’

[Repeated in The Daily Courant, Tuesday 6 August]

Saturday 24 August. Weekly Journal or British Gazetteer.

Richmond Theatre, 2nd September: ‘…a Farce of one Act call’d Pyramus and Thisbe. To which will be added, A divesting Droll, call’d The Blind Beggar of Bednal Green… With a Concerto on the small Flute by Mr. John Baston. And several surprising Entertainments of Rope Dancing by a young Lad lately come from France… And Ladder-Dancing by the greatest Performer in the World…’

[Repeated in Weekly Journal or British Gazetteer, Saturday 31 August]

---

2 *The Strolers* was a new play, with the first performance three days earlier on 16 July 1723 (Burling, *op. cit.*, 102).

3 *The Tricks of Harlequin* was first performed on 2 July 1723 ((Burling, *op. cit.*, 100).

4 A review of the performance appeared in *The Daily Post* on 5 September 1723: ‘Mr Penkethman . . . had the Honour to divert their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Wales, with Entertainments of Acting and Tumbling perform’d to Admiration… There were present Nobility, Gentry and Ladies upwards of 200.’
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Drury Lane, 13th May: ‘...a Comedy call’d The Lancashire Witches’... ‘With select Pieces of Musick and Entertainments of Dancing between the Acts... At the End of the second Act, a Concerto on the Stage, composed and performed by Mr. John Baston on the sixth Flute... At the End of the fourth Act, (by Desire) the Fifth Concerto of Signor Vivaldi...’


Drury Lane, 12th May: ‘...a Comedy call’d The Chances... With select Pieces of Musick between the Acts. Particularly, a Concerto on the little Flute by Mr. Baston. To which will be added, a Farce of two Acts, call’d The School-Boy...’

[Repeated in The Daily Courant, Tuesday 12 May]
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Wednesday 31 March. The Daily Courant – Issue 7318.

Drury Lane, 31st March: ‘...a Comedy call’d Love’s Last Shift... a Concerto on the Little Flute by Mr. Baston, and others; a Trumpet Sonata perfrom’d on the Stage...’

Tuesday 18 May. The Daily Courant – Issue 7359.

Drury Lane, 19th May: ‘...a Comedy call’d The Old Batchelor... With Select pieces of Musick between the Acts, particularly Signor Corelli’s First Concerto; and a Concerto on the Little Flute by Mr. John Baston.’

[Repeated in The Daily Courant, Wednesday 19 May]
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Saturday 30 April. The Daily Post – Issue 2059.

Lincoln’s Inn Fields, 30th April: ‘The Tragedy of Mariamne... at the End of the second Act... a Concerto on the Small Flute by Mr. John Jones’

Drury Lane, 23rd May: ‘… a Play call’d Timon of Athens… a Concerto on the Little Flute by Mr John Baston… And the 8th Concerto of Sig. Archangelo Corelli.’

[Repeated in The Daily Courant, Monday 23 May]


Drury Lane, 25th May: ‘A Comedy call’d Sir Courtly Nice… And a Concerto on the Little Flute by Mr. John Baston. Being the last Time of the Company’s acting this Season.’
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Saturday 13 May. The Daily Post – Issue 2383.

Drury Lane, 15th May: ‘A Comedy call’d Love’s Last Shift… With some select Pieces of Musick; particularly, a Trumpet Sonata on the Stage, and a Concerto on the Little Flute by Mr. John Baston.’

[Repeated in The Daily Post, Monday 15 May]
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Tuesday 12 March. The Daily Post – Issue 2643.

York Building, 13th March: ‘For the Benefit of Mr. Gadbury… An Extraordinary Consort of Vocal and Instrumental Musick, by the best Masters: with some Celebrated Pieces; particularly, A Concerto for the Little Flute, by Mr John Baston: a Solo on the Violin, by Mr. Jones…’

[Repeated in The Daily Post, Wednesday 13 March]
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Friday 11 April. The Daily Post – Issue 2982.

Hickford’s Room, 16th April: ‘For the Benefit of Mr. Kytch, First Hautboy to the Opera. Concert of Musick by the best Masters from the Opera-house. I. The Ouverture of
Ptolomy…The Eighth Concerto of Corelli…II. A Concerto Grosso, by Dr. Pepusch, with Solo Parts for the Harpsichord, to be perform’d by Mr. Bach… A Concerto for French Horns &e. Composed by Sig. Nicholini… A Concerto for the little Flute, composed by Mr. Babel…’

[Repeated in The Daily Post on Monday 14, Tuesday 15 and Wednesday 16 April]

1730


Drury Lane, 29th April: ‘…a Comedy called Amphitryon… With several select Pieces of Musick and Entertainments… In the third Act, a Concerto on the Little Flute by Mr. Baston…’

[Repeated in The Daily Post, Wednesday 29 April]

Saturday 2 May. The Daily Post – Issue 3313.

Drury Lane, 2nd May: ‘The Tragedy of Macbeth… With several Entertainments of Dancing… A Concerto on the little Flute by Mr. John Baston…’

Saturday 2 May. The Daily Post – Issue 3313.

Drury Lane, 4th May: ‘…a Comedy call’d Love’s Last Shift… With Entertainments of Musick and Dancing… At the End of the Fourth Act, a Concerto with Flutes…’


Goodman’s Field, 11th June: ‘…a new Comedy call’d The Widow Bewitch’d… To which will be added a new Concerto on the Flute to be play’d on the Stage, by Mr Jacob Price, who never perform’d in publick before.’

[Repeated in Daily Journal and Daily Post on the same day]

---

5 The Widow Bewitch’d was a new play, with the first performance three days earlier on 8 June 1730 (Burling, William J.: A Checklist of New Plays…, p. 136)
Haymarket, 10\textsuperscript{th} May: ‘For the Benefit of a Family in Distress… The Author’s Farce. In which will be introduc’d an Operatical Puppet-show, call’d The Pleasures of the Town… to which will be added, a new Play, call’d The Tragedy of Tragedies… with several Entertainments, particularly at the End of the Author’s Farce, a Concerto on the Trumpet… at the End of the Puppet shew, a Concerto Grosso on the Flute, by Mr. Kytch…’

Saturday 3 July. The Daily Post – Issue 3679.

Long Room, Enfield, 5\textsuperscript{th} July: ‘For the Benefit of Mr. Jones… A Concert of Musick by the Best Masters. Particularly, several Concertos and Solo’s for the Violin, by Mr. Jones… and other Pieces for Flutes and German Flute by Mr. Neal; a \textbf{Concerto for the little Flute by Mr. Baston}…’

[Repeated in \textit{The Daily Post}, Monday 5 July]


[Repeated in \textit{The Daily Post on the same day}]

Lincoln’s Inn Fields, 10th March: ‘A Concert of Vocal and Instrumental Musick… a Concerto for Two Trumpets… Concerto Corelli… **Concerto for the Flute**… a Concerto for two French Horns… Concerto Corelli… Concerto for Trumpets.’


Chancery Lane, 17th March: ‘A Grand Concert of Musick… Concerto for French Horns… **Solo Flute Concerto**… Concerto Hautbois… Seventh Corelli Concerto… Concerto French Horns… with several Flute pieces by Mr. John Baston.’

[Repeated in *The Daily Journal*, Friday 17 March]

**1733**

Friday 13 April.⁶

Goodman’s Fields, 13th April: ‘The Constant Couple… I: Concerto for German Flute by Burk Thumoth. II: The 5th Concerto of Vivaldi. III: Trumpet Concerto. IV: **Concerto with Flutes and German Flutes**.’


