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ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Three Manifestations of Carlos Seixas (1704-1742): A Study of Historiographical Biography, Reception, and Interpretation

by

Gary W. Barnett

Doctor of Philosophy, Graduate Program in Music University of California, Riverside, March 2012 Dr. Rogerio Budasz, Chairperson

Since the eighteenth century, the biography of Portuguese composer Carlos Seixas (1704-1742) has been shaped under different, sometimes controversial agendas to the point that one could refer to it as a literary construct. Although incorporating some actual historical data, this evolving narrative is also a marker of the epochs and paradigms of the various human beings who have contributed to the legendary and shadowy iconic status of Carlos Seixas.

The principal research questions of this dissertation are directly associated with three “manifestations” of this construct: (a) an initial manifestation of Seixas’s artistic legacy during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, tied to early Portuguese histories and the always-present mixed feelings towards the music of Italy and Spain, (b) the manifestation of a newer artistic construct in the early to mid-twentieth century tied to various musical analytical models of Seixas’s keyboard works, and (c) manifestations associated with historically informed performance editions and musical style from the late twentieth century to the present day.
Each one of these three manifestations will be considered in a separate part of this dissertation. In the first part, I consider how the cultural and political climate of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Portugal have influenced the fixation on and transmission of Seixas’s presence in drawings, literature, and histories. The second part poses questions that require unveiling the agendas and motivations behind the scientific analysis of musical style from the earliest editors of Seixas’s books, articles, and modern editions from 1910 to 1968. The third part deals with questions associated with manifestations of modern editions, and Seixas’s musical style, and paradigms associated with keyboard organology in the period 1969-2012. I conclude this dissertation by considering how saudades (nostalgia), as a genuinely Portuguese topos, might have played a role in shaping these three manifestations.
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INTRODUCTION

A standard biography of the Portuguese composer Carlos Seixas (1704-1742) that attempts to provide only factual accounts from extant eighteenth-century sources provides for a decidedly thread-bare narrative. Born in the city of Coimbra (one hour north of Lisbon by train), Seixas’s earliest musical instruction is traditionally associated with his father, who was an organist, although the Bibliotheca Lusitana and other late-eighteenth-century accounts are elusive in more specific details. By his late teens, Seixas is known to have traveled south to Lisbon and to have enjoyed success in church and teaching positions in keyboard, although again, a variety of source material from the eighteenth century to the present interprets the reasons for his departure, his keyboard abilities, as well as his ecclesiastical and teaching activities in a variety of ways. Married with children, affluent, and established in Lisbon, Seixas died at the age of 38. Although a variety of interpretations from the late eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries argue for and against Seixas’s fame in Portugal and abroad during his lifetime, his popularity today as one of Portugal’s most famous composers is less disputed.

My earliest “direct” encounter with Seixas was playing through the sonatas of volume ten from the Portugalia Musica series at the piano, which I chanced upon in the music library of Brigham Young University in 2006. Like so many keyboardists before me, I was swept off my feet at having encountered so many remarkable works of a single composer from Portugal during the first half of the eighteenth century; I had no idea such a rich array of keyboard works from Portugal has been the subject of such extensive scholarship.
Although Seixas is one of Portugal’s most famous composers, he has been studied and “constructed” in so many contexts and for so many agendas since the eighteenth century that the story of his reception through time is arguably as interesting as the performances, recordings, and editions now ubiquitous in libraries and the Internet. My initial research forays found that Seixas’s pairing with Domenico Scarlatti that first surfaced in the later eighteenth century was to be continually visited through the passage of time in a variety of laudatory and pejorative comparisons. As well, after reading the customary entries in dictionaries such as the *New Grove* from my side of the Atlantic, I was to find that Seixas’s biography in Portuguese musical dictionaries provided many interesting, contrasting narratives. Several unique historical factors continually cropped up in relation to Seixas’s reception through time, one being the fear of how a small country like Portugal might be viewed negatively by the ever-present foreign eye. In the presence of historical to even modern “inferiority complexes” in Portuguese narratives and constructs of Seixas, a more prominent feature seemed to continually come to the fore, Seixas, though influenced in degrees by foreign influences, was nonetheless intrinsically Portuguese in his musical style, life, and compositions. Thus, from my preliminary encounters with these narratives, I set out to explore more fully Seixas’s reception through time, and eventually to provide a construct of my own in the form of this dissertation.

Despite Seixas’s present iconic status, not a single full-length book is in print, a circumstance owing in part to this dearth of biographical data as well as the absence of not even a single autograph manuscript, personal writings, letters, or diaries. Thus, this
dissertation attempts to provide for an accounting of whatever material there is, and
examines the confluence of source material such as manuscripts, context, including
historical and social influences, and interpretative endeavors such as modern performance
editions in a straightforward methodology. As is inevitably the case, sometimes source
material from one epoch may be lacking, requiring more attention to historical contexts,
while at other times, the converse is true, where interpretations of source material,
especially in the eighteenth century, are lacking, yet the sources themselves are more
plentiful.

Although the primary focus of this dissertation adheres to analysis of these
parameters and their influence upon one another, it abstains (for the most part) from
fabricating and/or conjecturing upon newer paradigms (from my part) when under
discussion. Thus, a musical analytical approach contributed from a mid-twentieth-
century scholar such as Macario Santiago Kastner will be presented and utilized in
context of a discussion in its twentieth-century temporal context, abstaining from trying
to “correct” assumptions that were to be later deemed erroneous or misguided. Beyond
smaller tributaries of secondary themes that course through this dissertation, a major
current throughout is that all interpretive endeavors contributing to Seixas’s multiple
narratives, “manifestations,” are best described as an artistic process.
E até hoje fui sempre futuro,
And until today I have always been future.
– Almada Negreiros (1893-1970)

1.1 - An Unclean Fountain: Vieira and Vasconcellos

Poor Casimiro! Poor Casimiro! Poor Casimiro!

Three times, the late-nineteenth-century historian Ernesto Vieira cries out in an angry lament against the injustices inflicted upon the musical figure Joaquim Casimiro, in his bio-bibliographical dictionary of Portuguese musicians and history, published in 1900. Vieira describes, amidst these anguished cries, that Casimiro is the most inspired Portuguese musician, the greatest artistic soul that art has ever produced in the country; no modern contemporary is equal or comparable to his genius. Ridden with setbacks his entire life, judged wrongly after death, his memory being maltreated, Casimiro took it upon himself to write his autobiography on his own terms, his own understanding in the final melancholic years just before he died. The extensive entry contains a partial reproduction of Casimiro’s hand-written autobiography for verification of the integrity of Vieira’s modern transcription, which was signed Joaquim Casimiro Júnior, in Campo Grande, March 19, 1860. Also included in the entry is a description of Casimiro’s works,
biographical details, poems, inscriptions, a chronological listing of his works, 62 cantos in his honor, and various published reviews.¹

Three decades earlier, in a musical dictionary of Portuguese musicians by Joaquim de Vasconcellos, Casimiro is described as having been resting in the earth but a little while; although it would be sacrilege to exhume his cadaver and play with it, he being a cherished composer, the public is obliged to determine his merit by analysis of his musical works. After comparatively scant biographical details in Vieira’s entry, mostly confined to his role as the patriarchal chapel master of Lisbon and his training under Fr. José Marques da Silva, a teacher who detested the Italian dramatic style in sacred works, Casimiro is shown to be riddled with popular Italian elements, so much so that Casimiro became to be known as the “Portuguese Donizetti.”²

Here, Vasconcellos lets it be known that Casimiro, like Donizetti, was never an artist but a hack, a composer who ignored the lofty ambitions and requirements of the highest arts. Casimiro prostituted himself by aspiring only to delight the vulgar audiences, profiting by sales of his work to the greater mob. He laments how history could allow such things to happen in modern times and dramatically asks the reader if such a judgment is too severe with Casimiro. The answer is negative, the public is only meting out justice; societal and political codes have punishments according to the severity of the crime committed. So too are there codes of an artistic society, the society of critics and artists that embody and constitute artistic truth. Casimiro has committed a

severe crime, one that demands an appropriate form of justice. Finally, in a dramatic
note, Vasconcellos repeats the “fact” that Casimiro was never an artist. The height of his
lofty namesake, a namesake usually reserved only for the dignity of sovereign nations, is
but the representation of the knowledge of the ignorant, the feathers borrowed from a
peacock!3

These two entries, published only three decades apart, display a remarkable scale
of judgment on the part of the authors, to say the least. Their dramatic tone and bold
assertions invite just as much inquiry into the writer as the actual person being written
about. Why is Casimiro being condemned for his Italianisms, his pandering to the
common mob by Vasconcellos, while Vieira hails Casimiro as Portugal’s greatest
composer? Questions like these often offer multiple, sometimes contradictory answers.
The first Vatican Council in 1869-70, as well as the beginnings of the Cecilian
Movement, might have played a role in Vasconcellos’s conservative vision. More than
that, both Vasconcellos and Vieira were just as much defending their strong views,
utilizing the tools of their age as legitimacy for their conclusions, as they were acting
within the modern forces of their times and, as receiving influences from previous
generations of writers. Often, they were writing to be a lasting, definitive voice, striving
for the approval of the future.

Understanding modernity in this sense requires looking backwards to the
preceeding generations, a “retrograde chronology,” in which each successive generation of
historical contexts and the sources that were being interpreted for these manifestations are

3Ibid.
traced to an original source. Debates as to whether historical narratives are more
effective by forward motion as opposed to retrograde chronologies (or even skipping
around) suggest that, in some instances, one is better than another. Mark Kinkead-
Weekes, for example, argues for the traditional “forwards chronological” perspective in
writing biographies. He gives a number of reasons, one of which is that it is easier for the
reader to become engaged in the sense of how a life unfolds, with all its anticipations,
tension, and drama, when encountered in a chronological fashion. There is also a danger
for the author who decides to move backwards, as he might provide too much
information at the outset, hampering a sense of anticipation so necessary in keeping the
enthusiasm of the reader.⁴

This retrograde chronological quest for an original source is not a biography,
however. Anticipation, tension, and a natural unfolding involve imagining how
historians dreamed of the future in their own epochs. Their modernity was always
chained to the modernities of the historians that preceded them, and to some extent, the
historical tools that were either going to be continued to be used or willfully discarded.
Vieira brandished a very specific tool in his entry on Casimiro that Vasconcellos did not
utilize, a tool that was used in previous generations of historians all throughout Europe to
demonstrate authorial integrity, legitimacy, and most importantly, superiority over one’s
predecessors—the tool of autobiography. This tool, the lucky card in the hands of
historians as early as the eighteenth century, was used in a variety of contexts. At times,

some historians expertly blended fiction and conjecture to such an extent that reality, though drawing upon the “legitimacy” of autobiographical accounts, was transformed into a blurred concoction of fiction and reality.

Catherine O’Rawe demonstrates how the earliest biographer of Pirandello, Nardelli, for example, used a straightforward methodology, but blurred and confused the identity of Pirandello by using autobiographical material along with fiction from the author. Nardelli informed the reader that he systematically interviewed Pirandello, and then asked Pirandello at regular intervals to verify and approve his accounts, to help demonstrate his authority. Although Nardelli’s mixture of autobiographical accounts and fiction from Pirandello were liberally criticized by successive biographers, his methodology, as well as examples of fictional texts and chronologies, was copied for generations, and eventually Nardelli as a historian became all but forgotten.5

The brief entry of Vasconcellos on Casimiro as a “non-artist” does not have the autobiographical tool that Vieira later used to help back up his authority; in fact, his only reference given was an article, “A Música em Portugal” in the periodical Gazette da Madeira, of 1866. What might have been obvious to Vasconcellos, and possibly to the public who bought and read his book, was that the excessive Italianisms were subservient to an even bigger issue: compositional crime. Casimiro was stripped of the merits of even being called an artist for deliberately using his musical training in amoral behavior of the greatest magnitude. The brevity of this entry also says a lot. Vasconcellos has

done enough by stating the “facts,” then, after passing a harsh, though appropriate
judgment, moves on to the multitude of other Portuguese musical figures in his two-
volume set, some of which are more “law abiding,” even musicians of the greatest
esteem.

José Antonio Carlos de Seixas, as interpreted by Vasconcellos, may be likened in
this sense to a “law-abiding” artist, the diametric opposite to Casimiro. Not only is
Seixas an artist, but in all probability the greatest organist that Portugal has ever
produced. Noting that Seixas never left the country of Portugal, Vasconcellos goes on to
describe Seixas as always grateful, and though well known in his time, has now been
forgotten, like so many of Portugal’s artists. There is a profound admiration, mixed with
a certain nostalgia better expressed through the Portuguese word *saudade*, for this great
man’s legacy, evident in the fact that his remains were soon moved after his interment at
the brotherhood of the Santissimo Sacramento to the convent of Nossa Senhora da Graça,
under the supervision of the hermits of Santo Agostinho. Besides the admiration and
saudades, as well as the longing for earlier, simpler times, Vasconcellos elevates the
importance of Seixas by reporting what was being said abroad, based on the presence of a
painting of Seixas mentioned in Germany. Further, it is conceded as very possible that
the artist who painted this only extant picture of Seixas was the celebrated Francisco
Vieira de Mattos, better known as Vieira Lusitano, who was born and died in Lisbon,
1699-1783, and described in a dictionary of historical artists by Raszinski as a Portuguese
painter on par with many of the most famous foreign artists.\(^6\)

---

\(^6\)Vasconcellos, *Os Musicos Portuguezes.*
Seixas, as “law-abiding artist,” is worthy of footnotes, citations, and a description of plentiful source material. Among Vasconcellos’s sources are the *Bibliotheca Lusitana* of Barbosa Machado, a monumental bibliographic dictionary of people who published books, poems, and music, as well as numerous locations for his manuscripts of a large and varied oeuvre. Vasconcellos states how one can travel to Coimbra, for example, to find a modern copy made by Father Caetano da Silva e Oliveira of a manuscript of twenty-nine sonatas that once belonged to the library of Mosteiro of Santa Cruz in Coimbra. Further, in this manuscript, it appears that there were at least some indications of a didactic intent, evidenced in part by the presence of the solfège system taught in the seminary by Father João Jorge. Among the errata, sonata number 27 is missing, and the 26th piece, a toccata, has an epigraph indicating that it could possibly be that of the celebrated Domenico Scarlatti. Included in the listing of works are 700 sonatas for harpsichord! (Vasconcellos’s exclamation), ten masses for four to eight voices with orchestra, a Te Deum with four choirs customarily sung on the last day of the year, in the custom of S. Roque, sixteen other pieces, and various motets of two, three, and four voices with and without instruments.7

José Antonio Carlos de Seixas receives a rather different assessment in the interpretations of Vieira, although his principal resource was the same—Machado’s *Bibliotheca Lusitana*. He begins by writing that Seixas was a notable organist and harpsichordist, but his short life prevented him from gaining greater fame. Evidence of an early talent on the organ became apparent at the age of 16 and prompted relocation to

---

7Ibid.
Lisbon at the patriarchal basilica. At this point, however, Vieira questions the validity of some of Machado’s claims. The likelihood of a 16-year-old boy coming to Lisbon and obtaining an appointment at this basilica is hardly slight; at best Seixas could only have received minor orders. Even harder to believe is that, based only on his precocious talent, he obtained such a lofty position at the patriarchal basilica. What is certain about Carlos de Seixas is that he was more of an amateur than a professional artist and belonged to a noble family. Although he was a Chevalier of the Order of Christ, and a member of the Order of S. Thiago with the dignity of a grand master, it was the friars of the Convento da Graça who elevated his namesake after his death in Lisbon, on August 25, 1742, to the pompous obsequities associated with the court nobility.8

Vieira does not argue much with Machado, however, in terms of credibility concerning Seixas’s prodigious output in a variety of musical genres, and though differing somewhat in his interpretation, he says a lot of the same things Vasconcellos does. Vieira simply reiterates, without commenting on Machado’s credibility, that Seixas possesses an enormous quantity of tocatas for harpsichord and organ, a number possibly exceeding 700, ten masses for four to eight voices with orchestra, a Te Deum for four choirs that was sung in the Church of St. Roque in the last day of the year, and various motets. There is mention of the painting made by the celebrated artist Francisco Vieira that was reproduced in two different engravings, though with no further commentary about foreign accolades, and the location of manuscripts at the Coimbra University Library, at the Ajuda Palace, and at the National Library in Lisbon.

