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A new collection of viola d’amore music from late 18th-century Bohemia

In 2013 Veronika Uhlířová identified an important manuscript of viola d’amore music in the Národní Muzeum (National Museum of Prague—Czech Museum of Music) in Prague. This manuscript was copied around 1800, and contains 26 solo works for viola d’amore bearing the title ‘Galanterie 26 / á / Viola d’Amour / von Joseph Fuchs und Franz Götz’. Unknown until Uhlířová’s discovery, these galanteries are an important part of an extraordinary collection of music for viola d’amore associated with Götz (1755–1815), including three multi-movement duos, two nocturnes, a double concerto, and a short primer or ‘fondamento’. The manuscripts, all of them at the Národní Muzeum, are in excellent condition and bear little or no sign of use. They are of immense significance to the history of this unusual instrument, and shine a bright light on an extraordinary but short-lived virtuoso school of viola d’amore playing in Bohemia and Moravia around 1800.

Myron Rosenblum’s article on the viola d’amore the New Grove Dictionary suggests that Carl Stamitz (1745–1801) was the primary composer for the instrument in the latter half of the 18th century, and Götz’s name is nowhere to be found in Harry Danks’s book on the viola d’amore—a study that has otherwise been a useful entry point for those wishing to learn more about the instrument. Götz’s works for the viola d’amore have remained largely outside of the historical narrative not because of any wilful negligence, but rather due to a variety of circumstances that contributed to their obscurity. According to Uhlířová, the manuscripts were copied by or associated with Václav Kralé (1756–1824), a little-known figure who was active in Prague as a choir director and violinist. It appears from the handwriting that each manuscript was copied all at once, rather than over a span of time. The manuscripts’ whereabouts remained conjectural until 1903, when the vicar of Kyšperk gave them to Ondřej Horňík, a prominent Prague collector who was also an organist and composer. After Horňík’s death in 1917, the manuscripts went to the King’s Museum (Museum Regni Bohemiae) and from there to the Czech National Museum, of which the Národní Muzeum is a part. Most of these manuscripts bear stamps of Albrecht Blumenzweig (a writer for a German-speaking Moravian newspaper around 1900 who lived in Olomouc), and Vincenz Micko (a Prague pianobuilder who lived from 1834 to 1913), but the nature of their relationship with the manuscripts remains unclear. Recent research on Götz has progressed rapidly thanks to Uhlířová’s work.

In this essay I place the ‘Galanteries’ manuscript in its historical context, arguing that the discovery of this remarkable collection invites a reassessment of the history of the viola d’amore during the late Classical period, tilting the centre of gravity away from Stamitz’s Mannheim towards Bohemia and Moravia.

I shed new light on Götz’s compositional collaborator, Josef Fuchs, about whom almost nothing is known, and on the pair’s relationship with the court of Kroměříž. Finally, I analyse some of the more remarkable qualities of the galanteries themselves, both in terms of their stylistic traits and technical elements.

Personalia

Born in Strašice, a small town east of Pilsen, Franz Götz originally planned to enter the Benedictine order, but decided instead on a career as a musician.
In the 1770s he made the acquaintance of Dittersdorf, and later served as Kapellmeister and violinist at the theatre in Brno for two years before being appointed Kapellmeister in Kroměříž in 1788. Götz’s patron, the Archbishop of Olomouc, Anton Theodor Colloredo von Waldsee-Mels (illus.1), had his administrative headquarters in the Moravian city of Olomouc but like his predecessors preferred to live in Kroměříž, some 45km to the south. The Kroměříž court that Götz joined was associated with the viola d’amore throughout the 18th century, and stimulated a vibrant musical tradition in Moravia while maintaining ties to Prague, Mantua and Vienna. In the 17th century the Bishop of Olomouc, Karl Liechtenstein-Castelcorno, amassed an enormous collection of manuscripts including many works by Biber and Schmelzer. Pavel Josef Vejvanovský (c.1639–93), who served the bishop as Kapellmeister, trumpeter and composer, copied many works in the bishop’s collection. In the court’s 1695 inventory, two violas d’amore are listed. Compiled shortly after the death of Karl Liechtenstein, the catalogue also includes a duo by Gottfried Finger, a composer and gambist associated with Olomouc and Kroměříž. This duo was probably written for two violas d’amore.

Interest in the viola d’amore endured throughout the 18th century, and three chamber works by Jan Kuzník (1716–86) feature the instrument; their manuscripts can all be found in Kroměříž. Thus if he had not already known about the viola d’amore, Götz would have almost certainly have encountered it soon after he took up his position in Kroměříž.

Though he probably spent most of his time at the Kroměříž court, Götz travelled to Prague on several occasions. One especially noteworthy journey was his attendance at the coronation of Leopold II in 1790. There, Götz met W. A. Mozart and Salieri, who, according to G. J. Dlabacz, ‘were astounded at his excellent musicianship and compositions, and strongly encouraged him in the development of his zeal to spread his art’. Götz’s fame as a viola da gamba player stemmed from the celebrated performances he gave in 1792 for the coronation of Franz II in Prague. Dlabacz reported that Götz had composed a great number and variety of works for the gamba. However, Jiří Sehnal speculates that Dlabacz may have meant ‘viola d’amore’ instead of ‘viola da gamba’, since Götz’s gamba music has never surfaced—apart from one obbligato part in a soprano aria. Nevertheless, it would be wise to approach Sehnal’s speculation with caution, as much of Götz’s music has been lost and he may very well have written compositions for the viola da gamba.

