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Abstract

While being one of the most popular instruments in Western culture, the guitar has received relatively little scholarly attention. Music historians particularly overlook the guitar and its impact upon the development of music. Writings about the *Hausmusik* tradition that existed around the turn of the nineteenth century, however, suggest that the guitar was an important part of amateur music making. Analysis of publisher’s catalogs from the period also indicate the existence of a thriving guitar culture at the time. By performing a comparative analysis on works based on a theme by Giovanni Paisello from Fernando Sor and Mauro Giuliani, a wide range of complexity for a range of expertise is discovered. This range of complexity, coupled with the publication of music and its role in *Hausmusik* establishes the guitar as an important part of music at the beginning of the nineteenth century.
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Introduction: *Hausmusik* and the Guitar

There is a prejudice in music that reaches back to the nineteenth century; a widely accepted bias that discriminates against one of the most popular instruments in the Western world. Reviewing today’s musical history texts reveals this deficiency. In Richard Taruskin’s *Music of the Nineteenth Century*, we find the guitar is only mentioned in reference to Spanish dances. Taruskin explains salon and Beidermier music in the nineteenth century in detail, but makes no mention of the guitar being played.¹ Craig Wright and Bryan Simms make mention of the Gaultiers during the Baroque era and their lute music in France in *Music in Western Civilization*, but then go silent on the fretted side of the string family.² It is not until *A History of Western Music*, by J. Peter Burkholder, Donald Grout, and Claude Palisca, that we find any mention of guitar being used in conjunction with domestic music (albeit in Spain).³ *A History of Western Music* is the only music history text that makes mention of the fact that domestic music written for voice and guitar existed during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.⁴

At the turn of the nineteenth century, music making in the home was increasing in popularity. Amateur musicians were forming the backbone of a new publishing trend and had demands unique from professional musicians. According to Erich Valentin, this domestic music making should be divided into the categories of salon music and

---

⁴ Ibid., 500.
Hausmusik. Salon music is concerned entirely with keyboard music, where as Hausmusik is concerned with all other instruments. The term Hausmusik is first recorded as being used by Johann Rist in the title of his 1859 collection of worship music for the home, “Frommer und Gottseliger Christen Alltägliche Haußmusik.” Valentin also makes a distinction between Diletattanten and Liebhaber. Diletattanten is the plural of dilettante, which means being an amateur or a dabbler. In contrast, a Liebhaber is an aficionado or an enthusiast. Valentin pairs the Diletattanten with the Hausmusik occurring in central Europe at the start of the nineteenth century. Therefore, the term Hausmusik as it is used in the nineteenth century refers to music for amateurs performing on non-keyboard instruments, such as the violin, flute, and guitar.

What is needed, then, is an assessment of the guitar and its place Hausmusik. Even with the aforementioned circumspect histories presented by Taruskin, Wright, Simms, Grout, Burkholder, and Palisca, we can establish the standing of the guitar at the start of the nineteenth century by doing a survey of extant publisher catalogs, analyzing the works that were published, and doing a comparative study of two pieces that share source material. These factors, when combined, may provide a more accurate view of the importance of the guitar during this period.

Historical texts present a limited view of salon music during the nineteenth century. According to these textbooks, salon music consisted of people gathering in the front room of a house to discuss the important news and politics of the day while enjoying music that was composed specifically for these small, intimate settings. The virginal and Elizabethan lute were the preferred instruments for these types of gatherings.

---

during the Renaissance, and the harpsichord in the Baroque provided music for the home and other small gatherings. The current view is that the music performed in these settings during the nineteenth century was based around the keyboard and occasionally small groups of string players. All of these performances are gathered under the umbrella of salon music. Valentin divides this into the aforementioned grouping of salon music and *Hausmusik*, allowing for equal consideration.

Lujza Tari presents a tradition of home performance that predates the salon music of Paris in the 1900s. According to her, this repertoire was simpler than that heard in the concert hall, and family and friends would gather to perform this music together. Simpler music coincides with Valentin’s statement of *Diletattanten* performers. Indoor instruments were preferred, meaning piano, guitar, strings and some members of the woodwind family. Looking through publishers’ catalogs, we see works offered for all of these instruments, but the music for piano (in both two- and four-hand variety) and guitar make up the two largest groups. The large amount of four-handed piano scores emphasizes the social aspect of this style of music.

Familiar melodies would be the basis of music performed in such settings. Opera themes were a popular choice of these performers, as would folk tunes and familiar dance forms. *Hausmusik* is, after all, casual and social, as well as part of popular culture. It must lend itself to being performed in an intimate setting and be fairly accessible to the audience. If we accept this definition and couple it with the survey of publishers’ catalogs, we find that the guitar would have been a very popular choice of instrument on which to play *Hausmusik*. The evidence shows that the guitar was a part of *Hausmusik*

---

6 Lujza Tari. “*Hausmusik* instruments in Hungary in the era of Viennese Classicism”, *Festschrift Christoph-Hellmut Mahling zum 65.*, 1420.
culture throughout Europe at the turn of the nineteenth century. Knowing that the guitar was important to home music making, a question must be asked. What happened to the popularity of the guitar? When did the guitar shift from being a popular choice among composers and publishers to being an afterthought? Perhaps the answer can be found in the statement “History is written by the victors”.

Modern Western music history, it could be argued, is written with a German bias. Music history dictates that the torch passes from Bach to Haydn to Mozart to Beethoven to Wagner to Mahler. This lineage of influential composers defines much of our modern musical identity. We note curiosities, such as Berlioz working out his compositions on guitar, Paganini being more skilled on a guitar than a violin, or that Schubert wrote some works for the guitar along with his piano and vocal compositions, but these instances are placed in a context so as to make them aberrant. But if the guitar was viewed so poorly how could players such as Mauro Giuliani and Fernando Sor be successful in touring and composing? Both of these composer/performers had successful careers during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. There seems to be an incongruity between what the evidence tells us and what the history books tell us.

