

Urtext Editions of Guitar Music

An Overview of the Problems of Editing

Lecture held at the Lake Konstanz Guitar Research Meeting, March 2007
Hemmenhofen, Lake Constance

Michael Sieberichs-Nau

March 2007

EVSN

Contents

1	Introduction · A Survey in general	4
2	Editing guitar or lute music	6
2.1	Music of the 16 th and 17 th century	6
2.1.1	The Schrade-Gombosi dispute	7
2.1.2	Realizations of Thorough Bass – Figured on Nonfigured	8
2.1.3	Musica fictia	9
2.2	Music of the 19 th century	9
2.3	Some Remarks on the Neuland and the Dubez Urtexts I prepared for Chanterelle	14
2.3.1	Neuland op. 29	14
2.3.2	Dubez (Op. 1 ?)	15
3	Historical Sources	18
4	Discussion · Remarks on the Lecture by the Audience	19
5	Additional Remarks on Music of the 20th century	19

Preface

This essay is dealing with the problems of editing guitar music related to the aims of urtext or critical editions. It is a summary of a lecture I held at the Guitar Summit at Lake Constance 2007 March 24th and 25th in Hemmenhofen, near Constance.

The last sections were added later to create a more complete text version on the topic.

In the following summary I will discuss some issues on editing music especially related to Urtext. I have chosen topics representing the process of editing.

As a teacher as well as a performer I always wanted to proof the authenticity of a given text: indications of tempo, dynamic, expression and also the technical application, which relates directly to the authentic way of performing. Expecting answers research became a new focus and challenge for me. The sources which were subject of my investigation were method books, tutors, studies and the repertoire of the guitar as well as works written for piano or violin. Some of the authors provide new evidence and are especially inspiring. Only to name a few in advance: Czerny, Hummel, Türk, Spohr, and of course the standard works by Ph. E. Bach, L. Mozart and J. Quantz.

To some extent my serious and intensive concern with these philological problems were a result from my studies of the viola da gamba. But then, I made an effort by reading the fascinating book by the Alfred Brendel, »Nachdenken über Musik«. (I read this book before I started studying at the University of Music Cologne / Aachen.)

At that time I did not start my research mainly due to the aim of publishing music. The lack of serious editions made me realize the importance of finding solutions. My thesis, I wrote for obtaining the diploma in 1988, dealt with transcriptions and principles of editing the lute music of John Dowland; including an approach to the subject.

Beside my published editions for Ricordi – suitable for pupils at music schools – and the ones made by selfpublishing, there will be two editions will be issued by Chanterelle, Heidelberg in 2007: Wilhelm Neuland, *Fantaisie Germanique*, op. 29 and Johann Dubez, *Hungarian Fantaisie*, op. 1 (?). I will introduce these editions to make things more concrete.

First of all I will summarize some ideas in general, then I will introduce some special details from my practicing as well as from my editing. I hope the examples will be representative.

Let me state some points in advance, this is a subjective statement. We should not only consider a good edition as a summary of correct notes. It is also necessary to give more information particularly on questions relating to performance practice. Former times did not give much attention on the uncorrupted text, we see this clearly by considering the Aguado version of Sor's Gran Solo or of Hummel's ornamented versions of Mozart's piano concertos. In this way urtext should be more than a version suspected to be the original. Do we have a concept for that? Of course we have not, our editions we are accustomed to use such as the Scheit of Segovia series by UE resp. Schott are done without modern editorial competence. If we compare this to Henle's urtext, we find that there is a lack in the editorial practice for the guitar.

Furthermore I think that our view on performance practice or that what we are used to consider as what some of us may name so is a concept we should take a new and closer review. My point of doubt to this topic is that we use to simplify subjects. For a good performance we should not apply rules being too simple for the musical sense. Sometimes I feel that there is not a good relation between musicology and practical performance. To give only one example: I am sure that many of the so-called baroque conventions survived during the romantic period parallel to that we are accustomed to be romantic. (Read Clive Brown's recommendable book: *Performing Practice ...* Oxford University Press / Many thanks to Erik Stenstadvold for the recommendation.)