In 1794 Götz unsuccessfully applied for the post of Kapellmeister at the cathedral of Olomouc. Sehnal surmises that Götz’s decision to apply for the Olomouc position was not necessarily a financial one, but rather because in Kroměříž, the composer was occasionally obliged to perform duties outside his musical work, such as serving the court as a valet. On his death in 1815, Götz left an unusually valuable library of music worth 150 florins, which was more than three times the value of the archbishop’s own large musical collection.
Götz’s collaborator, Joseph Fuchs (or Fux), is a more enigmatic personality. He is difficult to pin down since many musicians in Austria and Bohemia had that name, and writers of the time were often themselves uncertain about his identity. Dorothea and Michael Jappe suggest that Fuchs was one of Götz’s orchestral colleagues; they hypothesize that Götz’s concerto for two violas d’amore was written with his colleague in mind as the second player. This conjecture seems speculative, however, and furthermore if Fuchs was indeed Götz’s orchestral partner, it might not have been at the Kroměříž court, since most sources put him either in Prague or Vienna; Sehnal (who spells Fuchs’s name ‘Fux’) also notes that this name does not appear anywhere in the archbishop’s register books. Nevertheless, Fuchs apparently had an interest in the viola d’amore and the Kroměříž court. A solo viola d’amore concerto in D major with the dedication ‘Dem Kardinalen und Olmützer Fürst Erzbischöfeng: Coloredo im Jahr 1796’ is attributed to Fuchs. A short set of variations for two violins in Kroměříž is attributed to ‘signor Fuchs’, and written on paper from Vienna from the 1790s. This virtuoso piece contains many of the same advanced techniques as the galanteries, and so it is quite likely that it was written by the same Fuchs.

The instrument

Judging by the music they composed, both Fuchs and Götz excelled at playing the viola d’amore and had an intimate knowledge of its idiosyncrasies. But what did ‘viola d’amore’ mean to them, and what kind of an instrument would musicians in the 18th century have known?

The viola d’amore is held on the shoulder, usually has a flat back and sloping shoulders like a viola da gamba, and originally employed a set of wire playing strings. Later in the 18th century, the instrument was often strung with gut strings and metal sympathetic strings. These resonating strings lie beneath the playing strings, and pass through a tunnel under the fingerboard. During the first few decades of the 18th century, sympathetic strings were increasingly associated with the viola d’amore until they became ubiquitous. Over the course of the century the number of playing strings on the viola d’amore gradually increased to seven, whereas the number of sympathetic strings varied from six to more than twelve. Instruments with more than seven sympathetic strings were somewhat unusual and often unwieldy. Joseph Anton von Riegger (1742–95), a lawyer and historian who lived in Prague after 1778, divided stringed instruments into two groups based upon whether they employed gut strings or metal strings. Without specifically saying that it had sympathetic strings, he categorized the viola d’amore as a hybrid since it had both types. The topos of love was strongly associated with the instrument, and most often one sees flames cut in the top instead of the f-shaped sound-holes more common on the violin, and a blindfolded cherub instead of a scroll.

Along with its shape, strings and sound-holes, an important distinguishing characteristic of the viola d’amore is that its tuning was highly variable. Although the instrument was often tuned in D major, tuning was frequently adjusted to fit a particular context. Because there is no one tuning for the viola d’amore, the term ‘scordatura’ is generally applicable. While many composers specified how the playing strings were tuned, the tuning of the sympathetic strings was not usually indicated. Even though many pieces were composed specifically for it, the viola d’amore was often an auxiliary instrument; it provided an unusually soft and sweet sound that is difficult to achieve on any other instrument. Dilettantes, professional musicians and aristocrats played the viola d’amore. Wealthy patrons sometimes commissioned highly ornamented instruments—one such example in the collection of the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna has an astonishing amount of ivory and ebony decoration on its fingerboard, tailpiece, ribs and back.

The survival of the viola d’amore into the late 18th century certainly owes something to its easy adaptability into an Empfindsam culture that, as Annette Richards writes, valued ‘inwardness, melancholy and solitude’. It is possible to think of the viola d’amore as the string player’s clavichord, an instrument whose ‘softness of tone allowed for performances that were both expressive and remarkably intimate’. The Czech artist Jan Kupec (or Johann Kupetzky, 1667–1740) even painted a portrait of a young lady holding a viola d’amore while playing a clavichord (illus.2). Indeed, Schubart’s poetic suggestion that by playing the clavichord, one might ‘improvise by
2 Jan Kupecký (Johann Kupetzky, 1667–1740), portrait of a young woman at a clavichord, with a viola d’amore (1720s); possibly Maria Helena Sabina Imhoff (1698–1727) (95 × 74 cm, Museum of Fine Arts, Budapest, Inventory No. 53.398)
the light of the moon,' or ‘celebrate the evenings of spring’ seems strikingly similar to Leopold Mozart’s observation that the viola d’amore ‘sounds exceptionally charming in the stillness of the evening.’