Writings, like those of twentieth century German historian Peter Schmitz, help explain this marginalization. Schmitz was part of a movement in German culture in the early 1900s to remove all traces of the guitar from history books and to vanquish the instrument from pedagogy and concert halls. This movement, called *Jugendmusikbewegung*, was a blatant attempt to minimize the guitar’s role in the development of music. The concept behind this movement was that the guitar was not an
appropriate instrument for teaching or concertizing. The rational behind this thought was that the guitar was a connected to the lower classes, and therefore not held to the higher standards of pedagogy and performance found with instruments such as the piano. There is a surprising shortage of German guitar composers from the early twentieth century. Most of the literature for the guitar is written in Spanish, with select few pieces of literature being written in Italian. The identity of the guitar therefore became a cultural one (and one that still exists in the form of the misused identifier of “Spanish Guitar”). A German-centric historical record would therefore have no place for an instrument that was cultured and curated in Spain. This, coupled with the concept of the unseen audience, explains the absence of the guitar from contemporary textbooks. Marie Sumner Lott defines the concept of “unseen audience” as the silent majority powering musical trends during the 1800s. These audience members purchased or rented sheet music and performed the pieces in the privacy of their own homes. By following the example of Lott and analyzing the records of the publishing companies, we can begin constructing a more complex view of not just Hausmusik, but the vital role the guitar played in domestic music making in the early 1800s.  

---

7 Peter Schmitz, "It was high time to put down the utter chaos going on in guitar music: The Jugendmusikbewegung criticizes the guitar movement," Gitarre & Laute, Vol 17(1).
Chapter I: On Publishers and Operas

The prevalent thread in the narratives of music history focuses upon chamber works for the keyboard and string family. The logic of this thread is that publishers catered to the wants and needs of their audiences, and that music for these instruments was widely available. With the absence of guitar from traditional music history teachings, the assumption could be made that there was not a wealth of guitar music being published during this period. Certainly, any indications of a larger body of guitar music being published and purchased should be taken into consideration when viewing the role that the guitar played in the early nineteenth century.

The research about guitar and amateur musicians, particularly in regards to *Hausmusik*, leads to the question of just how much guitar music was being published during this period. One way to obtain an estimation of this figure would be to reference publishers’ catalog listings. Looking over the Artaria catalog, I have isolated a section of their publishing records starting in September of 1804 and going through August of 1814. *Vollständiges Verlagsverzeichnis, Artaria & Comp.*, published by Alexander Wiemann, lists the publications of Artaria in order of the plates (or publications), with each entry listing the composer, name of the work, instrumentation, and the date of publication where available. Artaria was a publishing house based in Vienna and was one of the larger publishers of sheet music during this period. Composers such as Haydn, Boccherini, Mozart, and Beethoven had their works published by Artaria, and the publisher existed up until the early 1900s.
Between 1804 and 1814, Mozart’s and Beethoven’s operas comprise a total of sixty-one plates among five separate works; these larger works were split into several plates, isolating groups of arias. In this span of time, Artaria published five hundred thirty-four works. Almost all of this music is noted to have parts for clavichord or pianoforte, either as a central part of the work or as accompaniment. The number of works written for guitar during this period totals ninety-four, which works out to roughly one guitar piece published for every five pieces published for any other instrument.

Nearly one-fifth of the published sheet music from Artaria is for guitar, leading us to reasonably believe that there were a substantial number of actively performing guitarists at this time. There is a noticeable increase in the number of guitar works during the last five years of this period; over half of the ninety-four pieces were published between 1810 and 1814. This increase of publication would most likely have been attributed to consumer demand. The composers of guitar music found in the catalog include Mauro Giuliani as well as lesser-known composers such as Andrew Shulz, Louis Bambilla, Friedrich Spina, and Andreas Oberleitner. Plate numbers 2158 and 2159 are actually lieder credited to Ludwig von Beethoven that contain optional guitar accompaniment.

This data presents us with a very clear illustration of a popular instrument on the rise. If this is indeed the case, then the music itself deserves a closer inspection to allow us understand how it may have functioned in musical society.

During the classical era, opera served as a form of entertainment as well as an important indicator of popular culture. As previously demonstrated, the catalogs of publishers included a large amount of music from operas, a great deal of which has been lost. The ephemeral nature of some of these works reinforces the idea that opera was
considered to be music and entertainment for consumption. Opera music is often compared to modern pop music in terms of its permanence in culture. Exploiting this demand with print music from operas would be the next logical step for any publisher. The public demand for adaptations from current operas made such arrangements lucrative for composers.

In order to make the most impact with a work, a composer would have to select the source music for his arrangement carefully. With this in mind, the most popular choices for arrangements became arias and overtures. Arias were often the main draw of the opera, with the performers’ reputations adding to their popularity. This would have been advantageous for a composer looking for source material, as most themes were based around a melody that used repetition, with varying degrees of embellishment or improvisation. This simple formula helped composers who wished to adapt the melody and accompaniment to music.

Another draw for composers was that the overture and arias could be adapted to many different instruments, regardless of the initial setting. Prior to the ability to record music, these arrangements were used to provide the public with a platform on which to perform music for their own enjoyment at home, either salon or Hausmusik. The aforementioned simplistic melodic content along with the relative harmonic simplicity found in most overtures and arias (particularly from the popular galant style operas of this period) provided accessibility for musicians of varying levels of ability. This simplicity translated well to most instruments, and these factors lent to a large quantity of arrangements being composed for a wide variety and combination of instruments. An overture could be arranged for four-handed piano, an aria adapted to solo guitar, or a
potpourri of themes for piano and violin. The flexibility of the music to be easily adapted to other instruments served the composers well, as music could be set in many different ways, thus optimizing the ability to make money. The opera theme, therefore, became a prevalent tool for the composer of this era.

One theme that this study will look at is “Nel cor piu non mi sento,” composed by Giovanni Paisiello for his opera La molinara in 1788. Paisiello is considered to be one of the most successful and influential opera composers of the late eighteenth century. He lived and worked largely around the Naples area. He specialized in comic operas and was a rival of Puccini. Paisiello was commissioned in 1776 by Catherine II of Russia to be her maestro di capella in St. Petersburg for the impressive sum of 3000 rubles a year for three years. Paisiello stayed until 1783, but he left on a one year paid leave and never returned. In 1787, he was named the maestro della real camera by King Ferdinand in Naples, placing him in charge of all music at the court while paying him a healthy pension. This lasted until an overworked Paisiello had a breakdown in 1790 and requested his release. He briefly traveled to France at the request of Napoleon, only to come back to Naples where he remained until his death in 1816. Paisiello's works were in widespread demand in Italy, Vienna, and Paris. The Vienna Opera Company performed more of Paisiello operas in the 1790s than those of any other composer. “Nel cor piu non mi sento” is still considered to be an important piece of the vocal repertoire, and was a popular theme around the turn of the nineteenth century.