1 Introduction · A Survey in general

In former times, especially the late 19th century, editions of music followed principles of personal taste and practice. These editions often are product of well known, highly esteemed performers; they reflect the personal application of fingering, articulation, phrasing and in general the performance practice contemporary to the time of the editor not of the composer. (Therefore, the editions could be a helpful source to derive the characteristics of interpretation and performance of that time.)

From this time in history we still use the terms »instructive edition« and »interpretative edition«. Busoni's famous editions of the Bach keyboard works with his own comments and hints, how to interpret the music (in Busoni's personal style), are famous examples. Numerous publications survived e. g. from the »Welltempered Clavier« elaborated with slurs, phrasing and dynamical indications, Bach would never have used in his manuscripts.

Towards the end of the 19th century the point of view changed. Urtext was

developed to supply a text that reflects a version as assumed to be original. Heinrich Schenker was one of the first musicologist suggesting urtext editions. This development is connected to the later concept of »historical performance practice«. Today Henle in Munich, Bärenreiter in Kassel and Wiener Urtext Edition in Mainz/Vienna are the leading publishing companies specialized in urtext editions and well known for their standards in editing music. Also other companies provide urtexts. The most reputed houses are Breitkopf & Härtel and Peters. Peters was also the original company for several composers in the 19th century, i. g. Edvard Grieg. Using the same »data« as done for the first edition made the situation for preparing the edition easy. But they do not supply guitar music, except one edition with music for violin and guitar from Paganini issued by Henle.

There are only a few publishing companies dealing with urtext editions of guitar-music, e. g. Chanterelle, Ut Orpheus, Tecla, Scelte, Editions Ophee are known throughout the world of the guitar. There are also several facsimile editions, i.e. the Collected Works of Giuliani by Tecla London and several editions published by Minkoff in Geneva.

The term »urtext« is not defined by law but we can derive the meaning from the common use in practice. If you prefer – there are good arguments to do – you may use »critical edition«. In order to the most important items being used in general to determine the pretention to urtext editions I point out the following summary:

1. All sources have to be named and their value has to be judged critically.
2. The original text as assumed to be intended by the composer has to be the main aim.
3. All changes, additions as well as omissions have to be indicated. Manuscripts and early printed editions have to be compared and furthermore letters, corrected prints and further documents may be used to verify the text.
4. Preface and »critical notes« describe the principals and problems of the special edition. They will also supply historical background information.
5. Every edition has specific questions on performance practice. In many cases, the editor can make suggestions, often concerned with the specific practice of notation.
6. An urtext is a practical edition not mainly an academical one. It is worth to mention, that a practical urtext edition has to be engraved accurately.

As a premise it is useful to state, that nearly all questions on interpreting are related to the meaning of notation. A very pure statement is that of Ferruccio Busoni in his »Ästhetik der Tonkunst«. The following quote will make clear, that the relation between a musical idea and its notation needs interpretation (in a degree, either depending on the reliability of the source or on the special accuracy of the notation).

... Jede Notation ist schon Transkription eines abstrakten Einfalls ...
... notation is always a transcription of an abstract Idea ...

Several questions derive from this statement.

1. Did conventions change since the time of the composer?
2. Did the composer or the engraver use notation in a degree of accuracy which give us an information of musical performance we can realize more or less literally. (What does it mean for the editor / for the performer?)
3. Is there any realistic possibility to state an original text, reflecting the intentions of a composer worth to be attributed as an urtext (german prefix "ur" means original)?
4. What is to be stated as objective or subjective? Is objectivity a property of musical notation? How literal is e.g. a note value?
5. My last question: Do the performers from today know how to interpret a musical text? Are they familiar with the conventions of notation in former centuries? Do they know that e. g. accidentals relate to all octaves in 19th century (in contrary to the conventions today)? Are they aware of the problems of reading what the text means? (Should an editor provide information in this field?)

Please hold these topics and questions in mind, I will relate to them by working them out in concrete examples.

