



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

**Dolce Napoli: Approaches for performance**  
De Avena Braga, I.

**Citation**

De Avena Braga, I. (2015, July 2). *Dolce Napoli: Approaches for performance*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/33729>

Version: Corrected Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/33729>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/33729> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

**Author:** Avena Braga, I. de

**Title:** Dolce Napoli : approaches for performance - Recorders for the Neapolitan Baroque repertoire, 1695-1759

**Issue Date:** 2015-07-02

*I think that instruments from every period have effects and colors that cannot be reproduced on today's pianos – that compositions were always conceived with the instruments of their time in mind, and only on those can they achieve their full effect; played on today's instruments they sound at a disadvantage.*

Anton Rubinstein (1892)

## Chapter 4: The Artist's Choice: recorders for the Neapolitan Baroque repertoire

---

### 4.1 Drawing a map of possibilities

With the overtake of the Neapolitan government by the Austrian Habsburgs in 1707, Neapolitan works and composers began to be more widely known in the Austrian dominions of Bohemia, the Austrian Netherlands and Saxony. This becomes clear when we see the abundance of manuscripts, especially of sacred music, by composers such as Francesco Mancini and Domenico Sarro (as well as Francesco Durante and Nicola Fago) found in Belgium and in the Czech Republic.<sup>634</sup> This 'Habsburg music highway' lasted at least until 1734, when Naples regained independence; in this case a direct connection between Naples and these Habsburg-influenced northern territories was at a peak just at the time when the largest part of the Neapolitan repertoire for the recorder was being either published or copied (e.g. twelve Mancini sonatas of 1724, twenty-four miscellaneous concerti of c. 1725, two concerti of 1726 and 1728 by Nicolò Fiorenza and the many undated works in the collection of Count Aloys Harrach – who, as mentioned earlier, served in Naples between 1728 and 1733).<sup>635</sup>

The Galant style, "a simpler, more direct musical language"<sup>636</sup> which rejected "contrapuntal complexity and other intricacies of the past,"<sup>637</sup> is convincingly argued by Hertz to have its origins in works by composers such as Leonardo Vinci, Giovanni Battista

<sup>634</sup> Dietz details this when writing about Durante and the early spread of his music in these territories. Hanns-Bertold Dietz, "The Neapolitan School: Francesco Durante (1684–1755) - Aspects of Manuscript Dissemination, Misattributions, and Reception," *Música em Perspectiva: Revista do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Música da Universidade Federal do Paraná, Departamento de Artes* vol. 2, no. 2 (2009). pp. 7-30.

<sup>635</sup> See Chapter 2 and Appendix 2 for details.

<sup>636</sup> Daniel Hertz, *Music in European Capitals, The Galant Style, 1720–1780* (New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company, 2003). p. 999.

<sup>637</sup> Ibid.

Pergolesi and Johann Adolph Hasse, all of whom were trained in Naples.<sup>638</sup> This style spread to the north through Venice, “finding especially fertile ground in Dresden, where the musical establishment was closely tied to Venice, later to Naples.”<sup>639</sup> At that time, Italian composers and their works – and with them their musical style – were absorbed by the culture in Dresden and other Italianate cities in Germany. And with composers and music, other aspects of musical life also spread, including performers as well as instruments. It is thus quite possible to imagine a fluid exchange of a variety of instruments throughout these territories; and this fluidity makes it difficult to pinpoint the ‘appropriate instrument’ for the Neapolitan recorder repertoire.

The strong links between Naples and Venice around this time are also important for the repertoire in this study. These links existed thanks mainly to sacred music and opera: “[I]a presenza di musicisti veneziani a Napoli nel Settecento parte da Cristoforo Caresana che fa ancora parte – dopo oltre un quarantennio – dell’organico della Cappella Reale come organista nello “Stato dei Musicisti di Palazzo” del giugno 1702.”<sup>640</sup> Neapolitan *opera seria*, and the circulation of Neapolitan productions in Venice from especially the 1720s (but also the 1730s) was carried north by Venetian impresarios, in part due to the success of *opera buffa*.<sup>641</sup>

Considering the importance of Venice for the history of the recorder, and the role it played in the early eighteenth century in nurturing the publication and dissemination of a large corpus of music for that instrument, it is important to note that at least three of the Italian makers who were studied here had a foothold in Venice: Giovanni Maria Anciuti, N. Castel and Domenico Perosa. All three flourished within the years relevant to this study.

As already discussed, the presence of one recorder by Panormo and the magnificent Anonymous alto (Ano.ALT.01) believed to be of Neapolitan manufacture, do not by

---

<sup>638</sup> Ibid.

<sup>639</sup> Ibid.

<sup>640</sup> Translation by the present author: “The presence of Venetian musicians in Naples in the eighteenth century begins with Cristoforo Caresana, who is still a part – after more than forty years – of the workforce of the Chapel Royal in the “Stato dei Musicisti di Palazzo” in June 1702 as organist.” Marina Marino, “La musica sacra nel Settecento a Napoli,” in *Storia della musica e dello spettacolo a Napoli, Il Settecento*, ed. Francesco Cotticelli and Paologiovanni Maione, vol. II (Naples: Turchini Edizioni, 2009). p. 2.

<sup>641</sup> Although the connection between the sacred and the secular repertoires and their composers is not self-explanatory, it must be remembered that the musicians in Naples in the early eighteenth century were employed numerous times in multiple musical institutions, playing not only in private palaces but also in opera houses and various religious services. Therefore, even if the recorder is not always used in these three spheres, its players were there, and their movements allowed for the possibilities of exchange of instruments. On the Neapolitans in the Venetian opera scene of the eighteenth century, see Reinhard Strohm, “The Neapolitans in Venice,” in *Con che soavità, Studies in Italian Opera, Song, and Dance, 1580–1740*, ed. Iain Fenlon and Tim Carter (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995). pp. 249-274.

themselves attest to Neapolitan school of recorder making.<sup>642</sup> But the fact that Giovanni Panormo did make (at least) one recorder, makes it a model born out of the Neapolitan environment that nestled the composition of over ninety instrumental works, even though Panormo's recorder seems to be slightly anachronistic to the core period of the repertoire considered here.<sup>643</sup> It is *only one*, however, one which can be used as means of comparison to others, whatever the parameters may be. Furthermore, it seems improbable that this recorder would be *the* only one in a city where the recorder was intrinsic to private musical life. It is unlikely that Panormo's recorder was born out of his onetime inspiration or experimentation, without any prior examples for him to study, analyze, learn from, copy or develop.

I have previously outlined three main historical veins for the 'instrumentation' of the Neapolitan Baroque recorder repertoire: that which comes from a purely governmental influence (Habsburg territories), that which comes from the context of regular musical exchange with another Herculean music capital (Venice) and that which is born within the walls of the Parthenopean city. Other, lesser links, were also postulated in Chapter 3, leading us to England and, more remotely and hypothetically, to France and the Netherlands. All these avenues appear to offer a wide range of recorders to choose from for the performance of the Neapolitan Baroque repertoire: not only Panormo and the Anonymous recorders similar to Panormo (e.g. Ano.ALT.01) in their construction, but also instruments from Nuremberg (e.g. Jacob Denner), Venetian instruments by Castel or Perosa, and perhaps even Peter Bressan or Thomas Stanesby instruments from London.

We might also approach the question of instrument design from the other direction: considering the music and what it 'asks for' – what instruments are best suited to play this repertoire. With this in mind, let us review what has been presented in previous chapters in this regard.