Drury Lane, 9th May: ‘…a Comedy, call’d Rule a Wife and Have a Wife… Also select Pieces of Musick between the Acts, particularly a **Concerto on the Little Flute** by Mr. John Baston…’

---

⁶ This advertisement does not appear in the Burney Collection, but it is reported in detail in *The London Stage* (Part 3, Vol. 1, 288).
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Wednesday 8 May.\(^7\)

Goodman’s Fields, 8th May: ‘King Richard the Third… *For the 2nd Musick, a Concerto of the late Mr Woodcock's on the little Flute. For the Third, the 8th Concerto of Corelli.*"

(1738)


Marleybone Gardens, 12th July: ‘Will be perform’d a Concert of Musick by the best Masters, and will continue every Evening during the Season. In which will be performed 18 Pieces, viz. The Overture of Hester. A **Concerto on the little Flute, and two songs.** A Concerto of Corelli. A Concert on the Hautboy. Concert on the German Flute, and two songs. **Concerto on the Little Flute.** Concerto of Giminiani. Overture of Alcins. Concerto on the Hautboy and two songs. Concerto of Mr. Handell’s. Concerti for Two Hautbois of Mr. Giminiani. To perform the same Number of the celebrated Pieces every Evening during the Season, with Alterations. The best of Wines and Eatables that the Town can afford, will be furnish’d as the most reasonable Prices of every thing, and fix’d in several Parts of the Garden. Gentlemen are humbly desired not to smoke in the Walks.’

[Repeated in *London Daily Post*, Tuesday 11 July]

\(^7\) This advertisement also does not appear in the Burney Collection, but in *The London Stage* (Part 3, Vol. 1, 396).
Appendix B

Concertos for Recorder. ‘Catalogus Musicus’ –
Limburg, 1750 (Kapellmeister: Johann Martin Dömming)

Recorder concerto incipits from Section 3 of the ‘Catalogus Musicus’ – ‘Flaut Trav: et Flaut Abec Concert.’

‘Albenoni’ [Tomaso Albinoni] (1671–1751):

‘Dömming’ [Johann Martin Doemming] (1703–1760):
‘Dömming’ (cont.):
‘Fasch’ [Johann Friedrich Fasch] (1688–1758):

‘Graun’ [Johann Gottlieb Graun / Carl Heinrich Graun ?]:

‘Magini’ [Francesco Magini] (c.1670–1714):

‘Stulick’ [Matthäus Nikolaus Stulick] (c.1700–1740):
‘Teleman’ [Georg Philipp Telemann] (1681–1767):

‘Zobell’ [Johann Kaspar Zobell / Johann Conrad Zobell]:

‘N.N.’ [Anonymous]
Appendix C

Catalogue of Eighteenth-Century Recorder Concertos

Appendix C is a catalogue of all known recorder concertos. This includes extant concertos, as well as any recorder concertos which have once appeared in a catalogue or library record, but where the music has not survived today (or is yet to be found). Works which are known only from catalogue or library records (with no surviving music) are listed in italics in this Catalogue, and marked with the symbol ‡.

It should be noted that this Catalogue is a list of all concertos written specifically for recorder(s). It therefore does not include concertos (generally of French origin) where the recorder is listed as one of several possible solo instruments (for example, Jacques Christoph Naudot’s Op. 17 set of concertos, which lists flute, recorder, oboe, violin, musette, and ‘vièles’ as possible choices). Additionally, the Catalogue focuses on concertos where recorder(s) feature prominently; ‘ensemble’ concertos are not included if they recorder only features as an ‘ensemble’ instrument, in a small number of movements. ‘Concerto’ terminology in the early eighteenth century was ambiguous at times, with concertos, as we think of the form today, sometimes marked as sonatas, suites, or even sinfonia. A broad view of these terms has been taken here, to avoid arbitrarily ignoring works. If the piece was marked as a ‘concerto’, either by the composer or the copyist, it has been included; as have other works which were not marked as a concerto, but which would generally be classed as a concerto in the modern sense of the word.

As mentioned in the Introduction to this thesis, there are a number of resources that should be highlighted here. Andrea Bornstein’s  flauto dolce website (www.gardane.info/flautodolce) is an excellent aid to players. The website requires registration, but once obtained, includes performing editions of a vast amount of repertoire, including many of the concertos mentioned in this Catalogue. I urge readers to explore it.

There are also two existing catalogues which are important to mention here. The first is the (online) Catalogue of Historical Recorder Repertoire, which is found at the Stichting Blokfluit website (www.blokfluit.org/historical). This is a very helpful site for
modern players, providing detailed and annotated information of quite a large part of the eighteenth-century repertoire. Though each entry on the website does not include a catalogue reference number, the website is easily searchable. Therefore, any item in my Catalogue which also appears on the Stichting Blokfluit website is marked with the letters **St.Bl.**, allowing the reader to search the website and further explore the sources.

The second significant catalogue (this time offline) is Ingo Gronefeld’s *Flötenkonzerte bis 1850: Ein thematisches Verzeichnis*. This is a catalogue of ‘flute’ concertos (including some recorder concertos) to the year 1850. It is an impressive and well-researched catalogue (in four volumes), and is particularly useful for flautists. However, it contains some minor misattributions of recorder concertos as flute concertos, and several recorder concertos are missing (the first volume was published in 1992, and catalogues can quickly become out-of-date as new music is found). For ease of cross-referencing between catalogues, where a source appears in Gronefeld’s catalogue, a reference number to the catalogue has been provided, e.g. KatGro 1514.

Suggestions for useful modern editions have also been included in my Catalogue (using the symbol ➤). This is by no means an exhaustive list of modern editions, but simply recommends accurate performing editions (and, where relevant, facsimile editions) that will be helpful to players.

Finally, several concertos in my Catalogue do not appear in either the Stichting Blokfluit or the Gronefeld catalogues. These new entries have been marked with an asterisk (*).

**Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R.</th>
<th>Alto recorder</th>
<th>TrF.</th>
<th>Transverse flute</th>
<th>Vc.</th>
<th>Violoncello</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sf.</td>
<td>Sixth flute</td>
<td>Ob.</td>
<td>Oboe</td>
<td>VL.</td>
<td>Violone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ff.</td>
<td>Fifth flute</td>
<td>Bsn.</td>
<td>Bassoon</td>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Cembalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qf.</td>
<td>‘Quartflaut’</td>
<td>Tr.</td>
<td>Trumpet</td>
<td>Bc.</td>
<td>Basso continuo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft.</td>
<td>‘Flautino’</td>
<td>V.</td>
<td>Violin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIP.</td>
<td>‘Flûte Pastorelle’</td>
<td>Va.</td>
<td>Viola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Catalogue

Albinoni, Tomasso (1671–1751)

  ‘Catalogus Musicus’ – Limburg, 1750 [see Appendix B].
  KatGro 2224.

‘Alludemori, G. C.’ (date not known)

- Concerto [B-flat major]. 2 R., 2 R. rip., Bsn., C. *
  Allegro – Grave (Prestissimo) – Allegro
  AT-OeSta / AVA FA Harrach HS 266.

Babell, William (1690–1723)

Concertos in 7 Parts: The first four for Violins and one small Flute, and the two last for Violins and two Flutes. The proper Flute being nam’d to each Concerto. Compos’d by the Late / Mr Will Babell. / Perform’d at the Theatre with great applause. Opera terza. (Walsh & Hare, 1726).

- Concerto I [D major]. Sf., 2 V., 2 V. rip. Bc.
  Allegro – Adagio – Allegro
  KatGro 2311.
  St.Bl.

- Concerto II [D major]. Sf., 2 V., 2 V. rip., Bc.
  Adagio – Allegro – Adagio – Allegro
  KatGro 2310.
  St.Bl.