Beethoven, for instance, used it as the basis for Six Themes in G Major for Piano (WoO

---


10Ibid.
77), composed in 1795. Both Fernando Sor and Mauro Giuliani also wrote variations on “Nel cor piu non mi sento,” and their compositions will serve to show the wide range of complexity available to guitarists at the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth century.
Chapter II: Considering Theme and Variations

Theme and variations was an incredibly popular form throughout Europe in the Classical period and had been utilized by Mozart, Handel and Beethoven. A great deal of discussion has occurred around the use of theme and variation as a pedagogical tool and a demonstration of virtuosity. This chapter will consider both the pedagogical and virtuosic uses and help to frame the intent or purpose of composition for the chosen works.

A theme and variation has an inherent strength: the core of the work is a melody that is familiar and recognizable. This benefits the composer, the performer, and the audience. The composer has the melody and structure for the entire work ready before putting ink on paper. The performer can approach the work knowing the basic melodic content, making it more accessible, and we assume the audience would be familiar enough with the theme to recognize what the composer and performer have done to change it. If a well-written and well-known theme is used, the process is streamlined from start to finish. It would then be expected that a theme and variation would be based on familiar themes.

Once a familiar theme is chosen, a composer has a choice to make. Will the work be didactic, or will it be intended for concert performance? Though its history goes back much further, the usage of theme and variations as a teaching tool has its roots in the Classical period. The aforementioned advantage for the performer comes into play when using theme and variations for education. The student will be familiar with the theme,
which replaces intimidation of an unfamiliar piece with a connection to the work, ensuring enjoyable practice. It should be noted that while pieces are often labeled “Theme and Variation” by the composer, historians and theorists have retroactively applied the label to include works that are titled “Fantasies” or “Fantasias”.

During this period there was definite pedagogical value placed on theme and variations. Thomas Fielden, British pianist and pedagogue during the early twentieth century, states that the foundation of pedagogical theme and variations for the piano is the establishment of useful patterns for the left and the right hand. This focus on technical facility over artistic expression states a clear case for the theme and variation form being used for a pedagogical purpose. On the piano, a simple arpeggio pattern could be played in the left hand while the right hand plays the melody, followed by the left hand playing the melody while the right plays a simple arpeggio.

In the subsequent variations, varying arpeggios could be used, increasing the technical difficulty. Most musicians during this time period were expected to have the ability to improvise, a skill that has declined greatly over time. Fielden states that theme and variation form provides students with a blueprint for improvisation, preparing them for further musical studies. Guitarist and composer Dionisio Aguado gave rough forms for improvised preludes for the guitar, written for easier transposition. Aguado also makes note of Sor’s Fantasie Variations, Opus 7, which is a theme and variation in which improvisation on a melody is considered to be a type of ornamentation. The improvised prelude and variation of a melody shown in the method book are very similar to the expected prelude and variations found in a theme and variation.

---

Elaine R. Sisman states that theme and variations are a strictly symphonic form.\textsuperscript{12} While this is true a majority of the time, there is a secondary type of theme and variation that this paper will consider. The type of theme and variation discussed here functions as a suite of movements with individual variations, as well as the theme, separate from each other. These works are intended for solo performance, most commonly on the piano and the guitar. There are some conventions that we find in these theme and variations, and when an exception to the rule is found, there is usually intent behind the change. The generic structure of a classical theme and variation is a statement of theme, followed by a set of variations. The final variation would contain a finale of some sort, most often a coda.\textsuperscript{13} Beethoven's variations often altered between parallel major and minor keys, while other composers chose to place one variation in the parallel major and minor keys. The variations themselves were very structured, as one would expect of works from this time. The form of individual variations followed that of the original theme, most often being ABA. The usage of a small musical idea, often times eight to sixteen measures in length, kept the variations short and evenly structured with very little space for harmonic exploration. How a composer approaches these rules can help us determine the intended performer and audience.

If we are to consider the variation as pedagogical, then it must have certain characteristics. Largely, we look for the repetitive patterns as noted by Thomas Fielden. These repetitive patterns in place of artistic expression provide a framework by which the

piece can be used to teach. The key of the work can also be considered, as there are many keys that a beginning musician would consider unfriendly on any instrument, while a small family of keys will play well. A variation based around an easy to play or idiomatic key will make for a more accessible work. Concepts throughout the work should be developed in a linear fashion, with each successive variation building upon the first. Perhaps most importantly is the usage of the familiar theme, and the preservation of said theme through the work.

Not all variations are intended for the beginner musician. Some of these works were intended to provide a higher level of performance for the more experienced musician. The focus turns away from clever manipulation of a melody to a showpiece for technical skill and ability. This is the style of variation most commonly found in symphonic works. In these cases, the theme is often deconstructed so far that it is largely unrecognizable. In the case of some of Beethoven's piano variations, such as the Diabelli Variations (Opus 120), the purpose seems to be complete deconstruction of the theme in order to achieve a higher degree of creativity. This idea of deconstruction and invention in a theme and variation provides our foil; whereas pedagogical works are intended to provide a starting point for a musician, the ability to deconstruct a melody to create new material was considered to be an arrival point for a performer or composer.

Theme and variations also have a unique connection to the guitar as far as key is concerned. Popular forms, such as sonata, would require a modulation to conclude the exposition and begin the development. Modulations were difficult to achieve on the

---

15 Ibid., 93.
guitar, and few composers were able to do so successfully (Fernando Sor being the most accomplished at this feat). Theme and variations does not require any such modulation as long as the melody the work is based off of remains in one key. This made the theme and variation form attractive to composers writing for the guitar.