In Chapter 1 I argued that the Italian recorders made in the Baroque period have unjustifiably been neglected. The construction of the majority of these instruments is significant in its quality, in both aesthetic and technological terms. No completely new

---

<sup>642</sup> See Chapter 1 and Appendix 1.

<sup>643</sup> A few details presented before should be recalled here: the fact that Perosa was paid in 1753 and 1754 for working on the recorders of the Pietà in Venice also indicates that recorders were still generally being used. Furthermore, in 1759, recorder music was still being copied in Naples (as seen by Man.SON.03b, and the four Pullj sonatas). It is highly plausible that Giovanni Panormo, the son of an instrument maker, could have been making instruments at an early age, even if still as an apprentice. It is not impossible therefore that his recorder (Pan.ALT.01) would be from the 1760s and thus contemporary to the 1759 copies of sonatas by Mancini and Pullj.

design feature was found in the instruments for which measurements are now available, neither was this expected prior to the study. They are consistent with instruments of other European recorder schools of the time, especially in the most significant feature: the bore. The shapes of the bores of the Italian Baroque recorders studied here are mostly similar to English instruments, although more conical; the Italian instruments show a truly 'standard' design, with a diameter size that falls midway between the very wide instruments of London and the very narrow ones of Nuremberg.

Nonetheless, the voicing of the Italian instruments merits discussion: elements of the voicing point to unusual ideas, which are unique in execution and attest to personal and independent solutions to the balancing act that is the making of any recorder. Anciuti's instruments, with their absence of chamfers, which Grassi apparently copied, are extreme examples. All the other Italian recorders share similar voicing features, with small nods to other recorder schools: Castel has even wider windows than English recorders, and the long undercutting of the labium of the Panormo alto is characteristic of German instruments such as those of Denner.

We also saw that some of the Anonymous instruments are so similar in their bore, either to other Anonymous (such as Ano.ALT.01 and Ano.ALT.02), or to indeed signed instruments (Ano.ALT.03, Ano.ALT.04 and the Perosa soprano and sopranino), and we cannot ignore the possibility that other instruments now considered Anonymous may, with further studies, turn out to be Italian.

Furthermore, a very coherent, repetitive design concept can be seen in the work of Anciuti. He took what might be called a 'factory' approach of uniformity in both the bore and voicing of his recorders; only the pitch varies. It also became evident that, concerning bore and voicing, the Grassi alto of Rome is strikingly similar to the Anciuti altos. This is further confirmation of the link between the two makers, corroborating the conclusion that Grassi apprenticed with Anciuti. Further archival research might shed light on this relationship.<sup>644</sup>

The extant Castel recorders are all similar in design, but also show a more experimental, crafting approach, not only in the small variations of the bores but also in the less uniform voicing of the instruments examined. This variety may suggest that Castel was a mark associated with more than one maker within the family, but it seems more likely to me that Castel's goal was to create unique instruments each time. It is important to point out, though, that Cas.ALT.01 and Cas.ALT.03 share a remarkably similar bore design, even

---

<sup>644</sup> Questions such as this, which surpass the focus of the present study, remain unanswered, to be investigated in future research.

though the maker's marks of these instruments are not the exact same. This is important confirmation of the fact that the stylized 'N' and the simple 'N' are associated with the same person, therefore disproving the existence of a J. C. Castel, at least with regard to the recorders. In this same line of thought, I suggest, by the comparison of their bores, that Ano.ALT.01 and Ano.ALT.02 may also be in the 'school' of Panormo, and as such, represent other examples of Neapolitan recorders.

Chapter 1 also showed that none of the recorders that were studied and played displayed characteristics that would make them particularly suitable to very virtuosic music, in the way that Denner instruments are, especially regarding easiness of speech in the high register.<sup>645</sup> Still, the fact that these Italian recorders have a more conical bore than English instruments, and the details of voicing that determine how they speak, points to an intention to create a balanced instrument that can function well in repertoire that demands versatility.

Turning to the repertoire (discussed in Chapter 2), a number of Neapolitan works call for high notes, such as F6 (Fio.CON.01, Fio.SIN.02, Fio.SON.01, Leo.SON.04, Mel.CON.01, Sca.CAN.01). This might indicate the existence in that city of instruments, such as those of Denner, that function very well in the higher range, or it may be testimonial to the virtuosity of the players for which the works were composed. As the two versions of Mancini's Sonata III (Man.SON.03a and 03b) show, I am inclined to conclude that the 'normal' range of the recorder in Naples was slightly higher than that of the recorder in England, corroborating the observation that the Italian recorders in general follow a design path in between England and Germany. This cannot be affirmed with complete certainty by the existence of these two versions of a same sonata, but the adapted fugal entrances (shown in Chapter 2, Table 2.3.5) corroborate the claim.

Also in Chapter 2 we saw that fugal second (or third) movements were an important trademark of the style of the older generation of Neapolitan composers, and that this continued to inform the writing of their younger colleagues. The use of the term "dolce" instead of "piano" is, in my opinion, another point of unity amongst the Neapolitan composers; this will be discussed next.

The examples of ornamentation in the *soffeggi*, and in the sonatas presented in Chapter 2, point to a common language, which was *learned* at the Neapolitan *conservatori*. I see these ornaments much less as tools for expression of individuality by the musicians who performed these works – as is often considered to be the case especially at the moment the

---

<sup>645</sup> This observation will be exemplified with a practical account using a Panormo recorder copy later.

*Galant* style took over – but rather more as further compositional tools that reinforce the existence of a ‘Neapolitan style’.<sup>646</sup>

Finally, the sheer number of purely instrumental works for the recorder written or copied between 1699 and 1759, prove that in these sixty years the recorder enjoyed great popularity, especially in the aristocratic circles that sustained the production of music in Naples.

As explained in the Introduction, the lack of music treatises offers no help in determining what type of recorders were used in Naples. But, although Naples lacks any treatise with mention of the Baroque recorder, a Spanish treatise may be of some use. The *Guía para los principiantes* (Valencia, dated 1720, copied 1767<sup>647</sup>), written by the composer and music theorist Pedro Rabassa (1683–1767), shows the range of the “flata [sic] dulce” to be from F4 to C6 but “aun sube tres o quatro puntos mas,”<sup>648</sup> therefore reaching G6.<sup>649</sup> Rabassa was educated in Barcelona, and, according to Miguel-Ángel Marín, “must have been influenced by the Austrian and Italian musicians employed at the court of Archduke Carlos III, who had temporarily settled in Barcelona during the War of the Spanish Succession (1701–14).”<sup>650</sup> From 1724, he was *maestro de capilla* in Valencia, a city in which he had lived since 1713,<sup>651</sup> and which had had connections with Naples since the fifteenth century.<sup>652</sup>

Quickly reviewing the list of the European treatises (presented in the Introduction) that include the recorder in the Baroque period, one sees that the first English treatise to include F6 was published by an Anonymous author in 1706, whilst the also Anonymous

---

<sup>646</sup> In my opinion, this practice of composing ornaments as a part of the melodic line is not the same as, for example, J. S. Bach’s practice of notating grace notes and embellishments in detail; Bach’s intention was mostly to specify his preferred ornaments with precision (Johann Adolf Scheibe, 1708–1776, criticized this practice, referring specifically to Bach’s *doubles* and arguing for simplicity in music). I see the ornaments in the Neapolitan recorder works that were examined as an intrinsic part of the melodic line, especially in the case of appoggiaturas.

<sup>647</sup> Rosa Isusi Fagoaga, “La Música en la Catedral de Sevilla en el siglo XVIII: la obra de Pedro Rabassa y su difusión en España e Hispanoamérica” (PhD, Universidad de Granada, 2012). p. 326.