8Vieira, Dicionario Biographico de Musicos Portuguezes.
Comparative analysis of these two entries reveals an important aspect of Carlos Seixas, then known as José Antonio Carlos de Seixas, within the milieu of Portuguese historians in the late nineteenth century: it was very important to have earned the title of “artist.” This exemplary status was judged in large part by the authority of the historian’s knowledge of the contemporary cultural life and musical styles of the modern composers, as well as a profound connection to the trends of times past. Among the devices used for authority and legitimacy were claims to the citation of an older, important primary source, in this case Machado’s *Biblioteca Lusitana*. In this instance, we witness an interpretive process geared in part towards a moral judgment, deciding upon which musicians were worthy of praise, or which unfortunate beings were going to be condemned.

Beyond the sensational rhetoric of both Vasconcellos and Vieira, the point is clear, they are concerned with constructing lives seen as ideal and praiseworthy in the domain of artistry. This practice of referring to an archaic source in building or destroying the exemplary status of a human being is certainly not confined to the nineteenth century or to the country of Portugal. Sergei Averintsev points out that as far back as the histories of the Greeks and Romans, above and beyond describing the chronological narrative of a person’s life, beyond their tone and choice of various peoples of different social levels,

Odd individuals, indeed scandalous persons of different classes, including famous whores (the subject of a lost work by Suetonius), not to mention tyrants or eccentric poets and philosophers, were all among the favorite heroes of the biographical genre. Yet, in spite of all the differences between didactic and purely sensational purpose, the intellectual attitude and the logical pattern remain the
same: instructive or not, individual characters were seen and pictured essentially as exempla.9

Further, Averintsev points out that beyond the description of a person as an exemplary model, certain qualities of these early biographies were similar in many respects to the Gospels. The Gospels are texts that are devoid of their own commentary, are elusive, if not impenetrable in interpretation, and provoke “innumerable commentaries, interpretations, expositions. The task of interpretation of this primary text, never to be accomplished once and for all, gives to each culture its paradigm.”10

Vasconcellos and Vieira’s entries on Seixas are not the Gospels, and though some might argue that there are aspects of their texts that are impenetrable, at least here, they have provoked some degree of interpretation as well as musings upon cultural paradigms. Beyond a fact-finding mission into the details important in our own modernity, there is much of interest in the larger context of the late-nineteenth-century’s conception. As absurd as it would be today to seriously consider printing in a venerable dictionary such as the New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians a judgment call on whether or not a composer was an artist, to write in an impassioned tone with frequent exclamations, to include lengthy printed letters, reviews, extensive foldouts throughout, or vindictive prefaces, these very qualities characterize invaluable historical documents and comparative resources.

10Ibid.
In this respect, it is important to consider aspects of both Vasconcellos’ and Vieira’s dictionaries. Before the preface of Vieira’s dictionary, there is to be found a dedication on the cover page with a quote by Sá de Miranda, “tell the whole truth to all those who ought to hear it.” Vieira then proceeds to his preface with a description of the dictionary of Vasconcellos printed in 1870. He explains that in the form of a dictionary, Vasconcellos hastily used information on the musicians of Portugal from the Bibliotheca Lusitana of Barbosa Machado and the Biographie Universelles des Musiciens of François-Joseph Fétis, adding in his own substandard work decorated with his pretentiousness, all devoid of a judicious methodology. Further, his dictionary blatantly trampled two of the most eminent of modern musicians: Joaquim Casimiro and Santos Pinto, and whatever Vasconcellos’s motives were for these foolish injustices, it had disastrous effects.

Vieira’s paramount concern with the dictionary is beyond these tramplings, however, he is most concerned with their reception abroad. He states that modern editors, either in Portugal or abroad, have had to seek information about Portuguese composers and drink from this “unclean fountain,” and have reproduced his work full of errors and misinformation, like bushy weeds growing on uncultivated land. He angrily continues that Vasconcellos was not content in his malevolence simply to write in Portuguese, but sent his work to be added as a supplement to the Biographie Universelle of Fétis, and thus, material that contains the errors and omissions of Pinto and Casimiro. Finally, Vieira must pass judgment on Vasconcellos, explaining that, in light of the
greatness of composers like Joaquim Casimiro and Santos Pinto, these representations of Portuguese composers abroad constitute a grave crime against the country of Portugal.

Interestingly, much like the entry on Casimiro within the dictionary itself, Vieira refers to his methodology for authority. The latter part of this preface turns from the tirade against Vasconcellos to an appeal to the reader. Because of what he perceives as the lamentable quality of an epoch that could clamor over a dictionary like this, Vieira, deeply concerned, has taken it upon himself to carefully study with time and patience, to find out little by little the entire truth. He then lets the reader know that his methodology, a unique quality of professionalism and distance, a rare commodity, free from excuses, can be found.11

As a kind of premonition, Vasconcellos adds an inscription on the cover page of his dictionary before his preface. It is a quote from Goethe, “Light! Light! Light!”12 Perhaps it is here, even before the preface begins, that we witness the many crimes of Vasconcellos against his country, the wellspring of a spewing, “unclean fountain.” It is divided into seven numbered essays entitled “preliminary ideas.” His first essay provides an important paradigm to be found in the dictionary. The history of art is divided into four major eras and four respective civilizations. They are given in a chronological fashion, starting with the Greeks, the Middle Ages, the Renaissance, and culminating in modern times; specifically, modernity is defined as the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The ultimate art of Vasconcellos’s modernity is representative of Handel in the oratorio, Mozart in the opera, Haydn, Beethoven and Berlioz in the symphony, and J. S.  

11Vieira, *Diccionario Biographico de Musicos Portuguezes*.
12Vasconcellos, *Os Musicos Portuguezes*.
Bach, Bach is the extraordinary talent representative of earlier generations, from which all other later generations of music progress in admiration.

One of the most striking entries is on Marcos Antonio da Fonseca Portugal. It is just shy of 40 percent of the total second volume, totaling 74 pages out of 294. If there is any reason to doubt who the hero of Vasconcellos’s dictionary is, in consideration of its mammoth size, the first line of this entry eliminates all uncertainties. Vasconcellos explains it is necessary to consult the opinion of someone abroad, the eminent literary figure from Belgium, Fétis, to dictate to the reader what Vasconcellos needs to say from the words of a foreign mouth, “Look ye hence thither, look—there was a great artist.”

After a discussion on the relationship between art and craftsmanship, and how the Portuguese government for years was to blame for aiding in the destruction of the arts, Vasconcellos proceeds with biographical details and several timelines, the first of which details performances of Portugal’s operas in various countries throughout Europe. At the end of the dictionary, there are six appendices, three of which are enormous over-sized foldouts. They detail errata and amendments as well as financial information, including the salaries of chapel masters of the royal chapel.

What can be seen from Vasconcellos’s dictionary is that, among other things, there is a prodigious amount of information to sift through. It is cumbersome to pore over timelines, the listing of cities in which premieres took place, the letters, and the enormous foldouts, items that today would be printed as separate publications. There are obvious prejudices, apparent favorites, those stalwart heroes shown to stand above the

\[13\]Ibid.
rest by preferential treatment. In addition to these bulky entries that are tomes in themselves, as in the case of Marcos Portugal, discrepancies in “factual” content and a wide range of methodologies cause one to wonder just how “definitive” these dictionaries were in their day. Answering that question is beyond this dissertation, but it does pose an even larger inquiry into the effort to designate one musical figure as towering above others.

Two musicologists, Paula Higgins from the United States and Antontio Jorge Marques from Portugal, have delved into the inner workings of peoples, social contexts, literature, musical scores, and non-literary sources in championing musical icons. Higgins scrutinizes a confluence of events and actions of leading figures in the musical world of roughly the past thirty years that contributed to the apotheosis of Josquin des Prez as a musical genius. Succinctly she was able to outline Josquin’s apotheosis as follows:

The late twentieth-century apotheosis of Josquin, I would suggest, arose from a confluence of highly contingent musical and historical circumstances involving the impending completion of the opera omnia in the 1960s, the publication of Osthoff’s Josquin monograph of 1962-65, Lowinsky’s “Genius” article of 1964, the Kerman-Lowinsky debates of 1965, and above all, the International Josquin Festival-Conference of 1971, which, I would further suggest, appropriated Josquin des Prez as Renaissance musicology's very own genius, historically refashioned in a Beethovenian guise.14

Perturbed, she found herself on a mission, intent on discovering how Josquin became the unquestioned figure of mythological proportions so associated with composers like Beethoven. Beyond her disturbance, she marveled at how the rhetoric, a

tone of complicit acceptance as though it were totally natural, was being wholeheartedly accepted in publications. What was the process underlying the ability to talk about Josquin, until recently, in such new terms so unquestionably consented upon?

She discovered that the process of genius building was directly related to tone and rhetoric. Ideological and social issues were all being talked about in naturalistic terms that were carefully being transformed into a broader cultural paradigm. An alchemical process was at work, what once did not exist culturally was now an extant myth caged in the rhetoric of something unquestionably normal; in short, culture was being changed into nature. She regrets that in our postmodern era, the richness of a composer like Josquin can be overshadowed by a new iconic construct of genius, a construct now intellectually bankrupt. She wants justice to be met by stripping him of such confusion and supplying him with a more appropriate construct. She relates,

If seeing Josquin as a “genius” means eradicating all signs of history—of his own musical and cultural past—and regarding him as some infallible, timeless, mythical force of Nature; if it means imposing ahistorical standards of perfection on pieces historically attributed to him; if it means perpetuating in eternam the current fetish with authentication studies and thereby consigning some of the most breathtaking music ever written to the dustbin; if it means misappropriating “Josquin” in the commodification of stereotypes of gender, race, class, and sexuality, then for the sake of the disservice it does to the historical body of musical texts surviving under his name, I would not only deny but, more importantly, spare him the ignominy of genius status.\(^{15}\)

Among her admonitions is to incorporate better methodologies and theories based upon self examination; by doing so, a composer like Josquin could better benefit from cross-disciplinary boundaries of research and scholarship.

\(^{15}\)Ibid.
Antonio Marques examines how the genius of Seixas is a construct spanning hundreds of years, tied in great measure to the years just before the Second World War back to the reign of Dom João V. Before the Second World War, pioneering musicologists such as Macario Santiago Kastner interpreted early published resources such as Machado’s *Lusitana* and José Mazza’s eighteenth-century biographical dictionary, as well as a host of non-literary sources. From a literary perspective, he examined the political and economic climate of the earliest years of the eighteenth century, during the reign of Dom João V, with descriptions of how the immense flow of wealth created an unparalleled epoch in Portugal’s history as important contextual material. An absolute monarch like Dom João V chose to spend vast amounts of this revenue on elevating the status of his country through unique relationships and maneuvers with Rome and the Catholic Church, for legitimization of Portugal as a world power, as both an ecclesiastical and political force.

With this historical context as a backdrop, Marques interprets some non-literary material, such as a painting of Seixas, arguing through analysis of various symbols, how important clues can be gleaned in the earliest days of Seixas’s genius building. Perhaps known as a different kind of genius during his life in comparison to the construct we encounter today, Seixas did enjoy a prosperous life, and from an analysis of his music, one that reveals an exceptional, multi-faceted style. He argues that Seixas had a privileged relationship with Dom João V as a devoted servant, though he had to be careful in his musical freedoms, as his audience, though primarily the educated society of Lisbon, had its limits. Marques reflects on how the earthquake of 1755 resulted in the
destruction of invaluable biographical testaments to Seixas as well as scores—a
tremendous obstacle in Seixas musical scholarship. If it were not for the cathedrals
outside of Lisbon that had copies of his scores, such as those in Evora and Viseu (another
testament to Seixas as a composer of some renown during his life), there would be even
fewer resources today. From a perspective of today’s paradigm of Seixas’s growing
genius status, an ongoing process, he suggests a more complete, thorough analysis of his
works.16

What can be seen from the scholarship of Marques in his examination of the
genius construct of Seixas are important corollaries, as well as divergences from the
conclusions and methodologies of Higgins concerning Josquin. Higgins discovered
within the last thirty years a process of changing nature into culture with a detrimental
byproduct of apotheosis of Josquin des Prez into a musical genius. Marques, however,
demonstrates a cultural awareness of processes associated with Seixas’s genius building
that trace from the years just before the Second World War back to the beginning of the
eighteenth century, during the early years of the reign of Dom João V. Higgins is
perturbed by how the alchemical process of Josquin could have gone unobserved for just
over 30 years; Marques is filled with melancholy, knowing that the sources, debates, and
key figures associated with Seixas’s eighteenth-century world are spread far and thin,
mostly due to a terrible natural disaster in Lisbon, 1755. Higgins can be succinct in a
chronological sequence of events, citing instances such as the Kerman-Lowinsky debates,
but Marques must grapple with the peculiarities and scarcities of source material