- Concerto III [E minor]. Sf., 2 V., 2 V. rip., Bc.
  Adagio – Allegro – Adagio – Allegro
  KatGro 2309.
  St.Bl.
• *Concerto IV* [A major]. Sf., 2 V., 2 V. rip. Bc., Bc. Rip.  
  *Allegro – Adagio – Allegro*  
  KatGro 2308.  
  St.Bl.  

• *Concerto V* [D major]. 2 Sf., 2 V. or 2 Ob., Bc., Bc. rip.  
  *Adagio – Allegro – Adagio – Allegro*  
  KatGro 2307.  
  St.Bl.

• *Concerto VI* [F major]. 2 R., 2 V., Bc., Bc. rip.  
  *Andante – Allegro – Adagio – Allegro*  
  KatGro 2306.  
  St. Bl.

**Bach, Johann Sebastian (1685–1750)**

• *Concerto 2do*. [F major]. (Brandenburg Concerto No. 2, *BWV 1047*). R., Tr., Ob., V., 2 V. rip., Va., Vl., Bc.  
  [1st mov.] – *Andante – Allegro assai*  
  Autograph: D-B Am.B 78 (2).  
  KatGro 2271.  
  St. Bl.

• *Concerto 4to*. [G major]. (Brandenburg Concerto No. 4, *BWV 1049*). 2 R.(‘Fiauti d’Echo’), V., 2 V. rip., Va. rip., Vl., rip, Vc., Bc.  
  *Allegro – Andante – Presto*  
  KatGro 2270.  
  St. Bl.  
  ➢ There are numerous modern editions (performing and facsimile) of the  
    Brandenburg concertos. Bärenreiter’s urtext editions and commentary are well  
    respected.
**Barbella, Francesco (1692–c.1732)**

- *Sonata Terza [C major].* R., 2 V., Vc., Bc.
  - *Amoroso – Allegro – Adagio – Allegro*
  - Manoscritto di Napoli, 1725. I-Ne (38.3.13).
  - KatGro 532.
  - St. Bl.
  - ⚫ Ut Orpheus, 1996.

**Baston, John (c. before 1709–c. after 1733)**

*Six Concertos in Six Parts for Violins and Flutes viz. a Fifth, Sixth and Consort Flute. The proper Flute being nam’d to each Concerto.* (Walsh & Hare, 1729).

- *Concerto I [G major].* R., 2 V., V. rip., Va., Bc.
  - *Allegro – Largo – Allegro*
  - KatGro 1198.
  - St. Bl.

- *Concerto II [D major].* Sf., 2 V., V. rip., Va., Bc.
  - *Allegro – Adagio – Presto*
  - KatGro 1131.
  - St. Bl.
  - ⚫ Schott, 2000.

- *Concerto III [G major].* R., 2 V., V. rip., Va., Bc.
  - *Allegro – Adagio – Allegro [1st mov. again]*
  - KatGro 1159.
  - St. Bl.

- *Concerto IV [A major].* Sf., 2 V., V. rip., Va., Bc.
  - *Siciliana - Allegro*
  - KatGro 1142.
  - St. Bl.
• **Concerto V** [D major]. Sf., 2 V., V. rip., Va., Bc.
  *Allegro – Andante – Presto*
  St. Bl.
  KatGro 1065.
  Ø Schott, 1991.

• **Concerto VI** [D major]. Ff., 2 V., V. rip., Va., Bc.
  *Allegro – Siciliana – Allegro [1st mov. again]*
  KatGro 1135.
  St. Bl.
  Ø Schott, 1991.


**Beckurs (no date known)**

• † **Concerto ‘2 Flutes Octaves a bec, 2 Flutes Quarto a bec, 1 Hautbois, 1 Cor de chasse & Basso’**. *
  *Catalogue of the music library... of Nicolas Selhof, sold in the Hague, 1759.*

‘Bernardi, e Torelli’ [Bartolomeo Bernardi (1670–1732) and Giuseppe Torelli (1658–1709)]

Six ‘Concerti à 5’ (five out of the six concertos are arrangements from *VI Sonates ou Concerts à 4, 5 & 6 parties composées par M° Bernardi, Torelli & autres fameux Auteurs...Livre Premier*, and ‘VIII Sonatas ou Concerts... Bernardi, Torelli & autres fameux Auteurs...Livre Second’). See Chapter 10 for more details.

• **Concerto 1<sup>mo</sup>** [A major]. Sf., 2 V., Va., Bc. *
  *Allegro – Adagio – Allegro.*

• **Concerto 2<sup>do</sup>** [A major]. Sf., 2 V., Va., Bc. *
  *Allegro – Adagio – Allegro.*

• **Concerto 3<sup>so</sup>** [D major]. Sf., 2 V., Va., Bc. *
  *Allegro – Allegro – Adagio – Allegro.*
• *Concerto 4th [D major]. Sf., 2 V., Va., Bc.
  Andante – Adagio – Allegro – Grave – Allegro.

• *Concerto 5th [A major]. Sf., 2 V., Va., Bc.
  Allegro – Adagio e Staccato – Allegro.

• *Concerto 6th [A major]. Sf., 2 V., Va., Bc.
  Allegro – Adagio – Allegro – Adagio – Allegro.

**Brescianello, Giuseppe Antonio (c.1690–1758)**

• ‡ Concertino [D major]. (R., 2 V., Bc.) Damaged by fire at Darmstadt (D-DS).
  KatGro 1380.

**Corelli, Arcangelo (1653–1713)**

**Arrangements:**

• Six Concertos for Two Flutes and a Bass... (Walsh & Hare, 1720). *
  Arranged by Schickhardt from Corelli’s Op. 6 Concerti grossi.

• XII Concertos, Transpos’d for Flutes, viz. a Fifth, a Sixth, a Consort, and Voice Flute; the Proper Flute Being Nam’d to each Concerto, and so Adapted to the Part that they Perform in Consort with the Violins and Other Instruments Throughout (Walsh & Hare, 1725). Anonymous arrangement of Corelli’s Op. 6 Concerti grossi.
  St. Bl.

**Dieupart, Charles (c.1667–c.1740)**

• *Concerto, ‘Flautino, et 4 Violons’ [A minor]. Ft., (R. or V.) 2 V., 2 Ob., Va., Bsn., Vl., Bc.
  Vivace – Grave staccato – Allegro
  D-DJ Mus. 2174-O-1
  KatGro 2141.
  St. Bl.
• ‘Sonata’ [E minor]. 2 R., Vc., Bc., ‘Choro 1st’: 2 V., Va., Vc., Bc., ‘Choro 2nd’: 2 V., Va., Vl., Bc. *

Andante – Largo - Vivace – Grave et Staccato – Allegro
D-Dl Mus. 2174-O-4

Dömming, Johann Martin (1703–1760)

• † Concerto [A minor]. R., 2 V., Va., Bc.
  ‘Catalogus Musicus’ – Limburg, 1750 [see Appendix B].
  KatGro 2228.

• † Concerto [G major] (i). 2 R., 2 TrF., C. *
  ‘Catalogus Musicus’ – Limburg, 1750 [see Appendix B].

• † Concerto [G major] (ii). 2 R., 2 TrF., Va., Bc. *
  ‘Catalogus Musicus’ – Limburg, 1750 [see Appendix B].

• † Concerto [F major]. 2 R., 2 V., Bc.
  ‘Catalogus Musicus’ – Limburg, 1750 [see Appendix B].
  KatGro 2225.