<sup>648</sup> Translation by the present author: “still goes three or four tones higher.”

<sup>649</sup> Rabassa also writes that “este ystrumento ay de diferentes especies pero esta es la mas comun,” confirming the alto in F as the recorder size most used also in his context. The manuscript is conserved in E-Vacp, and available in a facsimile modern edition. Pedro Rabassa, *Guía para los principiantes, Edición facsímil*, ed. Francesc Bonastre, Antonio Martín Moreno, and Josep Climent (Barcelona: Universitat Autònoma, 1990).

<sup>650</sup> Miguel-Ángel Marín, “Rabassa, Pedro.” *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed November 29, 2014, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com>.

<sup>651</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>652</sup> José Climent, “Valencia.” *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed December 18, 2014, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com>.



*Tutto il Bisognevole* and Bismantova's *Compendio* had already included G6 in the seventeenth century. Although all three French treatises, Etienne Loulié, Jean-Pierre Freillon-Poncein and Jacques Hotteterre, do include these higher notes, in the very modest repertoire for the recorder in France they are not to be found. It may be postulated therefore that from early on, the recorder in Italy had many aspects in common with instruments of Germany, starting already at the time of Silvestro Ganassi.<sup>653</sup>

## 4.2 Performance practice

Ornaments found in the recorder parts of the works in this repertoire have been shown in Chapter 2, other aspects of performance practice will be described below.

### *Time signatures, and tempo, expression and dynamic indications*

It would seem that the copyist that gathered the collection of the twenty-four concerti of Naples into one manuscript was very faithful to the dynamic indications of individual composers. Whilst Sarro, Francesco Barbella, and Mancini use *dolce* ("dol.") and *forte* ("f."), and Giovanni Battista Mele adds *assai* ("dol. assai," "f. assai"), Alessandro Scarlatti and Robert Valentine use *piano* ("p.") and *forte* ("f."), and the latter once indicates "eco." It seems significant therefore that in this collection the 'foreigners' use "p." instead of "dol." This theory is corroborated by Fiorenza's use of "for." and "dol." in his *concerti* and *sinfonie* for the recorder.

The use of tempo indications such as *Amoroso* and *Spiritoso* – besides the more common *Largo*, *Allegro*, and *Presto* – are useful clues of character more than actual tempo markings. "Rousseau (1768) equated it [Amoroso] with the French *tendrement*, with the qualification that *amoroso* had 'plus d'accent, et respire je ne sais pas quoi de moins fade et de plus passionné' (more emphasis and is perhaps a little less insipid and more impassioned')."<sup>654</sup> *Spiritoso*, in the case of the works treated in this study, should be

---

<sup>653</sup> Although J. C. Denner petitions in 1696 to become a master, being granted the right to produce 'the new French instruments' in the next year, this should not be understood literally, but rather should imply 'the new instruments', i.e. Baroque oboes and recorders. "Some of the early instruments show clearly the influence of French models, but further developed through the experience born of musical practice." Martin Kirnbauer, "Denner." *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed December 29, 2014, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com>. Jacob Denner's recorders show no sign that would corroborate a link with actual French recorders, indicating his design had already evolved into his own.

<sup>654</sup> David Fallows, "Amoroso." *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed December 29, 2014, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com>.

understood as the more fiery definition of the word, connected to a swifter tempo.<sup>655</sup> "That meaning, which is the one most commonly used today, stretches back well into the 18th century: there are several movements in Domenico Scarlatti and Rameau, for instance, that are so marked and must be fast. Alessandro Scarlatti's *Genuinda* (1694) includes the tempo mark *allegriissimo e spiritoso*."<sup>656</sup>

The divergences in the tempo indications between the various parts in a single piece – for example Man.CON.02 (all parts except recorder: Largo; recorder: Larghetto), Man.CON.03 (all parts except recorder: Allegro; recorder: Andante) – is most probably sloppiness on the part of the copyist. But it is tempting to hypothesize that it may be an interesting sign of the different expectations of tempo experienced by instrumentalists of different instruments.

Time signatures with mensural signs, such as C3/2, C3/4, C3/8, C12/8 (i.e. *tripla minore*,<sup>657</sup> according to Giovanni Maria Bononcini's *Musico pratico* of 1673), are used in conjunction with numerical proportions both in the vocal and in the instrumental repertoire studied, and are especially common in the works by Scarlatti. This is probably only a vestigial application of earlier practices, as described by Lorenzo Penna who, in *Li primi albori musicali* (1684) "omits the mensural sign (tempo) before the numerical proportion in his signatures. He mentions its former use but gives no reason for its exclusion."<sup>658</sup>

In 1714, Wolfgang Gaspar Printz explained these exclusions, in the second edition of his *Compendium musicae signatoriae & moulatoriae vocalis*, basing himself on Italian sources:<sup>659</sup>

Wenn der Gesang mit einer *irrationalem Proportion* anfängt/ lassen die meisten neuen *Musici* das *Signum quantitatis mensuralis* weg/ und setzen unter die Zahlen/ so die *Proportion* andeuten/ allein: und zwar nicht ohne Ursache. Denn weil die untere Zahl der vorgeschriebenen *Irrationalen Proportion* schon die Krafft hat des Länge des Tactes

---

<sup>655</sup> An example of this is found in Man.CON.09; most of the parts read Spiritoso, but violins I and II read Allegro.

<sup>656</sup> David Fallows, "Spiritoso." *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed December 29, 2014, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com>.

<sup>657</sup> George Houle, *Meter in Music, 1600–1800 – Performance, Perception and Notation*, ed. Thomas Binkley, Music: Scholarship and Performance (Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1987). p. 23. Giovanni Maria Bononcini, *Musico pratico che breuemente dimostra il modo di giungere alla perfetta cognizione di tutte quelle cose, che concorrono all'acomposizione de i Canti, di ciò ch'all'Arte del Contrapunto si ricerca* (Bologna: Giacomo Monti, 1673). This first print is available online from [http://conquest.imslp.info/files/imglnks/usimg/9/9d/IMSLP126026-PMLP248460-musico\\_prattico\\_1673.pdf](http://conquest.imslp.info/files/imglnks/usimg/9/9d/IMSLP126026-PMLP248460-musico_prattico_1673.pdf).

<sup>658</sup> George Houle, *Meter in Music, 1600–1800 – Performance, Perception and Notation*. p. 24. Lorenzo Penna, *Li primi albori musicali per li principianti della musica figurata*, 4th ed. (Bologna: Giacomo Monti, 1684).

<sup>659</sup> Ton Koopman, private communication.

[sic] anzudeuten/ so ist das *Signum quantitatis mensuralis* überflüssig/ unnötig/ und also/ vermöge ... abzuschaffen.<sup>660</sup>

As George Houle writes, “[e]ven in 1714, the fractional number of the time signature is explained as a proportion, but the omission of the mensural sign is explained as if it did not affect the proportional interpretation of the signature.”<sup>661</sup> I believe this to be the case in the works examined in this study that include mensural signs.

### **Strings: one or more to a part<sup>662</sup>**

In the *Sonata Decima nona* (Man.CON.11), Mancini indicates “soli” in bar 9 in the first violin part, at the second entrance of the recorder. The fact that the word is plural may indicate these works were to be performed with more than one violin to a part. It may also refer to the fact that the bass drops out, leaving the violins and recorder alone. This would show an inconsistency with the very beginning and other moments in the same movement in which the bass is silent, and which do not have any indication of solos.