16António Jorge Marques, “Contribuições para o estudo da sociologia do génio de Carlos Seixas e
para a reaprecação da sua obra sacra” (unpublished manuscript, Lisbon, 1999).
spanning hundreds of years. Higgins has initiated a debate saving Josquin from an indignity, while Marques argues for at least a more well-rounded view of Seixas by looking at his music as a whole. Finally, where the argument of Higgins could draw a good deal of her resources from secondary literature, and published scores, Marques had comparatively limited resources for establishing Seixas’s genius status, and in many instances, had to resort to non-literary primary sources such as musical manuscripts.
1.2 – Trivia: Lambertini and Moreau

Robert Daly, in his cultural study of the transatlantic culture of the United States and England from the eighteenth to later centuries, notes how connections between a wide variety of source studies, from traditional literary perspectives to more modern, less conventional approaches and sources, have helped illuminate how varying epochs have evolved, changed, or influenced one another. Piecing together what it was like in the United States in a larger world beyond more traditional publications and studies, where “Other writings, inspired less by the lyric Muse than by Roman and English politics, tobacco, commerce, and the salary of the governor of Massachusetts, were left standing trackside while the Edwards-to-Emerson express roared by,” Daly is able to argue that as cosmopolitan as we are today in our current thought, we have relocated our American predecessors to a simpler culture that is still bound in large part to literature.17

Scholars gain a broader picture of history from sources other than literature, helping us to understand the context of historical epochs, providing clues to the agendas of writers from earlier epochs as early as the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. For example, in the late seventeenth century, myth and fable were seen as devices of political unity in times of uncertainty and cultural division; many of the creators of these myths were conscious of what they were doing; John Adams, among others, was aware of such inventions, and warned that these falsehoods, then just beginning to be promulgated, were obliged to be corrected. He illustrates that although it is easy today, through

---

applications of new methodologies and scholarly approaches, to comprehend connections between past epochs, it may not have been so easy to previous scholars. Nineteenth-century Americans were bewildered by the eighteenth-century fascination with the poetry of Horace and Virgil, and Daly ponders if earlier writers, though bereft of our modern hindsight and methodological and analytical tools, shared similar interests and inquiries, and perhaps “self-consciously participated in the cultural conversations of their own times.” In any event, as attested to in a nineteenth-century memoir, numerous eighteenth-century tomes gathered dust on shelves, hibernating peacefully, undisturbed for years.\(^{18}\)

In the fertile regions of the upper Alentejo, a locale with a rich cultural history, though sparsely populated in comparison to the bustling metropolis of Lisbon, in the public library of the ancient city of Evora, Portugal, one such tome has also been sleeping peacefully for many years.\(^{19}\) This manuscript too may have been enigmatic to nineteenth-century Portuguese sensibilities, and the signed roster of visitants in the early twentieth century, just under four decades after the publication of Vieira’s dictionary, confirms that this lightly beige, stained, moldy, and battered codex was rudely yanked from its slumber. José Mazza wrote it in the late eighteenth century, and it was later transcribed and re-printed with a preface by Padre José Augusto Alegria during the years of 1944-45.\(^{20}\) Alegria reveals that Ernesto Vieira had perused this book, though no

\(^{18}\)Ibid.


\(^{20}\)José Mazza, *Dicionário biográfico de músicos portugueses com prefácio e notas do Padre José Augusto Alegria*, extracted from the journal “Ocidente” (Lisbon: Tipografia da Editorial Império, 1944/1945).
specific date is given (it had to be at least before 1915, as that was the year Vieira died in Lisbon). Among the earliest names in the roster of “visitants” in the front of the book are Antonio Rodrigues Correia in 1937, Jorge C. de Vasconcellos and Padre Alegria in 1939.21

Vieira, after examining this codex, apparently was not very impressed with what he found, and ultimately deemed it, along with its assorted bric-a-brac, a collection of trivia without interest to anyone. Alegria, far from agreeing, set about arguing through reference to Mazza’s own words, as well as demonstrating Vieira’s poor lack of judgment, why this codex was such an invaluable resource.22 Vieira, in his dictionary, flagrantly omits the composer Rodrigues Esteves (a contemporary of Seixas). Had he consulted Mazza’s book, he would have known that Esteves was sent to Rome by Dom João V to study as a royal scholar, an important fact absent in Vieira’s dictionary. Alegria believes this codex is worthy enough when Mazza dictates that even if this volume re-iterates all that has been said before him, yet contributes but one new piece of information, it will make this of some practical use. As he points out, there are much more than just one or two items to be found, but rather a multitude of new, important facts that illuminate Portugal’s musical history.

To further validate his arguments, Padre Alegria freely divulges his interpretive methodology in a modern mid-twentieth century, “scientific” fashion, providing a detailed, physical descriptive analysis of the book as well as citations and references. He
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22Mazza, *Dicionário biográfico de músicos portugueses*.
gives precise measurements of the book, 25 centimeters long by 18.6 cm wide, details of
the binding, the number of sheets, some with original markings, others with penciled-in
markings presumably added after Mazza’s time, and then proceeds to a description of
eight other materials that serve as part of the codex. By describing the physical quality as
well as the contents of these eight materials, he appeals to the reader that his modern
analytical tools and interpretive methodologies are legitimate and sound. These materials
include scraps of paper, letters, philosophical musings, biographical notes of various
composers such as Antonio Leal Moreira and institutions like the Patriarchal seminary,
and a curious translation by a Tuscan, Tomas Garzoni, “that nothing is well done without
missing something.” After a personal exclamation towards the end of the preface, “Ah,
that the poverty of my resources may serve to awaken some great hidden value!,” a
glimpse into his motives becomes apparent when he compares this re-print of Mazza’s
dictionary, something he deems a very rare source, drawing upon newspapers,
magazines, and other eighteenth-century sources, to the cumbersome, hard-to-find
dictionaries of both Vieira and Vasconcelos. Alegria concludes that this re-print of
Mazza’s dictionary is an exemplary, concise source of great utility for the general public.

In the National Library of Portugal there are also many non-literary sources,
unique “books” dating from the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries sharing many
aspects with Mazza’s dictionary, containing massive amounts of “trivia,” some of it a
treasure trove of valuable information, other of it perhaps genuine trivia. Two such
examples are a collection of five volumes of miscellaneous material collected or written
by Michel’angelo Lambertini containing primarily musical programs of the eighteenth to
early twentieth centuries, mostly from Portugal, and the other a published book with transcribed programs, as well as a general history devoted to the São Carlos Theater in Lisbon from the same time frame. The sheer volume and wealth of information in these resources, especially the Lambertini, is an incredible challenge to interpret and understand. With the first volume of the Lambertini, for example, the body of the book is 658 pages, with each page containing an enormous amount of information in the form of programs that are attached in most cases by scotch tape. Anywhere from one to several programs are attached to both sides of a page with concert dates, venues, repertoire, soloists, conductors, and publicity flyers. Lambertini, presumably the author of an unsigned sixty-page index in this first volume, attempted to index at least a part of this information at the back of the book, but admittedly someone wishing to find the performance history of a particular composer such as Domenico Scarlatti or Carlos Seixas will have to go through each page, as only a small fraction of the composers are detailed in the index.

Conducting a positivistic, “scientific” descriptive analysis, akin to Alegria’s assessment of Mazza’s dictionary, is rife with complications. Like Mazza’s dictionary, it is also well worn, though it dwarfs its neighbor in terms of its weight: lifting this gargantuan tome off of its shelf and carrying it to an inspection table is a herculean task.
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24Mário Moreau, O teatro de S. Carlos: Dois séculos de história. Two volumes (Lisbon: Hugin Editores, 1999).
This weight comes in most part from both the programs and the tape that holds the programs of varying sizes, some as small as 11.5 cm x 8 cm, and others as large as 32.5 cm x 14.5 cm. Resembling Mazza’s codex, this manuscript contains no date, title, or authorship of any kind beyond the handwriting of the author’s index and notes within the book itself. His index, hand-written on a completely different paper than the body of the book, a light blue-lined paper with glued-on alphabetical letters, measures 44 cm x 26 cm, and contains the watermarks “THOMAR” and “CAVALLEIROS.” With the exception of the first page of this index, which contains unknown (thankfully odorless) marbled coffee stains spilled all over its surface, most of its pages are in tolerable condition.26

Lambertini’s index is a laudable accomplishment; his organizational methodology involves alphabetical headings of each page listed first by venue in one column, then correlates dates by another column, finally followed by columns of selected composers. Thumbprints of Lambertini’s tastes, his motivational zeal in collecting these programs, as well as possible contexts of his geographical location and time start to come into focus. This source in and of itself indicates the wide range of a musical aficionado bent on understanding diverse repertoires and genres spanning diverse epochs, including an abundance of keyboard performances of various Portuguese artists of Baroque, Classical, and Romantic keyboard composers.

A brief biographical account by Carla Capelo Machado, entitled *A actividade musical de Michel’angelo Lambertini*, in the book *Michel’angelo Lambertini (1862-
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26Lambertini, *Bibliophile Musicale*, 1-5.
1920),\textsuperscript{27} confirms why there might be such an abundance of piano performances:

Lambertini was himself a musician, studying piano, among a variety of other instruments, and graduated from the school of music at the Royal Conservatory of Lisbon in 1881 with distinction. He was actively involved with music making in Portugal from his early years and all throughout his life, with a prominent influence in a variety of organizations and societies, including the Royal Academy of Amateurs of Music and the Society of Chamber Music with Alexandre Rey Colaço and Vítor Hussla, among others.

Table 1.1 presents data extracted from Lambertini’s first volume, focusing on pages 243, 373, 496, and 644, respectively. These pages were chosen after a preliminary perusal of the index, a scanning of all 658 pages in the main body of the book, then further selection of material from programs attached to each page with the following three objectives: (a) find performance histories, if any, of music of Carlos Seixas during the nineteenth century; (b) obtain a generalized “snapshot” of selected performers, dates, venues, and composers of keyboard repertoire from the time period in which Vasconcellos and Vieira published their musical dictionaries; and, (c) find, in the absence of any performance records of Seixas, any accounts of other eighteenth-century contemporaries of keyboard music, especially keyboard performances of Domenico Scarlatti.

Table 1.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Composers</th>
<th>Keyboardist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>Solo piano performance</td>
<td>3-14-1881</td>
<td>Teatro de D. Maria II</td>
<td>Beethoven, Mozart, Handel, Field, Chopin, Mendelssohn, Schumann, Rubinstein</td>
<td>Anton Rubinstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373</td>
<td>Solo piano performance</td>
<td>1-19-1889</td>
<td>Concert Hall Royal Academy of Music Amateurs</td>
<td>Gluck-Saint Saëns, Daquin, Scarlatti, Strauss-Tausig</td>
<td>Alexandre Rey Colaço</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496</td>
<td>Solo piano performance</td>
<td>12-9-1894</td>
<td>Concert Hall Royal Conservatory of Lisbon</td>
<td>Liszt, Chopin, Tchaikovsky, Godard, Tansig, Vianna da Motta</td>
<td>José Vianna da Motta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644</td>
<td>Solo piano performance</td>
<td>3-6-1898</td>
<td>Concert Hall Royal Conservatory</td>
<td>J.S. Bach, Pergolesi, A. Scarlatti, C.P.E. Bach, Couperin, Daquin, Handel, Martini, Paisiello, Rameau, D. Scarlatti</td>
<td>Alexandre Rey Colaço</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From table 1.1 it can be seen that Lambertini did not register any performances of Carlos Seixas during the second half of the nineteenth century, although during the time of Vasconcellos’s and Vieira’s dictionaries, a variety of keyboard repertoire of varying time periods, including keyboard music of Domenico Scarlatti, was being played by Portuguese pianists in venues throughout Lisbon.

Table 1.2 focuses on the two-volume book of Mário Moreau, containing transcribed concerts and various records from the São Carlos Theater in Lisbon.28 The aims of this probe, incorporating the same objectives of table 1.1, are now modified not
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28 Moreau, *O teatro de S. Carlos: Dois séculos de história.*
only to satisfy, but to go beyond what was previously sought—in essence, to achieve a “dialogue” between a traditional literary source and Lambertini’s non-literary manuscript. These “enhanced” objectives are modified thus: (a) continue to search the record for any performances of Carlos Seixas or contemporaries such as Domenico Scarlatti in the nineteenth century; (b) obtain a more focused, “higher-resolution” image of concert life relating to keyboard, beyond the snapshot generalities from table 1.1; and, (c) enlarge the time frame not only of Vieira’s and Vasconcellos’ epoch, but extend to the first half of the nineteenth century as well.

Table 1.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Historical Significance</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Keyboardist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piano solo performance</td>
<td>8-24-1821</td>
<td>First piano recital at São Carlos Theater</td>
<td>D. Pedro IV</td>
<td>João Guilherme Daddi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano concerto</td>
<td>6-2-1841</td>
<td>First piano concerto at São Carlos Theater</td>
<td>Thalberg</td>
<td>C. Weber, João Guilherme Daddi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano lecture-recital</td>
<td>2-6-1845</td>
<td>First piano lecture-recital at São Carlos Theater</td>
<td>D. Pedro IV</td>
<td>Franz Liszt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano solo performance</td>
<td>5-25-1886</td>
<td>First performance of D. Scarlatti at São Carlos Theater</td>
<td>D. Scarlatti</td>
<td>Alexandre Rey Colaço</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From table 1.2 it can be seen that Moreau did not register any performances of Carlos Seixas at the São Carlos Theater during the nineteenth century; ironically, the earliest
performance would be the same year that Ernesto Vieira died. According to Lambertini’s manuscript, the earliest performance of a Scarlatti sonata in Lisbon was January 19, 1889.

The very virtues that make Moreau’s two-volume set so much more convenient than Lambertini’s manuscript prove to be drawbacks as well. Devoid of interpretive interference, the original programs in Lambertini provide a host of information that is unlikely, or in some cases even impossible, to transcribe in a book such as Moreau’s. For example, from table 1.1, the concert by Anton Rubinstein measures 22 x 13.5 cm, has an elaborate embroidered edge around the program with flowers and filigree, and provides information beyond the repertoire, e.g., about the Erard piano he performed on. The concert by Colaço is comparatively dainty, though embroidered in its decorative trim in no less impressive a fashion and accompanied by an RSVP invitation card to a “Mademoiselle Annette Hussla.” The third concert, by Viana da Motta, is the largest program of all, measuring over 32 cm tall, though it is comparatively very stark in its graphic design. Finally the fourth program of table 1.1, one of the last concerts played in the nineteenth century by Colaço, contains program notes by him in a lecture-recital on the “cravistas” of the eighteenth century of various European countries. Understandably, these details are left out in the transcriptions of Moreau’s programs, yet when present in Lambertini’s manuscript provide important historical contexts.