2 Editing guitar or lute music

2.1 Music of the 16th and 17th century

It is worth noting, that editing music from the 16th or 17th century will cause a couple of special questions. Sometimes we have to consider that also composers of the 19th century follow conventions of notation that were used in

their period but not being common in use today. (I read an article from Paul Badura-Skoda on this topic, dealing with the use of accidentals in Beethoven's Op. 106.)

Few examples: Baroque notation can be misleading. Time signatures, accidentals, the force of accidental or ornamentations are used in a manner not easy to understand without special knowledge because of the differences to modern conventions.

Often a sharp related to a note with a flat means that what we would use as a natural sign. Today alterations affect all the notes of an equal pitch until the bar line according to the rules valid today. This is completely different to the convention of former times.

The *musica ficta* is a very confusing problem I will deal with below.

2.1.1 The Schrade-Gombosi dispute

The first complex I want to describe refers to the notation of lute or guitar music. One of the most important tasks of an editor is to find a compromise between the original and the modern notation and provide the method in the commentary.

Tabulatures only contain the beginning of each note. Polyphonic structure has to be added by the performer or by the editor. Therefore a specific knowledge of style and counterpoint is necessary to transcribe.

In 1931, the musicologists Leo Schrade and Otto Gombosi had a dispute about the method of transcribing tabulatures of L. Milan. Schrade transcribed them in a very literal manner. He wanted to create an "objective" staff notation which meant, that he avoided any interpretative, polyphonic notation (polyphonical structure can be obtained by using different note stems (upwards and downwards), rests, and note values to distinguish the voice leading). Schrade's result has been a curious manner of notation completely inadequate to the musical structure. I am convinced that his manner of "objectivity" has nothing to do with the composer's mind. Most of Milan's *El Maestro* is objectively polyphonic, and Schrade's notation is a contradiction to the musical sense. It is more incompatible than any interpretation of polyphony could ever be.

Gombosi attacked Schrade's method in a review in the *Zeitschrift für Musikwissenschaft* ZfM XIV/1931, p. 185-189. Later the editors preferred the Gombosi's manner appropriate to the polyphonic structure. (See also: Diana Poulton, *The Collected Lute Music of John Dowland*)

2.1.2 Realizations of Thorough Bass – Figured on Nonfigured

It is a common practice that editors supply a realisation of the figured bass. My suggestion is to follow the practice of editing keyboard music. The editorial realization often is engraved in smaller size, than the bass and the signatures. Analogue free ornamentations of baroque music may be also engraved in the same manner.

It is an important fact, that we frequently find different versions of music. Let us consider the music of Robert de Visée in his book from 1886, there are two issues: one is a soloverision the other is a version for melody-instrument and figured bass. Comparing will help to find a suitable harmonization, due to the fact that thorough bass signatures and indication often is missing. In this situation the performer or the editor has to add the signatures – often a subject of guesswork or speculation.

Comparing sources can also be helpful for further problems in connection with continuo playing. The following example is taken from Nigel North, "Continuo Playing on the Lute, Theorbo and Archlute". It is an excerpt from "I saw my lady weep" from John Dowland, "The second book of Ayres". The vocal part contains the forth suspension as well as the resolution, which is also indicated in the signatures.

To use them also in the lutepart would cause consecutive parallels of octaves. Insinght in Dowland solves this problem gives us a solution we can transfer to any other continuo realization. Dowland omitts the resolution in the lute part. Similar to that, Alonso Ferrabosco left either the forth or the resolution to the singer.

The image shows a musical score for a vocal line and a lute part. The key signature is one sharp (F#) and the time signature is 6/8. The vocal line is on a single staff, and the lute part is on a grand staff (treble and bass clefs). Annotations with arrows point to specific notes:

- 4 Suspension:** Points to the fourth note in the vocal line, which is a half note G4.
- 3 Resolution left to the singer alone:** Points to the fifth note in the vocal line, which is a half note A4.
- 4 Suspension:** Points to the fourth note in the lute part, which is a half note G4.
- 3 Resolution omitted by Dowland:** Points to the fifth note in the lute part, which is a half note A4.