In my experience, balance issues arise if the work is performed with more than one violin to a part: the recorder part is clearly audible in these concertante works if the strings are one to a part. Especially in the fugal movements, when all instruments have their equal entrances, it becomes clearly unbalanced between recorder and strings if the strings are played with more than one to a part. If the recorder part were written in a higher range, this might not have been an issue, but the fact that very often the recorder is in the middle, middle-high range, equal to the violin parts, means that it gets covered in performances with more than one string to a part. However, if it was indeed played with more than one to a part, this may be a strong indication of the qualities of volume and type of sound of the recorders used to perform these pieces at the time of their composition.<sup>663</sup>

---

<sup>660</sup> Translation by George Houle: “If the music begins with an irrational proportion [3/1, 3/2, 3/4, 3/8], most of the new musicians omit the mensural sign, and use only the numbers that show the proportion. This is not without cause, as the denominator of the indicated proportion already has the ability to show the length of the tactus: therefore the mensural sign is superfluous, unnecessary, and should be abolished.” George Houle, *Meter in Music, 1600–1800 – Performance, Perception and Notation*. p. 25. Wolfgang Caspar Printz, *Compendium musicae signatoriae & modulatoariae vocalis, das ist: kurzer Begriff aller derjenigen Sachen, so einem, der die Vocal-Musik lernen will, zu wissen von nöthen seyn* (Dresden: Mieth, 1689).

<sup>661</sup> George Houle, *Meter in Music, 1600–1800 – Performance, Perception and Notation*. p. 25.

<sup>662</sup> For an interesting discussion on this matter, see Richard Maunder, *The scoring of Baroque concertos* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2004).

<sup>663</sup> The choice for one or more strings to a part has also to do with the sizes of modern halls, and in that sense should be seen pragmatically in concert situations. Still, my opinion is that this music should maintain the character of chamber music, rather than be treated orchestrally.

In Sca.CON.01b, now in Bologna, the six staves are assigned to "Flauto, Violini [2 staves], Viole, Violoncello, Basso," and the fact that the added viola line is pluralized (in fact blank for the most part, except for the last Allegro, which reads "Viole col Basso") indicates that at the time of the later copy the work was performed with more than one to a part.<sup>664</sup> More than one to a part also seems possible in the case of Scarlatti's *Sinfonie di Concerto Grosso*. The recorder usually plays 'solos' accompanied only by the cello, playing a secondary textural role in many of the *tutti* sections. This may actually be the best indication that Scarlatti had meant the works to be performed by more players in the upper strings, the fact that precisely when the recorder needs to be heard, the texture is thinner, allowing for the 'soloist' to be audible.

It is my belief that all the Neapolitan *concertante* works for the recorder should be played with one to a part, in order to preserve the delicate balance between all instruments, save the exceptions mentioned above. This is especially important in the case of the Vinci concerto and Sar.CON.02, which are quartets in a sense, and have a more intimate kind of writing, therefore seeming out of character if played by a larger group. As mentioned before, in order to preserve a balance in the fugal movements, the twenty-four concertos would also benefit from a performance with one upper string to a part.

### **Continuo section**

The continuo group in Naples in the eighteenth century is yet to be studied in detail. It is possible nonetheless to form an idea based on the evidence extracted from the documentation stemming from musical institutions of the time, as well as by analyzing the music itself for clues of what is requested by the composers.

As seen in Chapter 3, archlutes were employed in the Royal Chapel concomitantly to the addition of the oboes "con l'obbligo del flauto," but the only instance in which (two) archlutes explicitly appear alongside the recorder in this repertoire is in Leo.SER.01.

The harp was abolished from the Cappella del Tesoro di San Gennaro in 1699 because "l'instrum[en]to dell'Arpa non unisce bene con l'armonia dell'altri Istrum[en]ti precisam[en]te per lo ripieno che si costuma modernam[en]te. [...] in contro cambio del

---

<sup>664</sup> All the viola parts found in recorder concertos in Naples are assigned to the "violetta." Though having different meanings through the centuries, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the term "violetta" was used commonly for the viola. Howard Mayer Brown, Stephen Bonta, "Violetta." *Grove Music Online*. *Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed December 28, 2014, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com>.

quale se' determinerà appresso l'elettione d'altro Istrum[en]to a' corda."<sup>665</sup> As mentioned in Chapter 3, a harp was present in the Royal Chapel until at least 1704, but no longer mentioned in 1708.<sup>666</sup> The harp is not mentioned at all in any of the works that include recorder parts.

The first unequivocal mention of the cello in Naples is made in that same 1708 payment list of the Royal Chapel, which also lists double basses.<sup>667</sup> As Guido Olivieri writes<sup>668</sup>

[I]t is unlikely that this instrument appeared so late and so abruptly in Naples. The characteristic elusiveness of terminology for string bass instruments around this time makes it extremely difficult to identify with certainty the instruments used and to determine exactly when the violoncello took the place of the violone or of other transitional instruments. Although thorough research on the continuo instruments used in Naples has yet to be done, it is reasonable to presume that the developments in the Neapolitan milieu were not very dissimilar from those that occurred in Rome, where the term "viola" was still commonly employed before the first quarter of the eighteenth century to describe the string instruments of the continuo group (including the 8' violone), and a widespread use of the term "violoncello" began only around the 1720's. This hypothesis seems to be confirmed by the existence of a set of 28 duets for 2 cellos written in 1699 by Rocco Greco (ca. 1650-1718), a teacher of string instruments at the Conservatorio dei Poveri di Gesù Cristo, which bears as a title "Sonate a due viole." Certainly by 1708 a fine cello school already existed in Naples. It is otherwise difficult to explain the sudden advent of several exceptional virtuosi such as Francesco Alborea, Rocco Greco, or Francesco Supriani coming from the Neapolitan training.<sup>669</sup>

---

<sup>665</sup> Translation by the present author: "the Harp does not combine well with the other instruments, more precisely because of the *ripieno* that is customary now. [...] in exchange, another [harmonic] string instrument will be elected." Marta Columbro, Paologiovanni Maione, *Gli Splendori Armonici del Tesoro: Appunti sull'attività musicale della Cappella tra Sei e Settecento* (Naples: Deputazione della Real Cappella del Tesoro di San Gennaro, Arte Tipografica S.A.S., 2002). p. 43. Squared brackets by Columbro and Maione.

<sup>666</sup> Francesco Cotticelli, Paologiovanni Maione, *Le Istituzioni Musicali a Napoli durante il Vicereame Austriaco (1707–1734)* (Naples: Luciano Editore, 1993). p. 18.

<sup>667</sup> In this context, a 16-foot.

<sup>668</sup> Guido Olivieri, "Cello Teaching and Playing in Naples in the Early Eighteenth Century: Francesco Paolo Supriani's Principij da imparare a suonare il violoncello," in *Performance practice: issues and approaches*, ed. Timothy D. Watkins (Ann Arbor: Steglein Publishing, 2009). pp. 109, 111-112.

<sup>669</sup> It is worthwhile to mention that Rocco Greco's *sinfonias Quinta* and *Sesta* are most likely the first source to shed light on the practice of chordal realization on the cello. Inés Salinas Blasco, "The cello in Naples in the early 18th century" (Master, Royal Conservatoire, 2015). p. 37. Although the title page may raise doubts as to whether or not "viole" could refer to the viola da gamba, it is clear the works are for cello for the following reasons:

*"The highest pitch on the first voice is a f', and [it] rarely goes higher than d' (Helmholtz pitch notation). If they would have been meant for the viol, the composer would have probably used the upper register of this instrument more often.*

*The 28 sinfonie are entirely written in bass clef, except [for a] few bars in [the] first voice in the Sinfonia Prima, which are in tenor clef. Solo music for viol is often written in alto clef.*

*They are part of a large manuscript (which seems to be copied by the same copyist) which contains music for solo cello and continuo, namely two "Sinfonie per Violoncello del Sigr. G. Bononcini" and 10 "Passagagli [sic] per Violoncello del Sigr. Gaetano Francone".*

Inés Salinas Blasco, private communication.