Having satisfied the objectives of both tables 1.1 and 1.2, the following three points of intersectional data prove useful: (a) the curious titles of “Pastorale and Capriccio” of Colaço’s performances of Scarlatti on his recitals suggest he played the same pieces in a variety of venues, and it was published in Germany, edited by Carl
Tausig; (b) the concert preceding the first Scarlatti performance at the São Carlos Theater was also a first of its kind, a lecture-recital given by Franz Liszt on the hymn composed by prince Dom Pedro upon the returning of the Portuguese Royal family from Brazil in 1821, probably influenced by his collaboration with the Portuguese piano virtuoso and composer João Guilherme Daddi; (c) Daddi was a high-profile pianist, intimately woven into the fabric of the lore of the São Carlos Theater throughout the nineteenth century, whose debut and choice of repertoire at the age of seven occurred at a critical point in Portugal’s political history.

From these points of intersectional data, we begin to understand the reason for Vieira’s lackluster assessment of Seixas’s oeuvre and artistry. The comparison of these two sources provides a unique window of context, indicating that no one was playing the keyboard music of Seixas during the second half of the nineteenth century in major public venues. The fame of Daddi’s successes at the São Carlos Theater, not to mention his stature among famous foreigners visiting Lisbon, such as Franz Liszt, may indicate why Seixas was more of a gifted amateur to Vieira, while Daddi, was “one of the most notable pianists of Portugal as well as an excellent composer.”

This comparison demonstrates that the great Portuguese pianists of the nineteenth century were in a very real sense “performer-historians” at home and abroad, publishing and performing their “histories” as program notes in their lecture-recitals, championing a variety of composers including Scarlatti and João Domingos Bomtempo (1775-1842), among others. To be sure, their repertoire was diverse, and primarily devoted to the traditional composers of
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29 Vieira, *Diccionario Biographico de Musicos Portuezes*. 
the nineteenth century such as Chopin and Liszt, but as can been from these programs, they were also prominent composers as well, often playing their own folk-inspired fados and Portuguese rhapsodies.\textsuperscript{30}

1.3 – Lacunae: Innocencio, Fétis, and Waxel

The hymn of Dom Pedro IV championed by the seven-year-old Daddi\cite{31} was performed at a time when there were not very many histories of Portuguese music. Thirty years after the return of the royal family from Brazil to Portugal, Innocencio Francisco da Silva (hereafter Innocencio, as he was widely known) began a monumental Portuguese bibliographic dictionary in 1858.\cite{32} This colossal 23-volume set exchanged stewardship after Innocencio’s death over its 100-year life span, successively passing the torch of leadership on to a host of scholars. Chronologically they were Brito Aranha, Pedro V. de Brito Aranha, Gomes de Brito, Alvaro Neves, and Ernesto Soares.

Innocencio was more concerned with a “wider” perspective of names to include than mere musicians, Dom Pedro IV, for example, was included, but there is no reference to his musical abilities,\cite{33} let alone the national hymn that so captivated the pianist-historians Franz Liszt and Guilherme Daddi. Portugal’s musicians, be they Casimiro, Pinto, Portugal, or Seixas, all lost out in these earliest years of the series; in fact, over its 100-year life span, Seixas never did join the roster of remembered names of various musicians, political figures, war heroes, and writers, although another Antonio Carlos de Seixas, a public figure in journalism and legislature in nineteenth-century Lisbon in the

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{31}Francisco da Fonseca Benevides, \textit{O Real Theatro de S. Carlos de Lisboa desde a sua fundação em 1793 até à actualidade: Estudo historico} ed. and transcribed from the 1883 original in two volumes by Ivo Cruz (Lisbon: Enclave de Reabilitação Profissional do Instituto da Biblioteca Nacional e do Livro, 1993).
\textsuperscript{32}Innocencio Francisco da Silva, \textit{Diccionario Bibliographico Portuguese estudos de Innocencio Francisco da Silva aplicaveis a Portugal e ao Brasil}, 1-9 (Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional, 1858-1870).
\textsuperscript{33}Innocencio Francisco da Silva, “D. Pedro, duque de Bragança (IV de Portugal, e I do Brasil),” in \textit{Diccionario Bibliographico Portuguese estudos de Innocencio Francisco da Silva aplicaveis a Portugal e ao Brasil 7} (Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional, 1862), 98.
\end{flushright}
nineteenth century, did. Marcos Portugal, whose miniscule entry of just several paragraphs five volumes earlier, makes a laudable, though modest, appearance.

Innocencio begins his preface acknowledging Diogo Barbosa Machado, and cordially commences, “Allow me to introduce myself, as a friend and in familiarity, with all due respect, in this space to those who are my readers.” He explains his devotion of more than two decades to the lessons found in the good vernacular books, followed by an intensive study of Machado’s *Lusitana* and other bio-bibliographies. One of his primary motivations is to provide correct information in an age where both authors and the press often lie, where they indulge in mixing facts along with things that are freely invented. He indicates that in his time it is often heard that the “journal killed the book,” that there are legions of varying literary genres, and only time will tell what is to survive and ultimately be deemed as legitimate. Innocencio might have been pleased to note that today, over one hundred and fifty years later in his native country, time has indeed smiled favorably upon his bibliographic dictionary, the complete series sitting proudly adjacent to other reference materials, including Machado’s *Lusitana* in the reference section of the National Library of Portugal in Lisbon. As can be seen, not only Innocencio, but other historians such as Vieira were very much concerned with the survival of their endeavors.
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34Brito Aranha, “Antonio José de Seixas,” in *Diccionario Bibliographico Portuguez estudos de Innocencio Francisco da Silva applicaveis a Portugal e ao Brasil continuados e ampliados por Brito Aranha em virtude de contrato celebrado com o governo portuguez*, 20 (Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional, 1911), 368.

35Brito Aranha, “Marcos Antonio Portugal,” in *Diccionario Bibliographico Portuguez estudos de Innocencio Francisco da Silva applicaveis a Portugal e ao Brasil continuados e ampliados por Brito Aranha em virtude de contrato celebrado com o governo portuguez*, 16 (Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional, 1893), 345-46.
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appealing to their contemporary as well as imagined readers in the future by indicating their motivations, sources, and methodological integrity.

As Vieira feared, Vasconcellos’s “crimes” against his country, i.e., the impurity of his source material, indeed may have had some impact on foreign historians. François-Joseph Fétis’s *Biographie universelle des musiciens et bibliographie générale de la musique*, the eight-volume set with two supplementary volumes, begun in 1860 and finished in 1880, specifically mentioned by Vieira in his preface, seems to be devoid of both Vieira’s beloved Casimiro and Pinto. However, this Belgian’s accounting of Vasconcellos’s cherished musical hero, Marco Portugal, is both acclamatory as well as substantial. To add insult to injury, the non-artist though gifted Portuguese amateur keyboardist, Carlos Seixas, sneaks his way into Fétis’s series, where “Joseph-Antoine-Charles Seixas, a Knight of the Order of Christ, an organist of the Holy Basilica in Lisbon, born in Coimbra in 1704, who died in Lisbon 1742 at the age of 38 years,” is a distinguished composer leaving manuscripts of ten masses of four to eight voices with orchestra, a Te Deum for four choirs, sixteen toccatas for organ, and several motets for two, three, and four voices with and without instruments.

Fétis was considered one of the most influential musical figures of Europe and known widely as a musicologist, composer, critic, and pedagogue. He was born in the

---

latter part of the eighteenth century in the city of Liège and lived well into the last quarter of the nineteenth century. As a ten-year-old boy, he witnessed the beginnings of Belgium as a modern nation state through the final years of the prince-bishopric’s hold on Liège within the shifting territories of the lowlands in 1794 onwards to the policies of Charles V dissolving the political unions of the Netherlands and Belgium in 1830.41 Almost three decades after Belgium’s emergence as a modern nation state, Fétis’s dictionary might be considered a source of both national pride and stability, a celebration of Belgium’s re-defined sovereignty. In such a view, Innocencio’s work might be considered in a similar light, as his monumental bibliographic dictionary was also born three decades after a re-definition of Portugal.

The German musicologist Platon Lvovitch Waxel (1844-1919), although born in St. Petersburg, spent enough time in Portugal and Madeira to be considered Portuguese in heart, if not in in soul as well. His writings were not confined solely to Portuguese music, but extended to Russian music as well, and were circulated both abroad and in Portugal during his life. He first came to Madeira with his family in 1862 and remained eight years. He was very active in the milieu of Portuguese cultural life from the island of Madeira as well as Lisbon, where in 1865 he began collecting materials for a Brief History of Portuguese Music, published in 1883;42 prior to that he published various
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articles in journals, one of his earliest articles being published in the *Gazetta da Madeira* in 1866.\(^{43}\)

Waxel’s *Brief History* describes the state of affairs of source materials in Portugal as well as the difficulties in dealing with their scattered conditions, conditions primarily a result of natural calamities and political circumstances including the 1755 earthquake as well as the years of the revolution in 1834. Among his references are Vasconcellos’s dictionary, Machado’s *Bibliotheca Lusitana*, as well as a host of other non-musical sources of histories of literature, poetry, and theater. Considering the brevity of this dictionary as well as the chronological accounting of names of the church composers in Lisbon during the first half of the eighteenth century on page 24, Seixas, with an entire paragraph devoted solely to him, seems to have made an impression. Although he specifically does not cite his references for Seixas, his writings about Dom João V and music life in Portugal on the same page lists both Vasconcellos and Fétis—telling clues as to who were his influences. He writes of Carlos Seixas (1704-1742), as a musician of the most exquisite talents, who, at the early age of sixteen, was called into service as an organist at the Patriarchal Basilica in Lisbon. He gained all the sympathy of Lisbon at his funeral after twenty-two years of duly performing his services. Apart from church music, he wrote hundreds of toccatas for keyboard as well as twenty-eight sonatas for organ, the latter of which are to be found at the University of Coimbra.

Prior to Waxel’s Brief History, Fétis’ dictionary, or Innocencio’s mammoth twenty-three-volume set, there are no comparable Portuguese monuments to be found in the first half of the nineteenth century. David Cranmer points out that it is difficult to get a clear picture of how music making was taking place during this time. In his book, Mozart, Marcos Portugal and Their Time: A Portuguese Perspective, he notes that only “a handful of flyers advertising performances at public theaters and the accounts of foreign visitors, principally through letters later published in book form or as reports in periodicals, most notably in the Leipzig weekly, the Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung” makes knowledge of music making in Portugal “nothing like as great as we should wish.” Cranmer reveals that opera was heard from the turn of the eighteenth century into the beginning of the nineteenth century, with many of the same performances of productions heard elsewhere in Europe by composers such as Mozart, Paisiello, Anfossi, Farinelli, among others. It would take just over two decades into the nineteenth century for a Philharmonic Society to be established in Lisbon, under João Domingos Bomtempo, where a concerto such as João Pedro Scola’s horn concerto or a symphony such as Mozart’s G minor could be heard. Due to political instabilities, series of concerts could be interrupted or even abandoned in light of the disruptive turmoil of the early years of the nineteenth century. Assessing a variety of musical works of Marcos Portugal, Cranmer employs a methodology that begins with a pairing of Mozart and Portugal, describing why the pairing is beneficial, surveying records of performances of the two
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composers in the country along with public reception histories, and moves from their pairing and operatic works to a wider perspective of composers and countries, including Portuguese and Brazilian composers António José do Rego and António Leal Moreira. To some extent, a slightly modified version of Cranmer’s methodology was applied to Carlos Seixas in tables 1.1 and 1.2, pairing Scarlatti to Seixas in searching for keyboard performances of their works in the nineteenth century, although in the case of these tables, a scarcity of Seixas’s performance histories required a more hasty segue to a broader perspective of other composers and performers, such as Daddi, Liszt, and Colaço.

Data in table 1.3 derives from records of the Patriarchal Seminary, initiated in the early eighteenth century by Dom João V and closed in 1834. Rui Cabral published a preliminary inventory of the music books from the Patriarchal Seminary in 1999, where many of the 134 volumes are now located at the National Library of Portugal in Lisbon.46 Cabral explains how he has organized this preliminary inventory, with details such as author’s last name, reference numbers, and generic titles, followed by a page of abbreviations, such as “pf,” “cemb,” and “org,” for piano, clavichord, harpsichord, spinet, or organ, respectively. Well over a hundred musical volumes are inventoried, most of which are vocal and religious books; only a few volumes have solo keyboard music in them, their paucity saying something about what was a priority in performance and pedagogy of this important Portuguese musical institution.47 In the absence of keyboard music of either Scarlatti or Seixas, as well as any mention of specific

47Ibid.
performers or dates, table 1.3 segues to the following parameters as well as obeys caution to an irksome lacuna of convenient data available from tables 1.1 and 1.2.

Table 1.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Publication Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ignace Pleyel</td>
<td>Keyboard sonata</td>
<td>Manuscript copy</td>
<td>22 x 30.5 cm “BVC” watermark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(incomplete)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.J. Haydn</td>
<td>5 Keyboard sonatas</td>
<td>Manuscript copy</td>
<td>21.8 x 29 cm Faint illegible watermark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-mvmt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni Maria</td>
<td>3 Keyboard sonatas</td>
<td>Typeset publication</td>
<td>23 x 32 cm no watermarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zucchinetti</td>
<td>Multi-mvmt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>António Leal</td>
<td>Keyboard sonatas</td>
<td>Manuscript copy</td>
<td>22.5 x 31.5 cm “AL MASSO” Watermark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreira</td>
<td>Multi-mvmt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.3 draws its data from a single volume from Cabral’s catalog, number CN 115.48 Measuring 24 x 32.5 cm, it has a lightly striped blue cover with brown trim binding and a red spine, decorated with six gold bands, exhibiting the title “Sinfonia de varios authores.” The pages are in a landscape format, with page numbers penciled in at a presumably later date than the Seminary’s closing in 1834. A title page lists almost all keyboard pieces for piano (mostly sonatas and a few variations, and assorted arrangements), although on the titles of the manuscripts themselves, they sometimes indicate either harpsichord or piano, such as the Pleyel and Zucchinetti sonatas.49 Unlike tables 1.1 and 1.2, this data is derived from an institution that is devoted not only to performance but also to the instruction of Portugal’s musicians. In this instance, it is not so important to date the copying of a score, although admittedly that would be a welcome

49 Ibid.
piece of information (hence the data in the table concerning watermarks and publication type), but rather to determine the possible concept of a performing and teaching “canon,” those works that were exemplary enough to be preserved and catalogued from a prestigious performing and learning institution for its students throughout the generations.50

Table 1.3 indicates that although the keyboard sonatas of Scarlatti and Seixas might not have been performed in the early nineteenth century, later successors to them, such as the Neapolitan Giovanni Zucchinetti as well as the Portuguese António Leal Moreira, were. Keyboard instruction was not limited to Italian and Portuguese composers, but instead a variety of Europeans, as evidenced by the multiple sonatas of F.J. Haydn and Ignaz Pleyel, almost all of which are multi-movement sonatas in a fast-slow-fast movement and tempo scheme. There is no information on who collected these pieces or what criteria were used in including them in this volume, but the physical qualities of the book reveal just as many mysteries as they do clues in how long they might have been part of a performance and pedagogical canon.