So, for editions of music for lute or vihuela and other instruments from the 16th and 17th century a practical solution can mean, to offer both: staff and tabulature in one score. For me it is an extremely important argument, that the original notation contains the original fingering or the fingering solution most near to the composer's environment. To supply the music to modern guitarists, the transcription could be transposed a third lower suitable to the tuning of the guitar. Tilman Hoppstock used this method for his edition of Bach's lute works, it is also used in Mönkemeyer's series "Die Tabulatur" issued by Hofmeister.

A realization of a figured bass is not an urtext in a direct sense, but it shows very clearly the process of solving problems. One of the most important aspects of editing music – even when we are dealing with urtext of arrangements – is the evidence of sources as pointed out in the six items.

2.1.3 Musica fictia

Comparing with tabulature can also be helpful finding answers to questions concerning the treatment of accidentals. Since tabulatures for the lute determine the absolute pitch and that there is no chance to omit an additional accidental we have a good reference for the meaning of e.g. vocal music written in staff notation.

We know the intavolatura practice in lute and vihuela music. The most famous example may be "Cancion del Emperador" a transcription of "Mille Regrets" from Josquin de Prés.

I had a discussion and controversy with the editor in chief of RICORDI in Munich on this topic. We prepared the edition "Early Music for Fore Guitars". All the pieces are taken from choir music. I transcribed a version for quartet.

There is a short section; just one bar being repeated directly and literal in the original. The editor in chief could not believe that measure 9 should be altered in measure 11. I argued that Luys de Narvaez wrote this altered version in measure 11. So we decided a compromise. The additional accidentals are indicated above the note in smaller size and the relation to the intavolatura is mentioned in the preface.

2.2 Music of the 19th century

The 19th century has been the epoch of classical and romantic music. Guitar music reflects the classical style from Haydn and Mozart as well as the style of

Hummel, Moscheles and other composers between the classical and romantic style.

The “new” style is connected with a new instrument: the classical guitar. From 1800, the guitar was strung with single gut strings, not courses using double strings unison or in octaves.

Even the manner of notation changed. Some traditions of the tablature remained, particularly the violinlike simplification of polyphonic structures: bass notes do not use a special stem to indicate musical meaning and concrete note value (Carulli, Ferrandiere) The problem is similar to the Schrade-Gombosi dispute mentioned above. In fact there is more than just one solution possible. Let us have a look on the examples, sometimes, editors maybe in a situation that remind us to the Schrade-Gombosi-dispute.

The first one is an excerpt from Carulli’s Duo op. 34/2. A relict of the tablature. The second example is taken from the “Vollständige Gitarrenschule“ also from Carulli.

1 Ex. 1



Original

Musical notation for Ex. 1 Original: A single staff in treble clef with a key signature of one sharp (F#) and a time signature of 2/4. The melody consists of eighth notes and quarter notes, starting on G4 and ending on G4. The notes are G4, A4, B4, C5, B4, A4, G4, A4, B4, C5, B4, A4, G4, A4, B4, C5, B4, A4, G4.



Interpretation

Musical notation for Ex. 1 Interpretation: A single staff in treble clef with a key signature of one sharp (F#) and a time signature of 2/4. The melody is the same as the original, but the bass line is simplified, consisting of quarter notes and rests. The notes are G4, A4, B4, C5, B4, A4, G4, A4, B4, C5, B4, A4, G4, A4, B4, C5, B4, A4, G4.

Ex. 2



Original

Musical notation for Ex. 2 Original: A single staff in treble clef with a key signature of one sharp (F#) and a time signature of 6/8. The melody consists of eighth notes and quarter notes, starting on G4 and ending on G4. The notes are G4, A4, B4, C5, B4, A4, G4, A4, B4, C5, B4, A4, G4, A4, B4, C5, B4, A4, G4.



