



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Thinking through the guitar : the sound-cell-texture chain

Titre, M.

Citation

Titre, M. (2013, December 10). *Thinking through the guitar : the sound-cell-texture chain*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/22847>

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/1887/22847>

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

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/22847> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation

Author: Titre, Marlon

Title: Thinking through the guitar : the sound-cell-texture chain

Issue Date: 2013-12-10

Chapter 4 Guitar, guitarist and composer

Contents

4.1 Guitar composition through the ages	32
4.1.1 Renaissance and Baroque	32
4.1.2 From the classical era to the Torres guitar	38
4.1.3 The modern classical guitar since Torres.....	43
4.2 Match or mismatch?.....	47

Chapter 4 Guitar, Guitarist and Composer

In this chapter, the history of the relationship between the guitar, performer and composer is explored. In the first part of the chapter, the characteristics of this relationship are examined for the various eras of the development of the guitar. The second part of the chapter seeks to answer the question whether there currently is a mismatch between guitar, guitarist and composer.

4.1 Guitar composition through the ages

In this section, the historical conditions under which composers have written for the guitar are examined. The history of the guitar is divided here into three eras that are separated by important changes in construction and instrument characteristics. The first era, starting in the early sixteenth century, covers the renaissance guitar, baroque guitar and related instruments like the lute and the vihuela, and ends with the demise of the lute and the extension of the amount of strings on the guitar. The second era, starting in the late eighteenth century, begins with the introduction of the six-string classical guitar and runs until a period of decline for the guitar in the middle of the nineteenth century. The third era, starting in the late nineteenth century, begins with the introduction of the modern classical guitar and continues until the present day.

Questions leading the examination are: what were the characteristics of the instrument (appearance, number of strings, loudness, tuning, and number of frets)? Which developments occurred in the construction of the instrument? What type of music notation was used? What kind of repertoire (solo, accompaniment, and chamber music) was written for the instrument? What composers wrote for the instrument and how did the music of non-guitarist composers relate to that of guitarist composers? Which actions were taken to explain the scoring potential of the guitar to non-guitarists?

4.1.1 Renaissance and Baroque

Instrument characteristics and development

In sixteenth century Europe, three categories of guitar- and lute-like instruments were in use: the four- and five-course¹⁷ renaissance guitar (developing into the five-course baroque guitar in the seventeenth century), the vihuela, and the lute (Päffgen, 2002, pp. 45-89; Dausend, 1992, pp. 6-9). The guitar, the smallest of the three, was strung with four courses and had a flat back. The vihuela was a six- or seven-course instrument with a flat back, while the lute was a five-course instrument with a single top string and a rounded back. Strings were made of gut and were not overspun, which meant that the loudness of the instruments was relatively low, which was partially compensated by the use of courses instead of

¹⁷ A course is a “group of strings tuned in unison or in the octave and plucked simultaneously so as to give extra loudness” (Oxford Dictionary of Music, 2012c). Guitars, vihuelas and lutes were strung with double courses.

single strings. On the lute, the weakness of sound was also partially compensated by a cross-grain bracing that created a “relatively loud, but rapidly decaying sound” (Heck, 1971, p. 47). The loudness of the guitar and the lute improved with the gradual adoption of overspun strings starting in the end of the seventeenth century, although many players did not make use of this development due to their habits and taste (Dausend, 1992, p. 23; Peruffo, 1994). The vihuela had fallen into disuse by this time. For the four-course renaissance guitar, two relative tunings were used: an “old tuning” and a “new tuning” (Bermudo, 1555). The “new tuning” is identical to the tuning of the relative tuning of the fourth to the first string on the modern classical guitar, while the “old tuning” had the fourth course tuned a second lower. The tuning of the seventeenth century five-course baroque guitar is identical to the tuning of the fifth to the first string on the modern classical guitar. In addition to the usual order of historical and contemporary tunings, in which the lowest string was tuned to the lowest pitch, there existed a practice in which the fifth, and sometimes also the fourth, courses were tuned an octave higher. These types of tunings, called re-entrant tunings, contained upward as well as downward jumps in their relative intervals, as the fifth course was tuned higher than the third course. On the one hand, these tunings made it possible for the performer to play scale passages more rapidly over multiple strings (so-called *campanellas*), and change the timbre of the guitar as the result of the *scordatura*. The possibilities of these tunings were widely exploited by composers in a way they saw fit for different types of works. Sanz, for instance, used standard tunings and two different types of re-entrant tunings for basso-continuo playing, but preferred only one re-entrant tuning for solo works (Dausend, 1992, p. 23). On the other hand, this feature made the baroque guitar tuned in re-entrant a complex instrument to understand for composers who did not play the instrument.

The customary relative tuning of the renaissance lute and the vihuela was the same, making it possible for lutenists to play vihuela scores and vice versa (Dausend, 1992, p. 9). Due to the similarity in tuning, amount of strings, the possibility to play vihuela music on the lute and vice versa, and the fact that the vihuela was primarily used in Spain, the vihuela is often considered to be the Spanish version of the lute (Griffiths, 2010, p. 126). Around 1650, the hitherto customary tuning of the lute lost ground to the d minor tuning, in which the instrument was tuned to a d minor chord.

The number of frets on the renaissance guitar, the vihuela and the lute was much lower when compared to the nineteen frets of the modern guitar. In the early seventeenth century, Dowland described the lute as an instrument with eight frets, and points to a French development of fretting the lute with ten frets (Lowe, 1976, p. 14). The vihuela and the four-course renaissance guitar usually had no more than ten frets. For the lower strings on the fingerboard of the lute (excluding the non-fretted basses) this meant that up to four notes could be doubled in unison on the next higher string. The complexity of the fingerboard was lower than it is on the modern classical guitar: with the exclusion of the first string, which does not have a higher neighboring string, all strings on the modern guitar contain at least fifteen pitches that are also present on the next higher string. On the baroque guitar, an increase of the amount of frets can be seen when compared to the renaissance guitar: the baroque guitar is described as having had twelve frets reaching to the edge of the instrument’s body (Dausend, 1992, p. 22).