The galanteries
Although a few of the galanteries could have been performed by less-experienced musicians, none are altogether trivial. The ordering of the pieces in the manuscript is curious and may give the impression of some haphazardness, even though the manuscript itself is carefully and clearly copied. The manuscript’s accuracy is particularly noteworthy—especially given the large variety of tunings called for—because many copies of viola d’amore music contain mistakes. While many galanteries are grouped by key, the procedure is not consistent over the whole collection. Nor are the galanteries always arranged according to their scordatura, though once again some are grouped together in clusters (see Table 1). There is only a vague sense that the technical difficulty increases towards the end of the collection, and plenty of evidence to the contrary: Galanterie no.7 begins with a virtuoso ascending run in semiquavers spanning no fewer than four octaves (ex.1), and contains much more technical material later on. On the other hand, Galanterie no.23 returns to bagatelle-like simplicity and brevity (ex.2). Without any doubt the last two galanteries (no.25 and no.26) function as virtuoso capstones for the set. No.25 is a sizable rondo; no.26 merits special commentary below.

Table 1 ‘Galanterie 26 / á / Viola d’Amour / von Joseph Fuch[s] und Franz Götz’ (Prague, Národní Muzeum (National Museum of Prague—Czech Museum of Music), Ms. x.liv-A-440): list of contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Tuning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fuchs</td>
<td>G major</td>
<td>Adagio</td>
<td>d’’’ a’’ f’’’ d’’ a d G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fuchs</td>
<td>G major</td>
<td>Menuetto</td>
<td>d’’’ a’’ f’’’ d’’ a d G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Fuchs)</td>
<td>F major</td>
<td>Adagio</td>
<td>d’’’ a’’ f’’’ d’’ a d A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(Fuchs)</td>
<td>F major</td>
<td>Menuetto</td>
<td>d’’’ a’’ f’’’ d’’ a d G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(Fuchs)</td>
<td>B♭ major</td>
<td>un poco Adagio</td>
<td>d’’’ a’’ f’’’ d’’ a d B♭</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Fuchs)</td>
<td>B♭ major</td>
<td>Menuetto</td>
<td>d’’’ a’’ f’’’ d’’ a d B♭</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(Fuchs)</td>
<td>B♭ major</td>
<td>Allegro molto</td>
<td>d’’’ a’’ f’’’ d’’ a d B♭</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Götz</td>
<td>A major</td>
<td>Andante molto</td>
<td>d’’’ a’’ f’’’ d’’ a c4 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fuchs</td>
<td>A major</td>
<td>Menuetto</td>
<td>d’’’ a’’ f’’’ d’’ a c4 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>(Fuchs)</td>
<td>B♭ major</td>
<td>Polonese</td>
<td>d’’’ a’’ f’’’ d’’ b♭ d B♭</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>(Fuchs)</td>
<td>E♭ minor</td>
<td>Lamentabile</td>
<td>d’’’ a’’ f’’’ d’’ a d A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Götz</td>
<td>E♭ major</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>d’’’ a’’ f’’’ d’’ a d A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Fuchs</td>
<td>A♭ major</td>
<td>Adagio</td>
<td>d’’’ a’’ f’’’ d’’ a d A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>(Fuchs)</td>
<td>A♭ major</td>
<td>Menuetto</td>
<td>d’’’ a’’ f’’’ d’’ a d A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Götz</td>
<td>A♭ major</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>d’’’ a’’ f’’’ d’’ a d A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>(Götz)</td>
<td>D major</td>
<td>Andante</td>
<td>d’’’ a’’ f’’’ d’’ a d A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>(Götz)</td>
<td>D major</td>
<td>Menuetto. Moderato</td>
<td>d’’’ a’’ f’’’ d’’ a d A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>(Götz)</td>
<td>A major</td>
<td>Adagio</td>
<td>d’’’ a’’ f’’’ d’’ a d A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Fuchs</td>
<td>D major</td>
<td>a la Polaca</td>
<td>d’’’ a’’ f’’’ d’’ a d A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Götz</td>
<td>D major</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>d’’’ a’’ f’’’ d’’ a d A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Fuchs</td>
<td>G major</td>
<td>Adagio</td>
<td>d’’’ a’’ f’’’ d’’ a d A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Götz</td>
<td>G major</td>
<td>Menuetto</td>
<td>d’’’ a’’ f’’’ d’’ a d A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Fuchs</td>
<td>E♭ major</td>
<td>Poco Andante</td>
<td>d’’’ a’’ f’’’ d’’ a d B♭</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>(Fuchs)</td>
<td>G major</td>
<td>Polonese. Moderato</td>
<td>d’’’ a’’ f’’’ d’’ a d A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Götz</td>
<td>G major</td>
<td>Rondo. Allegro</td>
<td>d’’’ a’’ f’’’ d’’ a d A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>(Götz)</td>
<td>B♭ major</td>
<td>Allegro (Flagioletto Solo)–Andante molto–Menuetto poco Allegretto–Trio</td>
<td>d’’’ b♭’ f’ b♭’ f d B♭</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the last decade of the 18th century a set of pieces called ‘Galanteries’ would have triggered many associations among musical minds. In Germany the term usually signified something that was ‘up to date’, or written in a lighter, less serious style, but its meanings were in fact quite diverse. As David Sheldon reminds us, some stylistic elements of the galant style were ‘outmoded tradition’ by the end of the 18th century; in the 1790s, it would have been thought of by many as ‘representing the last vestiges of an essentially Baroque musical conception’. Daniel Gottlieb Türk provided a useful frame of reference in 1791:

In the free (galant) way of writing, the composer does not always follow the grammatical rules so strictly. For example, he allows certain dissonances to enter unprepared; he gives the dissonances a longer duration than the consonances (something that does not occur in the strict style); with respect to modulations, he wanders about; he allows a variety of ornaments [Verzierungen]; allows more passing notes; in short, he works more for the ear and behaves—if I may be allowed to put it this way—less as a learned composer.

Türk’s observations provide a useful context in which to understand the Götz/Fuchs galanteries. While certainly not Baroque in their stylistic alignment, the collaborators undoubtedly aimed to please the ear with catchy tunes, unusual key signatures and distant modulations. The first of these ‘galant’ qualities can be found in Götz’s D major Galanterie no.20 (ex.3). Opening with a straightforward eight-bar A section, its B section hardly departs from the dominant; instead, a Minore section provides contrast. Both Maggiore and Minore sections are 8 + 12 bars long. Although Galanterie no.20 could come across as something possibly composed by a ‘less-learned composer’, Götz’s keen awareness of the possibilities for parallel 3rds and 6ths on the viola d’amore is evidence of a profound understanding of the instrument’s special qualities. The two quadruple-stop chords that begin the Minore lie particularly well for the fingers, and could not have been written by someone lacking knowledge of the scordatura’s inherent possibilities.

Fuchs’s Galanterie no.11 lies at the other extreme (ex.4). Written in the key of Eb minor, it is marked ‘Lamentabile’. The puzzling cadence at the end of the A section, in Bb major—the major dominant—aligns with Türk’s remark that the composer may ‘wander about’ with regard to modulations, and this observation seems even more aptly applied to the work in question when considering the
circuitous way in which B♭ major is attained. An abrupt turn back to E♭ minor (bar 15) stuns the ear and raises the expectation of even more surprising harmonic moves to come. Even the expressive leap to the high C in bar 20 is trumped a few bars later by aching chromaticism (bars 23–4). A formal imbalance in the reprise reflects its more intense rhetoric: whereas the A section and the bridge were both eight bars long, the reprise (starting at bar 17) is 13 bars. Certainly one of the more daring compositions in the collection despite its brevity, Galanterie no.11 clearly forms a pair with no.12, a work composed by Götz: not only do the two share key relationships, but they are also written on the same page in the manuscript. While Galanterie no.12 is more formally regular, starting in E♭ major, its B section is followed by a Minore in da capo form whose second section cadences in G♭ major (ex.5). The tonal connection between these two galanteries by Fuchs and Götz also suggests the close collaborative nature of the collection as a whole; it seems unlikely to be a coincidence, since the tonal juxtaposition found in both pieces does not appear in any other galanterie.

Appearing at the very end of the collection, Galanterie no.26 is the only piece of its kind in the set. It employs a unique scordatura (B♭ major), and it is the only one of the pieces that is subdivided into several movements (Allegro–Andante molto–Menuetto poco Allegretto/Trio). Marked ‘flagioletto solo’, its most remarkable element is the almost constant use of flageolet tones (or harmonics) in all but a small section of the first movement.37 If one bears this in mind then the reason
for the unusual scordatura, which specifies the tuning of the lower strings as well as the upper strings in B major triads, becomes obvious: it allows for more variety of pitch through natural harmonics. This piece would surely have produced a remarkable effect in its time, and it is surprising that we find no specific mention of it in any of the available sources—underlining the question of whether the galanteries existed primarily for private contemplation or public performance. However, we do have one astonishing eyewitness account of how Jakob Scheller (1759–1803), a virtuoso violinist with an international career, performed flageolets. Reporting on a concert near Leipzig in 1794, Gerber writes that during his performance of a Hoffmeister concerto,

[Scheller] played the entire first section [Satz] of the Rondo using flageolet tones, in a manner so clear, light and clean that it was impossible to distinguish it from the sound of organ pipes [Pfeifwerken].

Since Scheller spent time studying in Vienna and then several years working in Munich, Mannheim and Württemberg, it is possible that he came into contact with Fuchs or Götz at some point. If Fuchs and Götz got the idea of writing whole sections of music in flageolet tones from Scheller, they must themselves be credited for adapting the idea to the viola d’amore, for there is no evidence that Scheller ever played the instrument.