Interpretation

Musical notation for Ex. 2 Interpretation: A single staff in treble clef with a key signature of one sharp (F#) and a time signature of 6/8. The melody is the same as the original, but the bass line is simplified, consisting of quarter notes and rests. The notes are G4, A4, B4, C5, B4, A4, G4, A4, B4, C5, B4, A4, G4, A4, B4, C5, B4, A4, G4.



Reduction

Musical notation for Ex. 2 Reduction: A single staff in treble clef with a key signature of one sharp (F#) and a time signature of 6/8. The melody is the same as the original, but the bass line is simplified, consisting of quarter notes and rests. The notes are G4, A4, B4, C5, B4, A4, G4, A4, B4, C5, B4, A4, G4, A4, B4, C5, B4, A4, G4.

Ex. 3



Musical notation for Ex. 3: A single staff in treble clef with a key signature of one sharp (F#) and a time signature of 3/4. The melody consists of quarter notes and eighth notes, starting on G4 and ending on G4. The notes are G4, A4, B4, C5, B4, A4, G4, A4, B4, C5, B4, A4, G4.

1 Ex. 4



Musical notation for Ex. 4: A single staff in treble clef with a key signature of one sharp (F#) and a time signature of 3/4. The melody consists of quarter notes and eighth notes, starting on G4 and ending on G4. The notes are G4, A4, B4, C5, B4, A4, G4, A4, B4, C5, B4, A4, G4.

Of course in Ex. 1 both solutions would be thinkable.

There are arguments for the original version:

The pupil should learn to read different modes of notation. He has to understand, that he is the performer and has to find a suitable articulation; a task similar to the interpretation of the tabulature.

Ex. 1 is original notation.

Below we find an interpretation by an editor. While it is meant to a suggestion, it could also be a hindrance for individual solutions (the bass could also be a minim). But there is also a good argument for a more polyphonic notation.

We can find it in the original version of Ex. 2 that shows the same degree of polyphonical notation as the interpretation of Ex. 1.

This is a very simple example. But it makes clear that the editor has to find answers as well as the guitarist has to do. The problems sometimes are the same ones. This aspect deals with the relation between notation and musical performance. In this case it concerns the articulation of the bass notes in Ex. 1 as well as the articulation of the three part structure in Ex. 2.

To reduce the notation in Ex. 2 is only a theoretical solution. It would be the same reduction as the "modern" tabulatures for guitar. Whatever the preference would be: we can see that an editor will be responsible for the musical interpretation. In every case he has to mention changes in the text or the commentaries.

There is a great variety of possibilities to achieve degrees of polyphonical correctness. Sometimes it seems to me that Sor does too much. Ex. 3 is taken from op. 35/3. Ex. 4 is taken from the next study.

What is to do in the following case? What shall we do with misprints or mistakes?

The next example is an excerpt from Küffner's Pot-Pourri op. 86 (this work is not available in the major libraries today, I have a original copy of the flute part and a photocopy of the guitarpart from Kenneth Sparr, Sweden). In the second bar we find a fourth suspension on the second beat at the same time with the third played by the guitar. I did not hear it while practicing, but in a rehearsal with the violonist we both mentioned the detail. Did somebody play a wrong note?

Of course the mistake is to find very easy, but not for beginners (the work does not require a virtuoso). Should we correct the mistakes a composer made? From my point of view, we should do it in this case. Important is, that we have to mention it. Maybe it is not a mistake as in the following example.

The excerpt is taken from a famous work, composed by a German master – I do not mention his name – but it is evident, not to correct the text, because there is obviously no mistake. (For a serious reader it looks like a mistake, you see it, but you do not hear it as a mistake.)

For a reader of the scores the problem seems to be the same. The fourth suspension appears at the same time as the resolution. Probably you all know the piece and the composer. You will have heard and practiced the work several times in your life without remarking a problem.

There are several reasons, why the second example is not a mistake but a masterpiece. But I do not want to discuss. For the present consideration it is important to find a solution.

4 suspension

ad lib.

colla parte

p

pp

4 suspension

Sometimes – first of all it would be a decision left to the performer – there will be problems have to be solved.