In addition to the extension of the number of frets, the development of the lute included the addition of strings. During the course of the sixteenth to the eighteenth century, various types of lutes were constructed that contained additional bass strings connected to a second pegbox: the theorbo and

chitarrone, for instance, were manifestations of the lute with added bass notes placed above the fretboard in order to extend the bass range of the lute. These bass notes were tuned diatonically and could not be fingered with the left hand, although it was possible to raise or lower the pitch of the open bass strings to suit the key of a piece. For some players, the bass note additions on the theorbo and chitarrone made mastering the instrument more challenging when compared to learning to play the six-course lute. The varying amount of strings and differences in body shape led to a myriad of different lute types. Although some efforts were made by luthiers in the eighteenth century to reduce the number of strings on the lute, probably under the influence of the growing popularity of the guitar (Hellwig, 1974, p. 29), the lute collapsed in the mid of the eighteenth century when its “grass-roots support” disappeared due to the impracticality of the instrument and other options, such as the keyboard, seemed easier for beginning players (Wade, 1980, p. 88). The life-span of the vihuela was even shorter than that of the lute: it disappeared at the end of the sixteenth century. Factors cited as having contributed to its demise are the increased popularity of the guitar, which took the position of the vihuela, and the failure of lute players to adopt the vihuela (Turnbull, 1976, p. 32).

Notation

Composers used tablature, a notation system that records fingering positions rather than notes, for the notation of music for the guitar, vihuela and lute. Tablature took the form of horizontal lines representing the courses, while letters or numbers represented the finger positions of the left hand. Above the staff, note values were added to indicate the note length of the letters or numbers on the staff. For the performance of chordal accompaniments on the guitar, an alphabetic reference system for chords was introduced by Montesardo (1606). This so-called alfabeto notation expressed a fingering position for a chord in one symbol, much in the same way as our contemporary guitar chord symbols do. Some composers wished to benefit from the advantages of both tablature and alfabeto, and adopted a hybrid notation in which tablature notation for polyphonic lines was mixed with alfabeto for the notation of chords. This type of notation can be found in the works of Sanz, Foscarini and Corbetta. As tablature notation was the chosen form of notation for composed music for the guitar-like instruments, and alfabeto was used as a shorthand notation of chords sometimes integrated into tablature, the following discussion will primarily concentrate on the advantages and disadvantages of tablature notation.

The advantages of tablature notation stem from the fact that it has a strong visual relation to its performance on the instrument; tablature essentially instructs the reader where to place the fingers. Tablature made it relatively easy to learn to play the instrument, to acquaint oneself with sophisticated music, and to notate music (Griffiths, 2002, p. 93). Tablature provided a direct and practical means of capturing a composition in notation, even for players in early stages of the development of their skills. Griffiths points to the fact that tablature notation makes a “graphically compact” notation possible, thus, notation on one staff without the help of ledger lines (Griffiths, 2010, p. 129). Instead of having to learn music notation and translate the notes in a score to positions on the fretboard, which was and still is particularly challenging for the performer of a guitar or guitar-like instrument as a note in a music score can be played on various strings in different positions, players could immediately read finger positions instead. Moreover, tablature made it possible for players and composer to switch between tunings (such

as standard and re-entrant tunings on the baroque guitar), and to explore unusual or experimental tunings without complicating the reading and notation process (Campion, 1716, p. 22). The intention of the alfabeto notation was that it would enable the performer to play pieces without a teacher (Montesardo, 1606). Due to the ease with which this system could be learned, alfabeto notation was particularly popular, especially in its country of origin Italy (Päffgen, 2002, p. 101). In addition, reading chords in alfabeto is easier than reading chords from tablature, as the complete chord is captured in one symbol. Alfabeto notation was therefore used as an extension of tablature by some composers, as described above.

Two types of disadvantages of tablature can be distinguished: the first in terms of its notation, and the second in terms of the difficulties it raises for non-guitarist composers to write for the instrument. Tablature is notoriously inadequate in demonstrating the distinction between voices, which is of particular importance in polyphonic music. The moment a note should be played is indicated in the tablature, but as soon as subsequent notes appear inside a measure, it is not clear for how long the initial note should ring on. Lutenists at the time of the birth of these works knew how to separate the voices, based on their experience in playing polyphonic music (Griffiths, 2002, pp. 96-97). Separating voices in a tablature thus required experience, knowledge and skill. As a result of the imprecision of tablature, transcribing a tablature from this era into music notation is a question of interpretation rather than a one-on-one transcription (Dausend, 1992, pp. 56-57). Lute, vihuela and guitar tablatures can be transcribed into staff notation with a literal or an interpretative notation. The literal notation only indicates the moment a note should be plucked, but not its duration, leaving the interpretation to the performer. The interpretative notation, on the other hand, seeks to interpret the note durations of the tablature and translate them into staff notation. In the nineteenth and twentieth century, differing opinions as to which of these two types of transcription is the more appropriate have led to extensive discussion and disagreement in the lute world (Ophee, 1998).

The second type of disadvantage stems from the fact that tablature notation differs from staff notation and is therefore not familiar to non-players. For composers, guitar-like instruments of this era were not primarily accessible through the established method of music notation. Composers had to familiarize themselves with the instruments and their notation, or rely on a knowledgeable performer to transcribe their music notation into tablature. Perrine, who published a lute book in 1679 containing harmonic instruction and transcriptions, both in music notation and tablature, criticized tablature for keeping lutenists from playing with other instruments (Perrine, 1679, p. 15). His suggestions for notating lute music in music notation were not widely followed, conceivably due to the fact that tablature had more advantages for the average player, was widely and overwhelmingly used, and because learning to play music notation took more time than learning tablature, as Perrine himself pointed out. Not much later, de Visée added staff notation to publications with his tablature works for baroque guitar. The reason de Visée used this notation was not primarily to help the guitarist play with other instruments, but on encouragement of his friends, to allow his works to be played on "le Clavecin, le Violon et autres instruments" (de Visée, 1682, p. 4).