The first section of the first movement of Galanterie no.26 (ex.6) provides basic insight into Götz’s flageolet writing. Although mostly playable with natural harmonics, one note (repeated in bars 12 and 16) needs to be executed using an artificial harmonic. The rapid string crossings after the double bar (bars 10–17) coupled with the use of the artificial harmonic as well as the rapid alternation of fingers makes the passage unusually technically demanding. At the very end of the section (bar 30) the performer must reach for half-string harmonics in order to articulate the cadence, a clever way that Götz marks the end of the section both through harmonic and timbral resources. The harmonic content of this section centres exclusively around tonic and dominant, and so on the surface it can seem, in Türk’s words, ‘less learned’. Yet the proper execution of the flageolets requires formidable technical mastery to create nuance in the sound of the high, glittering harmonics, and demands exceptionally specialized knowledge and experience to get those sounds out of an instrument that is intrinsically fussy even when played in a ‘normal’ fashion. If the resultant musical surface is perhaps ‘less learned’, it can only come about through a process that is highly studied, so the challenge to the
performer is not only to achieve a high technical level but also to make that accomplishment appear simple and easy in its execution.

The second movement of Galanterie no. 26 provides further evidence of innovative technique (ex. 7). The use of artificial harmonics suggests that the performer had to lay his or her chin on the instrument in order to execute the necessary position changes properly, since shifting downwards while simultaneously holding two fingers on the fingerboard is nearly impossible without extra support. Associated with Louis Spohr, the chin rest was not invented until about 1820, but evidence from erosion patterns on many earlier stringed instruments suggests that some form of chin stabilization was used in more demanding technical passages. The need for chin stabilization in this galanterie underscores its high level of technical difficulty.

Throughout the collection of galanteries, Götz and Fuchs employ a hybrid approach to scordatura. They consistently keep the upper four strings tuned to the ‘familiar’ D major pitches, but freely alter the lower three strings to provide bass notes that match the principal key more closely (see Table 1). This permits some variety of tonal colour in different keys while making it easier to play structural chords and achieve virtuosic effects with *bariolage* technique: in a sense, it is a compromise solution. It also makes it easier to perform several galanteries in the same concert programme, because it is often less disruptive to the overall tuning of the instrument to alter the pitch of the lower strings than to do the same to the higher ones (since the lower strings are under lower tension). The exception to this general tuning scheme comes with Galanterie no. 26, which is the only piece in which the upper four strings are not in the usual D major configuration. Owing to the technical demands of the pieces, it is inconceivable that any galanterie could be played in a tuning other than the specified one; yet the way in which the tuning of bass strings varies offers further evidence that Götz and Fuchs had a considerable amount of practical experience with the instrument. Although this approach to scordatura is somewhat unusual in the history of the viola.
d’amore, it is very well suited to the kind of music in this collection.

Many other aspects of the ‘Galanterie’ manuscript are worth remarking upon. First, Götz and Fuchs often write ‘Harp;’ indicating that notes written as chords should be arpeggiated (see ex.2, Galanterie no.23, bars 5 and 13–15; ex.4, bar 9). The number of times this notation appears, as well as the variety of musical contexts in which it occurs, invites the performer to devise many different ways of realizing the effect. Another unusual sign is the diagonal slash that sometimes splits chords apart vertically (ex.2, bar 15; ex.4, bars 1 and 17). This notation can be found in much earlier music,

Ex.6 Götz, Galanterie no.26, first movement (opening)
including works by Biber. The slash indicates that a chord should be broken: in other words, that the notes below the slash should be played together and then the notes above should be played. Usually a chord is broken either because (1) it may not be playable or comfortable in one hand position, or (2) the chord itself may actually involve skipping over an entire string. A third important category of special indications in the manuscript relates to articulation marks. The frequent notation of staccato marks, often mixed with daggers, indicates a keen awareness of this important facet of performance: Haydn and Mozart differentiated between these strokes as well.

Götz and Fuchs provide a considerable number of fingering suggestions for the performer, offering a valuable insight into interpretative choices and instrumental technique in the late 18th century. Götz seems consistently averse to ‘barring’ the fingers across the strings when such an approach would technically be feasible (see illus.3, which shows the original scordatura notation, and the transcription in ex.8). Instead, he often calls for different fingers to be placed extremely close to one another. Many players today would find this approach risky, since the fingers are bunched up together in a way that many find uncomfortable and unreliable. Götz’s approach becomes more understandable if we keep in mind that he was using gut strings, which go out of tune very easily: Leopold Mozart’s comment that the viola d’amore ‘unfortunately suffers frequently from mis-tuning’ ought to be kept in mind. By using two different fingers instead of ‘barring’ them across two strings, the performer might gain better control over intonation when strings are slightly out of tune. Moreover, since some strings are tuned in 3rds, using two fingers instead of one also allows the performer more ability to tune this interval precisely.