Dating each composition proves difficult, the safest conjectures being that at least by 1834 the seminary was known to be shut down, and thus, for periods in the first part of the nineteenth century, a good deal of these sonatas might have been both performed as well as taught. In Pleyel’s sonata from table 1.3, for example, the copyist in this rare instance provides the following information regarding the publication from which the

50Ricardo Bernardes, “The Musico-Stylistic Trends of ‘A Saloia Namorada’ (1793) by Antonio Leal Moreira and Domingos Caldas Barbosa in the Context of the Late Eighteenth-Century Comic Opera in Portugal and Brazil” (Ph.D. diss., University of Texas at Austin, in progress, 2011).
copy was made, “Chez le Senhor Sieber Musecien rue St. Honore entre elles des Villes estuve ec celle Dorleans ches 4 Apothecaire, number 1792.” Attempting to cross reference this address and whether that number is a cataloguing number or an actual calendar date with Anik Devriès’ and François Lesure’s *Dictionnaire des éditeurs de musique français* proves problematic, as the addresses associated with Pleyel’s early days before 1795 are not well established; chronological listing of dates begins with the year 1795, with Pleyel’s address as “204, rue des Poulies,” followed by “rue Neuve-des-Petits-Champs, number 24, entre les rues Sainte-Anne et Chabanois” in 1796. An examination of the paper quality, rastrology, size, and watermarks indicate that at least the paper was made prior to the nineteenth century, but how long that paper might have been sitting on a shelf before the copyist got to work copying is impossible to say, not to mention the possibility of the copyist making an error in either the address or date of 1792.

By broadening the genre from keyboard music to vocal music, it can be seen that in the context of vocal music, in the thirty-second volume of Cabral’s inventory, an eight-voice organ vocal motet of Seixas was very likely sung and taught in the early part of the nineteenth century. The four nineteenth-century motets in table 1.4 must deal with many of the same issues of table 1.3; not only are there an absence of dates, but any other publication information by the copyist such as that given for Pleyel’s sonata are nonexistent.
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Table 1.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Publication Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marcos Antonio Portugal</td>
<td>Motet Organ 5 voice</td>
<td>Manuscript copy Multi-mvmt.</td>
<td>30.5 x 22 cm 3 Half-moon Watermarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eusébio Tavares Le Roy</td>
<td>Motet Organ 5 voice</td>
<td>Manuscript copy Multi-mvmt.</td>
<td>30.5 x 22 cm Oval-Diamond Watermark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>António Teixera</td>
<td>Motet Organ 8 voice</td>
<td>Manuscript copy Single-mvmt.</td>
<td>29 x 21 cm Elaborate Shield-crown with “GM” Watermark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos Seixas</td>
<td>Motet Organ 8 voice</td>
<td>Manuscript copy Multi-mvmt.</td>
<td>30.5 x 22 Oval, “MA” Watermark</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlike the sonatas in table 1.3, these motets are in portrait format. Volume thirty-two measures 31.5 x 23 cm., with page numbers penciled in at a presumably later date, is in much better condition, is lightly striped blue with brown edges, and has a title and gold bands on the binding indicating “Motettos de nove authores.”

This book is also a compilation of differently bound scores from different composers, different time periods, and different papers, although what is mysterious in this volume is that the copyist appears to be the same for many of the composers. Penmanship, such as the more elaborate and curly bass clefs in Marcos Portugal’s organ motet indicates a clear difference from those of Le Roy, Teixera, and Seixas. However, the bass clefs of the latter three composers are remarkably similar, so further examination of other issues of penmanship comes into question. Stemming from a particular side on certain notes, such
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as the right side on half notes as well as the manner of writing accidentals such as sharps, again indicates a close similarity. The paper and watermarks of Seixas and Le Roy indicate a similar quality, but those of Teixera are clearly different, and quite possibly a much earlier time period. As in the instance of the Pleyel sonata, it becomes necessary to practice caution in ascertaining a specific date of when the composition was copied, conjecturing that at least these compositions were in the repertoire of the Seminary until its closing in 1834.\textsuperscript{56} What can be said with certainty about these motets is that they are multi-movement as well as single-movement vocal works, are written for various combinations of 4-8 voices, and display figured-bass symbols indicating a continuo, presumably to be played by an organ. Some have clear indications of da capo returns, others have versos, vary in tempo from Largo to Allegro, although the voices, versos, repeats, and tempi of Seixas’s motet SATB-SATB, Grave-Allegro-Tempo Giusto-*Allegro, are marked with an asterisk and (al segno*) designation.

Providing context to these vocal works, Cranmer’s \textit{Cronicas},\textsuperscript{57} another book relating to musical life in Portugal during the first half of the nineteenth century, is comprised primarily of articles from the \textit{Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung}, which were discovered during the summer of 1982 while he was searching for materials related to his research on opera in Portugal from 1793 to 1828. Authorship of these articles is difficult to ascertain, although three German merchants residing in Lisbon seem to be identifiable with many of them. Although the aristocracy primarily enjoyed the privileges of

\textsuperscript{56}Ibid.
cultivated music, there was also the presence of many musical amateurs with considerable performance skills, many of which were women keyboardists.\textsuperscript{58} Thus, if the keyboard music of Seixas was indeed still being played and taught in the first half of the nineteenth century, at least by the keepers of the surviving manuscripts, it could very well have been played by gifted women pianists. Seixas’s vocal music on the other hand is known to have been played and taught by professionals and talented students at the Patriarchal Royal Seminary, one of the most prestigious teaching and performing institutions of Portugal.

\textsuperscript{58}Ibid.
1.4 - The Giant Before the Finger: Mazza and Saramago

José Mazza’s musical dictionary, the source of trivia and subject of debate for Vieira and Padre Alegria in the later part of the eighteenth century, stands as the next major historical enterprise before Innocencio’s dictionary. As alluded to previously, a certain amount of political turbulence owes to the fact that wars and political events were unsettling in this epoch and had an effect on musical scholarship and music making in general.

An important source of information comes from Anyda Marchant, detailing Dom João VI’s early life in the late eighteenth century in Portugal, his flight to Brazil in the first decade of the nineteenth century, and subsequent return back. She describes how his birth in 1769 was an embodiment of Portugal’s struggles, from a broad political perspective. 59 His early memories of his father were not exactly favorable, and of his mother as completely mad, lost in visions of Hell, where the Devil needed to be appeased for both son and father’s weighty sins. By the age of twenty-eight, Dom João VI was regent, and apparently sat “stout and clumsy, with prominent eyes that tended to stare, taciturn and without social graces” in the palace of Mafra, while Napoleon’s Army was able to gain victory after victory, until finally, in November of 1808, things came to a head. Having procrastinated until the final hour, he finally decided to flee for Brazil, barely escaping the harbor as General Junot’s forces were entering Lisbon, where “the last puffs of a favorable but dying wind filling the sails of his own vessels and those of

the British naval escort,” amidst bedlam and “confusion so great and the scramble of people and baggage so complete that, it is said, sheets had to be cut up to make shirts for him on the passage across the Atlantic.” As comfortable as he may have become in Brazil, the chain of events occurring back home in Portugal, as well as relationships between Brazil and Portugal into the first decade of the nineteenth century, eventually made the King’s return mandatory. By 1814 he made the announcement that he would return if the forces of Napoleon were unquestionably defeated, and gloomy indeed, when it became undeniably apparent that he had to return, on April 24, 1821, he set sail on a “departure made in funereal gloom, over a sea as stormy as that over which he had come in 1807.”  

In light of these political events, José Mazza’s musical dictionary begins to come into focus. A survey and descriptive analysis of the “dictionary” itself shows that this tome is far different from those of Vieira and Vasconcellos in many aspects, especially its unfinished state. Mazza’s penmanship is exquisite and contains few errors and corrections. It is well preserved in a reddish-brown ink, which contrasts to another dark-black ink used for changes Mazza made at a later time. Many of the composers are left with blank space after their names, presumably to be filled in later. Among these composers are Antonio Leal Moreira and Antonio Nunez, others being completely crossed out such as Francisco Luiz, who, for unknown reasons, was not deemed worthy of being a part of the finished product. Entries that stand out the most are those that have not only prominent blank space after their names, but substantial prose, often filling a

60Ibid.
page or more. Seixas’s entry, for example, is one of the most prominent in the book, well over two pages and free from editorial scribbles or corrections from Mazza’s black-ink pen. A lot of care and detail were lavished upon this entry.\(^{61}\)

Besides the entries themselves, there are plenty of blank pages left at the back of the book, possibly for addendums, and at the front of the book are to be found scraps of paper, letters, and a large piece of paper neatly folded into four sections.\(^{62}\) As noted by Alegria in his preface in 1944, many of these scraps of papers are related to the dictionary. Further, these papers, be it a personal letter to Mazza or notes referring to Rousseau, have other scribbles and notes on the back side of them.\(^{63}\) One paper contains details about Antonio Leal Moreira and might be interpreted as preliminary notes and research on the composer to be filled in later. The dictionary itself has over twenty-one blank pages before the first alphabetical entries of composers by first name, beginning with the letter “A.”\(^{64}\) Although the blank pages at the back of this manuscript may be construed as space for addendums, the blank pages in the front of the dictionary pose more of a puzzle. The blank space might have been meant for a preface with the scraps of paper in front as a preliminary working out of ideas for the preface. The large folded piece of paper provides an interesting interpretive clue to this mystery, although Alegria conjectured that it might be totally irrelevant.\(^{65}\) Mazza did not personally sign this piece of paper, although the handwriting appears to be his in a comparison to the penmanship of the dictionary. The prose and penmanship are carefully worked out with few

\(^{61}\)Rivara, *Catalogo dos Manuscriptos da Bibliotheca Publica Eborense*.

\(^{62}\)Ibid.

\(^{63}\)Mazza, *Dicionário biográfico de músicos portugueses*.

\(^{64}\)Rivara, *Catalogo dos Manuscriptos da Bibliotheca Publica Eborense*.

\(^{65}\)Mazza, *Dicionário biográfico de músicos portugueses*. 49
corrections, and contain a Latin phrase at the top of the paper, “No one who does not know things with excellence and thoroughness can respond well,”66 which is followed by the main body of the text. The text itself contains philosophical ruminations on the nature of music and its effects, yet does not specifically refer to the entries in the dictionary.

In a grandiose fashion, Mazza begins his “preface” with a statement about the wondrous effects of music on the human being in a variety of circumstances and argues that it is necessary to observe various examples of its qualities in a number of settings to understand its effects. For example, the suffering encountered by being bitten by poisonous animals and insects, particularly the tarantula, can be somewhat alleviated by the hearing of a specific type of music. He further argues that music is part of a kind of “motion” that is omnipresent in phenomena as diverse as heat, a motion that is always part of a chain sequence of previous reactionary interactions, and that it is the substance of all living things. Thus, when one “plays a chord with sweetness, or when one hears trumpets and drums in a march, one is animated and invigorated to war”; music as motion in this sense causes undulations not only in the air but solid materials as well, including the human body, and its interaction with the already present motions in human bodies has either harmful or beneficial effects. Thus, it is possible to cure a malady as dreadful as a tarantula bite by understanding the interactions of the motions of certain musics in

66Rivara, *Catalogo dos Manuscritos da Biblioteca Publica Eborense*. 50
tandem with the constant motion of all things living, including those motions within the human body.  

Interpreted as a “preface” in rough draft, this folded piece of paper is a far cry from those of Vieira, Vasconcellos, or Francisco da Silva. To begin with, the Latin inscription does not hail the glories of Goethe’s “Light!” or restrict knowledge only to those who should hear it as quoted from Sá de Miranda, but instead conveys to the reader those qualities necessary and essential in the enlightened response to knowledge. Restating what many seventeenth- and eighteenth-century treatises had to say about music and its effects upon human beings, these writings may be just as indicative of Mazza’s epoch as the angry tone of Vieira, or the concerns of Vasconcellos as to whether a composer was an artist or a hack. Although this “preface” and the other small scraps of paper do not clearly state a methodology about the entries within the dictionary, by virtue of their unfinished state, with various notes and corrections, they demonstrate the many intentions that could not be found in a finished, published work. In this light, Seixas can be seen as a favorite not only from the entry’s extended length but also by the great care in its execution, as evidenced by the neatness of a penmanship devoid of any later corrections. Francisco Luiz, on the other hand, can be seen as a musician first worthy to be included, only later to be crossed out, while still others, such as Antonio Leal Moreira, can be seen as an entry in progress. Had the dictionary made it to press, these details, a unique insight into eighteenth-century historical methodology, might have been lost forever.
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Regardless of whether or not this large piece of folded paper can be interpreted as a preface in rough draft or unrelated musical writings somehow attached to the manuscript dictionary in the Évora Public Library today, it does generate a considerable amount of interest in Mazza the man and his modern world. Alegria, after having sifted through these scraps of paper and the dictionary, inquired, “Who however, was José Mazza?”68 and proceeded to marvel at what could have been significant aspects of his life and epoch. Among these there was Mazza’s great love of poetry, and thus he traced his early studies as a musician, composer, and poet and early publications to his later successes and entry into high social circles. Alegria speculated that it was through Mazza’s encounter with Frei Manuel do Cenáculo Vilas Boas, later the archbishop of Évora, that he would eventually be elevated into the company of such notables as the Marques de Pombal. Apparently, Mazza admired this bishop all throughout his life, as evidenced by numerous poetical verses of varying rhymes and meters, and eventually, through Bishop Vilas Boas’ intervention, was to become a professor in Évora.69 He presumably was born and died in Lisbon (1735-1797), and as noted by Robert Stevenson, produced through this dictionary the first of its kind. Mazza, as music lexicographer, included contemporary composers of his locale and epoch, many of whom were just gaining renown.70

From a musical perspective the Lisbon of Mazza’s day can be fleshed out from the accounts of visiting foreigners, including the English aristocrat William Beckford, the

68 Mazza, Dicionário biográfico de músicos portugueses.
69 Ibid.
ambassador to France, the Marquis de Bombelles, and Carl Israel Ruders, a Swedish Protestant Father.\textsuperscript{71} From them we learn that Lisbon was a city dominated by religious austerities as well as multi-cultural elements, a metropolis still under the fear and awe of the Inquisition, not to mention a strong Arab influence in law and custom. Despite all this, there was still at least a semblance of salon culture in the city where amateur musicians could informally meet, talk, make music, and even dance with members of the opposite sex. Professional musicians like Jerónimo Francisco de Lima (1741-1822), in the employ of Portuguese nobles such as the Marquês de Marialva, were cast in an unfavorable light by Beckford, who complained that the pleasantries after high tea were spoiled when “one violin player, another a priest, and still others, the parasites of the marquis, threw themselves into an uncouth music making, pounding away sonatas on the poor piano, regardless of whether anyone wanted to hear them or not.”\textsuperscript{72} Table 1.5 provides glimpses into what one might have heard in gatherings like those described by Beckford.