The repertoire and its composers

The effective use of the guitar, lute or vihuela in a solo composition required intimate knowledge of their techniques and notation practice. As a result, composers of solo repertoire were predominantly player composers. Apart from use in solo repertoire, the lute and guitar were also widely used as ensemble instruments, in which case scores were often written by non-player composers.¹⁸ The lute or guitar was then used as a continuo instrument. For the performance of this part, the lutenist or guitarist created a more elaborated part based on the figured bass indications in the score. On the one hand, this demonstrates the trust composers appear to have had in the abilities of lutenists to improvise on the basis of the figured bass indications. On the other hand, the minimal detail in notation when composing basso continuo parts for the lute by non-player composers signals the limited access these composers had to the practice of tablature reading. Solo pieces, which required fully worked-out scores, were seldom written by non-player composers. In the case of Bach, who is one of few non-player composers who wrote extensive solo works for the lute, there exist serious doubts in modern scholarship as to whether Bach wrote his lute suites to be played on the lute.¹⁹

Apart from the fact that solo works were primarily written by player composers, the difference between the works of player composers and non-player composers appears to have been relatively small in the sixteenth century. Besides, Griffiths points to the proximity of vocal polyphony to lute music in the sixteenth century (Griffiths, 2002). Because of the widespread practice of intabulating vocal works, lutenists were well aware of the polyphonic conventions of the sixteenth century. Moreover, many of the composers who are nowadays considered to have been primarily lutenists, such as da Milano and Dowland, were also composers of vocal polyphony (Griffiths, 2002). In the early eighteenth century, during the decline of the lute, the compositional practice of player composers started to drift away from the practice of non-player composers. The voice leading of music written in the seventeenth century by lute and guitar composers, and the way lutenists and guitarists performed their basso continuo parts were different from the standard of polyphony in vocal music (Miles, 2011; Dean, 2009). Scholars have criticized voice leading in early seventeenth century guitar accompaniments (Miles, 2011, p. 143), but these divergent voice leading practices of player composers are sometimes judged positively as having had a positive influence on continuo playing (Dean, 2009, pp. 218-273), or even as being inspirational for composers in the twentieth century.²⁰ De Visée apologized in advance for possibly breaking musical rules in his *Livre de guitarrre*, claiming that it is the instrument that desires these offenses, and that the music is lastly meant to please the ear (de Visée, 1682, p. 4). Miles defends the criticism on voice leading by explaining that the harmonies appearing in guitar accompaniment were solutions performed on an

¹⁸ For section 4.1.1, the term player composer is used instead of guitarist composer for composers who played the guitar, lute or vihuela.

¹⁹ The autographs of Bach's lute works were written in two staff music notation rather than in tablature, and are believed to have been written for the lute-harpsichord, a keyboard instrument strung with gut strings that imitated the sound of the lute while taking advantage of the technical possibilities of the keyboard (Bach J. S., 2002, p. ix).

²⁰ "This style knows nothing of the otherwise usual requirements and prohibitions of voice-leading; it can only be understood in relation to the fingering technique; it frequently applies the sound of open strings and in no way avoids the otherwise so despised parallel 5ths and octaves or unisons. The dissonances and other conflicting sounds which appear so often ... strike me as exciting and revealing" (Orff, 2013).

instrument with a limited bass range, and that they had to be suited to the instrument in order to be playable (Miles, 2011, pp. 129,157-158).

Communication of scoring potential

The literature of this era in which technical and musical possibilities of the guitar-like instruments were described took the form of instruction works, written for those wishing to master the art of playing such instruments. Two of the most well-known examples of such works, both written for vihuelists, are *El Maestro* by Milán (1535) and Bermudo's *Declaracio de instrumentos musicales* (1555). Where Milan's work was primarily intended to teach the reader to play the vihuela through an understanding of the technical issues pertaining to the instrument, Bermudo sought to instruct the reader in musical understanding (Griffiths, 2010, pp. 126-127). In the *Declaracio*, Bermudo taught the reader to play, compose and arrange on the vihuela. According to Bermudo's method of instruction, composing could be learned by, first, practicing to intabulate (i.e. notate in tablature) vocal works of increasing difficulty, absorbing compositional techniques by playing works of the great masters, and finally, using this knowledge to create one's own works. Bermudo advised the aspiring composer and arranger to create a score in mensural notation first and only then to intabulate the music. This advice rises from Bermudo's idea that first notating music in mensural notation allows the composer to be "able to predict problems likely to arise in intabulating" (Griffiths, 2010, p. 130).

Publications expressly written for the purpose of explaining the potential of the lute, vihuela or guitar to a composer rather than a player did not appear at this stage, nor do they appear in the seventeenth and eighteenth century. The publication of such a work would not have been inconceivable: Roeser published his *Essai de l'instruction à l'usage de ceux, qui composent pour la clarinet et le cor* in 1764 (Roeser, 1764), answering to a need existing on the part of composers for learning how to write well for the clarinet and the horn. With the observed difficulties of access to the guitar-like instruments for non-player composers, how could it be that there was no such work written for these instruments? Four responses to this question are given here.

First, the lute and the guitar were primarily used by non-player composers when writing ensemble works. Basso continuo, which consisted of a bass line or a bass line with figures, provided the lutenist (or guitarist) with the musical and harmonic cues for the part. It was then up to the performer to translate this into music suitable for the instrument. The performer could improve this craft with the help of lute manuscripts that supplied formulas to be used in "improvised works during performance" (Griffiths, 2010, p. 134). Basso continuo notation took away from the composer the responsibility to write out the music for the lute, and gave this responsibility to the performer. Paradoxically, the disadvantage of the complexity of the instrument and tablature notation thus turned out to have its questionable benefits: it allowed the composer to score basso continuo parts without having to worry about writing impossible or non-idiomatic parts, and without having to study in more detail the techniques and notation practice of the lute or guitar.

Second, where the lute took the position of a central instrument of the sixteenth century music experience, comparable to that of the nineteenth century piano (Griffiths, 2002, p. 92), it increasingly lost this central position in the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth century. Where composers of the sixteenth century were more likely to have some lute-playing skills, and were therefore able to write

for the lute, the degradation of the lute's central position was accompanied by a decline in the popularity and use of the lute. In France, for instance, the five-course baroque guitar experienced an increase of popularity in the second half of the seventeenth century (Dausend, 1992, pp. 36-39; Lowe, 1976, p. 19), although the theorbo was still used until the second half of the eighteenth century. In Germany, some of the greatest lute composers, such as Weiss, Baron and Reusner, wrote lute works in the first half of the eighteenth century (Dausend, 1992, p. 44). With the subsequent decline of the lute, the publication of a lute scoring guide became even less likely. Although the guitar did increase in popularity, it did not possess the same level of prestige as the lute, nor was it a central instrument in music practice.