To delineate a variation intended for pedagogical use versus a showpiece, there are some traits that one can look for. The key becomes largely irrelevant, though composing in an 'unfriendly' key may signify a higher level of difficulty. A good indicator of difficulty would be the individual focus on higher end concepts, such as advanced or extended performance techniques. The expansion of the theme and variation form, such as the addition of variations or an introduction would indicate the work was intended not just for an advanced player, but also for performance. The loss of melodic continuity may be difficult to pin down on a casual listen, but in-depth analysis of the material will show the level of deconstruction that the composer has achieved.

Publishers would undoubtedly expect to publish fewer of these works, as the demand for the more difficult works would be less than the easier, more didactic works. However, catering to the “advanced” player would provide a publisher with a type of legitimacy in their catalog, demonstrating their ability to provide music to a musician throughout their entire career. During this period, the ability to compose and improvise a theme and variation was considered part of a musician’s education. In this sense, the theme and variation then serves as both a bookend and a measuring stick for a musician's education and achievement, as well as a way to demonstrate the musician’s growth.\(^\text{17}\)

---

\(^{17}\)Thomas Fielden, “The Influence of the Pianoforte on Musical Progress,” 95.
Chapter III: Mauro Giuliani

Of the several guitar players and composers who were living and working in Vienna at the turn of the eighteenth century, Mauro Giuliani was the most popular and influential. Born in Bisceglie, Italy in July of 1781, Giuliani showed musical capability at a young age. His formal music training began on the cello and most likely the violin as well. It has been written that he subsequently began playing guitar shortly after learning to play the cello. There is no definitive evidence of this, as Giuliani's early life, including his movements around Italy and the names of his teachers, remains a subject of scrutiny and speculation. What is known is that around 1805 Giuliani was struggling to find success with his guitar music in Italy, a country that preferred opera to instrumental music. In 1806, he migrated to Vienna in order to have a career in music. By 1807 Giuliani had begun to embrace the Viennese style of instrumental solo music and began publishing his compositions for solo guitar. He premiered his “Guitar Concerto” in 1808 to great public acclaim and found himself elevated to the upper levels of Viennese musical society. His friendship with Ludwig von Beethoven led to Giuliani performing on the cello for the premier of Beethoven's Seventh symphony in 1813.\(^{18}\)

Mauro Giuliani did much concertizing as a solo guitarist and was heavily involved in the growing presence of the guitar in the public concert setting. His appearances with Johann Hummel and Joseph Mayseder in the 1815 “Dukaten Concerte,” a series of public

chamber concerts held in the Schöbrunn Palace, helped establish the guitar as a viable concert instrument. These performances also increased Giuliani's own renown as a performer. This exposure led to Giuliani's appointment as official concert artist for celebrations surrounding the Congress in Vienna.\(^\text{19}\)

Giuliani's arranging style was distinctly classical and he was considered one of the finest musicians of his day.\(^\text{20}\) Giuliani's works were published by Artaria, Diabelli, and Ricordi. These pieces were then circulated throughout Europe, which increased his popularity along with a steady stream of concertizing.\(^\text{21}\) His fame and notoriety prompted Giuliani to move to Paris, where he was employed by Empress Marie-Louise in 1814 as the “virtuoso onorario di camera,” a well paying court position. This lasted until 1819 when Giuliani, hounded by debt and personal issues, then retired to Naples where he was patronized by nobility at the court of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies. Giuliani remained in Naples until his death in 1929. His popularity would lead to the posthumous creation of the Giulianiad, a fan publication that recounted his performances, and also shared arrangements of his more popular pieces. This publication was published in Europe between 1833-1835.\(^\text{22}\)

A look at Giuliani's Opus 1, Studio per la Chitarra, gives us important insight into the composer’s view of the guitar and how it should be played. It should be noted that Giuliani is often times credited for the change in notation that would become the standard. While guitar music had been notated on one staff since the late eighteenth century, Giuliani is credited with being the first to have all of the parts notated on one staff.

\(^{19}\)Thomas Heck, Maruo Giuliani: Virtuoso Guitarist and Composer (Columbus OH: Editions Orphee, 1995).

\(^{20}\)Ibid.


\(^{22}\)Thomas Heck, Maruo Giuliani: Virtuoso Guitarist and Composer, 270.
staff, with all of the voices shown via varying note values and stem directions. This varied from all of the previous methods, which had been modeled after violin notation. Giuliani took great care to ensure that the melody and accompaniment were separate parts that were easy for the performer to read.

*Studio per la Chitarra* begins with extensive arpeggio exercises intended to work the right hand dexterity of the player. These 120 exercises demonstrate various arpeggio patterns with note durations up to sixty-fourth notes. While these exercises are intended to focus on the right hand, the left hand of the guitarist is instructed to hold only two chords – C major and G7 – for a measure each. This simplistic harmony is a recurring theme throughout the method. The second part is a collection of melodic intervals. Giuliani chooses the keys of C, G, D, and A for these exercises and constructs material based around the third, sixth, octave, and tenth in each key. Extensive position markings and explanations are provided to the player so that the neck can be navigated as Giuliani intended. This exercise is intended to work the reach and facilities of the left hand, leaving the right hand little to do other than alternate the thumb with either the index or middle finger. Part three covers issues such as articulations, damping, right hand alternation, ascending and descending *acciaccatura*, grace notes, *mordents*, *grupetto*, *ligado*, and *glissando*. Each concept is briefly explained in Italian, French, and German, then a short musical example based entirely around the concept is given.

The choice of keys is of interest to us, as the only keys used are D and A, which are both very guitar friendly keys. This chapter of the book concludes with a short explanation of trills (both single and double string styles), followed by a notated example of how the trill should sound. The method concludes with “Twelve Lessons,” a
collection of short works intended to highlight the concepts that had been explained up to this juncture. What we find in looking at these works is the reappearance of the guitar friendly keys. Number 9 is the only work that varies, as it is in the key of F and requires a barre for a majority of the work. A barre is a moderately difficult technique that calls for the player to place his or her index finger across several strings simultaneously, requiring flexibility and finger strength. When the key of C is used, we find that the subdominant of F is almost entirely avoided and the harmony is restricted to the motion of I – V. The form of the works is almost entirely ternary, with occasional codas (such as Number 1 and Number 2). The ternary form could be seen as the influence of the popular sonata form, or as a way of simplifying the examples through repetition.