• † Concerto [G major]. 2 Qf., 2 TrF., Vc. *
  ‘Catalogus Musicus’ – Limburg, 1750 [see Appendix B].

• † Concerto [F major]. R., 2 V., Va., Bc.
  ‘Catalogus Musicus’ – Limburg, 1750 [see Appendix B].
  KatGro 2228.

• † Concerto [G major]. 2 R., 2 V., Bc. *
  ‘Catalogus Musicus’ – Limburg, 1750 [see Appendix B].

• † Concerto [C minor]. R., 2 V., Va., Bc.
  ‘Catalogus Musicus’ – Limburg, 1750 [see Appendix B].
  KatGro 2218.

• † Concerto [C minor]. R., 2 V., Va., Bc.
  ‘Catalogus Musicus’ – Limburg, 1750 [see Appendix B].
  KatGro 2229.
• ‡ Concerto [D major]. Qf., 2 V., Va., Bc.
  ‘Catalogus Musicus’ – Limburg, 1750 [see Appendix B].
  KatGro 2254.

• ‡ Concerto [F major]. Qf., 2 V., Va., Bc.
  ‘Catalogus Musicus’ – Limburg, 1750 [see Appendix B].
  KatGro 2222.

• ‡ Concerto [G minor]. R. or TrF., 2 V., Bc. *
  ‘Catalogus Musicus’ – Limburg, 1750 [see Appendix B].

• ‡ Concerto [D minor]. R., 2 V., Va., Bc.
  ‘Catalogus Musicus’ – Limburg, 1750 [see Appendix B].
  KatGro 2217.

• ‡ Concerto [A minor]. Qf., 2 V., Va., Bc.
  ‘Catalogus Musicus’ – Limburg, 1750 [see Appendix B].
  KatGro 2253.

• ‡ Concerto [B-flat major]. Qf., 2 V., Va., Bc.
  ‘Catalogus Musicus’ – Limburg, 1750 [see Appendix B].
  KatGro 2259.

See Appendix B for incipits of the Dömming concertos.

Eisenmann, Angelus Anton (fl. 1785)

• Concerto [F major]. Ft., 2 V., 2 Hn., Va., Bc.
  Allegro moderato – Andante – Rondo (Moderato)
  CH-E 16,3 Ms. 1826
  KatGro 597.

Fasch, Johann Friedrich (1688–1758)

• Concerto [D minor]. R., 2 V., Va., Bc.
  ‘Catalogus Musicus’ – Limburg, 1750 [see Appendix B].
  KatGro 2240.
• **Concerto** [F major]. R., 2 V., Va., Vc., C. *

  *Allegro – Largo – Allegro*


**Fehre, [possibly Christoph Ludwig (1718–1772)]**

• ‡ **Concerto** [B-flat major]. Ft., 2 V., Va., Vc.

  *Breitkopf catalogue, 1763.*

  KatGro 769 – though misidentified as for piccolo flute.

**Fick, Peter Johann (1708–1743)**

• ‘**Concerto a 4’** [A minor]. R., TFt., V., C., Bc. *

  *Andante – Vivacett – Andante – Allegro*

  D-SWl Mus. 348/9.

• ‘**Concerto a 5’** [C major]. 2 R., 2 V., C.

  [1st mov.] – *Adagio – Vivacett – Polonaise*

  D-SWl Mus. 349/13.

  KatGro 1724.

• ‘**Concerto a 6’** [G major]. 2 R., 2 V., Va., C., Bc.

  [1st mov.] – *Siciliano – Vivacett – Polonaise*

  D-SWl Mus. 351a.

  KatGro 1220.

• ‘**Concerto a 7’** [F major]. 2 R., 2 Ob., 2 Hn., C. *

  [1st mov.] – *Adagio – Menuett* (alternative), *Trio*

  D-SWl Mus. 352a.

• ‘**Concerto a 7’** [F major]. 2 R., 2 Ob., 2 Hn., C. *

  [1st mov.] – *Adagio – Vivacett – Polonaise*

  D-SWl Mus. 352b.

• ‘**Concerto a 8’** [G major]. 2 R., 2 Ob., 2 Hn., Bsn., Bc. *

  [1st mov.] – *Adagio – Vivacett*

  D-SWl Mus. 353a.
Fiorenza, Nicolò (c.1700–1764)

- ‘Sinfonia a Flauto... ’ [G minor]. R., 3 V., Bc.
  Largo amoroso – Andante – Largo – Allegro
  I-Nc Ms 2258-2262.
  KatGro 423.
  ➢ Ut Orpheus, 2007.

- Sinfonia per due Flauti... [A minor]. R., 2 V., Bc.
  Grave – Allegro – Grave – Allegro assai.
  I-Nc Ms 2210-2217.
  KatGro 1292.

- Concerto [C minor]. R., 3 V., Va., Bc. *
  Largo amoroso – Andante – Largo – Allegro
  I-Nc Ms 2263-2268.
  ➢ Doblinger, 2016.

- Concerto, ‘Di Flauto’... [F minor]. R., 2V., Va., Ve., Bsn. *
  Largo – Allegro ma non presto – Largo – Allegro.
  I-Nc Ms 2293-2297.
  ➢ Girolamo-Musikverl, 2011.

Förster, Christoph (1693–1745)

- ‘Concerto a 6’ [G major]. 2 Ft., 2 V., Va., Bc. *
  Molto Allegro – Amabile – Prestissimo
  S-L Saml.Kraus 156.

Graun, [Carl Heinrich (1704–1759) or Johann Gottlieb (1703–1771)]

- † Concerto [G minor]. R., 2 V., Bc.
  ‘Catalogus Musicus’ – Limburg, 1750 [see Appendix B].
  KatGro 2246.
Graun, Johann Gottlieb (1703–1771)

- *Concerto* [C major]. R., V., 2 V. rip., Va., C.
  
  *Allegro – Adagio – Allegro*
  
  D-Ds Mus. ms 353/2.
  
  KatGro 849.
  
  St. Bl.
  
  ➢ Moeck, 1960.

- *Concerto* [F major] (i). R., 2 V., Bc.
  
  *Moderato – Largo – Allegro*
  
  D-KA Mus. Hs. 181.
  
  KatGro 729 – though misidentified as a flute concerto.
  
  ➢ Moeck, 1966.

- *Concerto* [F major] (ii). R., 2 V., Bc.
  
  *Allegro – Andante – Vivace*
  
  D-KA Mus. Hs. 181.
  
  KatGro 730 – though misidentified as a flute concerto.

Graupner, Johann Christoph (1683–1760)

- *Concerto a Flute a bec...* [F major]. R., 2 V., Va., C., Bc.
  
  *Allegro – Andante – Allegro*
  
  D-Ds Mus.ms. 411/32.
  
  KatGro 1437.
  
  St. Bl.
  

- *Ouverture a Flute a bec...* [F major]. R., 2 V., Va., C.
  
  *Overture – La Speranza, Tempo giusto - Air en Gavotte – Menuet – Air – Plaisanterie*
  
  D-Ds Mus.ms 464/65.
  
  KatGro 1064.
  
  St. Bl.
  
  ➢ Facsimile editions of both concerto and overture published by Fac-Simile Jean-Marc Fuzeau, 1995.
Heinichen, Johann David (1683–1729)

- ‘Concerto: a 8’ [C major]. 3 R., 2 V. rip., Va., C., Bc.
  Allegro – Pastorell – Adagio – Allegro assai
  D-DS Mus. ms. 240/3 (Seibel 211).
  KatGro 1066.
  St. Bl.

- ‘Concerto à 2 Violini à Flauti...’. 2 V. or 2 R., 2 Ob., 2 Va., Bc.
  Andante e staccato – Vivace – Largo – Allegro
  D-DS Mus. ms. 240/6 (Seibel 215).
  St. Bl.