Third, it is important to recognize that the emergence of scoring guides specifically aimed at composers started in the second half of the eighteenth century and were intended to explain the effective use of newly introduced instruments in an orchestra. The first of these works, by Roeser (1764), Francoeur (1772) and Vandenbrock (1793) were all written to describe the scoring potential for the clarinet and horn, as these were, at the time, only recently introduced in the orchestras (Bartenstein, 1971). Later orchestration guides also included the rest of the orchestra, while instruments that were not part of the orchestra were only first described by the orchestration guide by Kastner (1837). It is in his *Traité general d'instrumentation* that we find brief overviews of the potential not only of the guitar, but also of the decacord (a ten string guitar), the lute and the theorbo. As the guitar-like instruments were not part of the orchestra, they were only described in the later orchestration guides of the nineteenth century, and in little detail. And finally, fourth, influential vihuela players such as Bermudo propagated the idea that one learned to compose through playing the instrument, rather than learning to write from a distance without knowing how to play. In the *Declaracio*, Bermudo gave careful instructions as to how this process of learning to compose through the instrument was to take form. The idea that a composer could learn to write for the instrument without being able to play is quite at odds with this method of compositional instruction.

4.1.2 From the classical era to the Torres guitar

Instrument characteristics and development

Towards the end of the eighteenth century, the sixth course was added to the five-course baroque guitar, extending the bass range of the guitar. The sixth course made it possible to easily create I-IV-V progressions on the guitar, "giving the classic guitar a kind of perfection which the five-course baroque guitar had resisted for about 200 years" (Heck, 1971, p. 40). Soon after the adoption of the sixth course, the courses were abandoned altogether, which left the guitar with six single strings. The use of double courses, a leftover from the Baroque era that was intended to increase the resonance of the string, became unnecessary when overspun strings were adopted (Päffgen, 2002, p. 124). As a result, six-string guitars were louder than their five-course forebears.

The standard tuning of the six-string guitar from the end of the eighteenth century is the same as that of the non-re-entrant five-course baroque guitar tuning, and has an added sixth string a perfect fourth below the fifth string. In the repertoire of the end of the eighteenth century and the nineteenth century, the standard tuning was only rarely abandoned. When the standard tuning was changed in this era, it

typically meant a downward detuning of the sixth string by a major second. Scordaturas fell into relative disuse: there are no works for six-string guitar from this era that display the wide array of tunings that were seen in the five-course Baroque guitar works of Campion (1705). The reason behind the lack of variation in tuning can partly be explained through Heck's assertion that the six-string guitar was conceived as a "chord-oriented instrument" (Heck, 1971, p. 40). By keeping the tuning of the guitar fixed, the composer could rely on familiar left-hand positions for the harmonic progressions of his music. The fall into disuse of the various tunings may also in part be explained by the transition from tablature to staff notation, as will be discussed in more detail under the header "Notation". Re-entrant tunings disappear altogether, as they were "*Notlösungen*" for the "inadequate" range of the baroque guitar (Päffgen, 2002, p. 124), now fixed by the extended range of the six-string guitar. Unusual keys are now reached with the standard tuning, facilitated by the extended range, as is demonstrated in the set of preludes in all major and minor keys by Legnani (1822).

A significant development of the six-string guitar was that its range was extended upward by the addition of frets. In the 1820's, guitar maker Stauffer built his guitars with the still customary first string range of an octave on the neck with an additional range of a fifth on the body of the instrument (Heck, 1971). The extension of the range of frets, coupled with the addition of the sixth string meant that the range of the guitar was extended upward and downward. This enlarged its musical possibilities, but also complicated the already complex grid of the fretboard. Position playing became more common, as the composer could now benefit from the three bass strings. In higher positions, the composer could score a melody two octaves above a bass line. The number of notes that could be reached in the bass register was limited when playing in higher positions, as the lowest range of bass notes can only be played in one position. This led to the use of typical keys, centered on open string pitches of the bass register. With the new, extended fretboards, each string with the exception of the highest string had at least fifteen pitches that could also be played on a higher string on the fretboard, and with the exception of string one and two, each string had at least fifteen pitches that could be played on at least two other higher strings. A number of guitar offshoots were invented, such as a guitar modeled after a lyre, and guitars with seven to twenty strings. The romantic guitar composer Johann Kaspar Mertz, for instance, first used a six-string guitar, and later moved towards a ten string guitar (Wynberg, 1985), and Giuliani wrote duets for a guitar and *terz* guitar, a smaller guitar tuned a minor third higher. None of these instruments, which guitar scholar Wade dismissingly called "monstrosities" (Wade, 1980, p. 98), enjoyed widespread adoption. The lack of adoption was conceivably caused by the same factors as those responsible for the demise of the lute: a large number of strings made these instruments harder to learn and less practical in use.

Notation

From the early nineteenth century, music for the six-string guitar was notated in staff notation, rather than tablature. Simon Molitor, one of the pioneers of the six-string guitar, motivated the necessity of using staff notation by claiming that this allowed the guitar and its music to be removed from a limited circle of amateurs, and to be introduced to the general musical arena. As a result, Molitor claimed, guitar music could now be subjected to criticism or praise by knowledgeable critics (Heck, 1971, p. 86). For the notation of guitar music, the treble clef was chosen, with guitar notes sounding an octave lower than notated. According to Peter Päffgen, guitarist and guitar scholar, it is not clear how and why the

transposing treble clef was chosen (2002, p. 137), but it quickly became a generally accepted notation custom, despite the awkwardness it entails for the notation of the three-and-a-half octave range of the guitar, requiring multiple ledger lines for the notation of its upper and lower registers. The influential guitar composer Sor agitated against the use of the treble clef, claiming it lacked “precision” (Sor, 1824?). Instead, Sor suggested a non-transposing two-staff notation with alternating use of the treble clef, alto clef and bass clef, which he introduced in his *Fantaisie op. 7* (Sor, 1824?). The score of the *Fantaisie* was very difficult to read for even professional guitarists; the two staves after all did not refer to two different hands, guitarists were not familiar with simultaneous reading in three clefs, and the new notation was not adopted. In his second edition of the *Fantaisie* and in the rest of his guitar works, Sor abandoned his suggestion for two-staff notation with three clefs altogether and reverted to the standardized single-staff, octave transposing notation. Although staff notation was widely accepted by guitarists as the customary means of notating guitar music, the quality of notation often left much to be desired. In its early days, staff notation of guitar music was still influenced by tablature notation, which meant that scores did not distinguish between voices. In the course of the nineteenth century, this practice improved, and guitar music that contained multiple voices was increasingly notated correctly (Päffgen, 2002, pp. 138-139). Hereafter, the customary notation for the classical guitar has remained staff notation, and it still is today.