The indication "basso" in the title pages of each part book of the twenty-four concerti, should be taken with the knowledge that not only a "violongello" [sic] part is extant but also a fully figured bass part. This is also the case in the scores of all twelve *Sinfonie di Concerto Grosso* by Scarlatti, which show an independent line given to the "violoncello," above the unassigned, figured bass line. It seems logical that this 'generic' bass line would be played by a harpsichord as well as a double bass. On this assumption, Olivieri notes something else of interest:<sup>670</sup>

The association of violoncello and double bass around the 1730s is also attested to by the *Sonate a Quattro* by Angelo Ragazzi. The edition of these works printed in Rome in 1736 follows the local practice and presents a single part for the violone, while the manuscript preserved in Naples (probably an earlier version) has the parts for "violoncello" and "contrabasso."

It is worth noting that it was common for the double basses to outnumber the cellos in the orchestra of the *Teatro di San Carlo*, for example; this was already noted in the 1770s by Charles Burney.<sup>671</sup>

In the case of the recorder works by Fiorenza, the instrumentation of the bass seems to be treated individually:

- The 1726 concerto (Fio.CON.01) has two sets of parts for each instrument, from different copyists. One of the sets has a figured bass part entitled "basso." The other has a part called "Controbasso, [sic] o Cembalo," also figured.
- The 1728 concerto (Fio.CON.02) is scored, as can be read in the title page, for "Violongello, [sic] e Basso" but the only bass part to be found is that of the "Violongello," unfigured.
- In the sinfonia in G Minor (Fio.SIN.01), the only bass part is not assigned to any specific instrument, but does contain figures, and one section at the end of the second movement indicates "tasto solo," which implies the use of a keyboard instrument as well.<sup>672</sup>
- In the sinfonia in C Minor (Fio.SIN.02) the only bass part is that of the "Violongello," which is unfigured. In the second movement though, there are markings for "Viol. solo" and "tutti" which denote the presence of another

---

<sup>670</sup> Guido Olivieri, "Cello Teaching and Playing in Naples in the Early Eighteenth Century: Francesco Paolo Supriani's Principij da imparare a suonare il violoncello." p. 114 (footnote 13).

<sup>671</sup> Michael F. Robinson, *Naples and Neapolitan Opera* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972). p. 161.

<sup>672</sup> An archlute type instrument is not to be ruled out, although it is never explicitly requested in any of the instrumental works with the recorder.

continuo instrument besides the cello, be it a harpsichord or a plucked chordophone (e.g. archlute), another cello, or a double bass.

On the basis of the information already provided about the continuo instruments enumerated in the instrumental works that were examined, I propose a continuo section of at least cello, double bass and harpsichord for the concertante works, with the exception of the Vinci concerto and Sar.CON.02, in which cello and harpsichord seem more appropriate, for reasons mentioned above.

As for the Neapolitan sonatas, I often choose not to use a cello in the continuo, for I consider the writing of the bass line in these works to be more suitable for a keyboard instrument than for a bowed instrument. This is especially the case in the twelve sonatas by Mancini, and in Fiorenza's A Minor sonata. Furthermore, with the equality in the writing of the recorder and bass lines, especially in the works of Mancini, performance largely gains freedom when rendered by only two musicians.<sup>673</sup> However, stylistically later works, such as the four sonatas by Pullj, very much profit from an added melodic bass line. With the simplified texture of these sonatas, the cello is also freer to explore a chordal and embellished realization of the bass line, especially helpful in the slow movements in providing depth of sound and sustaining interesting harmonies.<sup>674</sup>

### **Pitch**

Bruce Haynes has shown that the majority of Italian woodwinds in this period were pitched around A=410 Hz, as were the majority of German, English and Dutch woodwinds. Germany

---

<sup>673</sup> These sonatas often seem to be written-out *partimenti*, with voices divided between two instruments. As such, they are based on structures normally thought and performed on a keyboard instrument. Furthermore, in many instances the bass lines have a range which reaches higher than what is usual in the rest of Italy, not only in the Neapolitan recorder sonatas but also in the concertos and sinfonias. Naturally, the extension of this upper range is more uncomfortable for a bowed bass instrument than for a keyboard one. As a curiosity, and supporting the idea that these pieces work well without a bowed bass instrument, Neapolitan harpsichords, including the soundboard, are typically made in maple instead of the more usual cypress. Maple is denser than cypress and harpsichords made with denser woods produce a clearer sound. The sound of a Neapolitan harpsichord, as described by Grant O'Brien, is a "strong, sweet sound, full of character and personality." Edward L. Kottick, *A History of the Harpsichord*, vol. 1 (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2003); Grant O'Brien, "Why choose a Neapolitan harpsichord as a model for building a modern harpsichord?" accessed December 29, 2014, [http://www.claviantica.com/Design\\_files/Reasons.html#\\_ftn1](http://www.claviantica.com/Design_files/Reasons.html#_ftn1). p. 97. For wood density references see "Physical Properties of Common Woods." accessed December 29, 2014, <http://www.csudh.edu/oliver/chemdata/woods.htm>. On the various Neapolitan keyboard makers of the period (e.g. Giovanni N. Boccalari, the Sabbatino family), as well as regarding specific characteristics of the typical Neapolitan harpsichord (documented already in the sixteenth century and observed in the extant instruments of Onofrio Guarracino, for example), see Francesco Nocerino, "Gli strumenti musicali a Napoli nel secolo XVIII," in *Storia della musica e dello spettacolo a Napoli. Il Settecento*, ed. P. Maione F. Cotticelli, vol. 2 (Naples: Turchini Edizioni, 2009). pp. 775-780.

<sup>674</sup> On relatable issues on the instrumentation of the bass part in Corelli's Op. 5, see, for example, David Watkin, "Corelli's Op.5 Sonatas: 'Violino e violone o cimbalò?'" *Early Music* 24, no. 4 (November) (1996). pp. 645-646, 649-650, 653-654, 657-663.

has a second peak at A=415 Hz, and third at 405, whilst England and Holland both have a second peak at 405. The rest of Italian woodwinds are equally distributed by Haynes' graph at A=412, 422, 425, 430, 438 and 443 Hz.<sup>675</sup> Haynes equates the pitch of approximately A=415 Hz with "A-Kammerton" and with the pitch in Naples.<sup>676</sup> After all the divergent information presented in various chapters, it seems Haynes concludes A=410 Hz to be the approximate meeting point of a variety of sources on the pitch in Naples.

As mentioned in Chapter 1, the auditory perception of musical instruments' timbral qualities, by players and listeners alike, changes from one pitch to another. Still, the sensory perception of the player can remain unchanged at different pitches. As an example of that, the fact that Denner recorders respond very easily in the high register is the same whether the instrument is at A=415 or 440 Hz, and the feeling of the player in producing these high notes is also unaffected. At 415 and 440 Hz, the color of the sound of the two instruments in this high register may be different, but the sound production, and the way it feels to produce that sound, remains the same. In this respect, the pitch of the instruments researched in Chapter 1 is irrelevant to the discussion of their suitability to the performance of the repertoire listed in Chapter 2; the shape of the bore and the details of voicing, the construction of the instruments and, consequently, the way they *feel* when played are decisive in this equation. Naturally, the 'original pitch' of an instrument is tied up in the design concept it presents, but once this concept is known, studied and understood, one can extrapolate these qualities independently of pitch.