The pieces included in Studio are simple, easy to approach, and when coupled with the previous material, serve a didactic purpose of getting the beginner guitarist reading sheet music. These works are almost too simplistic, and the explanations for the various techniques are short. There is no concern for discussing music theory, notation, or tonal keys that are awkward for the guitar. The successors to Studio are Esercizio per la Chitarra (Opus 48) and XVIII Lecons Progressives (Opus 51). Lecons, while written later, is possibly the easier of the two, with shorter pieces that stay in the easier keys (Numbers 12 and 13 give us d minor and F Major, respectively). The works are largely built around arpeggios, with very few examples of contrapuntal composition. Exercizio, which gives us a study in Bb as well as notated sixty-fourth notes, gives the performer more of a challenge, with the twenty-fourth and final exercise including passages played in the fourteenth position of the guitar.
If we are to consider these works as Giuliani has labeled them, we can draw several conclusions. The first is the issue of key in relation to the guitar. Instead of focusing on extensive coverage of all available keys, Giuliani composes almost entirely in just four keys, and these are keys that best facilitate left hand chording. We also find that Giuliani avoids chords that would be uncomfortable for the player, further simplifying the harmonic content of the exercises. The style of the music is seen as a large amount of arpeggios, with the occasional scalar run. *Acciaccatura* is also common, although it is not always clear if it is a matter of style or a matter of simplification of the right hand. These pieces are simple and intended for the beginner; Giuliani's compositional style in these works gives us a clear picture of what he expected the beginner guitarist to be able to achieve.
Chapter IV: Fernando Sor

At the time of Giuliani's rise in Vienna, Fernando Sor was establishing himself as a premier guitarist and composer as well. Sor's continental lifestyle led to a blending of musical styles, and his military training is demonstrated in his direct style of writing. Born in Barcelona, Sor's family intended that he would follow the family tradition of military service. These plans were put at risk at a young age when Sor showed a fondness for Italian opera. His musical talents were noticed by the abbot of Santa Maria de Montserrat, who then provided tuition for the young Sor to study music at their choir school.

Napoleon's invasion in 1808 led to Sor enlisting in the Spanish army, where he held largely administrative posts and composed patriotic songs for voice and guitar. This lasted until 1810 when Sor took a position under the French occupiers. When the French retreated in 1813, Sor followed and moved to Paris. His stay was brief, as 1815 found Sor moving to London where he attempted to build a reputation as an all-around composer, writing several ballets, piano solos, piano duets, and numerous guitar solos. In 1823, Sor traveled to Russia in pursuit of Félicité Hullen, a prima ballerina. Not much is known about this period of his life, and he eventually returned to Paris in 1826 where he published many of his works, including his guitar method and instructional opus works. In the preface for Opus 48, he remarks that he sees Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven as
models for his compositions, and that he tried to avoid “transitions and writing that they would not approve of.”

In all, Sor composed more than sixty five works for the guitar.

Fernando Sor's scores give us a significantly different view of what the guitar was during this period compared to Giuliani. His Method for Guitar is stark in comparison to the Giuliani method. Where Giuliani gives countless musical examples with very little in the way of explanation, Sor puts his energy into discussing the finer pedagogical points of the guitar. The cover of Method for Guitar carries a quote from Fernando Sor: “I have supposed that he who buys a Method means to learn it.” Eschewing extended musical passages as an educational device, Sor turns to prose and illustrations, explaining in detail the manner in which various techniques are to be executed. The function of striking the string is explained in great detail, as is the angle of the hand in relationship to the guitar. This is not a Method (Sor's capitalization) to get the player off to a swift start playing music; Sor's Method demands a level of dedication and respect that only a serious guitarist could give.

After a lengthy discussion about how anatomy affects guitarists and should influence their playing posture, Sor turns to a discussion about thirds and sixths and their importance in regards to harmony. No musical examples are given, but a theoretical discussion ensues about how thirds and sixths can be used to harmonize, construct harmony, and connect the neck of the guitar. In fact, Sor states that “The key to the mastery of the guitar (an instrument of harmony) consists in the knowledge of thirds and sixths.”

---

The concept of harmony and melody being played simultaneously is next, and Sor states that chords and scales are inherently connected to one another. The ability to connect chords to their scales is important to Sor, which shows a departure from Giuliani’s school of thought. Giuliani's method stands chords and scales separately, while Sor makes the two dependent upon each other. Sor dissects keys individually, describing the proper way to connect scalar based melodies to the appropriate chords. It is an interesting thing to read, even from a modern perspective. The method then continues with a deeper discussion regarding the creation and shaping of tone with the right hand. Following this we get a discussion of more advanced concepts. Harmonics are first, complete with a breakdown of the overtone series, followed by an in-depth discussion of improvising accompaniment. Sor finishes with an appendix of musical examples, separated from the text, requiring the player to turn back and forth from Sor's descriptions to the matching musical passage.

The initial examples in the appendix are simple, doing little more than showing what Sor explained in the text. There are a few examples that are longer than a few measures, but none of them would be considered a study or etude. The section labeled “Exercises on Thirds” recalls some of Giuliani’s style, but in the first example, Sor is adding a pedal tone to the exercise, increasing the difficulty. Example forty eight gives us a “Chord Study,” where the player must make difficult left hand leaps in an effort to mimic a piano. More examples follow, short examples of the concepts described (most no more than eight measures), followed by a series of charts discussing the harmonic overtone series. This is followed by an example of how to take a previously composed piece and convert it entirely to harmonics (a concept that modern guitarists would
struggle with). To finish the text? Guitar reductions of an aria from Don Giovanni and The Creation. Quite a leap for the beginning guitarist to make.

This emphasis on the technical aspect of guitar performance occasionally put Sor at odds with his publishers. Publishing music that was too difficult for the public to play would be a waste of money, and Meissonnier expressed this concern to Sor. The subtitles and prefaces of Opus numbers 43, 45, 48, 51 and 59 paint the ensuing struggle in an entertaining light. Opus 43 Mockingly states “...To anyone who cares to have them,” while Opus 45 is subtitled “Let's see if this is it.” Opus 48 questions “Is this it?” while Opus 51 declares “At last!” These subtitles echo the conflicts with his publishers, who were pushing him to create easier works.