The advantage of the adoption of staff notation was, indeed, that guitar music became accessible to non-guitarists. Through the correct use of staff notation, guitar scores could now specify more clearly what the desired length was of the various notes. The disadvantage of staff notation was that playing, reading and writing guitar scores became more challenging. Reading passages in higher positions became particularly difficult, as it required excellent knowledge on the part of the player of the multiple locations where a note could be found, as well as the best ways to finger combinations of multiple notes, combinations that could be fingered on multiple locations. Another disadvantage of staff notation was that reading and writing music that employs alternative tunings became particularly challenging. Staff notation for alternate tunings is much more complex than tablature notation, both for the composer to score and for the performer to decipher, as it changes the range of possible intervals and chords for the composer, while the player has to re-learn playing positions for each detuned string. As we have seen above, Campion excused his use of tablature by the fact that he used multiple tunings (Campion, 1716). Remarkably few pieces in unusual tunings appeared in the era from the introduction of the six-string guitar to the invention of the Torres guitar. To the present day, compositions scored for an alternative tuning other than the two most commonly used (i.e. sixth string to d, or sixth string to d and fifth string to g), two staves are often used, one of which is provided for the purpose of facilitating reading for the performer and notates pitches as they would have sounded in standard tuning.

The repertoire and its composers

The early nineteenth century saw the emergence of the first guitarist composers who created a large body of solo and chamber music repertoire, as well as a number of concertos for guitar and orchestra. The era between 1800-1850 is considered a “miniature golden age” of musical and technical progress for the guitar, while that of the latter half of the nineteenth century is again considered to be an era in

which the guitar survived but was not blessed with inspiring composers (Wade, 1980, pp. 99,130). The era between the introduction of the six-string guitar to that of the Torres guitar is being credited as being the first in history in which guitarists looked outward to the mainstream music world for inspiration, while also laying the foundations of modern guitar technique (Wade, 1980). The transition from courses to single strings required a new technique, which was developed in a wave of publications of guitar instruction works and etudes. Virtuoso performers primarily wrote their own solo, chamber and orchestral works for their performances and published etudes for the market. The Italian composer Mauro Giuliani and his Spanish counterpart Fernando Sor are considered to be the most distinguished guitar composers of this generation (Päffgen, 2002; Wade, 1980; Turnbull, 1976). Although their works made a “distinguished contribution to the repertoire” (Turnbull, 1976, p. 92), they do not display the same level of excellence as works by the greatest composers of their day. I agree with Wade that their smaller works are often received favorably, but their larger works sometimes “veer towards the grandiose” (Wade, 1980, p. 104). The picture of guitar works written by guitarist composers is one of extremes: while the virtuoso performers wrote dazzling and impressive pieces for their own performances (still challenging for professional players today), sometimes with considerable musical merit, there is much guitar music written in this age that is characterized by a “tedious sameness” and a content that is “cliché-ridden” (Turnbull, 1976, p. 88). The difficulty in creating large works was certainly partly caused by the difficulties in escaping the favorable tonalities of the guitar through harmonic and technical inventiveness, so much required in the development section of, for instance, the sonata form.

Non-guitarist composers only rarely wrote for the guitar, and when they did, their pieces were usually not solo works. Pieces written by non-guitarist composers such as Schubert and Berlioz, invariably confined the guitar’s role to that of accompaniment. The guitar parts in their scores are usually unassuming and are very simple for the professional guitarist to play. This is in part explained by the fact that they may have written for players that were not virtuoso performers themselves, but even the solo and chamber music works of Paganini “do not reach the complexity one might expect from the man whose performances on the violin were the talk of Europe” (Turnbull, 1976, p. 87). Despite the efforts of the six-string guitar pioneers to enter the guitar into the music mainstream, the guitar music written in this period was almost exclusively composed by composers who also played the instrument. Why was it that during this era the guitar was so confined to a narrow circle of guitarists and guitarist composers? An important factor was the difficulty to write for the guitar, especially for those who did not play the guitar. As may become clear from the discussion of the development of the instrument and its notation, the instrument’s already complex fretboard had extended greatly, and through the adoption of staff notation, scoring became further removed from the visual aspect of the performer’s playing experience on the guitar. A second and equally important factor was the lack of information on how to write well for the guitar (Turnbull, 1976, p. 88). Considering this difficulty, the lack of practical information was a considerable burden for composers. Berlioz undertook efforts in lowering this burden by including the guitar in his orchestration study. These efforts are discussed in more detail in the following section. A third factor was that of the guitar’s weak tone in comparison to other instruments. This almost disqualified the guitar for use as an orchestral instrument, and nearly disqualified it for use in all but the most intimate chamber music works, as it was easily overshadowed by instruments from other instrument families. Giuliani, who premiered his first guitar concerto in 1808, was ridiculed by a music

critic for trying to use the guitar as a solo instrument next to a full orchestra (Turnbull, 1976, p. 98; Heck, 1971, p. 94). Berlioz attested the limited use of the guitar to “*la faible sonorité*” of the instrument (Berlioz, 1843?, p. 86). Finally, a widespread disdain for the instrument in educated music circles further explains the lack of non-guitarist composers writing for the instrument. This disdain comes forward in music dictionary entries of the guitar and critiques of guitar performers in this age (Heck, 1971, pp. 60-63). The guitar was not a lute, and had never occupied an important position in musical life. Rather, it was considered to be an instrument not fit for serious musical study and performance. This prejudice against the instrument was actively countered by the composing and performing activities of, in particular, Sor and Giuliani, who, however, as the above criticism on their works indicates, only partially succeeded in their efforts.

Communication of scoring potential

While guitarists produced a large amount of pedagogical works for amateur guitarists, only a small number of works explaining the guitar’s scoring potential were published during this period. Scoring for the guitar was discussed in two orchestral scoring guides, by Kastner (1837) and Berlioz (1843?). Kastner’s description of the guitar is short and rudimentary, and presents the guitar as a chord instrument. His representation of the range of the guitar is not entirely accurate, and neither is his description of favorable keys. Berlioz’s presentation of the guitar is more extensive, but also suffers from inaccuracies, such as an erroneous representation of difficult chords. Closest to a scoring guide for the guitar was a work published by the guitarist Carulli under the title “*L’Harmonie Appliquée à la Guitare*”. The book shows how an accompaniment can be created on the guitar, but this work is primarily intended for use, as Carulli puts it himself, by “amateurs” (Carulli, 1825). Carulli’s book thus fits in the category of Bermudo’s *Declaracio*, which propagated the idea that one could learn to compose through playing the instrument. Why was it that no more publications on the scoring potential of the guitar have appeared, despite the introduction of staff notation, the more outward looking attitude of guitarists, and the popularity of the guitar at the beginning of the nineteenth century?