### **Temperament**

Speaking of temperament in the case of over 300 years old recorders is a complex matter for a variety of reasons. First, the instruments have often become distorted, from use and with the passing of time, and therefore how 'in- or out-of-tune' the instrument currently is, cannot always serve as an indication of how it used to be. Then, there is the issue of the changes made in subsequent eras to adapt the instrument to more modern ideals: shortening of joints, widening of holes and window etc. Finally, upon playing the instrument, most players will immediately try to adjust to their own 'inner tuning system', so whatever information we can infer is to be understood as 'filtered'. As Haynes wrote, "[w]ithout a fixed tuning, intonation is influenced by technical situations, subjective perceptions, even

---

<sup>675</sup> "Graph 27: Woodwinds in Europe, 1700–1730." Bruce Haynes, *A History of Performing Pitch / The story of "A"* (Lanham, MD: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 2002).

<sup>676</sup> "Graph 35: Possible levels described by Agricola and Quantz." *Ibid.* p. 417.



differences in dynamics. Players of such instruments are incapable (even if they wanted it) of the level of consistency in intonation implied by a temperament."<sup>677</sup> That being said, recorders are less flexible in their tuning than violins, for example. Throughout the eighteenth century (as described by the literature of the period), the aim of string players and singers was 'just intonation', which was emulated in keyboards through a meantone temperament that fluctuated around 1/6 comma. My experience with original Baroque recorders has shown that indeed these instruments work best in meantone temperament.<sup>678</sup>

### 4.3 The Artist's Choice

#### *Recorders for the Neapolitan Baroque repertoire, 1695-1759*

We have seen that the instrumental repertoire produced in Naples for the recorder in the eighteenth century was cultivated in the highest spheres of society. We have also seen that through the fame and influential position of the composers who wrote those recorder works, the repertoire is part of a musical school that was unique and local in one sense but also fashionable enough to be exported and become cosmopolitan.

Music was circulated through the many cultural avenues that reached and even crossed Naples. A single approach to any part of this repertoire would be contrary to the multitude of characteristics one may want to emphasize in performance. The trail of clues left in the music itself, for the choice of instruments to be used in playing the recorder parts, leads to no single arrival point, but rather to several different ones.

In the Neapolitan works in which exploitation of the instrument's highest range is paramount, the best-suited instruments, in my opinion, seem to be those of the Nuremberg school.<sup>679</sup> This may not be the most obvious choice but, as seen before, it is also not a totally unlikely one. The Panormo alto also works well in these works but does not give the performer the same range of possibilities for performing those high notes, especially in regard to articulation response.

---

<sup>677</sup> Bruce Haynes, "Beyond temperament: Non-Keyboard Intonation in the 17th and 18th Centuries," *Early Music* 19, no. 3 (August) (1991). p. 358.

<sup>678</sup> This is also the conclusion reached by, for example, Eugène Eijken, "Een onderzoek naar getempereerd spel op de houtblaasinstrumenten in de 17e en 18e eeuw, in het bijzonder op de blokfluit." (*Scriptie Historische methodiek blokfluit*, Royal Conservatoire, 1982). p. 28.

<sup>679</sup> See Chapter 1 for the connection between some of the recorders studied with those of Nuremberg, and the Introduction and Chapter 3 for the connection between Nuremberg and Venice as well as Naples.

In the works with a range reaching no higher than D6, the decision of which instrument to use may be influenced less by aspects of articulation and more by timbre. An artistic and performance-led selection for the timbre, fingering possibilities with the keys of the works, articulation response, and actual feeling brings out the following choices:<sup>680</sup>

- to use the hoarse, warm sound of the Pan.ALT.01 copy in the works in which the lyricism of the writing is the most significant, for example in Fio.CON.01 and Sar.CON.01. Although Fio.CON.01 does reach F6, it is not within a particularly soloistic passage but rather more as a theatrical outpour of the melodic line;
- to take advantage of the nasal quality of the sound of Cas.ALT.01, for example in works such as Leo.SON.02. Furthermore, this work is in G Minor, which also means the double-holes of the instrument serve an extra purpose in the performance of more secure B<sub>♭</sub>s;
- to pair spirited<sup>681</sup> works such as Fio.SON.01, Man.CON.11, and Pul.SON.01–04, with instruments from the Denner school, which allow for quick changes in air pressure, more varied articulation throughout the entire range of the instrument and have a clear and bright sound.

### ***The Panormo anecdote***

#### *Prologue*

During the course of this research, I was faced with the limitations and possibilities of instruments in relation to my expectations as a player. In a world that thrives on the false assumption that it is possible not to compromise, modern performers often forget that the instruments we use are *always* a compromise, in one aspect or another.<sup>682</sup> Take the simple example of double, unequally sized holes on an average 'Baroque' recorder. If the original instrument that inspired the 'copy' had single holes, as it most probably did, an obvious compromise is being made: in order to facilitate fingering combinations the overall sound of the instrument changes, and is often not only softer but also less stable. Neither solution can be condemned, but it is only by being aware of the compromise that we can decide

---

<sup>680</sup> These, and a few other choices have been put to practice by La Cicala, Inês d'Avena, *Dolce Napoli, Sonate & Concerti per Flauto (CD)*, Passacaille 1007 (2014).

<sup>681</sup> See above the definition of *spiritoso*, which is indeed still present in the modern connotation of the word 'spirited'.

<sup>682</sup> Compromises are constantly being made on pitch, for example: in a concert situation, it is impractical (and often impossible) to play music of a variety of eras, geographic regions and styles faithfully respecting every single aspect of their original setting.

which is preferable. When we are accustomed to playing on only one kind of instrument, we become so used to one kind of compromise that we may cease to notice it – the compromise becomes a *conditio sine qua non*.

### *Act 1*

The very first concrete part of the present study was a visit to the Library of Congress in Washington in April 2011, which had the purpose of producing the technical drawings, measurements and pictures of the Panormo alto housed there.

After the trip, and after writing and publishing an article, it was time to copy the instrument so that it could once again be used for playing. It was then that the worrying began. After seeing it in Washington, and realizing that it looked not only beautiful but also very interesting from a constructional point of view, and that it would probably suit most of the repertoire, I started to doubt: what if it looked great in my hands and on paper but sounded bad? Or worse: what if it sounded mundane and nothing inspiring came out of this considerable effort? This was all the more disturbing as the original instrument is no longer playable, so the imagination of the sound of the instrument was entirely built on numbers and shapes, not on any practical experience.

The process I went through as a performer during the commission and subsequent use of the Panormo alto was interesting, to say the least. I would say it was inspiring, and certainly an experience that has enriched my playing and thinking about my instrument and music. I am not a maker, and prior to this doctoral research never had any real interest in recorder making. I knew the very basics, and did not ask many questions; it seemed to be something beyond my craft.

It quickly became clear, though, that if I wanted to write about it, I was going to have to learn a little bit more about the technical side of recorder construction. A brief acquaintance with books on instrument construction, acoustics, and historical organology followed. Why is the size of the window *this* on a Denner and *that* on a Stanesby? Why does the shape of the Denner bore produce better high notes? Why is the windway so curved on original instruments?