Linike, Johann Georg (1680–1737)

- Concerto (G major). R. (or TrF.), 2 V., Va., C., Bc.
  Allegro – Loure – Allegro
  D-SWl Mus. 3426.
  KatGro 237.
  St. Bl.
  ➢ Noetzel, 1962.

- ‘Concerto a 5’ (G major). 2 R., 2 TrF., Vc. *
  Largo – Allegro – Adagio – Allegro
  ➢ Kunzelmann, 1999.

Magini, Francesco (c. 1670–1714)

- ‡ Concerto [F major]. 2 R., 2 V., Bc.
  ‘Catalogus Musicus’ – Limburg, 1750 [see Appendix B].
  KatGro 2256.
Mancini, Francesco (1672–1737)

- **Sonata Prima** [C minor]. R., 2 V., Vc., Bc.
  Moderato – Grave – Moderato - Allegro
  Manoscritto di Napoli, 1725. I-Nc (38.3.13).
  KatGro 506.
  St. Bl.
  ➢ Ut Orpheus, 1995.

- **Sonata Quinta** [G major]. R., 2 V., Vc., Bc.
  Allegro – Largo – Fuga: Allegro – Larghetto - Allegro
  Manoscritto di Napoli, 1725. I-Nc (38.3.13).
  KatGro 575.
  St. Bl.
  ➢ Ut Orpheus, 1997.

- **Sonata Sesta** [D minor]. R., 2 V., Vc., Bc.
  Amoroso – Allegro – Largo - Allegro
  Manoscritto di Napoli, 1725. I-Nc (38.3.13).
  KatGro 393.
  St. Bl.
  ➢ Ut Orpheus, 1997.

- **Sonata Ottava** [C minor]. R., 2 V., Vc., Bc.
  Vivace – Andante staccato – Fuga: Allegro – Largo - Allegro
  Manoscritto di Napoli, 1725. I-Nc (38.3.13).
  KatGro 551.
  St. Bl.
  ➢ Ut Orpheus, 1997.

- **Sonata Decima** [B-flat major]. R., 2 V., Va., Vc.
  Larghetto – Allegro – Largo - Allegro
  Manoscritto di Napoli, 1725. I-Nc (38.3.13).
  KatGro 421.
  St. Bl.
  ➢ Ut Orpheus, 1997.
• **Sonata Decima Terza** [G minor]. R., 2 V., Vc., Bc.  
*Largo – Fuga – Largo - Spiritoso*  
Manoscritto di Napoli, 1725. I-Nc (38.3.13).  
KatGro 858.  
St. Bl.  
➤ Ut Orpheus, 1997.

• **Sonata Decima Quarta** [G minor]. R., 2 V., Va., Vc.  
*Comodo – Fuga: Allegro – Larghetto – Allegro*  
Manoscritto di Napoli, 1725. I-Nc (38.3.13).  
KatGro 761.  
St. Bl.  
➤ Ut Orpheus, 1997.

• **Sonata Decima Sesta** [F major]. R., 2 V., Vc., Bc.  
*Affetuoso – Fuga – Un poco andante - Allegro*  
Manoscritto di Napoli, 1725. I-Nc (38.3.13).  
KatGro 862.  
St. Bl.  
➤ Ut Orpheus, 1997.

• **Sonata Decima Settima** [A minor]. R., 2 V., Vc., Bc.  
*Allegro – Andante – Spiritoso – Largo - Allegro*  
Manoscritto di Napoli, 1725. I-Nc (38.3.13).  
KatGro 866.  
St. Bl.  
➤ Ut Orpheus, 1997.

• **Sonata Decima Ottava** [F major]. R., 2 V., Vc., Bc.  
*Largo – Fuga – A tempo giusto - Allegro*  
Manoscritto di Napoli, 1725. I-Nc (38.3.13).  
KatGro 979.  
St. Bl.  
➤ Ut Orpheus, 1998.

• **Sonata Decima Nona** [E minor]. R., 2 V., Vc., Bc.  
*Allegrissimo – Largo – Fuga – Moderato - Allegro*  
Manoscritto di Napoli, 1725. I-Nc (38.3.13).  
KatGro 550.  
St. Bl.  
➤ Ut Orpheus, 1998.
• *Sonata Vigesima* [C major]. R., 2 V., Vc., Bc.
  *Comodo – Allegro – Lento - Allegro*
  Manoscritto di Napoli, 1725. I-Nc (38.3.13).
  KatGro 1082.
  St. Bl.
  ➢ Ut Orpheus, 1998.

**Marcello, Alessandro (1669–1747)**

• ‘*Concerto di Flauti*’ [G major]. 7 R., 2 V., 2 Va., Vc.
  *Andante – Allegro – Presto*
  I-Vnm Mss. It.IV.573.
  St. Bl.

**Mele, Giovanni Battista (b. 1693/1694–d. after 1752)**

• *Sonata Decima Quinta* [F major]. R., 2 V., Vc., Bc.
  *Andante – Allegro – Adagio - Allegro*
  Manoscritto di Napoli, 1725. I-Nc (38.3.13).
  KatGro 861.
  St. Bl.
  ➢ Ut Orpheus, 1997.

**Montanari, Antonio (1676–1737)**

• ‡ [‘Montenari’]. *Concerto [B-flat major]*. Ft., 2 V., Va., Vc.
  *Breitkopf catalogue, 1763.*
  However, in the Universitätsbibliothek in Rostock, there is a manuscript of a concerto in B-flat major with the same musical incipit as the Breitkopf catalogue, but by ‘Di: Hendel’. In Chapter 3, I note that there are clear stylistic features of Montanari, and this is most likely a concerto by Montanari rather than Händel:

• ‘*Concerto à 4... di Sig’ Hendl.*’ [B-flat major]. Ft., 2 V., Vc.
  *Allegro – Adagio – Allegro*
  D-Rou Mus.Saec.XVIII:33.10.
Pepusch, Johann Christoph (1667–1752)

‘VI Concerts a 2 Flûtes à Bec, 2 Flûtes Traversieres, Haubois ou Violons & Basse Continue… VIIIème Ouvrage. (Jeanne Roger, 1718).

- **Concerto I** [F major]. 2 R., 2 TrF., Ob. or V., Bc.
  * Largo – Allegro – Adagio – Allegro
  St. Bl.

- **Concerto II** [G major]. 2 R., 2 TrF., Ob. or V., Bc.
  * Vivace – Grave – Allegro
  St. Bl.

- **Concerto III** [F major]. 2 R., 2 TrF., Ob. or V., Bc.
  * Vivace – Largo - Allegro
  St. Bl.

- **Concerto IV** [F major]. 2 R., 2 TrF., Ob. or V., Bc.
  * Largo – Allegro – Adagio - Allegro
  St. Bl.

- **Concerto V** [C major]. 2 R., 2 TrF., Ob. or V., Bc.
  * Largo – Allegro – Largo – Allegro
  St Bl.

- **Concerto VI** [F major]. 2 R., 2 TrF., Ob. or V., Bc.
  * Largo – Allegro – Adagio - Allegro
  St. Bl.

  ➢ All concertos published by Amadeus, 1984.

Prowo, Pierre (1697–1757)

- ‘**Concerto a 6’** [G major]. 2 R., 2 Ob., 2 Bsn., Bc. *
  * Allegro – Adagio – Allegro
  D-SW1 Mus. 4314.