The first factor is the difficulty of explaining the scoring potential for the guitar. Berlioz who, after all, took it upon himself to explain scoring for a large number of instruments in his orchestration study, seems to make a slight retreat when he discusses the guitar: “Il est presque impossible de bien écrire la Guitare sans en jouer soi même. La plupart de compositeurs qui l’emploient sont pourtant loin de la connaître aussi lui donnent ils à exécuter des choses d’une excessive difficulté sans sonorité et sans effet” (Berlioz, 1843?, p. 86). Berlioz then decides to continue his discussion of the guitar, limiting himself to “*simples accompagnements*”. Explaining the potential of the guitar that transcended its use in simply accompaniment was thus a complex task for a non-guitarist, which Berlioz was not able to accomplish. The second factor is the belief held among guitarists and non-guitarists that one could only write well for the guitar if one was able to play it. Berlioz made statements to this effect, as we have seen above, while Carulli’s work, the only guitar scoring guide written by a guitarist in this era, was written for guitarists and not composers. The third factor is that professional guitarists, who were the designated experts to create and publish such works, apparently did not see it as their task to help composers. Instead, they published pedagogical works for the large population of guitar amateurs, which carried more financial

benefits than a score guide for an instrument that was often looked down upon may have yielded. Guitarists seem to have been quite content with their own works, and did not recognize the necessity to enrich their repertoire with that of non-guitarist composers as they did in the twentieth century. If guitarists in the nineteenth century would have taken the development of the guitar's repertoire more seriously, they would have tried to work together with renowned composers and would have created scoring guides for non-guitarist composers, rather than just trying to emulate them. Instead, they looked outward to the musical mainstream for inspiration, but did not ask for works.

4.1.3 The modern classical guitar since Torres

Instrument characteristics and development

At the end of the nineteenth century, Spanish guitar maker Antonio de Torres created what is now considered the prototype of the modern guitar (Päffgen, 2002, pp. 167-168). The guitar remained a six-string instrument, but Torres built a larger body with a longer string length and larger frets, and changed the internal bracing. The result was a louder guitar with more resonance, which in effect prepared the guitar for a more fruitful life on the concert stage. The downside to this development, as pointed out by Heck, was that the guitar was now, and has since remained, a more difficult instrument to master as the frets are much further apart when compared to the early nineteenth century classical guitar (Heck, 1971, pp. 55-56). As the guitar's relatively low dynamic potential was one of its major weaknesses, guitar makers have tried to improve the sound level by making changes to its construction. Since the end of the twentieth century, guitar makers have experimented with ultra-thin tops, innovative internal bracing and alternative materials in order to expand the guitar's sound with varying results: while some performers enjoy the larger volume, others criticize the lack of timbre diversity on louder guitars (Vowinkel, 2008). A second answer to the issue of the guitar's weak tone is amplification: with the development of its technology, amplification was gradually adopted to enlarge the sound of the classical guitar, primarily for performances of guitar concertos and chamber music, but in the last decades also increasingly for solo recitals. Although some guitarists resist the use of amplification and even play their concertos without amplification, others do not have objections and some even see their use of amplification as an important factor contributing to their popularity (Tanenbaum, 2003, p. 199). A third answer to the issue of the guitar's weak tone is to both develop its construction and use amplification: this path led, in the first half of the twentieth century, to the invention of the electric guitar. The electric guitar then rapidly branched off into various types of electric guitars (such as jazz guitars, rock guitars), for which instrument- and style-particular playing techniques were developed. Although the electric guitar opened a wealth of new possibilities, such as the possibility to electronically alter timbre and a longer fretboard further extending the pitch range upward, electric guitar techniques were mostly plectrum based, and turned out to have limitations when compared to the classical guitar right hand technique (Dawe, 2010, pp. 49-50).

The standard tuning of the guitar has remained the same since the nineteenth century, and this is also the standard tuning for the electric guitar. Towards the end of the twentieth century, composers have increasingly used unusual alternative tunings (other than the usual major second downward detuning of the sixth string) in order to change the possibilities to form chords and to change the timbre. Such

alternative tunings were usually employed in works by guitarist composers such as Brouwer, Domeniconi and D'Angelo. The pitch range of the guitar has remained the same as it was in the nineteenth century, although, as explained above, the frets are now wider. The fretboard thus remains as complex today as it was in the nineteenth century, and more difficult to play on.

Although instruments with diverging amounts of strings have appeared since the Torres guitar, the six-string instrument has very much remained the norm, both for the classical guitar and for the electric guitar. Notable exceptions on the classical guitar include the ten-string guitar of Narcico Yepes and the eight-string guitar of Paul Galbraith. The ten-string guitar of Yepes contained additional, chromatically tuned basses, allowing for resonance of non-open string bass pitches. The guitar of Galbraith has one added higher string as well as an added lower string, thus extending the range both upward and downward. Although both guitarists have been followed in their endeavors by other players, their guitars have not enjoyed widespread popularity among guitarists. The early German guitar scene led by Heinrich Albert used guitars with differing range for the performances of guitar quartet repertoire (Morris, 2001). This was done in order to emulate the "range and instrumental disposition" of the string quartet. In the flowering activities of guitar orchestras, usually consisting of amateur guitarists, the use of guitars with different ranges, such as the soprano guitar, terz guitar and baritone guitar (Hampshire guitar orchestra, 2012), has met with widespread adoption.

Notation

The use of staff notation for guitar music on one staff, in treble clef and an octave higher than sounding has remained the standard since its introduction in the late eighteenth century. Although few non-guitarist composers in the eighteenth and nineteenth century wrote for the six string guitar, the adoption of staff notation eventually did make the guitar more accessible to such composers in the twentieth century, as will be discussed in more detail in the next section. With the development of contemporary classical music in the second half of the twentieth century, issues surrounding the development of contemporary music notation also affected guitar notation. Many composers developed their own symbols and notation practices. This sometimes led to confusion concerning notation, for instance in the case of harmonics (Warfield, 1973-1974). The guitar, now more part of the classical music world, saw the introduction of a plethora of notation practices, both within and outside the boundaries of staff notation, and various studies on guitar notation and guitar scoring examined contemporary forms of guitar notation and their relation to new playing techniques (Lehner-Wieternik, 1991; Schneider, 1985). Many of these forms of notation were, and still are, composer-specific and remain unstandardized; some composers even change their ways of notating a particular sound from one piece to the next, conceivably in an effort to improve it. Some of these notation practices are more effective and precise than others, and suggestions will be made for the improvement of notation.