In the second sonata from Sor Op. 25, we find the following problem: A thrill has to be realized and the repetition of the chord goes on.

tr

Original

Realization according to Meissonier

The realization similar to that I would prefer.

In my opinion, the editor should find practical adequate solutions. A thinkable one is a thrill in pairs with two notes. This is used in Meissoniers tutor and

Meissonier is one of the publisher of the Sor works issued in Paris. (It is worth to mention that Molitor, Giuliani and many others used thrill realized on two strings. Probably the thrill begins with the main note. (Hummel 1828))

Why should we require correctness and authenticity in questions concerning the text, when we accept that performers do not deal with questions of that what we name "historical performance practice". Both, editing and also performing, deals mainly with questions related to the problem of notation. May be, that an editor has more knowledge about the sources: tutors, methods, hints and remarks in historical scores such as the Sonata Op. 7 from Molitor or several Sor editions of the studies.

Sor indicated several of his studies very detailed. In his works he used to notate the polyphonic structures in a very elaborated manner. I think of his Op. 59 the "Fantasie Elegiaque" and also of his detailed way of indicating the slurs in the ornamentation. Especially the first movement with the turnlike ornaments will give us a hint how to realize longer embellishments. These works may be used as a hint to find solution for other works not indicated in the same way.

(Of course sometimes composers used the sluring very free. Giuliani has indicated some details in his op. 48 in another way than his op. 30.)

2.3 Some Remarks on the Neuland and the Dubez Urtexts I prepared for Chanterelle

2.3.1 Neuland op. 29

The Neuland edition contains a short biography. Dr. Haase-Mühlbauer has been very helpfull, but she did not know all the sources, a gitarrist will know. Some letters survived. I quoted them, because the relate to the text. Neuland states that the publishing houses made some misprints and that he had to correct them for second edition. Therefore I used the Simrock editon (this is the second edition) for the present issue.

It is very important, that Neuland lived some years in London. He met the family of Ferdinand Pelzer, Catharina Josepha Pelzer (married Sidney-Pratten) and the most reputed performer of the time, Regondi.

Neuland performed with L. Sagrini (Sagrini has performed Giuliani's Op. 130 together with Coste). Therefore the following quotation from the Sor-Coste method will be useful for editing the guitar part and will apogolize my fingering and sluring I have added to the edition.

Un trait tout en notes détachées qui se prolongerait trop , serait plat et sec . (Ex:22.)



Ce serait donc manquer de goût que de ne le pas entremêler de notes liées. Voici comme il faudrait l'exécuter. (Ex 25.)



Un trait tout en notes détachées se prolongerait trop, serait plat e sec.
 ... Ce serait donc manquer de gout que de ne la pas entremeler de notes liées.

That means, that a scale performed without using slurs will sound superficial and dry. I would be a lack of good taste to do in this manner.

In my edition of the Neuland Duo the score will supply the original text – the urtext. Only a few notes had to be discussed beeing divergencies between the editions issued by Richault and later by Simrock. All these are point out in the “Detailed Notes“. The guitarpart is also supplied extra. All editorial additions like slurs and fingerings are evident. A look at the score and notes will offer them.

Some further points: The manner of writing the acciaciaturas is left original, ties and slurring often used analouge to sections.

The turns use a semitone below the main note in spite of the lack of indication and thought causing a crossing position (in german: Querstand). This is derived from Bar 65, in other words it is derived from Neuland himself. It also fits with common use in this period. Editorial ossias show the literal realization of the turns. (Turn are one of the most difficult situations. Therefore editors do not mention the problem. Where no question arises no answer has to be given.)

2.3.2 Dubez (Op. 1 ?)

My Dubez edition begins with a biographical text. A comprehensive text is supplied by Alexander Mayer, a well known publishing company in Vienna in a printed version. It has been a suggestion made by Michael Macmeeken, to add

some information on this unknown composer and to offer the result of research by using the web.