In his preface to Opus 59, he lashes out at those who have “degraded” the guitar by arranging opera themes in overly simplistic settings, aiming his wrath at Matteo Carcassi, an Italian who vacillated between Vienna and Paris. He specifically mentions the arrangements that Carcassi composed of Rossini operas. Could this shot across the bow at Carcassi have been intended to include Giuliani, who arranged the same themes? Considering that Sor wrote his variation long after Giuliani wrote his, it is not impossible that Sor was aware of the work Giuliani had done and wished to improve upon it. We cannot make this statement definitively, as there are no primary sources to support this theory.
Chapter V: Study on Paisiello's Variations by Giuliani and Sor

Having established a trend of guitar publishing in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, as well as differences between Diletattanten and Liebhaber, we can begin to develop a clearer picture of the function of guitar music in this period. In order to argue for the value of the guitar to both the Diletattanten and Liebhaber of this time, we will analyze themes and variations from Fernando Sor and Mauro Giuliani based upon “Nel cor piu non me sento,” originally composed by Giovanni Paisiello. The intent is to analyze key choices, harmony, and techniques required for each theme and variation to establish difficulty and, therefore, intended audience.

Mauro Giuliani's “Six Variations on a Favorite Theme of La Molinara,” Opus 4, was published in Vienna in 1810 by Haslinger. The most notable attribute of this composition is that the theme and variation is in the key of A major, which would allow the I, IV, and V chords to be sounded with open strings for the basses. The original aria was in the key of F, which while not being incredibly difficult on the guitar does present issues for a beginner player: largely the necessity of barre chords to play the tonic and subdominant chord. The structure of the work is a theme followed by six variations, with the final variation containing a coda finale. The theme is plainly stated, harmonized in thirds (Figure 5.1). There is limited use of chromaticism in the A section, and where it is present it serves as a chromatic passing tone with no harmonic implications, such as at measures five, ten and eleven. During the B section, we find the expected tonicization of
E, leading to the usage of the D# for a B7 chord at measure thirteen. We also note the *da capo* form in the theme that will be used for all other variations.

Figure 5.1 - Mauro Giuliani, “Six Variations” Op. 4, mm 1-20.

Figure 5.2 - Mauro Giuliani, “Six Variations” Op. 4, Variation II.
The variations themselves offer nothing terribly difficult to the performer. Most of the music stays within the first few positions of the guitar. The highest note that we find is a C# in the fifth variation, played on the ninth fret of the guitar, placing that phrase in the fifth position.

The first variation uses sixteenth note runs that begin on the melody notes on the downbeats, followed by a leap and then descent to the next melody note. The second variation contains broken chords arranged in a call and response style (Figure 5.2). The chords could mostly be held down for an entire measure before moving on. We see the same passing chromaticism as in the theme, and no use of expanded harmony.
The third variation places the motion in the bass underneath thirds that utilize open strings (Figure 5.3). This is followed by ascending arpeggios that lead us into the B section. Once in the B section we find the instruction 'a due chorda,' indicating that the two notes are to be played on adjacent strings and allowed to overlap.

The fourth variation is the first real indication of difficulty for the player. Each note is to be approached via a grace note, requiring the left hand to be placed in anticipation of all notes (Figure 5.4). This variation recalls Giuliani’s Opus 1, specifically Part 3, No. 4. The markings of tenuto in measures five and six also add to this difficulty, as the notes must be stretched out, leaving less time for preparation. These challenges only exist on the surface as we see that the entire variation is rhythmically based around the eighth note, and every bass note (save for a B in measure ten) is an open
string. With these points considered, the variation becomes much more manageable and suited for Valentin’s *Diletattanten*.

The fifth variation is minor, with indications that notes are to 'crawl' up particular strings (Figure 5.5). There is also interesting usage of the Bb starting at measure nine in the B section, which when paired with the C# and D# of assumed E melodic minor creates a phrygian feel that is then obfuscated by a rising line of E-F#-G#-A-C-D# settling on an E major chord. This tension is swiftly swept away by alternation between an A minor and E7 chord. This variation features a coda built around a pedal A

![Figure 5.5](image.png)

Figure 5.5 - Mauro Giuliani, “Six Variations” Op. 4, Variation V.

and sixteenth note scalar runs. This extension does little harmonically other than to clearly re-establish the parallel minor, with plenty of motion through the G# and a triple
Figure 5.6 - Mauro Giuliani, “Six Variations” Op. 4, Variation VI
repetition of the A minor chord at the end. This variation is the only one that provides abnormal harmonic motion. Because of this, it stands out to the player and the listener.

The final variation is marked *con brio*, and contains brisk sixteenth note motion in the bass, but again, we find that the open A and E strings are used extensively (Figure 5.6). The melody is harmonized in thirds, which is very similar to the statement of the theme. It is at the B section starting at measure nine that harmony begins to open up and lead us on a tonal journey. We start off in what can be best stated as B minor, a closely related key. This is resolved by a shift to an E major chord at measure ten, which then sends us to a brief section of A major at measure twelve. This is not a settled point, as the use of F in the moving bass line does two things: it creates tension and separates the phrase from the one that opened the variation, creating the feeling that we are not yet done. Following a melodic run, there is a tension filled D# diminished arpeggio in measure thirteen that resolves to an E major. The E major turns dominant after the fermata, and we have a statement of V-I repeated several times until a D# is introduced just before the repeat.

After the second ending, we have four bars that echo the initial statement leading into what could be considered the coda of the work. Immediately thereafter we have a quick harmonic motion of A major, F# minor, B7, G7, A major, and E7 that occurs over three bars. This is followed by A major – E7 arpeggios that occur over two measures, followed by the initial three measures from the phrase. This creates an uneven phrase of nine measures. Measure thirty-three may be considered connected, but as it features a different pattern from the previous music, it seems to serve more as a transition into the final set of cadences. An uneven phrase would have been viewed as something different,
and possibly more challenging – fitting, then, that it comes less than eight measures from the end. The last seven measures are a rapid alternation between the dominant and tonic that ends with an octave displaced arpeggio of the tonic and triumphant statements of tonic in various voicings.