The last decades of the twentieth century and the beginning of the twenty-first century saw a remarkable return of tablature for pedagogical solo guitar music and for tablatures published online in a variety of music styles. This revival of tablature was evidenced by publications of classical guitar etudes, methods and pieces in tablature by major guitar publishing houses such as Mel Bay (Bach & Pincus, 1992) and Schott (Schmidt, 2004). Since the end of the twentieth century, the internet has enabled guitarists without notation software to publish their tablatures online. Modern tablature published on the internet

is virtually identical to baroque tablature, although it usually does not indicate note durations. As in the days of the lute and the baroque guitar, tablature again proves its attraction due to its easy access, this time to amateur guitarists.

The repertoire and its composers

The era since the introduction of the modern classical guitar has seen the greatest growth of solo, chamber, and concerto repertoire for the guitar. For the first time in its history, the guitar repertoire was enriched with solo repertoire written by non-guitarist composers. Andrés Segovia, who is widely credited for having been personally responsible for lifting the guitar to the level of the concert stage, accomplished this by maintaining a successful international concert career on a level hitherto unseen for a guitarist and his quest to expand the guitar's repertoire by asking "great composers" to write for it (Päffgen, 2002, pp. 185-190). The canonical guitar repertoire of today is still largely formed by pieces explicitly written for Segovia, such as the solo works written by Turina, Ponce and Moreno-Torroba. However, due to his "*konservative Ästhetik*" (Brill, 1994, p. 3), Segovia did not play works by the more progressive contemporary composers, did not request them to write works, and ignored the pieces they sent him. Schoenberg reportedly offered to write a work, but Segovia turned him down (Tanenbaum, 2003, p. 184). In the last decades, this has led to criticism of Segovia, and consequentially, of guitarists for accepting a canonical repertoire that is, to a large extent, based on the limited tastes of one person (Brill, 1994). Guitarists of the generation after Segovia with broader musical tastes have actively worked to broaden the repertoire, and managed to enrich the guitar repertoire with works by leading composers of the second half of the twentieth century. British guitarist Julian Bream, for instance, commissioned pieces by Henze, Britten, Bennett and Takemitsu. His American colleague Eliot Fisk commissioned works by Berio and Maw, while David Starobin, also from the United States, had pieces written for him by Carter, Crumb and Babbitt. From the above composers, works by Henze, Britten and Takemitsu are regularly featured on recital programs of guitarists, while other works by non-guitarist composers from the second half of the twentieth century are played more rarely. While there were relatively few guitarist composers in the first half of the twentieth century, Villa-Lobos and Barrios being notable exceptions, the second half of the century saw a "re-emergence of the guitarist/composer" in terms of output and popularity (Dawe, 2010, pp. 25-26). Among this group, Brouwer, Domeniconi, Dyens and Bogdanovic are now among the most prolific and most played. The works of above guitarist composers are often written in an idiom that takes strong influence from folk music, jazz and popular music. The popular features of such works coupled with their effective scoring for the guitar has led many guitarists to include these works in their programs. For some guitar scholars, the popularity of such works among guitarists and the increased blurring of the borders between classical and popular idioms are explained by the typical background of many classical guitarists: they initially start learning to play rock & roll, and only later discover the classical guitar (Coelho, 2003, p. 10; Tanenbaum, 2003, p. 198). Aesthetical objections to popular music are therefore perhaps not as widespread among classical guitarists. Other scholars consider the choice for works by contemporary guitarist composers over those written by the great composers of the second half of the twentieth century as the result of a narrow focus and a lack of curiosity for new music on the part of guitarists and guitar students (Evers & Brill, 1994). Both explanations ring true, but it is important to recognize that affinity for popular music should not

obstruct guitarists' view of the contemporary repertoire written by leading non-guitarist composers, as this repertoire is also highly valued outside the guitar community. The lack of curiosity for new music on the part of classical musicians to engage with contemporary music has not been unique to classical guitarists: composers in the second half of the twentieth century have often lamented classical musicians' lack of enthusiasm for contemporary music, and some have called for musicians or ensembles specializing in contemporary music (Andriessen, 2002, p. 121). Such developments also took place in the guitar world; the late twentieth century saw an increase of guitarists specializing in the performance of contemporary music (Tanenbaum, 2003, pp. 200-201).

As major composers only started to compose for the guitar in the course of the twentieth century, some guitarists, understandably, felt dissatisfaction with the musical level of the guitar repertoire written before this point. Consequently, they turned to the practice of creating transcriptions of works originally written for other instruments. The practice of transcribing is widespread in the guitar world, but it does not come without its problems. Transcriptions are sometimes successful: Albéniz for instance appears to have been satisfied with the guitar arrangements of his piano works (Turnbull, 1976, p. 107). At other times, transcriptions can be problematic, for instance when the performance practice of the work is not always taken into account by the guitarist (Evers & Brill, 1994, pp. 173-174), or when the work is simply not as effective on the guitar, for instance due to a more limited range of the guitar, or because the original contains highly idiomatic techniques for another instrument.

Chamber music involving the guitar followed quite a different path of evolution during this era. In early twentieth century Vienna, composers first borrowed the guitar from the cabaret tradition as a symbol for decadence and eccentricity. Because of its use in serious music, the guitar then became a legitimate instrument without these notions (Marriott, 1984). Subsequently, composers who used the guitar in chamber music were often interested in its timbral potential. Marriott credits Webern as being the first composer who used the guitar to add color to the musical texture rather than using references to popular or cabaret music in his *5 Stücke für Orchester* (Webern, 1951). Brill sees the timbre possibilities of the guitar as the main reason why all of the principal members of the Second Viennese School, Schoenberg, Berg and Webern, used the guitar in their works (Evers & Brill, 1994). Several decades later, Boulez also included the guitar in *Le marteau sans maître* (Boulez & Char, 1957) for coloring reasons: the guitar was included to imitate the sound of the Japanese koto (Boulez, 1971). The use of the guitar and the works by the composers of the Second Viennese School established the guitar as an instrument deserving serious attention of composers. Until the 1960's, composers preferred composing chamber music with the guitar rather than writing solo pieces, as "the instrument's technical complexity and its curious notation were too bewildering" for many of them (Marriott, 1984, p. 84). In order to make the guitar better heard in their chamber and orchestral music, composers such as Boulez and Stockhausen resorted to the use of the electric guitar. While these composers primarily used the electric guitar as a "loud guitar" (Mackey, 2002), there were increasing calls in the seventies for contemporary music to use the electric guitar in conjunction with its idiomatic possibilities and its associated electronic apparatus (Kozzin, 1977). The music of Steven Mackey in the late twentieth and early twenty-first century, often written for electric guitar in a chamber music setting, can be seen as one answer to that call.