- ‘**Concerto a 6’** [F major]. 2 R., 2 Ob., 2 Bsn., Bc. *
  * Allegro – Adagio – Allegro
  D-SW1 Mus. 4315.
• ‘Concerto a 6’ [C major]. 2 R., 2 Ob., 2 Bsn., Bc.
  Adagio – Allegro – Grave – Allegro
  D-SWl Mus. 4316.
  St. Bl.

• ‘Concerto a 6’ [F major]. 2 R., 2 Ob., 2 Bsn., Bc. *
  Allegro – Adagio – Allegro
  D-SWl Mus. 4317.

• ‘Concerto a 6’ [C major]. 2 R., 2 Ob., 2 Bsn., Bc. *
  Allegro – Adagio - Allegro
  D-SWl Mus. 4318.

• ‘Concerto a 6’ [C major]. 2 R., 2 Ob., 2 Bsn., Bc. *
  Adagio – Allegro – Allegro
  D-SWl Mus. 4319.

Ratzemberger, Giorgio (fl. 1719)

• ['Racemberger à Roma]. Concerto [B-flat major]. Ft., 2 V., Bc. [Recorder part missing]. *
  Allegro – Andante - Allegro
  S-Skma FbO-R.
  KatGro 311 – though misidentified as for piccolo flute.

Reutter, Karl Georg (1656–1738)

• Ciaccona [F major]. R., Bsn. 2 V., 2 Ob., 2 Va., Bc. *
  D-WD Ms. 726.
Sammartini, Giuseppe (1695–1750)

- ‘Concerto a piu Istrumenti per la Fluta’ [F major].
  Allegro – [2nd mov.] – Allegro assai
  S-Skma FbO-R.
  KatGro 297.
  St. Bl.
  - Schott, 1984; Amadeus, 1985.

Sarro, Domenico Natale (1679–1744)

- Sonata Undecima [A minor]. R, 2 V., Va., Bc.
  Largo – Allegro – Larghetto – Spiritoso
  Manoscritto di Napoli, 1725. I-Nc (38.3.13).
  KatGro 1057 (as ‘Sarri’).
  St. Bl.
  - Ut Orpheus, 1997.
- ‘Concerto con VV: e Flauto e Basso’ [D minor]. R., 2 V., Bc. *
  Amoroso – Adagio – Allegro

Scarlatti, Allessandro (1660–1725)

‘Sinfonia… di Concerto grosso’

- Sinfonia Prima [F major]. 2 R., 2 V., 2 Va., Bc.
  Allegro – Adagio – Allegro – Adagio – Allegro
  KatGro 193.
  St. Bl.
  - Bärenreiter, 1954.
- [Sinfonia Seconda] ‘Concertate Con li ripieni’ [D major]. R., Tr., 2 V., Va., Bc
  Spiritoso – Adagio – Allegro – Adagio – Presto
  KatGro 219.
  St. Bl.
  - Bärenreiter, 1968.
- **Sinfonia Terza** [D minor]. R., 2 V., Va., Bc.
  *Vivace – Adagio – Andante – Adagio – Allegro*
  KatGro 484.
  St. Bl.

- **Sinfonia Quarta** [E minor]. R., Ob., 2 V., Va., Bc.
  *Vivace – Adagio – Allegro – Adagio - Allegro*
  KatGro 266.
  St. Bl.

- **Sinfonia Quinta** [D minor]. 2 R., 2 V., Va., Bc.
  *Spiritoso e staccato – Adagio – Allegro – Adagio – Allegro assai*
  KatGro 869.
  St. Bl.
    - Bärenreiter, 1954.

- **Sinfonia Sesta** [A minor]. R., 2 V., Va., Bc.
  *Vivace – Adagio – Allegro – Adagio - Allegro*
  KatGro 533.
  St. Bl.

- **Sinfonia Settima** [G minor]. 2 R., 2 V., Va., Bc.
  *Moderato – Moderato – Grave - Allegro*
  KatGro 534.
  St. Bl.

- **Sinfonia Ottava** [G major]. R., 2 V., Va., Bc.
  *Allegretto – Adagio – Allegro – Adagio - Vivace*
  KatGro 2198.
  St. Bl.
- [Sinfonia Nona] [G minor]. R., 2 V., Va., Bc.
  Vivace – Adagio – Moderato – Adagio – Allegretto - Menuetto
  KatGro 2199.
  St. Bl.

- [Sinfonia Decima] [A minor]. R., 2 V., Va., Bc.
  Vivace – Adagio – Allegro – Adagio - Allegretto
  KatGro 2200.
  St. Bl.

- [Sinfonia Undecima] C major]. R., 2 V., Va., Bc.
  Spirituoso – Lento – Allegro – Adagio - Allegro
  KatGro 2201.
  St. Bl.

- [Sinfonia Duodecima] [C minor]. R., 2 V., Va., Bc.
  Adagio e staccato – Andante giusto – Adagio - Andante
  KatGro 539.
  St. Bl.
    ➢ Bärenreiter, 1970.

- Sonata Settima [D major]. R., 2 V., Vc., Bc.
  Allegro – Adagio – Fuga – Largo - Allegro
  Manoscritto di Napoli, 1725. I-Nc (38.3.13).
  KatGro 471.
  St. Bl.
    ➢ Ut Orpheus, 1997.

- Sonata Nona [A minor]. R., 2 V., Vc., Bc.
  Allegro – Largo – Fuga – Largo – Allegro
  Manoscritto di Napoli, 1725. I-Nc (38.3.13).
  KatGro 476.
  St. Bl.
    ➢ Ut Orpheus, 1997.
• *Sonata Duodecima* [C minor]. R., 2 V., Vc., Bc.
  *Moderato – Fuga – Largo – Andante* - *Andante*
  Manoscritto di Napoli, 1725. I-Nc (38.3.13).
  KatGro 470.
  St. Bl.
  ➢ Ut Orpheus, 1997.

• *Sonata Vigesima Prima* [A minor]. R., 2 V., Vc., Bc.
  *Andante – Allegro – Veloce (Lento) – Allegro*
  Manoscritto di Napoli, 1725. I-Nc (38.3.13).
  KatGro 477.
  St. Bl.
  ➢ Ut Orpheus, 1998.

• *Sonata Vigesima Seconda* [A major]. R., 2 V., Vc., Bc.
  *Allegro – Fuga – Adagio – Andante*
  Manoscritto di Napoli, 1725. I-Nc (38.3.13).
  KatGro 475.
  St. Bl.
  ➢ Ut Orpheus, 1998.

• *Sonata Vigesima Terza* [C major]. R., 2 V., Vc., Bc.
  *Adagio – Fuga – Adagio – Allegro*
  Manoscritto di Napoli, 1725. I-Nc (38.3.13).
  KatGro 469.
  St. Bl.
  ➢ Ut Orpheus, 1998.

• *Sonata Vigesima Quarta* [G minor]. R., 2 V., Vc., Bc.
  *Allegro – Fuga – Largo – Allegro*
  Manoscritto di Napoli, 1725. I-Nc (38.3.13).
  KatGro 473.
  St. Bl.
  ➢ Ut Orpheus, 1998.

• ‘*Sonata*’ [F major]. R., 2 V., Vc., C.
  *Spiritoso – Allegro – Grave – Allegro*
  D-MÜs SANT Hs 3957b (Nr. 5).
  KatGro 472.
• ‘Sonata’ [A major]. 2 R., 2 V., Bc.
  Grave – Allegro - Minuet
  D-MÜs SANT Hs 3957b (Nr. 7).
  KatGro 474.

Scheibe, Johann Adolph (1708–1776)

• Concerto [B-flat major]. R., 2 V., Bc.
  Allegro – Adagio – Poco Allegro
  B-Be MSM 5588.
  KatGro 1787.
  ➢ Moeck, 1958.