From my point of view, biographical information should be part of an edition, if there is not enough material in common secondary literature. This is of course not necessary when editing music by Bach or Mozart. Dubez and also Neuland are not well known today. The internet is a chance for an editor to provide additional information which can be actualized very easy if new evidence on the subject is obtained. This is a new idea, but the crisis of the publishing houses could be also a starting point to ideas how to use new media. I provided a text on Dubez containing several contemporary documents such as letter, critics and concert reviews, reports, historical editions and manuscripts. Of course, this is a large amount of research but also an matter of quality in connection with an edition of a composer's work which was not available for a long time. Another argument is that webpublishing do not cause considerable costs. It is a additional feature to an edition, an information at a range that would be too extended for a printed edition.

Various sources are discussed as required in the six items in the introduction of the Dubez edition.

These are the manuscripts from the Boije Colleciton in Stockholm, offering further arrangements of the themes developed in the Fantasia. A further manuscript in Copenhagen is obviously a copy, not autograph. It is identical with the printed version. One of the themes is also arranged for the Zither and the Harpe, the two instruments, Dubez published a lot of works for. All these versions are mentioned in the commentary.

I also identified the themes and you should know that is has been very difficult. These are:

1. Rákóczi-Marsch,
2. Marsch from »Hunyady-László« (1844) from Ferenc Erkel,
3. and Czardas a composition for piano by Benjámín Egressy issued as »Hontalan« 1848 in Pesth. Hontalon (!) is also published for the zither and the harp.

Of course I compiled a comprehensive catalouge of works in the biography.

Some hints to the performance. The present edition is concepted as an urtext. The Fantaisie has been composed for a guitar with eight strings. Only some sections are not executable with our sixstring guitars. Therefore all the ossias, on the last page they are original – and needed for the modern standard guitar.

For me it is very important to distinguish between original and editorial fingerings. The original ones are engraved in italics. (The same manner like the new Beethoven Sonata edition from Henle.) Some hints for fingering are derived from Dubez' teacher, J. C. Mertz and also the mss.

Trills, acciaturas, appoggiaturas and most other ornamentations are to be executed on the beat, subtracted not anticipated. This relates to the guitar (also to the violin as shown in the method from Spohr) I have found an interesting manner of notation in the mss. Some research on libraries in IGRA, California State University of Northridge, Royal Library of Copenhagen, Music Library of Sweden, National Library of Hungaria, National Library in Vienna, the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde in Vienna, the Stadt- and Landesbibliothek in Vienna, the State Library of Bavaria to name a few (the most important ones). Some persons wrote me without being contacted by me before. E. g. Prof. Franz Mailer who wrote me a letter with some helpfull hints. With Erik Stenstadvold I had discussions on the question how to realize a portamento ornanent. On the beat or not? Nice to meet him here in Hemmenhofen so that we can continue the topic.

In piano music the ornamentation in the practice of the 19th century often is before the beat. This is a very important fact showing that it is not a good idea to derive all the answers from piano, violin or flute tutors.

We all know the problem with dotted rhythm in a context of triplets. Ph. E. Bach states that the dotting should be adapted to the triplet while his contemporian J. Quantz states the contrary. Of course we can imagine the reason. Bach as a piano player has another approach than Quantz as a chamber musician.

...Wenn in solche punktierte Stellen Triolen einzutheilen sind, so wird die, nach dem Punkte folgende Note nach der letzten Triole angeschlagen. Dies geschieht aber nur im langsamen Zeitmasse.

...If dotted rhythm is confronted with triplets, the note following the dotted note will be performed after the last note of the triplet. This is only the fact in slow tempo indication.