I do not pretend to have come very far in my theoretical understanding, it is still something beyond my craft and, beyond the knowledge that we can extrapolate from the instruments, I have the impression much of it can only be done well by feeling. Much of what governs the decisions of makers is not necessarily translatable into numbers; it has to do with concepts and sound ideals, practical knowledge and the acceptance of trial and error. Nonetheless, this study opened up for me a new way of looking at, understanding and

playing my instruments. Everything on a recorder serves a clear purpose; change one detail and the instrument will indeed be something else. This in turn gave me a sincere appreciation of what my instruments can and cannot do. Discovering this seemed in itself encouraging. It validated my reasoning in this research: instruments can and do inspire, and probably did inspire composers to write in one way and not another.

November 20, 2011: the day had arrived, the Panormo copy was finally ready. I had inadvertently set a concert date with my new instrument for December 9, only a couple weeks away. So it had to be ready and had to be good.

I filmed our first encounter, and I had coached myself to take short mental notes of this first moment, as I wanted to have a genuine but clear reaction from myself. Of course, it was difficult to express all of my thoughts, my expectations were enormous and the anticipation difficult to control. As I played the first notes on my new instrument, the words that came to mind were:

- open;
- cantabile;
- sweet;
- warm;
- and very different from anything I had ever played.

These are all lovely thoughts, and they would make anyone like their instrument, regardless of the music they intend to play. There was one more thought that came later, not so lovely, and which nagged me: the high notes spoke with 'difficulty'.

Since a wooden musical instrument is 'alive', the next day the recorder sounded differently, and the problem of the high notes, which I had been trying to forget, was even more disturbing. It was still open, cantabile, sweet, warm, and very different from anything I had ever played, but now it had also a slightly hoarse coating in the middle register and I was not so sure that would go well in my plans for the works to be performed three weeks later.

Breaking-in a recorder consists of not playing more than 5 minutes the first day, 10 on the second, 15 the third etc., and this meant that I only really got to know the instrument by the time the rehearsals started, on December 3. By that moment I had also added to my previous list of adjectives that I felt the instrument was a true alto, it did not feel like a *dessus* instrument, it felt deeper. I had experienced the opposite feeling when playing on Baroque altos in G, which although only one tone higher, *feel* and *sing* as a soprano.

By then I had also already convinced myself that such an infant instrument would not withstand the full length of a one-hour concert without either impairing it for future use or damaging the actual concert experience for the audience. And so I decided I would use it only for the three pieces with strings, and that the two sonatas with harpsichord would be played on my Denner alto.<sup>683</sup> This is an important point: since 2005, my main instrument was a Denner, and that had been my point of departure, a *conditio sine qua non*.

On the first day of rehearsals I deliberately did not say much to my fellow musicians. I wanted any comments from them to be spontaneous. Indeed they were: no one said a word about the recorder's sound during the three days of rehearsals. I switched between instruments a lot, exploring the works with their different qualities, and none of my colleagues asked me why, or had any comments about how 'I' was sounding. These colleagues have known me for the past twelve years, and we have played together extensively since at least 2006. I have had the same Denner alto throughout this time, and it is the only instrument they know me to play.

My doubts increased: was the instrument not sounding all that different after all? And if so, was my research still valid? Why would I be looking for a special instrument for this repertoire, if most people around me could not hear any difference between this and what I had played before?

It may be important to point out that I have tried out a variety of 'new' instruments throughout my life, but never without knowing what to expect, and never before playing a copy that no one knew, except for me.

I was going to give a lecture-presentation shortly after the second concert, and the preparation for it had forced me to solidify the thoughts on my new instrument. I decided to focus on my first – and continuing – impression of it. I also decided to concentrate on how much I had to change my own playing for those concerts, in a very short time, and how that was remarkably challenging. To be forced to let the instrument tell you what to do, what is possible and what is not: wonderful, but difficult.

## Act 2

---

<sup>683</sup> It is important to point out that, for practical reasons, I used an alternative middle joint on the Panormo alto, so that the concert could be played entirely in A=415 Hz. Consequently, and luckily, the audience impressions which I narrate below have not been blurred by the possible differences caused by the impressions of timbre created by two different pitches.

On the program of the concerts that December weekend were five pieces with recorder. Of those, three were performed with my Panormo copy: three concertos by Sarro, Vinci and Fiorenza.

The Sarro concerto (Sar.CON.02) has a 'normal' range of A4–E6, thus no high F.<sup>684</sup> In the first movement I did not feel restricted by the instrument at all, and in fact I felt that the rusty alto sound it had developed was very welcome, and helped carry the wondrous melody. In the second movement though, it was problematic: having been mostly using a Denner copy since 2005, I was very much accustomed to high notes that speak in whichever way I play them, even with harsh articulations and focused blowing. It very rarely cracks and is usually quite powerful. So I went at it the same way on the Panormo, and got a loud squeak instead of a high D.<sup>685</sup>

Tone it down next time, I thought to myself. Retake from bar 11, and squeak again. That became annoying: I wanted that note to be strong, and sharply articulated, but that just did not work. I had decided in my head what the instrument had to do, but in practice that was not natural. The same problem happened in the last movement of the Vinci concerto (Vin.CON.01). I had to settle for a softer, rounder articulation for that passage, slightly changing the musical interpretation. It still worked, but it was different.

The third concerto in the program was by Fiorenza, Fio.CON.01, in A Minor. This is a piece I have played countless times since 2007. I have a variety of recordings of the piece in concert, up until 2011 always with my Denner recorder. Listening to the recordings made before discovering the Panormo in order to compare, I realized that my playing in the piece did not change that much with the new recorder, except that I had a much more docile articulation in the high notes, and my dynamics were less localized but were built up in an even more gradated way. Besides that, my sound is different with the Panormo, and my timing of things is more flexible. Having a truly new, unknown instrument forces one to take time, to listen to the color of the instrument's sound, to absorb what it does naturally and what it cannot be forced to do, *while* playing. I was making many more decisions 'in the moment.'

At the two December concerts in 2011, the audience had received a program booklet that indicated I was using two different instruments, and in which works I was using my new Panormo copy, but in a very understated way. During the first concert I said a few

---

<sup>684</sup> F6.

<sup>685</sup> D6.

words as well, but did not emphasize that the Panormo should sound differently from the Denner, or why. At the second concert *I did* tell the audience I was using one instrument for the concertos and another one for the sonatas, and spoke a little about their differences, but only after we had already played the first half of the concert.

At the end of the first concert, audience members came to me to talk about the Panormo and to tell me how they enjoyed not only the pieces but also the sound of the instrument. They were not musicians, let alone, recorder players. 'Very beautiful sound' was the recurring comment. I suppose this comment did not mean my other instrument, the Denner copy, did not sound beautiful. What I do think is that *I* played differently on the Panormo alto, for the reasons stated above.

At the second concert, three audience members also came to me, in turns, with comments. One of them said she very much enjoyed the warmth of sound of the Panormo and that the music sounded therefore very optimistic (which was a special remark, since the entire program was in minor keys). The second person said she thought the Panormo sounded 'less high' than my other recorder, and that she liked this sound very much. The third one, told me that even before I revealed to the audience that I was using two different instruments, she had already realized there was a difference in sound every time I switched from one piece to the other (which was not necessarily obvious – my two Denner altos are made of boxwood and so is the Panormo copy, and in concerts I usually alternate between the two Denners anyway).