\textbf{Table 1.5}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Composer(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. 1760’s</td>
<td>Ajuda Palace Lisbon</td>
<td>Musical manuscript number 48-I-2</td>
<td>Carlos Seixas, Handel, Purcell, anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1774-75</td>
<td>National Library of Portugal, Lisbon</td>
<td>Musical manuscript number 337</td>
<td>Carlos Seixas, P.A. Avondano, D. Perez, anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Keyboard music)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1774-75</td>
<td>National Library of Portugal, Lisbon</td>
<td>Musical manuscript number 338</td>
<td>Carlos Seixas, M. Elias, D. Scarlatti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Keyboard music)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\textsuperscript{72}Ibid.
João Pedro D’Alvarenga has dated the manuscripts in table 1.5 as well as provided information about who might have been playing them at the time they were copied. The manuscript from the Ajuda Palace, for example, was originally in the collection of Dom Jerónimo da Encarnação, a harpsichord teacher whose studio included the Infante D. António, and before arriving into the Ajuda Palace, was in a monastery in Coimbra. Both manuscripts 337 and 338 were originally a single manuscript and the work of a single copyist, although there is no other information about their original whereabouts or users. There are a variety of composers in these manuscripts, and unlike the dearth of source material for Seixas’s music from the nineteenth century, here at last is evidence that a plentitude of his music was being played as well as taught in the late eighteenth century. Although it is not known how long these manuscript copies might have been used in teaching and performance (no autographs of Seixas have yet been found), they are at least representative of the work of musicians of known and unknown occupations. Thus, Seixas’s keyboard music from table 1.5 may have been part of a performance canon, where in addition to music of Domenico Scarlatti, Pedro Avondano, Handel, Purcell, and various other composers, his music was most likely being played well into the eighteenth century to 1834. Comparatively speaking, these manuscript copies also share a kinship to the Lambertini collection of programs in that they are difficult to correlate with an abundance of extant programs, letters, diaries, newspapers,

and other literary sources. Ironically, given this abundance of keyboard music in the later part of the eighteenth century, comparable literary sources are relatively scarce.

The musical life of Dona Leonor de Almeida Portugal (1750-1839), who was a vital component in the intellectual landscape of Lisbon during the late eighteenth century, does provide some valuable literary context. Vanda Anastacio narrates the details of Alcipe’s (her literary pseudonym) early life, from her incarceration with her mother, sister, and brother at the convent of São Félix in Chelas, Lisbon, to her release at the age of seven, and various travels throughout Europe, especially Vienna, and subsequent return to Lisbon, to provide a contextual setting of her argument that she was an “opinion leader for writers, poets and politicians of various tendencies and social backgrounds, who saw admittance to her salon as a sign both of distinction and of legitimation.”

She contends that a vital element of this distinction was the cultivation of not only literary pursuits such as poetry but musical abilities as well. From extant letters, Alcipe reveals her views on why it is important to possess fine keyboard skills and why a keyboardist in Lisbon can help shape and influence culture and achieve an enhanced public image. These views present an evolutionary process in her musical development, and at the time admittedly

a new skill, which is to accompany at the harpsichord. I had despised it until now because I was content with playing in a mediocre manner without entering into this boring task. But there is no doubt that music is very needed in Society. Because of this I took advantage of the inclination people think I have.

---

In an effort to increase her virtuosity, Alcipe went beyond private practice to eliciting the help of formal keyboard instruction from a pedagogue by the name of Mr. Mondini. One particular lesson with Mondini involved teaching the concept of subdivisions from eighth notes to sixteenth notes in their various combinations and how they must be able to fit in a measure. To know the subtleties of the elements of music including rhythm, Mondini advised that one must look to the greatest teachers, who are to be found only in nature, such as the wind or the song of birds.\footnote{Ibid.}

In contrast to Alcipe, literary accounts of Gregório Franchi, one of the sixty-eight keyboard students at the patriarchal seminary from the later years of the eighteenth century, provide further insights into how keyboard repertoire was being performed and taught. Whether or not Franchi looked towards nature for elucidation beyond his human teachers at the seminary, he seems to have at least conveyed something of the sublime natural spirit to his listeners. Cristina Fernandes cites in her dissertation on the Royal Chapel and Patriarchal Seminary from 1750 to 1807, that far from complaining at the uncouth poundings on a piano by appalling keyboardists of questionable abilities under the employ of the Marquis of Marialva, Beckford adored the keyboard abilities of Franchi, to the point of remaining indoors despite a glorious day,

though the winds are hushed at length, and the ardor of the sun tempered by floating clouds, I lazily at home remained the whole morning, stretched on my sofas reading Cowper’s poems and hearing Franchi play my favorite adagio of Haydn.\footnote{Cristina Isabel Videira Fernandes, “O sistema produtivo da música sacra em Portugal no final do antigo regime: A Capela Real e a Patriarcal entre 1750 e 1807” (Ph.D. diss., University of Évora, 2010).}
Franchi, like other students specializing in keyboard studies at the Patriarchal Seminary during the late eighteenth century, endured a very rigorous, demanding curriculum. Besides the adagio, he had to play a variety of repertoire, not just from popular composers from continental Europe, but from Portuguese composers as well. His technical exercises went far beyond proficiency in playing rapid harmonic and melodic scales and required him to realize harmonic sequences from a figured bass, along with motivic dialogue, counterpoint, and imitation at sight. From the 1770’s onwards, the music faculty of the Patriarchal Seminary consisted of regular teachers along with an assorted group of adjuncts. Most faculty members such as José Joaquim dos Santos and António Leal Moreira had to make their way gradually through the ranks in an ordered hierarchal system. The seminary was very selective in admitting students and drew upon talent all over Portugal as well as abroad.

Besides the strict technical requirements for a keyboardist, a faculty member had to provide a well-rounded music education, giving lessons in singing and composition, although teaching materials, including repertoire, is now so dispersed in both domestic and foreign libraries that it is hard to make specific assertions beyond these generalities. At least one thing is known for certain faculty members of this time: their pay was not competitive. Comparatively speaking, their salaries were much lower than other Portuguese institutions such as the Basilica of Santa Maria and Jose Aguiar Ivo. Moreira and other faculty members in their keyboard instruction to pupils like Franchi benefitted in large part from a well-established system of copying music. During the period of 1760-1807, Fernandes points out that thirty-seven copyists could be identified who
contributed to the music from the Patriarchal Seminary. More specifically, certain
musical copyists’ salaries as well as names have been recorded, including José Maria de
Almeida and later his son Anthony Bernardo de Almeida, where the son enjoyed a
salaried monthly income. Regarding copying music specifically for keyboard, a Manuel
da Silva in 1786 was noted as having made copies for various harpsichord
compositions.77

Mazza begins Seixas’s entry on page 34 in a beautiful, error-free calligraphy
declaring that “José Antonio Carlos de Seixas” was born in the city of Coimbra and was
the son of Francisco Vaz and Marcelina Nunes. Biographical details draw primarily from
Machado’s Lusitano, sharing similarities to those copied later by Vieira and
Vasconcellos, including Seixas’s admittance as Patriarchal organist in Lisbon at the age
of 16, his death at the age of 42, his entombment attended by funeral ceremonies
associated in such high esteem as common to the nobility, and an opus of vocal
compositions including masses for four to eight voices and a Te Deum for four choirs.78
Interpretively, he treats aspects of Machado in a strikingly different manner,
demonstrating not only the tastes of a Lisbon musical milieu of “enlightened” Rousseau-
inspired sentiments, but also his own remarkable character and personality. The “facts”
important to Mazza seem to be just as remote to late-nineteenth-century sensibilities as
nineteenth-century paradigms were towards his epoch. Unlike Vieira or Vasconcellos, he
is not preoccupied with arguing for or against Seixas as an artist or a gifted amateur, or as
a composer pandering to the public mob utilizing excessive Italianate musical styles, but

77Ibid.
78Rivara, Catalogo dos Manuscritos da Bibliotheca Publica Eborense.
instead is interested in the magnitude of his overall musical opus, in particular the
number of his keyboard works. He describes his musical opus as “an infinite amount of
musical compositions,” and dissatisfied with Machado’s paltry sum of only 700 keyboard
sonatas, augments the tally of harpsichord sonatas to “beyond number,” well in excess of
a thousand.

Perhaps sharing some similarities to Vasconcellos and Vieira, Mazza is concerned
with Seixas’s musical abilities in keyboard performance, but his methodology and
interpretive procedure are far from their approach. To illustrate and defend his
arguments, he refers to an anecdote that provides important corroborative evidence in
support of Seixas not only as an important composer in the late eighteenth century, but as
a keyboard virtuoso whose music and namesake had lasted well after his death and the
devastations of the 1755 Lisbon earthquake. In the anecdote, he describes his virtuosity
as that of a “giant,” a Portuguese virtuoso on par with any illustrious musical foreigner.
In a way, Mazza, like Vieira, acknowledges a pre-occupation in his eighteenth-century
Lisbon towards foreigners in this account, especially regarding the supposed inferior
musical abilities of the Portuguese to a composer as illustrious as the Italian Domenico
Scarlatti. His preoccupation however is not so much concerned in this instance of what
foreigners are thinking of the Portuguese, but the converse—he wants to demonstrate that
the Portuguese also can “change” their attitudes, not to mention inferiority complexes.
The story is all the more extraordinary as the person responsible, the instigator who was
“behind the scenes,” so to speak, was none other than the Infante Antonio, the younger brother of Dom João V. 79

The story is as follows: in an undisclosed location and to an unknown audience, Seixas played the harpsichord for Scarlatti under the pretext of a preliminary assessment for musical lessons. The assessment of this lesson/encounter ended up in a confessional from Scarlatti that it was a great Portuguese master like Seixas who should be giving music lessons, not the other way around. One of the more remarkable aspects of the account is the manner in which he demands a sense of tasteful interpretation from the reader by leaving multiple translations of his “Baroque” word play. In his defiance against a literal, singular realization of meaning, Mazza employs the words “giant” and “finger” as symbols in a continuum of interpretive flexibility, encompassing a multitude of issues of keyboard virtuosity, deportment at the keyboard, improvisational ability, pedagogical authority, as well as improvisational facility. There is a play on time, as again, the “symbology” of these words are used in such a way that this text could be interpreted on one end of the spectrum as after Seixas played Scarlatti made his confessional, while Seixas played Scarlatti was forced into a later confessional, or before Seixas played Scarlatti could see, simply by the way he was sitting at the keyboard, his hand position, his concentration, the “giant” that he was, that Scarlatti had to internally collect himself and prepare his confession so that as soon as the miraculous playing

79 Ibid.
stopped, Scarlatti would have to resign himself to the fact that it was *he* that would need to commence music instruction under the tutelage of Seixas.\(^{80}\)

What did Seixas play that so captivated the great Italian foreigner? Where did this meeting take place? Is it possible that the music played in this encounter was the same that the Infante studied years later, which is now preserved in the Ajuda Palace Library in Lisbon today? Even more exasperating, Mazza does not indicate whether anyone besides Seixas and Scarlatti, including the Infante himself, actually heard the encounter. Although one might be conjecture what students like Franchi and/or teachers at the Patriarchal seminary such as Moreira might have played in the late eighteenth century for a visiting foreigner like Scarlatti, it remains completely undetermined at this point whether Seixas tastefully realized harmonic sequences in particular figurations to a figured bass, along with motivic dialogue, counterpoint, and imitation at sight, or if he freely improvised music without any help from a score, or even if he played some of his own music. It is only from Mazza’s dictionary, alongside factual contextual material, that tasteful, informed “fabrications” can be constructed to delve into queries of this nature, to explore through imaginative enterprise where Mazza left off, perhaps analogous in some respects to how Nardelli “fictionalized” aspects of Pirandello’s biography to construct a more complete rendition of an incomplete story.

José Saramago provides two such impressive completions to this anecdote in his novels *Balthasar and Blimunda* and *Journey to Portugal*. In both instances he might be said to pay homage to Mazza in his use of the words “giant” and “finger” as symbols,

---

\(^{80}\)Ibid.
leaving possibilities for open-ended, though tasteful, interpretations. He might also be said to be “Baroque” in his usage as well, employing “giant” and “finger” more like roots and inversions of a figured bass, playing with both sequential and non-sequential time to build upon an account that skips around both geological and sequential dimensions, than to provide a narrative with texts that are “complete” with their own commentary. In *Baltasar and Blimunda*, Saramago elaborates upon the possible scenarios of what keyboard instruction was like from a royal servant such as Scarlatti to the King’s daughter, Maria Bárbara. Lessons were far from being a private affair, and understandably, a young student would often be frightened at so many prying, expectant eyes from family and nobility. Concerning the actual location of the famed lesson/encounter, it is suggested that the Mafra Palace, while in the later stages of its construction, was the location where Seixas played for Scarlatti. Perhaps the most remarkable aspect of Saramago’s allusion to Mazza’s story is the lavish attention paid to Scarlatti in exclusion to Seixas—clearly Scarlatti steals the spotlight, while Seixas remains hidden, allegorically in dark shadows. See appendix A for a more detailed account of Saramago’s narrative.81

The “Baroque,” perhaps cryptic and figured-bass-like treatment of the elements of Mazza’s dictionary in *Baltasar and Blimunda*, be it keyboard pedagogy or cultural paradigms of the inferiority complexes of the Portuguese to illustrious visiting foreigners, are a marked contrast to how he utilizes the same material and symbols of “giant” and “finger” in *Journey to Portugal*. Instead of blending fact and fiction to provide

contextual support to a narrative, in *Journey to Portugal* “giant” and “finger” are more “modern” in their usage, focusing the interpretive elements on direct metaphorical interchange rather than multiple, tasteful elaborations on fundamental root and inverted symbols.\(^\text{82}\) When he decrees in his chapter on the city of Coimbra that “as a single finger gives a giant away, so a façade betrays the Jesuits,” the “giant” in this sense, though representative of several contextual elements such as the geological location of the city of Coimbra and the great cultural virtuosity and scholastic achievements of the Jesuits of this locale, serves essentially in a more binary fashion, to enable the façade to be the wellspring of interpretations by standing as an indeterminate, impartial element. Thus, when he states, “the façade of the New Cathedral is like a theatrical backdrop, not because of exuberant scenarios, which in fact it lacks, but for the opposite reason: its neutrality and sense of distance,” he is using this metaphorical element to open up and invite interpretations from anyone who chooses, or is able to do so, utilizing the façade as one pleases. And although he gives a possible example of how it could be used when he states, “you could put on a Greek tragedy or a cloak-and-dagger play in front of a façade like this. … It could adapt to anything, this Jesuit style defined by an impersonal elegance,” he is not actually utilizing the tool himself.\(^\text{83}\)

There is at least some similarity in *Journey to Portugal* in the usage of “giant” and “finger” to *Baltasar and Blimunda* in that the understanding of the Jesuit’s “giant” cultural, scholastic, and geological contexts are available to the most unlikely

---


\(^{83}\)Ibid.
witnesses—it is the traveler who, by virtue of his not being from Coimbra, is able to best see in the façade what has been present for eons to all. Both of these novels, regardless of their similarities and differences in how they utilize Mazza’s dictionary, illustrate how source material from the late eighteenth century can be problematic towards a singular, “authentic” interpretation of a text devoid of self-explanation as well as puzzling word play and “Baroque” syntax from original source material.
1.5 – The King and his Bibliographer: Barbosa Machado

Table 1.6 contains manuscript 5015, the earliest known manuscript of Seixas’s music which João Pedro D’Alvarenga has dated to at least 1750. Unlike his other manuscripts which date to the later eighteenth century, this testifies to the circumstance that a student, colleague, or professional keyboardist was hired to copy these sonatas. Further, it is not unreasonable to surmise that this copy was made by someone who personally knew him while he was alive.

