

earlier. It was careless of me to have overlooked the date of the preface to *Receuil des pieces*, which indicates that the copying of the manuscript was begun and completed in 1730, although it was not finally bound until after 1739. But this does not alter the fact that there can be no proven relationship between Murcia and Castillion.

In summary, Russell commits himself to some elaborate theories about Murcia and his music which are unsupported by any real evidence, and he often contradicts himself in order to defend these theories. There are other equally valid hypotheses which he seems unwilling to consider. Since Murcia is a composer about whom we know virtually nothing, it is better to keep an open mind.¹

MONICA HALL

Westminster City Libraries, London

Craig Russell responds:

To the Editor of the *Journal*,

IN HER LATEST LETTER, Monica Hall raises several objections to my work that appeared in the 1982 and 1983 editions of the *Journal* to which I would like to respond.

Her first objection concerns a premise (that she mistakenly attributes to me) that begins: "we can identify the sources which Murcia used when compiling *Passacalles y obras...*" I have never claimed to know precisely the avenues that Murcia used to obtain his information. I have merely pointed out that some pieces found in Murcia's books also appear in other sources and have attempted to explain how the two versions are related musically.

Furthermore, in presenting her case Ms. Hall repeatedly argues that there can be no proven relationship between two manuscripts unless there is a proven relationship between their authors. That is not necessarily true. There are a multitude of situations that could explain the same compositions being present in different manuscripts without the authors or scribes of those manuscripts knowing each other. The main point when viewing Le Cocq's and Murcia's manuscripts should be that a demonstrable relationship between the material in these manuscripts exists even though we cannot reconstruct the precise circumstances that made it possible.

Secondly, she objects that I assume that "the movements of the suites for which concordances have not been traced are original compositions by Murcia himself." I agree that we cannot be *certain* of authorship. We simply must wait for more evidence before making any final decisions. Any present theory (be it

¹ I refer my readers to my doctoral dissertation, "The Guitar Anthologies of Santiago de Murcia" (Open University, Milton Keynes, 1983); also my article "Le antologie per chitarra di Santiago de Murcia" *Il Fronimo*, 46 [1984], 9-22.

my own or Ms. Hall's) must unfortunately be based largely on a tenuous foundation of uncertainty, conjecture, and educated guess.

With respect to reworked compositions in Murcia's books, Ms. Hall accurately notes that some alterations are more substantial than others — a point that I emphasize. Although Ms. Hall objects to my use of the term "recomposition" to some types of minor alterations, I feel that her objection is primarily one of degree and of semantics. In issues of substance we appear to be in agreement.

Ms. Hall implies that I totally reject as impossible a trip by Murcia in 1714 to Antwerp to oversee the publication of his *Resumen de acompañar la parte con la guitarra*. This is not the case. I stated clearly (and restate here) that her theory of a possible Antwerp trip is plausible. I only observed that as of yet we have no conclusive proof. Unfortunately, Ms. Hall uses my observation to conclude — quite erroneously — that I therefore "think that Murcia was not familiar with the work of his French contemporaries before 1730." Those are neither my words nor my beliefs.

In closing, I too would like to mention Ms. Hall's dissertation "The Guitar Anthologies of Santiago de Murcia." It is a thorough and laudable piece of scholarship containing many gems of new information, extremely useful appendices, and an elegant transcription of Murcia's music.

CRAIG RUSSELL
California Polytechnic State University

To the Editor of the *Journal*,

I WAS VERY HAPPY TO RECEIVE ANOTHER EXCELLENT ISSUE of the *Journal*, and was especially interested in Joël Dugot's article on lutes in Paris museums, because of the the three mint condition instruments described on page 40 and illustrated on pages 44-46. Dugot says that they "would make an interesting study," and this is indeed true. May I draw your attention to Martyn Hodgson's Communication 175 in *FOMRHI Quarterly*, Bulletin 14 (January 1979), my paper "Mandores and Colachons" in the *Galpin Society Journal* XXXIV (1981) and the relevant entries in *The New Grove Dictionary of Musical Instruments* (1984).

"Lutes" of this type outnumber mainstream lutes of the same period in Pohlmann. The P. J. Horemans paintings of the Munich Court Musicians with their instruments, dated 1772, contain two such 6-course "lutes" and one 13-course lute. A lot of literary references and 6-course MS music survives in which these instruments are called Mandora/e or Gallichona/e (or Colachon, Gallizona, and several other cognates). The most generally known are the Partitas for