While a performer ought to have a grasp of the technical, formal and musical aspects of these pieces, he

Ex.7 Götz, Galanterie no.26, second movement (bars 1–12; the remaining four bars are the same as bars 5–8)

Ex.8 Götz, Galanterie no.18, bars 18–20, transcription (compare bar 19 in illus.3)
or she needs to have the right kind of instrument as well. What is the ideal type of viola d'amore for this music? The instrument has just about as many shapes and sizes as makers; indeed, one of the delightful things about the instrument is exploring the many individual solutions that luthiers have found for solving the unique structural and aesthetic problems it poses.

First, an instrument with seven playing strings is absolutely necessary for playing any of these works. A six-string model, which is adequate for much early 18th-century music, is obviously incapable of playing the countless bass notes in these galanteries. Large instruments with long string lengths pose intractable problems, since the reach over to the bass strings is too great for all but the largest hands, and the galanteries often require playing on those low strings. Moreover, the level of virtuosity in many of the pieces demands a smaller instrument to facilitate more agile hand movements. I have had the most success on an instrument that has a string length of 350mm or less. Crucial also to the physical ease of performance is an instrument that has narrow bouts, since these will permit the hand to play more easily in the higher positions and cause less fatigue. Whether or not performers choose to use a chin rest is a question each individual player must decide, though as mentioned before it would be difficult to execute some of these galanteries without one.

As was typical in their day, Götz and Fuchs do not make any suggestions regarding the tuning of the sympathetic strings. It is difficult to generalize regarding the best way to tune these special resonant strings, since instruments vary so much and performers may want to play works in several different keys. In general, the sympathetic strings can simply be tuned according to the principal key, in such a way that the extra resonance they create suits the interpreter’s aesthetic goals. If one wishes to perform galanteries in more than one key in the same programme, different qualities of sympathetic resonance will only bring out the special qualities of each unique instrument and each key.

These newly uncovered solo works show that a few viola d'amore players had intimate familiarity with advanced idiomatic possibilities on this unusual instrument in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. Nevertheless, the viola d'amore plunged into relative obscurity around the time that the galanteries were written. This was not only because of the instrument’s inherent and significant physical challenges, but also perhaps because of the difficulty of notating music for it—especially virtuoso music such as that in the ‘Galanterie’ collection. Taken together, the physical discomfort involved in playing difficult music no less than the intellectual strain of figuring out what notes to play in the first place could not have attracted too many adherents. Curiously, the viola d'amore never disappeared so completely as instruments like the viola da spalla or the baryton, but Berlioz mentioned around 1840 that only one person in Paris played it. It is fascinating to consider what the history of the viola d'amore might have been in the 19th century if these works by Götz and Fuchs had enjoyed wider circulation. Further work could provide insight into the peculiar dissonance between the viola d'amore’s typical feminine gendering and the masculine aspect of virtuoso display, as well as the implications of using an instrument marked as an ‘alternative’ voice in an era of growing industrialization and utilitarianism, in which economic and societal pressures to conform were gaining currency.

Paul Miller is active both as a scholar and a performer of Baroque music. His writing on Karlheinz Stockhausen has appeared in Perspectives of New Music, Opera Quarterly, Music & Letters and other journals. A noted viola d’amore player, he has performed across the United States and Canada, from Boston to Hawai‘i. After receiving a PhD in Music Theory and a Master’s in viola performance from the Eastman School of Music, Dr Miller held positions at the University of Colorado in Boulder and at Cornell University. Currently he resides in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. lauprellim@gmail.com
The Galanterie manuscript measures $315 \times 220$ mm, and contains 24 pages of manuscript paper with a wrapper. It is written on similar paper to the double concerto, the nocturnes, and a very short ‘primer’ or ‘fondamento’, which briefly describes how to read and write for the instrument. The obscurity of the Galanteries manuscript may stem from the fact that it has a very different shelfmark from the other viola d’amore music in the Národní Muzeum. The watermarks (letters ‘VA’ and a half-moon with a face) are the same as are found on the Nocturnes manuscript (Prague, Národní Muzeum Ms. ix-e-84) and date from the end of the 18th century.


5. Černušák, Stědroň and Nováček, Československý hudební slovník osob a institucí, p.474.

6. The viola d’amore was also played in England, and Peter Holman lists a number of English performers. Among the Bohemian players known to London audiences was Christian Renatus von Zinzendorf, who died in London in 1752 (P. Holman, Life after death: the viola da gamba in Britain from Purcell to Dolmetsch (Woodbridge, 2010), p.151).

7. The archbishop, who held his post from 1777 until his death in 1811, played a role in the careers of many musicians. See, for example, A. Lattanzi, Luigi Gatti and Anton Theodor Colloredo, Archbishop of Olomouc, in Keine Chance für Mozart: Fürsterzbischof Hieronymus Colloredo und sein letzter Hofkapellmeister Luigi Gatti (1740–1817), ed. E. Neumayr and L. E. Laubhold (Lucca, 2013), pp.343–57. Jiří Sehnal also provides considerable information about the archbishop’s musical activities in his ‘Die Musikkapelle des Omlützer Erzbischofs Anton Theodor Colloredo-Waldsee’, in The Haydn Yearbook 10 (Eisenstadt, 1978), pp.132–50. Anton Theodor’s second cousin was none other than the Archbishop of Salzburg, Hieronymus von Colloredo, who was so notorious in his dealings with W. A. Mozart. (Anton Theodor was in fact invested as Arch bishop by Hieronymus.) Later in his life, Beethoven’s patron Archduke Rudolf assisted Archbishop Colloredo and became Archbishop of Olomouc himself in 1819.