There is a fair amount of information to be gleaned from this work. Firstly, this work was intended for beginner to amateur players. The usage of a favorable key, widespread use of open strings and limited hand positions indicate this. The harmonic structure follows what we would expect of a similar composition from any of Giuliani's Viennese peers. We do find some anomalies toward the end of the work, but these can be explained as an attempt to add interest or flair to what had been a fairly straight-forward piece up to that point. The publishing of this work, initially by Haslinger and later by

Figure 5.7 - Fernando Sor, *Variations on Monsiuer Paisiello's “Nel cor piu non mi sento,”* Theme.
Ricordi, demonstrates that there was a demand for popular opera themes arranged for the amateur level guitar player or the *Diletattanten*.

Fernando Sor wrote his “Variations on Monsiuer Paisiello's 'Nel cor piu non mi sento'” (Opus 16) in 1823. The publisher for this work is listed as Meissonnier, who was based out of Paris.° There are no records of this work being published in London, where Sor was living at the time, but we can assume that he did perform this work in one of his many concerts due to its virtuosic nature. Sadly, there are few surviving documents that detail what early nineteenth century guitarists performed in concert, but we do know that there were performances during which guitarists would perform with other instruments in a type of variety show.°° Sor’s composition shows influence of Viennese classicism, and there are aspects of his arrangement that would seem to be more influenced by the works of Beethoven than the work of Mozart.

Fernando Sor made the decision to set the work in a key that doesn't work well for the guitar; the variation is in the key of C, which effectively eliminates open bass strings and creates extra difficulty for the player once in the parallel minor variation. The structure differs from Giuliani’s composition in that it contains a separate introduction before the theme and contains nine variations. The introduction is marked as *Andante Largo*, giving the feeling of a slow introduction of a symphony. The introduction contains no material related to the theme and has a heavily syncopated dance-like feel to it (Figure 5.8). In between the widely spaced chords, Sor injects rapid sextuplets and a thirteen-tuplet. As the movement comes to a close, artificial harmonics on the higherpartials, which are particularly difficult to execute clearly on a guitar, are required to play

---

the melody (although most modern guitarists would use artificial harmonics in this case) (Figure 5.8). This is followed by a G7 chord which is then followed by a chromatic melodic ascension for an *attaca* into the theme.

Figure 5.8 - Fernando Sor, *Variations on Monsiuer Paisiello's “Nel cor piu non mi sento,”* Introduction.

The theme consists of the melody being played over eighth note arpeggios (Figure 5.7). While not terribly difficult, all voices are being played by the left hand and must be
held; connecting the melody together then becomes slightly more complicated and requires precise fingering. Harmonic tension in this section comes from sequential augmented sixth chords beginning in measure nine, which point to a G7 chord that then resolves to the tonic after a suspension. Sor used this re-harmonization to create tension underneath the melody in place of the V of the dominant in a similar fashion to what we find in Giuliani’s piece. The music also features thirty-second quintuplets that connect chords together.

![Figure 5.9 - Fernando Sor, Variations on Monsiuer Paisiello's “Nel cor piu non mi sento,” Theme, mms. 52-60.](image)

![Figure 5.10 - Fernando Sor, Variations on Monsiuer Paisiello's “Nel cor piu non mi sento,” 1st Var., mm. 11.](image)

![Figure 5.11 - Fernando Sor, Variations on Monsiuer Paisiello's “Nel cor piu non mi sento,” 1st Var., mms. 18-19.](image)

to work out. There are also markings stating that the performer has liberty with the tempi in certain sections (Figure 5.11).
The second and third variations find more liberties being taken with the use of chromaticism. The second variation is based more around the interval of a third (Figure 5.12) and the third variation is based around the interval of a sixth (Figure 5.13). The basic note value is an eighth note, keeping the pace of the work at a manageable tempo. We can see then an evolution in the music from simple arpeggios to parallel sixths, with increasing chromaticism throughout.

![Figure 5.12 - Fernando Sor, Variations on Monsiuer Paisiello's “Nel cor piu non mi sento,” 2nd Var., mms. 1-4.](image1)

![Figure 5.13 Fernando Sor, Variations on Monsiuer Paisiello's “Nel cor piu non mi sento,” 3rd Var., mms. 1-3.](image2)

![Figure 5.14 - Fernando Sor, Variations on Monsiuer Paisiello's “Nel cor piu non mi sento,” 4th Var., mms. 1-3.](image3)

As we arrive at the fourth variation, Sor has marked the tempo as Lento a Piacere and works on the coupling of a harmonization of a third with the melody doubled at the octave (Figure 5.14). It appears similar to a chordal study, a favorite of Sor's, but instead has plenty of motion based around the important interval of a third. The lento marking is
deceiving as the rhythms increase to sixteenth notes, and Sor incorporates the high partial harmonics as well as open harmonics to fill out the arrangement (Figure 5.15).

Figure 5.15 - Fernando Sor, *Variations on Monsiuer Paisiello’s “Nel cor piu non mi sento,”* 4th Var., mms. 8-15.

Figure 5.16 - Fernando Sor, *Variations on Monsiuer Paisiello’s “Nel cor piu non mi sento,”* 6th Var., mms. 1-7.

In the fifth variation we return to sixths, but now Sor moves the pace along more quickly, marked as the same tempo as the first variation, but now we have sixteenth notes. Then, as we would expect, the sixth variation is broken arpeggios, similar to the initial movement, but we are now in the parallel minor, providing a challenge to the guitarist (Figure 5.16). C minor removes the ability to use four out of the six open strings, save for when harmonic minor is used, such as in the first and thirteenth measures. The use of C major and C minor during this era has been discussed as a reflection of heroism and growth in Beethoven’s works by historians such as Richard Taruskin. Considering Sor’s travels, it is not unlikely that he was aware of such
discussions and chose to place this work in C specifically so that he might write in C minor for this movement.