Schickhardt, Johann Christian (c. 1682–1762)

Six Concertos for 4 Flutes... (Walsh & Hare, 1719). Originally published in Amsterdam, by Roger in 1715: ‘VI Concerts à Quatre Flutes & Basse Continue. Dediez à Monsieur de Brandt Chambellan & Directeur General de la Musique de Sa Majesté le Roy de Prusse’.

• Concerto I [C major]. 4 R., Bc.
  Allegro – Adagio – Vivace – Allegro
  St. Bl.

• Concerto II [F major]. 4 R., Bc.
  Allegro – Vivace – Largo e Affetuoso – Allegro - Menuet
  St. Bl.

• Concerto III [D minor]. 4 R., Bc.
  Allegro – Adagio – Vivace – Allegro
  St. Bl.

• Concerto IV [E minor]. 4 R., Bc.
  Allegro – Largo – Allegro – Presto
  St. Bl.

• Concerto V [G major]. 4 R., Bc.
  Allegro – Adagio – Giga – Presto
  St. Bl.
• *Concerto VI [C minor]. 4 R., Bc.
  
  Vivace – Adagio – Rondeau – Allegro – Allegro – Menuet

St. Bl.
  
  ➢ All concertos published by Bärenreiter, 2012.

• ‘Concerto’ [G minor]. R., V., 2 Ob., 2 V. rip., Va., Vc., Bc.
  
  Allegro – Adagio – in poco Allegro – Vivace – Allegro – Allegro

S-Uu Instr. mus. i hs. 58:5.

St. Bl.
  
  ➢ Müller, 1963.

• ‘Concerto’ [F major]. R., V., Vc., 2 V. rip., 2 Ob., Va., Bc.

  Allegro – Vivace – Polonaise – Adagio – Allegro – Boure – Menuet – Vivace – Allegro – Allegro

S-Uu Instr. mus. i hs. 58:6.


Schultz, Johann Christoph (fl. 1729)

• ‘Concerto à 5’ [G major]. R., 2 V., Va., Vc., Bc.

  Allegro – Adagio – Vivace

D-SWl Mus. 4967.

KatGro 683.

St. Bl.

  ➢ Schott, 1969. However, the edition is attributed to the wrong Johann Christoph Schultz (c.1733-1813). See Chapter 9 for more details.

Simon, Martin (fl. 1728)

• *Concerto [C minor]. 2 R., Ob., Bc.

  Adagio – Allegro – Adagio – Allegro – Adagio – Allegro – Adagio – Vivace – Adagio

Stulick, Matthäus Nikolaus (d. 1732)

- ‡ Concerto [F major]. R., 2 V., Va., Bc.
  ‘Catalogus Musicus’ – Limburg, 1750 [see Appendix B].
  KatGro 2241.

- Concerto [C major]. R., Bsn., 2 V., Va., Vi., C. *
  Allegro – Largo – Allegro
  → Dolce, 2010.

Tartini, Giuseppe (1692–1770)

- Concertino [F major]. R., 2 V., Bc.
  Andante – Largo assai – Presto
  I-Nc Ms. 9936-9939.
  KatGro 418.
  → Carus-Verlag, 1995.

Telemann, Georg Philipp (1681–1767)

Solo Concertos

- Concerto [C major]. R., 2 V., Va., Bc.
  Allegretto – Allegro – Andante – Tempo di minuet
  D-Ds Mus.ms. 1033/23a (23b) [TWV 51:C1].
  KatGro 1470.
  St. Bl.

- Concerto [F major]. R., 2 V., Va., Bc.
  Affetuoso – Allegro – Adagio – Menuet 1 – Menuet 2
  D-Ds Mus.ms. 1033/34a (34b) [TWV 51:F1].
  KatGro 1469.
  St. Bl.
• ‘Concerto di Camera’ [G minor]
  Allegro – Siciliana – Bourree – Menuet
  D-Ds Mus. ms. 1033/49 [TWV 43:g3].
  KatGro 1461.
  St. Bl.

Concertouverturen

• ‘Ouverture’ [A minor]. R., 2 V., Va., Bc.
  Ouverture – Les Plaisirs – Air à l’Italien – Menuet 1 – Menuet 2 – Rêjouissance –
  Passepied 1 – Passepied 2 – Polonaise
  D-Ds Mus. ms. 1034/5. [TWV 55:a2].
  KatGro 478.
  St. Bl.
  ➢ Schott, 2000.

• ‘Ouverture’ [E-flat major]. FlP., 2 V., Va., Bc.
  Ouverture – Menuet 1 – Menuet 2 – Sarabande – Bourrée 1 – Bourée 2 – Passepied –
  Gavotte - Gigue
  D-Ds Mus. ms. 1034/14. [TWV 55:Es2].
  KatGro 2191.
  St. Bl.
  ➢ Prima la musica, 2009.

Double Concertos

• Concerto [E minor]. R., TrF., 2 V., Va., Vl., Bc.
  Largo – Allegro – Largo – Presto
  D-Ds Mus. ms. 1033/84. [TWV 52:e1].
  KatGro 664.
  St. Bl.
  ➢ Bärenreiter, 2005; Amadeus, 2005.

• Concerto [A minor]. R., Va da Gamba., 2 V., Va., Bc.
  [1st mov.] – Allegro – Dolce – Allegro
  D-Ds Mus. ms. 1033/59. [TWV 52:a1].
  KatGro 535.
  St. Bl.
• ‘Concerto à 6’ [F major]. R., Bsn., 2 V., Va., Bc.

  Largo – Vivace – Grave – Allegro

  D-Ds Mus. ms. 1033/32. [TWV 52:F1].

  KatGro 1062.

  St. Bl.


• Concerto [A minor]. 2 R., 2 V., Va., Bc.

  Gravement – Vistement – Largement – Vivement

  D-DI Mus.2392-O-20. [TWV 52:a2].

  KatGro 1468.

  St. Bl.

  ➢ Bärenreiter, 1962.

• Concerto [B-flat major]. 2 R., 2 V., Va., Bc.

  Grave – Vivace – Tendrement – Gayment

  D-Ds Mus. ms. 1033/87 and D-DI Mus.2392-O-19. [TWV 52:B1].

  KatGro 1061.

  St. Bl.

  ➢ Möseler Verlag, 1997.

Sonate auf Concertenart

• Concerto [G minor]. R., V., Va., Bc.

  Allegro – Adagio – Allegro

  D-DI Mus.2392-Q-42 (Q-82). [TWV 43:g4].


• Concerto [F major]. R., Hn., Vc.

  [1st mov.] – Loure – Tempo di menuet

  D-SWl Mus.5400/1. [TWV 42:F14].


• Concerto [G major]. R., Ob., V., Bc.

  Allegro – Grave – Allegro

  D-Ds Mus. ms. 1033/5. [TWV 43:G6].

  ➢ Amadeus, 2005.
• *Concerto* [A minor]. R., Ob., V., Bc.
  *Adagio – Allegro – Adagio – Vivace*
  D-Ds Mus. ms. 1033/6. [TWV 43:a3].

Telemann, Georg Philipp [disputed authorship]

• *Concerto* [G minor]. R., 2 V., Va., Vc., Bc.
  *Allegro – Adagio – Allegro*
  AT-OeSta / AVA FA Harrach HS 266.

Valentine, Robert (ca. 1680–1735)

• *Sonata Seconda* [B-flat major]. R., 2 V., Vc., Bc.
  *Adagio – Allegro – Adagio – Allegro*
  Manoscritto di Napoli, 1725. I-Nc (38.3.13).
  KatGro 596.
  St. Bl.
  ➢ Ut Orhpeus, 1995.