3 Historical Sources

- Bathioli, Franz:
- Coste, Napoleon
- Legnani
- Swoboda
- Mertz
- Sagrini, Luigi
- Blum
- Carcassi
- Carulli
- Sor, Fernando
- Giuliani, Mauro: op. 1
- Molitor
- Pelzer
- Meissonier
- Shand
- Aguado
- Götz
- Bayer
- Albert
- Horetzky
- Bortolazzi
- Decker-Schenk
- Molino

4 Discussion · Remarks on the Lecture by the Audience

All the lectures were followed by remarks, questions and answers. Matanya Ophee states that from his point of view (as a music publisher) he has seriously doubts that the term »urtext« is a adequate one. He stated that some of the great publishing companies in Germany used the label »urtext« due to merkantile aims. Erik Stenstadvold agrees to Mantanya Ophee. He explained that objectivity should not be suggested by an editor. Serious editing would mean to study, compare the sources therefore he prefers also »Critical Edition«.

Both argumentations agree in their criticism of that what the term urtext may suggest. Some of these points are mentioned above, indeed not as a main topic. I did not want to start a longer discussion on terms which would only be a semantical problem. Urtext is especially in Europa introduced since nearly 100 years. Therefore we all are familiar with the term. Therefore I used both: urtext or critical edition and I described the problems by using examples.

Critical edition is more related to the process of working, while urtext could also mean that there is one final version. Indeed, urtext will promise more than an editor could state as realistic. In the majority of our musical heritage this is not the fact. (Save from the fact that it could be the case that a composer would have given an autorisation.)

Either urtext or critical edition is a one mans work not a final one. It can be that new evidence on the autheticity will arise or that we find new sources. May be that the term urtext is formed by Heinrich Schenker. He also used the terms "Urlinie" and "Ursatz" in his concept of musical theory. We should value the decision to use urtext also from the point of view, Schenker and his contemporaries had.

5 Additional Remarks on Music of the 20th century

I neglected the 20th century completely in my lecture but of course I would like to make some remarks in a short version. Obviously there are more problems and hindrances to verify the musical text dealing with Castelnuovo-Tedesco, Manuel Ponce, Joaquin Rodrigo, Frederico Mompou or Villa-Lobos.

I started some investigations, so I wrote to Prof. Ragossnig and asked him, which version of the guitar part from Castelnuovo's Sonatina Op. 205 is authentic, the one in the score or in the guitar part. Mr. Ragossnig answered that he is the

owner of the manuscript and that he paid for it. This is the reason not to provide copies from the original.

Similar to that, I asked Pepe Romero some questions about the divergencies in the published versions from Rodrigo's "Invocation y danza". He did not answer but the publishing house wrote that the edition with copyright mark 1997 provides the original version. (Obviously this not the version performed on most of the recordings I know.)

So I have to read between the lines. Obviously the score contains the authentic version, while the guitar part differs from the original due to "spieltechnische Überlegungen". (Save from some missing accidentals.)

I also researched on Ponce's "Sonata for Harpsicord and Guitar" writing to Peer-Music to New York. The copies I got differ in many points from the printed edition. At the same time I practised the "Sonata Mexicana" and also wanted to find clarifications on some inconsistencies (in the exposition as well as in the recapitulation section). The manuscript got lost and verifications will remain impossible forever. Only the third movement remained as a reprint in Oteros biographical book on Ponce.

What shall we do with the "Villa Lobos 12 Studies"? There is a manuscript from 1928 and the printed version from 1929. Do you remember the Etude 12. There is a problem when the time indication, a question on the ratio of the quavers. No indication has been given so that we have to guess on the ratio of the quavers. The confusion grows by consulting the Noad Edition. He supplies a new manner of notation of the note values. I actually wonder about this matter. It seems that nearly no guitarist – also some of the leading performers – did not mention the inconsistencies. (May be they are not used to read music.) Investigating the recordings (I do not want to mention the names) shows very clear that there remains an enigma, which ratio Villa-Lobos had in mind.

Tilman Hoppstock made an remarkable attempt on some of the most famous Ponce Guitar Works. He tried to do something which is nearly impossible. His edition is the best what an editor can do, since no autograph remained. The Segovia editions are a precise example of the type of edition I mentioned in the first section of my lecture. He has also been a co-composer not only an editor for the Ponce works. I am sure that Hoppstock's attempt will be a new standard for all guitarists who will deal with Ponce's music.

Michael Sieberichs-Nau, March 2007