The real heft of the work is shown in the seventh and eighth variations and is what sets the work apart from that which Giuliani composed. Sor writes the seventh variation in a style of tremolo that would only be playable by students who followed his pedagogy, using just three fingers for articulation. A modern player, using four fingers for articulation, would look at the figure and be unable to play it. It requires a rest stroke of the thumb to play the downward stemmed notes, followed by \( m \) and \( i \), giving us a pattern of \( p-m-i-p-m-i \) (Figure 5.17). A four-fingered method would not fit into the groupings that Sor has written.

![Figure 5.17 - Fernando Sor, *Variations on Monsiuer Paisiello's* "Nel cor piu non mi sento," 7th Var., mms. 1-2.](image)

The difficulty is increased at this point, with Sor marking the eighth variation as *La main gauche seule*, or “with left hand only” (Figure 5.18). This instructs the player to use left hand strength and accuracy to attack the notes and slur them together. Even for modern players, this technique is very difficult to do correctly. The limitations of this style of playing remove any ability to play chords, so the variation is simply an ornamented version of the original theme.

![Figure 5.18 - Fernando Sor, *Variations on Monsiuer Paisiello's* "Nel cor piu non mi sento," 8th Var., mm. 1-4.](image)
The ninth variation and finale begins with vigorous thirty-second note arpeggios and leaps, once again imitating a pianist sweeping through chords across the keyboard and leaping down to start over again (Figure 5.19). With the inability to use the open notes as basses, the entire chord must be played and then shifted quickly, requiring not just accuracy but dexterity. Harmonically, we find a pair of fully diminished seventh chords at measure six first, then again at measures fourteen and twenty-six. In each case, the first diminished seventh chord resolves to the subdominant, the second resolves to the tonic. This works the arpeggio upwards from E to F and finally G. The finale starts with a twenty-one measure section of rapid broken arpeggios (Figure 5.20). The first measure serves as a transition into the arpeggios, which follow the form of ABCBB', each block consisting of four measures. The harmony in A and C alternates between G7 and C, while the B phrases are Am7/Dm/G7/C, a nice vi/ii/V/I progression in modern terms. Sor then returns to the march like style of the introduction, giving us repeated sixteenth and eighth notes followed by an ornamented arpeggio. This continues for ten measures until we reach the penultimate phrase, a syncopated hammering of the tonic, leading to the expected repetition of the tonic a grand total of seven times, marked by a descending bass note each time it is played. As far as “traditional” endings go, it is equivalent to the end of a symphony, with the composer ensuring that the tonic is left ringing in your ears after the music has ended.
Figure 5.19 - Fernando Sor, *Variations on Monsiuer Paisiello’s “Nel cor piu non mi sento,”* 9th Var., mms. 1-26.
Clearly Sor intended his music for a more advanced student. The usage of extended techniques that were unique to his pedagogy as well as several technically demanding variations within the work, coupled with the sheer scope of the work would
intimidate any amateur players. And yet, this composition was popular enough to be republished and circulated throughout Europe. Sor is able to navigate to harmonically diverse key areas that Giuliani would not dare to attempt. The result is something that, despite being composed by a Spaniard by way of Paris, shares much in common with works of Beethoven. In that manner, we find bridges to Romanticism in this work, much as we do in the late works of Beethoven. The usage of German sixth chords, as well as the curious choice of C major and C minor indicate that there was a connection between the two composers, though one has not been established through formal non-musical communications.

The difficulty of Sor’s composition presents a unique paradox. Here is a work based on a popular theme by a popular composer who concertized, but is above the difficulty level of most players. In this manner, it is an apt comparison to make between Fernando Sor and composers like Niccollo Paganini and Franz Listz. Both of those composers wrote music which challenged the audience and was intended for the Liebhaber that Valentin wrote about. This level of difficulty in the music served to elevate not just Sor, but the guitar as well. Fernando Sor’s “Variations” are a high point for the guitar, and represent a level of instrumental ability on par with Paganini’s 24 Caprices.
Conclusion

Thumbing though a modern music history text can leave a guitarist feeling neglected or overlooked. Missing among all of the mentions of Beethoven and Mozart and Mahler is any mention of the guitar as a serious instrument. The Jugendmusikbewegung seems to have been successful in its efforts to remove the guitar from the concert hall; yet buried in catalogs of sheet music is proof that publishers viewed guitar music as viable for market. The implementation of popular music as a source for a large portion of these works reinforces the concept of the guitar being a mainstream instrument and a part of Hausmusik.

Just as the piano had works composed for all levels of performers, the guitar had champions on both ends of the ability spectrum. Mauro Giuliani's variations are a clear example of what Fielden would consider pedagogical variations. Fernando Sor's variations, on the other hand, best exemplifies the compositional style that Beethoven utilized. Sor’s variations provide performers a platform upon which to showcase their ability on the guitar, much like the works of Liszt and Paganini allow performers to showcase their ability on the piano and violin, respectively.

This separation in difficulty demonstrates that the guitar is capable of being played by both Valentin’s Dillettantent and the Liebhaber. The guitar wasn't just an instrument for the casual musician, sitting at home and playing for an easily impressed, captive audience. A well-trained performer also had access to music that was engaging and challenging, pushing his or her capability to the limits. Publishers, while preferring
to cater to the larger base requiring music that was more accessible, recognized the fact that the guitar had an audience which was discerning enough to demand the types of works written by Fernando Sor.

The revision of history that occurred in the early 1900s, then, seems to be an unfortunate circumstance. The guitar was clearly a large part of the *Hausmusik* movement prior to the widespread dissemination of the pianoforte. It is important that the guitar was recognized by composers such as Beethoven and Schubert, yet puzzling that their respect for the instrument is downplayed, or even ignored. The ability for composers like Sor and Giuliani to tour and concertize gives the impression that the guitar was favored by the public, yet modern texts neglect the concerts that these composers performed with regularity.

The information provided in this study suggests that the current view of music making during the transition between the Classical era and nineteenth century may be more than inaccurate. The current view may be missing vital information about composers and instruments that were respected by the public. The guitar was clearly an important factor in *Hausmusik*, was supported by publishers, and was performed at all levels of difficulty. The works of Sor and Giuliani stand as representatives of the state of the guitar at the beginning of the nineteenth century.
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