Table 1.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location and call number</th>
<th>Publication Type</th>
<th>Historical Significance</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-20-1710</td>
<td>Ajuda Palace Lisbon 44-XIII-57 no. 12d</td>
<td>Royal Law</td>
<td>During Seixas’s early life in Coimbra</td>
<td>Drinking prohibition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-3-1742</td>
<td>Ajuda Palace Lisbon 44-XIII-6-7 no. 13</td>
<td>Royal Law</td>
<td>One month after Seixas’s death in Lisbon</td>
<td>Poisoning homicide prohibition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 1750 or earlier</td>
<td>National Library of Portugal Lisbon MM 5015</td>
<td>Manuscript music copy</td>
<td>During the time of Seixas’s death</td>
<td>Keyboard music</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diogo Barbosa Machado (1682-1772) might have personally known Seixas.

When Seixas was only four years old, Machado, though a “Lisboeta” by both death and birth, matriculated as a student of canon law at a university in Seixas’s hometown, the

---

84D’Alvarenga, “Some Preliminaries in Approaching Carlos Seixas’ Keyboard Sonatas.”
University of Coimbra, and sixteen years later in 1724, received his priestly ordination.\textsuperscript{85} 

Robert Stevenson deems the four-volume \textit{Lusitana} as Machado’s lifetime achievement, a project spanning eighteen years (1741-59), and among the imponderable listing of names in this four-volume opus, are 127 musicians and theorists. It is impossible to place an exact date on manuscript 5015 prior to 1750, although the copies present in the Ajuda Palace library of the two laws passed by royal order of Dom João V are unquestionably of the dates they purport to be. In the absence of a signed copyist, D’Alvarenga had to date manuscript 5015 principally by the binding, as well as consider other issues including rastrology, watermarks, calligraphy, and paper quality. The manuscript of the law prohibiting alcohol consumption is not only signed by the same copyist, but the eighth page from which the set of laws is copied is deliberately left blank for watermark inspection, leaving any further doubt as to its authenticity by the presence of one of the most glorious watermarks of the mid-eighteenth century—a watermark worthy of Dom João V replete with a crown, flags, castles, and coat of arms.\textsuperscript{86} (See Fig. 1.1) Unlike the 1710 edict, the 1742 decree in table 1.6 is not hand written but typeset, and any question as to specificity of dates is unambiguously answered by not only the presence of dates in the manuscript itself, but by the signatures and royal notary seal below them.\textsuperscript{87}


\textsuperscript{87}Ibid.
Seixas died just twenty-two days after this law passed on August 3, 1742, stating that “anyone willfully administering poison to someone, even if it doesn’t kill them is subject to the law.” After the law passed, it took an entire year to finally become published. To say that the malignant fever that killed Seixas on August 25th was the willful treachery of a homicidal maniac is naturally unfounded, but the law does say something about the dangers of Lisbon that year. Until August 2, 1742, in addition to the dangers of being burnt at the stake by the Inquisition, a person could presumably “indulge” in the luxury of attempting to poison an enemy, and unless the attempt was successful to the point of death, there was no written legal recourse.

---
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This, then, is a suitable context in which to examine the historical manifestation of Machado on Seixas, his entry in volume four of the *Lusitana*. Intriguingly, Seixas does not make it into the first three volumes of the series—not until the fourth volume, an addendum, on page 198, is he finally included. Indeed, without the transcriptive aid of a reproduction like Rui Vieira Nery’s *A música no ciclo da ‘Bibliotheca Lusitana’,* finding “Joze’ Antonio Carlos de Seixas” is a daunting task despite the indexes and appendices in the facsimile edition. For example, in volume two on page 899, another “P. Ioze’ de Seyxas,” was born in the city of Carlos Seixas’s adopted city of Lisbon, was the son of Belchior Gomez and Izabel de Seixas, and intriguingly died in Carlos Seixas’s birth city of Coimbra on February 9, 1691 at the age of 77. There is no known relation of Ioze’ Seyxas to the “real” Carlos Seixas or his father Francisco Vaz.

Machado’s preface begins with a visual expression presenting the principal subject of Dom João V as a bust atop a pedestal where three women, two erudite men, and three baby angels, one of whose tiny over worked wings can barely muster the strength to hold the King’s halo in place, all serve and sustain their King in auxiliary rapture. An obscured landscape suggests far-off vistas of azure skies and verdant trees, the foreground in contrast is highly ornate and has prominent musical overtones where on either side of the King’s center piece crown and coat of arms two cherubs blow their eternal praise on long valve-less trumpets; flags and other royal bric-a-brac, including the

---
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cross of the order of Christ on top of the center-piece crown harken and embellish their fanfare. Though there is no credit to the visual artist for this astonishing engraving, a minute Latin inscription written into the picture indicates that it was completed in 1742. Before the words of the preface unfold, one more small visual expression ensues where four nude auxiliary subjects peacefully support the principal subject, the Portuguese royal coat of arms in front of a natural paradisiacal landscape of abundant plant life.92 Here then Machado begins his signed preface from which the facsimile edition at the National Library of Portugal has provided countless Portuguese historians a primary reference source for centuries.

The preface93 reveals a mid-eighteenth-century modernity far removed from those historical manifestations that later succeeded him. Machado’s Portugal was the unquestioned super power of the world, part and parcel to its magnanimous sovereign King. Although Dom João V’s power is tied to the illustrious archaic and recent historical events and kings preceding him, he is the most illustrious of all of Portugal’s kings. His dedicatory inscription of “SENHOR” is statement to the obvious—a “fact” supported later by words that even religiously, this King of Kings, equal in biblical proportion to King Solomon, is superior to the Palestinians. Even Rome must climb seven steps of Parnassus to appreciate and witness his brilliance. Among Machado’s “facts” are that he, along with scholarly erudition, is but one strand in a glorious rope tied to the king. The methodologies of the king are the methodologies of great Portuguese

---
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scholarship, especially the *Lusitana*. Dom João V, as the world’s principal figure upon which everything is an auxiliary subject, had to develop his knowledge of the arts by long dedicated study since an early age. Machado succinctly states that he too had to apply “tireless zeal” in his studies.94

The king’s agenda is to ensure that Portugal remains among the world’s superpowers. The *Lusitana*, the first undertaking of its kind, demonstrates a Portuguese literary triumph as a model for foreigners to emulate and reflect upon. Beyond the succinct acknowledgment that Machado employed tireless zeal, his inherent methodology is in two parts: (1) to develop and build upon the King’s greatness as embodiment of Portugal’s former Kings and their exploits (in themselves great, but of course not so exalted as He), where these historical figures as Portuguese rulers instructed the Catholics and rued heretics, won decisive battles within the confines of their own country in such vital areas as Tejo and Santarém, won the first colonies in such far reaches of the planet, including Africa, and excelled in the sciences; (2) to utilize his praise as a critical “buffer” towards the king’s criticism for his election of the nine disciplines that will constitute the names to be recorded in the *Lusitana*, including poets, musicians, theologians, ecclesiastical judges, historians, time chroniclers, astronomers, and physicians.

From the inherent and stated motivations of Machado, alongside the contextual backdrop of the austerities and dangers of life as evidenced from the laws in table 1.6, it can be seen that self-preservation, both as a professional scholar and literal physical well-
being, was a stark reality. Unlike Vieira who is plainly stating in his preface that justice being met is a primary agenda, in the case of Machado, his agenda must be decidedly less plain, suggesting, even pleading in a cryptic hope that the King will adore and favor his work. His concern with the future is very different from that of Vieira’s in that the *Lusitana* is the first of its kind. He is not apprehensive of how the future and/or foreign generations might read other erroneous misconceptions of selected artistic professionals but absorbed with how he can best glorify a certain, foreordained future. He cannot even conceive of the notion that the *Lusitana* could be lost to future generations; unlike successive historians who saw how devastating natural, social and political calamities could forever erase such labors, he acknowledges in pride that his future was destined to begin in his “now,” a glory embodied in worldwide servitude to a magnanimous king.

The *Lusitana* portrays a Portugal that has solidified the union of government and science in addition to the union of “Love with Majesty.” It comes as no surprise then to find in Seixas’s entry that the “art of music” is inextricably intertwined to the sciences. Machado is concerned not only with painting a glowing picture of Seixas, but also with demonstrating the qualities of an exemplary Portuguese man of the mid-eighteenth century. He embodies these qualities as Catholic, moral, a family man with five children, and though born of a humble country locale and equally humble stock, was able to earn his merit and exemplary titles as one of the greatest “orators” of his time. What does come as a surprise is the astonishing detail lavished upon the exact accounting of days, months and years that he lived. Perhaps this is Machado “strutting his stuff,” displaying a prowess of arithmetic and counting that would not only impress both Balthasar and
Blimunda from Saramago’s book, but also many of Machado’s contemporaries. Regardless of whether he may be boasting, the exactitude is a statement about what he wants to convey in terms of literal interpretation—by stating such precision with these months, years, and days of his life, Machado is also dictating that the stated numbers of masses, motets, and sonatas are to be taken literally.

The biographical details of the entry, after the description of his earned titles, is clearly chronological and lends some degree of speculation as to whether or not his compositions are also chronological. He began his musical instruction from an unspecified teacher, and the marriage of science and art in his early lessons is manifested in the organ (no other instrument or form of pedagogy is provided). Despite early success in his native city of Coimbra, he meets with this mysterious family tragedy, and as an orphan, presumably alone, is forced into a mode of survival. At this juncture, without aspirations of fame or glory, he embarks for Lisbon to find ecclesiastical work as the logical choice for his subsistence. One can only guess at the hardships of a journey for an orphaned 16-year-old from Coimbra to Lisbon at a time when no royal carriage or house would be waiting for him upon his arrival. In any event, his talents at the organ were immediately recognized, and at the age of 16, he found himself gainfully employed.

Seixas’s immediate success in Lisbon says a lot about keyboard pedagogy in Coimbra, as his first nine years in his native city was not only far removed from the capital city, but also removed from the reforms of the Patriarchal Seminary under Dom João V in 1713. When two years later, at the age of eighteen, celebrated music professors noticed his “suavidade,” at the organ, and declared him a genius, a “monster of
nature,” they help corroborate Mazza’s anecdote as a factual occurrence. He does not even have to be audibly heard, as even the deaf can witness his “suavidade” through sight alone. If there is indeed chronological correlation of his compositions to this entry’s biographical layout, it lends some credence that Scarlatti might have heard Seixas’s *Te Deum* in the same church of São Roque before Scarlatti left Lisbon in 1729. All that can be surmised for certainty is that by the age of eighteen Seixas had composed a diversity of compositions.

Whether or not Seixas might have considered composing serenatas in the footsteps of Scarlatti in addition to his masses and *Te Deum*, by the time of his marriage at the age of 27 in 1731, he would most likely have abandoned such dangerous activities as the austerities and “clamping down” on such forms of music making by Dom João V was in full force. He was by this time, for all practical purposes, at the height of a teaching, composing, and performing career focused upon keyboard-related music making. In 1733, two years later, he received his Knighthood for the Order of Christ, as well as military orders. Machado lists “diverse” motets as the last compositions of his oeuvre. Whether or not they were “mature” works during the last nine years of his life after his earned titles, these years were for all practical purposes the height of his social status. Seixas now enjoyed the same privileges of a carriage and houses as any visiting musical foreigner. And thus, until the time of his death in 1742 at the age of 38, he could be said to be basking in the height of an international performing, teaching and composing career as one of Portugal’s artistic celebrities.
Chapter Two

2.1 - Revival: Kastner (1910-1950)

Macario Santiago Kastner (1908-1992)95 published *Cravistas Portuguezes*96 (Portuguese Harpsichordists) in 1935. It was the first publication of Seixas’s keyboard music alongside selected Portuguese contemporaries. His analytical approach begins with a historical narrative of keyboard works from as early as the late sixteenth century to the time of Seixas’s death in the middle of the eighteenth century. Manuel Rodrigues Coelho, born in 1583, represents one of the most important Portuguese composers on the Iberian Peninsula. He was influenced in some degree by a Spanish contemporary Cabezón, though there was a wide berth of European influences on Portuguese music during this epoch as far reaching as England and the Netherlands. Other composers such as Frei Jacinto are lacking in biographical information, and in the absence of a birth or death date, elicit some degree of caution in placing them in a chronological musical development scheme. See table 2.1 for the table of contents.