9. J. Sehnal and J. Pešková, Caroli de Liechtenstein-Castelcorno Episcopi Olomucensis operum artis musicae collectio Cremsirii reservata (Prague, 1997), p.77. Biber’s famous trio sonata for two violas d’amore (no.7 in the Harmonia artifioso-arioso set) was probably written in Salzburg in the 1690s, after he left Kroměříž.

10. Finger’s piece, for two ‘violettas’, is found in a manuscript from the Sünching collection in Germany (Sünching, Schloss, Ms.12); Robert Rawson surmises that it was intended for an early version of the viola d’amore with five strings (R. G. Rawson, ‘From Olomouc to London: the early music of Gottfried Finger’ (PhD diss., Royal Holloway, University of London, 2002), pp.105–6). Such an instrument is characteristic of the early history of the viola d’amore; see K. Koeppe, ‘Viola d’amore’, in Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart, Sachteil, ix, pp.1562–72. A piece by Philipp Jakob Rittler (c.1637–90) for ‘violin, violetta and viola or alto trombone and harpsichord’ can be found in the Kroměříž archive (Kroměříž, Archibiskupský zámek, hudební sbírka, iv a 79).

11. Kroměříž, Archibiskupský zámek, hudební sbírka, iv a 211, iv a 212, and iv a 213.

12. ‘Selbst Mozart, Salieri, und andere grosse Meister bewunderten seine treffliche Spielart und Komposition, und ermunterten ihn allgemein zur Fortsetzung seines Eifers für die Ausbreitung der Tonkunst’; Gottfried Johann Dlabacz, Allgemeins historisches Kunstler Lexicon für Böhmen (Prague, 1815), p.482. Translations in this essay are my own unless otherwise indicated.


14. J. Sehnal, ‘Götz, Franz’, in Grove Music Online, www.oxfordmusiconline.com (accessed 14 July 2017). Sehnal based his hypothesis on the fact that the viola da gamba was a very expensive instrument at the time, and was therefore only rarely used in Moravia (personal communication).

15. Uhlířová, ‘Franz Götz’, pp.49, 69. The gamba part in this aria is not particularly virtuosic; Götz’s aria calls for viola or viola da gamba, and the two parts are largely the same.


Gerber’s entry on Fuchs indicates that in 1796 he was a violinist in the Viennese kaiserliche Hofkapelle; curiously, Gerber does not provide Fuchs’s first name, but it seems likely that Schönfeld’s Fuchs is not the same as Gerber’s, since one was a violinist and the other a keyboardist (Ernst Ludwig Gerber, ‘Fuchs, (…);’ in Neues historisch-biographisches Lexicon der Tonkünstler, part 2 (Leipzig, 1812–14), col.216). To make things even more complicated, Gerber suggested—though he was not sure—that his Fuchs was the same as one Peter Fuchs (Pietro Fux [Peter Fuchs], 1753–1831). Although Gerber cites several works by Peter Fuchs, none are for viola d’amore. (‘Fuchs, (…);’ col.218). We do know a Peter Fuchs, however, from Dittersdorf’s autobiography (Karl Ditters von Dittersdorf, Autobiography, trans. A. D. Coleridge (London, 1896), p.139), and Dittersdorf was also an acquaintance of Götz. Dlabacz also briefly refers to a Fuchs who is probably the aforementioned Peter Fuchs (Dlabacz, Allgemeins historisches Kunstler Lexicon, p.434). In 1788, J. A. von Riegger (who, like Gerber, omits Fuchs’s first name) wrote that ‘for about 20 years, Fuchs was one of the greatest violinists in Prague, and thereafter went to Hungary. His current residence is unknown’ (Joseph Anton von Riegger, ‘Versuch eines Verzeichnisses der vorzüglichsten Tonkünstler in oder aus Böhmen,’ in Materialien zur alten und neuen Statistik von Böhmen, vii (Prague and Leipzig, 1788), p.159). According to Sehnal, Fuchs described himself as a court musician in Olomouc, but no records could be found to confirm this (personal communication). In view of this, Peter Fuchs can probably be ruled out as the Fuchs who worked with Götz.