Communication of scoring potential

Dearth of information on how to write for the guitar has remained a major obstacle for non-guitarist composers. In comparison to the complexity of the guitar and its age, the amount of works explaining to non-guitarist composers how to write for the guitar has remained conspicuously small. The first works explicitly written for this purpose only appeared at the end of the twentieth century, which is more than two centuries after the appearance of the first guide on how to write for the clarinet and the horn (1764). Accuracy and usefulness of the works that were published are questionable.²¹ Many renowned composers have expressed the frustration and difficulty at coming to terms with the scoring potential of the guitar.²² Guitarists, in turn, have expressed their discontent with the works of non-guitarist composers by massively turning to works by player composers. On the one hand, the re-emergence of player composers and the adoption of their works enrich the repertoire. On the other hand, when this is accompanied by a turn away from pieces by non-guitarist composers, it represents a regression to the circumstances of the nineteenth century, where the guitar was poorly integrated into the musical mainstream.

The described situation is particularly astonishing when one realizes that the classical guitar became much more integrated in both the classical mainstream and the world of contemporary composition during the twentieth century. Why would there be such a dearth of information on the guitar scoring potential, especially considering the efforts of guitarists to extend the repertoire with the works of non-guitarist composers? Why were there so few works and why are the works that were published not impressive in terms of their accuracy and utility? Two main factors play a role in this respect. First, the guitar has remained a complex instrument, with a labyrinth-like fretboard, making the playing possibilities difficult to explain, and difficult to understand for a non-guitarist. The view articulated in this study is that the guitar potential requires the development of a framework and a vocabulary that both suits the characteristics of the instrument, and allows for understandable communication to non-guitarists. Such a work has not appeared yet. Second, collaboration has served as a substitute for theoretical information. Guitarists have worked extensively with composers since the introduction of the Torres guitar. Particularly in the case of solo works, composers often write for a particular player who is consulted on how to write for the guitar, rather than a manual. However, cooperation with a performer is an unfitting substitute for theoretical information on scoring. Instead, theoretical information should be available to the composer in order for the cooperation between composer and performer to reach a level of creative exchange that supersedes instruction of the composer by the guitarist. This instruction is largely dependent on the ability of the guitarist in question to understand and explain the guitar's scoring potential.

4.2 Match or mismatch?

²¹ These works are discussed and evaluated in more detail in section 3.1.

²² See section 3.2.6.

In each of the eras of the guitar history, we find examples of a mismatch in the triangle of guitar, guitarist and composer. In the renaissance and baroque era, the tablature notation that players used to manage the complex fretboard of their instruments limited access to composers. Instead, composers wrote basso continuo parts, leaving the idiomatic implementation to the lutenist. In the classical era, performers did not translate knowledge of their complex instrument into scoring theory for composers, but preferred to compose their own works. A widespread disdain for the instrument, and criticism of its weak tone, further diminished its position in the classical mainstream. In the first half of the twentieth century, the growth of the solo guitar repertoire overwhelmingly depended on the scoring advice, rigorous editing and conservative personal taste of one individual, Segovia. Guitarists were interested in playing solo works, while the great composers of the age, such as Berg, Schoenberg and Webern, wrote chamber music works with guitar that were often neither challenging nor very suitable for the guitar. Few solo works were written by the great composers, either because of the difficulties they encountered when writing for the instrument, or because their offers were turned down by Segovia. While non-guitarist composers struggled with the challenging nature of writing a solo guitar work, the number of theoretical publications on how to score for the guitar remained small and unimpressive. At the end of the twentieth century, guitarists increasingly turned away from non-guitarist composers again and started playing works of guitarist composers out of dissatisfaction with the effectiveness of works written by non-guitarist composers. The lack of effectiveness of such works was caused by the complexity of the instrument for non-guitarist composers and the relative absence of useful scoring information. An overwhelming amount of the guitar repertoire was written by guitarist composers. Many of these guitarist composers received little or no training in composition, as a result of which many of their works were below professional guitarist's ideal standards for concert works. These pieces were then played only sporadically, while their expressive and musical powers failed to inspire and capture the imagination of non-guitarist composers. Non-guitarist composers, meanwhile, continued to avoid the guitar, due to their lack of knowledge and interest, and the amount of high-quality repertoire fell behind. In order to make up for this lack, guitarists developed the habit of creating transcriptions of high-quality works written for other instruments, thus expanding and improving the guitar repertoire, but not solving the mismatch between guitar, guitarist and composer.

In each era, efforts have been made by performers, composers and luthiers to minimize the mismatch. In the baroque era, performers and scholars called for the use of staff notation, which was consequently adopted at the start of the classical era. In the classical era, guitarists started to look at the mainstream classical world for inspiration. The pitch range of the guitar was extended, which augmented the scoring possibilities of the guitar. Torres built louder guitars, while luthiers and experts on amplification have ever since tried to further raise the dynamic potential of the guitar. Segovia undertook serious efforts, for the first time in the guitar's history, to enlarge the repertoire of the guitar with the works of non-guitarist composers. Other guitarists with less conservative tastes than Segovia continued this quest for works, thereby greatly extending and enriching the repertoire and improving the standing of the guitar in the classical mainstream and contemporary music world. A number of guitarists specialized in the performance of new music, and worked in close collaboration with non-player composers. For the first time, scoring guides on how to write for the guitar were published, although it is argued here that these guides had various, and serious, shortcomings.

In conclusion, it should be stated that there still exists a partial mismatch between guitar, guitarist and composer, although efforts have been undertaken to diminish the mismatch. The most serious mismatch exists in the field of theoretical information on scoring: the lack of this information serves as a major mismatching factor. It is natural that a certain tension exists between the three actors in the triangle guitar, guitarist and composer. However, when a persisting need of one of the actors in this relationship is not fulfilled, in this case on the part of composers, the tension is not productive, but rather destructive. A case in point is the trend of guitarists turning away from composers, exclusively composing their own guitarist composer works. It is my ambition that this study will serve to improve the match between guitar, guitarist and composer as a body of knowledge on the scoring potential of the guitar.