I had expected that the new instrument would sound perceptibly different to my colleagues and all the members of the audience. My expectation originated in the surprisingly new feeling I had when playing this instrument, especially the first times. Although some people did notice something singular and different in the sound of my new instrument it was evidently something that was not bluntly obvious to all, or that radically changed their perception of the music and of my playing. This was of paramount importance: did this realization invalidate my hypothesis that the repertoire had an influence in the decisions of contemporary instrument makers, and that a well-matched instrument could thus enhance a specific repertoire? Whilst I have not really found an obvious direct relation between all the Neapolitan works and the design of the Panormo alto (and neither between Venetian instruments and the music of Vivaldi, for example), I do believe the alto by Panormo serves the music very well. If I had found more Neapolitan Baroque recorders, a direct relation might have existed; this is hypothetical, posed as an open question, and only a partial answer is offered here: the influence of an instrument is most profoundly felt by the performer, who is directly affected by the instrument and in turn may present a

different rendition of the works. The 'enhancement' comes therefore from how the performer experiences the repertoire with one or another instrument, and this translates into the music played. Whether this 'affected' rendition is an enhancement also for the audience is for the audience only to say. One more essential point should be considered though: is the audience always aware of what we, performers, do? And, does this matter to their musical experience? I do not have the answer. Still, not knowing what it was that the public in these concerts actually experienced, except for what little they told me, it seems pointless to draw important conclusions as to whether or not what I postulated holds true singularly based on what little feedback I received from the audience; it may be more appropriate to distill from this experiment conclusions based on what *I* experienced. Remaining true to my intentions, feelings and experiences as a performer is probably what translates best into a successful performance, for myself as well as for the audience.

### *Epilogue*

Let us digress a little in order to review what I was looking for at the outset of my research. First, I wanted to know how much music was written specifically for the recorder in the Baroque period in Naples. The 144 vocal and instrumental works unveiled, including the few hitherto unknown, are, I believe, only a part of the total. I intend to continue to search for works, and I hope to be able to continue to add 'new' works to this list in the future. Having had the chance to perform and record only a small percentage of those works so far,<sup>686</sup> I look forward to acquainting myself further with the peculiarities of this repertoire in the years to come.

Second, I was seeking guidance for what instruments to use in playing the Neapolitan Baroque recorder repertoire. Out of the thirty-four recorders considered here, I now use four copies in my performance of this and other repertoire. I also regard the result of this study as a start, but it is certainly one that has proven to be both inspiring and gratifying. It is my intention to commission new copies, and I hope that more instruments will expand the present list as well. Adding 'new' recorders to the list would contribute to our understanding of the particularities of the instruments which were examined in the present study. With more instruments we might be able to identify which of the instruments we

---

<sup>686</sup> In order to acquaint the public with this still largely unknown repertoire (as well as the new recorders), a larger scale project of CD recordings began with eight of the instrumental works that were presented in detail in Chapter 2. This first recording included Fio.CON.01, Fio.SON.01, Leo.SON.02, Man.CON.11, Man.SON.07, Pul.SON.01, Sar.CON.01 and Ros.SIN.01. *La Cicala, Inês d'Avena, Dolce Napoli, Sonate & Concerti per Flauto (CD) Passacaille 1007* (2014). The five remaining sonatas that are dated 1759 (Pul.SON.02-04, Man.SON.03b and Ano.SON.01) will be recorded in the summer of 2015.



have are really unique, and which are surviving representatives of a more general type. The aim is eventually to bring out more common points in the design of these Italian Baroque recorders.

My quest to find out how these 'Neapolitan' recorders sounded and where they came from had surprising results. Having found only one instrument that originates in Naples itself (and two others that resemble this one, and therefore can be included in this category) I am unable to say anything meaningful about the sound of the Neapolitan recorders of this time, I can only speak with confidence of *a* Neapolitan recorder. I have found no information on 'new' recorder makers in that city, nor have I found information about purchases made by the conservatories or the Royal Chapel that detailed any such makers. It is also impossible to affirm with certainty where the recorders used in Naples came from. Future archival research might uncover more of these details.

I posed the question of whether the Neapolitan recorders followed a particular design principle and thus enjoy particular technical qualities. Did these qualities match the music in what concerns recorder-specific traits? Did the instruments enhance the music? Or did they in fact come from abroad – from elsewhere on the Italian peninsula or indeed from the rest of Europe? The one surely Neapolitan instrument, by Panormo, does have a rather particular design, as was seen in detail before. For the majority of the repertoire this recorder does indeed 'match' the music, and I believe its special timbre does suit the music. The fact that Panormo's alto does not serve well the totality of the repertoire makes me think that instruments from *oltralpe* were also used, and in that case, pinpointing precisely what constitutes the 'Neapolitan' recorder is, after this research, perhaps less relevant, and maybe even impossible.

This conclusion – that there may in fact be no such thing as the 'Neapolitan' recorder – led me to reexamine my sense that there were qualities in the repertoire that pointed to a particular instrument. That this did not seem supported by the evidence I found was baffling and, at first, something of a disappointment. But when combining the two paths of my research, joining the music with the instruments that were copied, the artistic result was far from dispiriting. In getting to know and learning to understand these instruments I had myself changed as a player, and by playing the Neapolitan repertoire using these 'new' instruments, my horizons for performance have been considerably expanded.

I can say that the results I had hoped for were achieved to some degree: I do have a more detailed overview of the available repertoire, and I certainly make use of more recorders when performing this music. As I wrote, I had also hoped to gain a new perspective on the intricate relationships that bind music and instrument. What I had failed

to envision when I set out was the role I myself would play in this equation. I had certainly not expected that the possibilities and limitations of the instruments I studied would have such a profound impact on the way in which I play the Neapolitan repertoire, or any other recorder pieces for that matter. Having to change pre-conceived musical ideas in order to allow the instruments' particularities to guide me in a different rendition of those works was quite challenging. This is perhaps the most interesting result for me as a performer.

I am aware that the use of different instruments, especially when they are scaled to the same pitch, has little or no impact on the listening audience or, surprisingly, on my colleagues. But the impact the instruments have in my own playing is significant. As one of many examples, listening now to the recording I did with my ensemble in 2013, it is striking to me how much more mellow my articulation is, especially in slow movements; it is almost as if these Italian recorders gave me a different accent for this repertoire. Not really surprising if I recall the difficulties with harsh articulations that I encountered at the first tries of the Panormo alto, for example, but certainly an important outcome.

The most important result of this study seems to be the very simple understanding that, even within an Early Music context (where high quality copies of original instruments are nearly compulsory), we still naturally force our own interpretations of the music upon our instruments. In searching for renewed inspiration for performance, we might find new paths of discovery by inverting the way we utilize both scores and instruments. I have found it thrilling to be guided by the instruments into viewing the repertoire in a very pragmatic way, and discovering, by means of 'instrumentation,' what possibilities can unfold in instances where work and instrument finally match. Beyond this thesis, it is, for me, a truly motivating artistic application of what was distilled from the data, which can be applied to other instruments and repertoires.

"The more we know about the instrument, the more unknown is its making" – the Anonymous epigraph of Chapter 1. That still holds true. Since no one else could tell me how to solve the problems with the Panormo, I had to listen to *it*. This may sound a little crazy, but it is in fact rather refreshing. I have since applied this feeling to all other recorders I play and this rediscovery of my own instrument, twenty-seven years after our first encounter, is truly inspiring. What more could I have hoped for? In search of 'authenticity' and 'historicity', I found pure enjoyment in the simple sound of my instrument.

*Minha intenção inicial era redescobrir o passado.  
Acabei conseguindo muito mais do que isso: redescobri o presente.*

Laura Rónai, *Em busca de um mundo perdido* (2008)