21 Vienna, Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde, Ms. ix6276. It is puzzling that the dedication is to ‘Cardinal’ Coloredo [sic], since the archbishop was not elevated to that rank until 1803 by Pope Pius VII. As if to muddle things even further, Harry Danks lists two separate composers with the name Fuchs: Giuseppe and Joseph (Danks, The viola d’amore, p.80). Dorothea and Michael Jappe suggest that these are one and the same composer. The British Museum catalogue lists a ‘Grand Concerto in B’ (Add. Ms. 31989), attributed to Johann Joseph Fux, whose dates are given as 1660–1741. This may be a misattribution, since the orchestration calls for two clarinets and three trumpets, an unusual orchestra in the early 18th century.
22 This manuscript bears the shelfmark a 2042 in Kroměříž, Arcibiskupský zámek, hudební sbírka. Jappe and Jappe list a ‘Fischer’ as the possible composer of a set of galanteries for viola d’amore and bass (Jappe and Jappe, Viola d’amore bibliographie, pp.60–61). Like Fuchs’s music for the d’amore, these works involve use of the upper positions and flagiolets. But they also include pizzicato, which is not a technique found in any of the Götz/Fuchs pieces.
23 Rachael Durkin surmises that the viola d’amore most likely descended from the baryton, and was originally a sort of treble viol restrung with wire; see Durkin, ‘The viola d’amore: its heritage reconsidered,’ Galpin Society Journal, lxvi (2013), pp.139–47.
24 Koeppe writes that five-stringed instruments with most of the characteristics of the viola d’amore but lacking sympathetic strings were known in Hamburg in the late 17th century; Tielke made such an instrument in 1690 (Lübeck, St Anne Museum, Inv. No.3587a) (see Koeppe, ‘Viola d’amore’). Filippo Bonanni was one of the first to write definitively of the viola d’amore’s metal resonating strings (Filippo Bonanni, Gabinetto armonica (Rome, 1723), p.110).
25 Koeppe writes that five-stringed instruments with most of the characteristics of the viola d’amore but lacking sympathetic strings were known in Hamburg in the late 17th century; Tielke made such an instrument in 1690 (Lübeck, St Anne Museum, Inv. No.3587a) (see Koeppe, ‘Viola d’amore’). Filippo Bonanni was one of the first to write definitively of the viola d’amore’s metal resonating strings (Filippo Bonanni, Gabinetto armonica (Rome, 1723), p.110).
Entire passages written solely in flageolet tones also appear in other galanteries, as well as in parts of Götz's duos, his nocturnes, and his double concerto.

For example, Paganini's instrument ('I Cannone', Giuseppe Antonio Guarnieri, 1743) has an enormous wear mark where the virtuoso's chin evidently eroded the varnish. This example is important because the instrument received very little use after Paganini's death—thanks to the efforts of the City of Genoa, which carefully preserved it for more than a century.


32 Leopold Mozart, Versuch einer gründlichen Violinschule, trans. E. Knocker (Oxford, 1985), p.112. There are several other intriguing connections between the viola d'amore and the clavichord, including one from the pen of Franz Anton von Weber, who wrote that the clavichord was the best keyboard instrument to accompany the viola d'amore (Weber, 'Abhandlung von der Viole d'Amore', Musikalische Real-Zeitung, xxxviii (23 August 1789), p.302).


34 Sheldon, 'The galant style revisited', p.269.

35 In der freyen (galanten) Schreibart befolgt der Tonsetzer die grammatischen Regeln nicht immer so strenge. Er last z. B. gewisse Dissonanzen unvorbereitet eintreten; er verlegt die Auflösung derselben in andere Stimmen, oder übergeht sie ganz; er giebt den Dissonanzen eine längere Dauer, als den Konsonanzen, (welches in der strengen Schreibart nicht statt findet;) er schweist ausserdem in Ansehung der Modulation aus; er erlaubt sich mancherlei Verzierungen; mischt mehrere durchgehende Töne ein; kurz, er arbeitet mehr für das Ohr, und tritt—wen ich so sagen darf—weniger als gelehrt scheinender Tonsetzer auf. Daniel Gottlieb Türk, Anweisung zum Generalbassspielen (Vienna, 1791), p.70.

36 Huberty's Lamantible (Huberty no.94), in C major, is a much less adventurous piece by comparison; see M. Rönez, trans. Carlos María Solare, 'Einführung zum Faksimile // Anton Huberty // Neu Method - Messige Viol d'Amore Stüke' (Stuttgart, 2008). Most writers in the late 18th and early 19th centuries viewed the key of E minor as something unusual and almost fearful. Writing in 1789, Schubart felt that the key conjured up 'feelings of the anxiety of the soul's deepest distress, of brooding despair, of blackest depression, of the most gloomy condition of the soup. Every fear, every hesitation of the shuddering heart, breathes out of horrible e-flat minor. If ghosts could speak, their speech would approximate this key' (quoted in R. Steblin, A history of key characteristics in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries (Ann Arbor, 1983), pp.122–3).

37 The use of harmonics in viola d'amore music was not unprecedented. Louis Toussaint Milandre's Methode facile pour la viole d'amour (Paris, 1782) shows how to play both natural and artificial harmonics, providing both a staff for the resulting sounding pitches and the fingering necessary to produce those sounds. Milandre even wrote several short pieces ('Airs en sons harmoniques') that were to be played with harmonics (pp.12–14).


39 Entire passages written solely in flageolet tones also appear in other galanteries, as well as in parts of Götz's duos, his nocturnes, and his double concerto.