Vinci, Leonardo (c.1696–1730)

• *Concerto* [A minor]. R., 2 V., Bc.
  *Andante – Adagio – Allegro*
  US-CHH.
  KatGro 2324.
  ➢ Instant Harmony, 2011.
Vivaldi, Antonio (1678–1741)

Solo Concertos

- **Concerto** [C minor]. R., 2 V., Va., Bc.
  
  *Allegro non molto – Largo – [3rd mov.]*

  I-Tn Giordano.31, 374-385. [RV 441].

  KatGro 240.

  St. Bl.


- **Concerto** [F major]. R., 2 V., Va., Bc.
  
  *Allegro ma non molto – Largo e cantabile – Allegro*

  I-Tn Giordano.31, 347-352. [RV 442].

  KatGro 228.

  St. Bl.


- **Concerto** [C major]. Ft., 2 V., Va., Bc.
  
  *[1st mov.] – Largo – Allegro molto*

  I-Tn Giordano.31, 292-301. [RV 443].

  KatGro 1069.

  St. Bl.

  - Carus-Verlag, 2008; Ars Antiqua, 2011.

- **Concerto** [C major]. Ft., 2 V., Va., Bc.
  
  *Allegro non molto – Largo – Allegro molto*

  I-Tn Giordano.31, 272-281. [RV 444].

  KatGro 1068.

  St. Bl.


- **Concerto** [A minor]. Ft., 2 V., Va., Bc.
  
  *Allegro – Larghetto – [3rd mov.]*

  I-Tn Giordano.31, 433-443. [RV 445].

  KatGro 217.

  St. Bl.

  - Breitkopf, 2009; Ars Antiqua, 2011.


‘Chamber’ Concertos

- **Concerto** [C major]. R., Ob., 2 V., Bc.
  *Adagio – Largo – Allegro assai*
  I-Tn Giordano.31, 404-411. [RV 87].
  St. Bl.

- **Concerto ‘Del gardellino’ [D major].** R., Ob. or V., Bsn., Bc.
  *[1st mov.]* – *Largo – Allegro*
  GB-Mp Ms. 580 Ct. 51. [RV 90a].
  St. Bl.

- **Concerto [D major].** R., V., Bsn. or Vc.
  *Allegro – [2nd mov.] – Allegro*
  I-Tn Giordano.30, 41-46. [RV 92].
  St. Bl.
  ➢ Amadeus, 2009.

- **Concerto [D major].** R., Ob., V., Bsn., Bc.
  *Allegro – Largo – Allegro*
  I-Tn Giordano.31, 412-419. [RV 94].
  St. Bl.

- **Concerto ‘La Pastorella’ [D major].** R., Ob. (or V.), V., Bsn., Bc.
  *[1st mov.]* – *Largo – Allegro*
  GB-Mp Ms. 580 Ct. 51. [RV 95].
  St. Bl.
  ➢ Amadeus, 2011.

- **Concerto [G major].** R., Ob., V., Bsn., Bc.
  *[1st mov.]* – *[2nd mov.]* – *Allegro*
  I-Tn Giordano.31, 308-313. [RV 101].
  St. Bl.
  ➢ Amadeus, 2010.
• **Concerto** [G minor]. R., Ob., Bsn.
  *Allegro ma cantabile – Largo – Allegro non molto*
  I-Tn Giordano.31, 228-234. [RV 103].

• **Concerto** [G minor]. R., Ob., V., Bsn., Bc.
  *Allegro – Largo – Allegro*
  I-Tn Giordano.31, 302-307. [RV 105].
  St. Bl.

• **Concerto** [A minor]. R., 2 V., Bc.
  *Allegro – Largo – Allegro – Largo*
  I-Tn Giordano.31, 220-227. [RV 108].
  KatGro 211.
  St. Bl.

**Woodcock, Robert (1690–1728)**

*XII Concertos in Eight Parts. The first three for Violins and one Small Flute. The second three for Violins and two Small Flutes. The third three for Violins and one German Flute and the three last for Violins & one Hoboy. The proper Flute being nam’d to each Concerto.* (Walsh & Hare, 1727).

• **Concerto I** [E major]. Sf., 2 V., Bc.
  *Presto – Siciliana Largo – Allegro*
  KatGro 1311.
  St. Bl.

• **Concerto II** [A major]. Sf., 2 V., Bc.
  *Allegro – Adagio – Menuett I – Menuett 2*
  KatGro 1312.
  St. Bl.
• *Concerto III* [D major]. Sf., 2 V., Bc
  *Allegro – Siciliana – Vivace*
  KatGro 1313.
  St. Bl.

• *Concerto IV* [B minor]. 2 Sf., 2 V., Bc.
  *Presto – Largo – Allegro*
  KatGro 1314.
  St. Bl.

• *Concerto V* [D major]. 2 Sf., 2 V., Va., Bc.
  *Allegro – Largo – Presto*
  KatGro 1315.
  St. Bl.

• *Concerto VI* [D major]. 2 Sf., 2 V., Bc.
  *Vivace – Largo - Gavotta*
  KatGro 1316.
  St. Bl.

  ➢ Editions of all Woodcock concertos published by Doblinger, 2000.
  ➢ Facsimile editions of all twelve concertos (including concertos for other instruments), published by Alston, 2002.

**Zobell, [Johann Kaspar or Johann Conrad (fl. 1745)]**

• † *Concerto* [F major]. R., 2 V., Va., Bc.
  *‘Catalogus Musicus’ – Limburg, 1750 [see Appendix B]*
  KatGro 2245.

**Anonymous**

• *Suite* [G minor]. R., V., Bsn. *
  *Entrée – Menuett – Trio – Sarabande – Menuett – Capriccio – Gigue*

• *‘Concerto per Flauto…’* [C major]. R., 2 V., 2 V. rip., Va., Vc., C. *
  *Allegro – Grave – Allegro*
  US-Nyp JOG 72-29, Vol. 22 [*Harrach* collection].
• ‘Concerto per il flauto...’ [G major]. R., 2 R. rip., Bc. *
  Adagio – Allegro – Allegro
  AT-OeSta / AVA FA Harrach HS 266.

• Sonata Quarta [C major]. R., 2 V., Ve., Bc.
  Largo – Allegro – Largo – Allegro
  Manoscritto di Napoli, 1725. I-Nc (38.3.13).
  KatGro 547 - included in Gronefeld’s catalogue as by Francesco Barbella. See Ch. 5 for details.
  St. Bl.
    ➢ Ut Orpheus, 1996

• Concerto [F major]. R., 2 V., Va., B. [Recorder part missing]. *
  Allegro moderato – Adagio – Allegro
  D-DO Don Mus.ms. 1063.

• Concerto [F major]. 2 R., TrF., Ob., 2 V., 2 Hn., Bc. *
  Allegro – Gavotte – Aria – Menuette

• Concerto ‘Del S’ Italiano ’ [F major]. 2 R., Ob., 2 Hn., Bc. *
  Allegro – March – Adagio – Aria
  S-L Saml.Engelhart 419.

• ‡ Concerto [G major]. 4 R., Bc. *
  ‘Catalogus Musicus’ – Limburg, 1750 [see Appendix B].

• ‡ Concerto [A minor]. R., 2 V., Va., Bc.
  ‘Catalogus Musicus’ – Limburg, 1750 [see Appendix B].
  KatGro 2223

• ‡ Concerto [F major]. 2 R., 2 V., Bc. *
  ‘Catalogus Musicus’ – Limburg, 1750 [see Appendix B].
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