---

Table 2.1: *Cravistas Portuguezes* (1935).
Table of Contents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Page Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manuel Rodrigues Coelho</td>
<td>Primeiro Tento do Primeiro Tom</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frei Jacinto</td>
<td>Toccata re menor – d-Moll</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos Seixas</td>
<td>Toccata fa menor – f-Moll</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“</td>
<td>Toccata sol menor – g-Moll</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“</td>
<td>Toccata Do maior – C-Dur</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“</td>
<td>Toccata re menor – d-Moll</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“</td>
<td>Toccata do menor – c-Moll</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“</td>
<td>Toccata do menor – c-Moll</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“</td>
<td>Toccata Sib maior – B-Dur</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“</td>
<td>Toccata sol menor – g-Moll</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“</td>
<td>Toccata mi menor – e-Moll</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“</td>
<td>Toccata Re maior – D-Dur</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“</td>
<td>Toccata si menor – h-Moll</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Toccata Do maior – C-Dur</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>João de Sousa Carvalho</td>
<td>Toccata sol menor – g-Moll</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kastner notes that by the eighteenth century, broad European influences on keyboard music are far more conspicuous; beyond the dominance of Spain since times
past, Italy becomes prominent. The Italian Domenico Scarlatti, upon arrival to Lisbon in 1721, enters the Portuguese court, and by virtue of his royal duties, including teaching the princess Dona Maria Bárbara, comes into contact with Seixas. At this juncture Kastner cautiously submits the musical language and abilities of Seixas in comparison to Scarlatti as meritorious, but not necessarily better or worse than the Italian master. His compositional prowess in a multitude of many musical languages is great, contains substance, spirit, and no small degree of musical sensitivity, yet does not necessarily have the same brand of Italian finesse and polish. Noting the contributions of Vieira and Vasconcellos, Kastner points out that it was only in the twentieth century that musicological research specifically devoted to early Portuguese keyboard music is ready to commence. He laments, however, that after such an enormous lapse of time, countless scores of keyboard music have become lost and/or unaccounted for, making this publication historically significant. With exception to Coelho’s tento, all of the keyboard works in this volume were never published during the various composers’ lifetimes.

Kastner’s analytical approach to Seixas’s keyboard music is a reflection of his earliest agendas and methodologies. He provides many parameters in these analyses, referencing tempi, acoustic space, organology, form, folkloric elements, and genre. From as early as Coelho to Seixas, it is in the realm of slower tempi that he finds the Portuguese disposition distinctly separate from other geographical regions. The Portuguese alma as the metaphorical soul, the mood of the country, is conveyed through lentos that exhibit mysticism, tenderness, and saudades that are as profound as they are simple.
Kastner admits the tremendous difficulties in editorial decisions and states that his interpretations reflect the sensibilities of a performing public and press. Posing just as difficult an issue in editorial artistry is the approach to issues of keyboard organology: this edition and its attendant fingerings reflect keyboards as diverse as the modern piano, organ, harpsichord, and even clavichord. Formally speaking, Seixas is closer to the predilections of the Spanish and Italians, as so many of his sonatas are in a bipartite form. That notwithstanding, Seixas’s own personality within the bipartite structure, not to mention his multi-movement treatment of keyboard suites, which include minuets, gigas, and toccatas, makes further investigations into Portuguese multi-movement suites particularly fascinating. His fourteenth sonata is of particular interest, in that as a largo in D minor, it possesses motives that are distinctly “folkloric.” They hearken to the adagio of his harpsichord concerto that is also reminiscent of popular Portuguese melodies. Seixas can be just as grand and dramatic as he is soft and intimate in his adagios, and in the fourth sonata, a march conjures the poetry of Gil Vicente as well as the painter Frei Carlos.  

As the first of its kind, *Cravistas Portuguezes* serves as an important foundation to Seixas’s early-twentieth-century paradigm as a composer. Prior to this publication, several important political, social, and musicological events are important to examine in determining the context of this 1935 publication, factors concurrent and preceding *Cravistas Portuguezes* that were to prove critical in sustaining Seixas’s now-ubiquitous iconic status throughout Portugal and abroad. It will be recalled that in 1915, the same
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97Ibid.
year that Vieira died, the first modern performance of Seixas’s keyboard music was given by Alexandre Rey Colaço’s daughter, Dona Maria Rey Colaço at the São Carlos Theater in Lisbon on March 21st. Although a pianist, Colaço premiered Seixas’s *Tocata* along with two minuets of Francisco Xavier Batista on a harpsichord. The copies of the manuscripts come from the National Library of Portugal, Lisbon, as well as the Ajuda Palace Library. We know that Pleyel was building harpsichords in Paris as early as the 1880s, but other than mention of the harpsichord coming from the private collection of Antonio Lamas, nothing else is mentioned about this particular harpsichord.

Eight years later, Ivo Cruz, one of the most important musical figures in Portugal, was also involved in the Portuguese “musical renaissance.” He played a capriccio of Seixas, a toccata of Batista, as well as a tento of Coelho at the Salão Nobre da Liga Naval. Among the principal members of this renaissance were Eduardo Libório, Evaristo Campos Coelho, Mário Sampayo Ribeiro, and Macário Santiago Kastner. In these early years of the twentieth century, Cruz likens the spirit of the epoch as embarking upon “seas that were never before navigated,” where in addition to keyboard performances, conferences were being held in such venues as the National Conservatory of Lisbon. In his book *O que fiz e o que não fiz*, he reminisces upon the tremendous magnitude and significance of these concerts that were in essence the first sounds to be heard after centuries of silence.

---

100 Ivo Cruz, *O que fiz e o que não fiz* (Lisbon: Tipografia Guerra, 1985).
The political and social milieu in Portugal from the first two decades of the twentieth century witnessed tremendous upheavals, and are arguably as traumatic as the epoch of Dom João VI a century before. Douglas Wheeler argues that the 1910 Portuguese revolution was a phenomenon distinctly Portuguese, a recurring narrative with roots stemming back as early as the late nineteenth century.\footnote{Douglas L Wheeler, “The Portuguese Revolution of 1910,” The Journal of Modern History 44/2 (June 1972): 172-94.} By placing the 1910 revolution as a place marker for correlative historical perspective, he notes how this event was directly tied to a modernity mirroring a national consciousness, an agitated consciousness comprised in no small degree to the restless urban masses. Thus, Wheeler’s methodology is an “attempt to analyze the nature and course of the 1910 revolution” by providing and specifying the critical sequence of chronological events that eventually spelled the creation of a new Portuguese republic. He notes that by 1890, Portugal was virtually bankrupt, riddled with incompetent governmental management in sectors as far ranging as agriculture, commerce, industry, and resource management. In fact, the severity was so pronounced the beloved bacalhau (codfish), among other staples, had to be imported. By the turn of the century, labor strikes were breaking out, and as early as 1910, most of the country was divided into three factions, “pro-Republican,” “neutral,” or “Republican”; eventually even the far left groups, be they socialists or anarchists, would find themselves cooperating with the Republicans in overthrowing the monarchy.

In October of 1910 the Carbonária, a secret group of the Republicans, was in the final stages of organizing the governmental overthrow on the “Street of Hope,” Rua da
Esperança. Wheeler describes the dramatic sequence of events on that fateful October 4th:

the signal for action was to be cannon fire from naval vessels in the Tagus harbor at 1:00 a.m. Scattered firing was heard at this hour, but in distant sections of Lisbon some revolutionaries failed to hear the signal and they became disheartened. The military leader of the conspiracy, retired Admiral Cândido dos Reis, believing that the revolution had failed, promptly committed suicide. … The fighting was characterized by little movement and maneuver but considerable small-arms fire and shelling.102

On the following morning of the fifth, King Manuel and his family fled the country, boarding an English ship for exile in the United Kingdom. The moment of the Republic’s birth occurred on the balcony of the Câmara Municipal in the capital city at 9:00 a.m., where the Republic was announced and the first provisional government put into effect.

This early government was comprised predominantly of intellectuals and professional men of the middle class. In this light, the strains of that very first harpsichord performance of Seixas’s toccata at the São Carlos Theater by Colaço stand as a testament to a twentieth-century event just as profound as the solo performance of the Hino Nacional by the young seven-year-old Daddi almost a century before. Professional men such as Ivo Cruz were supported and encouraged by the government in these early years of the republic to champion early Portuguese music, including Seixas’s keyboard music.103 As will be seen in the next chapter, one of Seixas’s most well-known compositions, his Harpsichord Concerto in A Major, is directly tied to these early years

102Ibid.
103Carlos Seixas, Concerto para cravo e cordas, ed. Ivo Cruz (Lisbon: Edição e propriedade do Conservatório Nacional Lisboa, 1970).
of the Republic’s involvement with the arts. Thus, Colaço’s premiere in the early years
of the republic, alongside Cruz’s revivals, is an excellent context to consider in
understanding why a publication like Kastner’s Cravistas Portuguezes finally made its
way to press in 1935.

However, the reasons behind the particular parameters attached to Kastner’s
earliest analytical approach are not so explanatory through this contextual framework.
As will be seen, his predilection for the parameters of tempi, acoustic space, organology,
form, folkloric elements, and genre were only part of a larger set of parameters that
would become increasingly important through the course of the twentieth century. While
a methodology for providing context to historical manifestations was best achieved by
examining a document such as a dictionary entry, its attendant preface, and the
biographical details of the historian, the methodology employed towards providing
context for illuminating upon preferred parameters of analytical approaches must traverse
other avenues and byways, intricately intertwined with publications devoted towards
virtuoso performers, pedagogy, and celebrated musicologists.

One such virtuoso is the harpsichordist Wanda Landowska (1879-1959),104 who
embodied all of these roles. Her Jewish ancestry and Polish heritage proved fateful in her
eighty years as a performer/pedagogue/scholar. Her early training took place in her
native Warsaw at the conservatory under the tutelage of esteemed Chopin
scholars/performers Jan Kleczyński and Aleksander Michalowski. Throughout her
concert tours, she was known to champion Chopin on the piano alongside Baroque

masters on the harpsichord. Her first contact with a harpsichord was in Berlin at the Hochschule für Musik, where she continued her studies in piano under such renowned names as Moszkowski. Concert tours were performed solely on the piano until she reached the age of 24, when she finally performed on a harpsichord in Paris; this debut was only a small part of a piano recital and reflects most of her concerts during 1903 to 1905. Although her performing and recording repertoire did not include Seixas, it is not altogether unlikely that she might have possessed a copy of the Cravistas Portuguezes in her immense library at the Ecole de Musique Ancienne before it was destroyed; possibly she might have even met Kastner sometime in Europe before her final emigration to the United States. See Appendix B for further information about Landowska’s impact upon performance, pedagogy, and revival of the harpsichord in the early twentieth century.

Two years after the end of World War II, Kastner published his book Carlos Seixas, so far the only full-length book devoted to Seixas. He begins with a dedication to Ivo Cruz, identifying him as one of the pioneers of reviving early Portuguese music. Following the dedication, he provides an intriguing pairing of Seixas to the twentieth-century Spanish composer Federico Mompou, to illustrate how two Iberian keyboard composers renowned for their compositions were linked to the keyboards of their respective epochs. In Mompou’s case, he is inextricably tied to the piano, and in Seixas’s instance, the tie is primarily with the harpsichord. By 1947, twelve years after the publication of Cravistas Portuguezes, Kastner notes how Seixas’s works are still mostly unpublished, due in large part to the difficult economic circumstances in Portugal.105

Before presenting his analytical approaches and musical examples, Kastner proceeds with an evolutionary chronological survey of Portuguese keyboard traditions starting with the seventeenth century that in many ways reiterates what he had said in *Cravistas Portuguezes*. During the seventeenth century, a thriving school of organ playing flourished in the Iberian Peninsula under Francisco Correa de Arauxo, Juan Bautista Cabanilles, and José Elias, who excelled in the composition of *tientos* and *batallas*. He argues that during his formative years, under the instruction of his father Francisco Vaz, Seixas assimilated the stylistic traditions and instrumental genres of the Iberian Peninsula.

The city of Coimbra, seat of Portugal’s most important university, was not so isolated as to have missed the influence of Italy or even the more far-flung countries of England, France, and Germany. Evidence of such influences is corroborated by manuscripts held at the University Library, which in addition to Portuguese keyboard music feature a plethora of composers from abroad, notably Bernardo Pasquini. Kastner uses the works of Seixas and his eighteenth-century contemporaries to demonstrate his idea of an evolutionary process in keyboard music: besides Iberian genres such as the *fantasia*, *tento*, *batalha*, *xácara*, and *espanholeta*, local renditions of the fugue, sonata, and suite are transforming as well. Processes relating to harmony and texture, in particular organ music, nonetheless still retain a sense of remote severity that could be associated with the more mystical and less secular seventeenth century. Despite the circumstance that the sonata during Seixas’s life was still in its “primordial stages,” he points out that the importance of Portugal in the development of the sonata form should
not be overlooked. Utilizing an analogy to demonstrate how countries all over Europe contributed to the stability of the form by the mid-eighteenth century, he states that “as many roads lead to Rome, so too do many roads lead to the sonata.”\textsuperscript{106} The great European smorgasbord of national genres traversing this road include the Italian canzonas, the French and German versions of the suite, English voluntaries, and of course the “primitive” bipartite sonatas of Seixas. Seixas’s bipartite sonatas are not only exemplary in how they contribute to the overall European sonata, but stand as the earliest examples of multi-movement sonatas of his epoch on the Iberian Peninsula. Kastner also sees Seixas as an innovator in extensive thematic development as well as incorporating two themes within the bipartite structure.

Specific examples of Seixas as an eighteenth-century Portuguese innovator include Sonata No. 7 from \textit{Cravistas Portuguezes}, which contains not only two themes but also key relationships of a first theme tied to the tonic and the second theme to the dominant. Regarding modulations and key relationships, his G minor Sonata (number 20 from manuscript 338 in the National Library of Portugal) initiates the principal theme in the tonic that will eventually navigate many keys, exhibit a “modest” chromaticism, and boldly embark upon the parallel major from the double bar only to arrive elusively to the subdominant of C minor. Although Seixas may incorporate aspects of ternary form within the bipartite structure such as Sonata No. 26 (from manuscript 57 of the Coimbra University manuscript), many similarities are to be found with his contemporary Domenico Scarlatti. By the time Scarlatti was in Portugal, he embodied within his

\textsuperscript{106}Ibid.
bipartite sonatas the harmonic idiosyncrasies of the Italian mold favoring the primary melodic entity centered in the tonic that will modulate to the dominant by the arrival of the double bar. From the double bar, the same key of the dominant commences, repeating in both texture and musical content the nature of the first part. If in many cases Seixas falls within the Scarlattian mold, very often his sonatas will play upon a monothematic musical phrase structure that varies from the perfectly symmetrical to two parts with different lengths. Sonata No. 12 in *Cravistas Portuguezes* is a notable example, where not only does the phrase symmetry differ, but the second part forges ahead without repeating the musical fabric from the preliminary part. Kastner’s analytical approach involves the counting of measures in both parts of the bipartite sonatas and comparing their number ratios in conjunction with other musical properties.

Despite various European influences, Kastner points out that Seixas still exhibits important aspects from his father’s training, in particular the influence of the tento. Sonata No. 10 from *Cravistas Portuguezes* displays the heritage of the tento, where modulations and harmonic aspects relate to one another in forming a broad harmonic context. Analogous to light and shadow, intensity is directly related to how thematic material transforms itself within these parameters, often creating a musical animation that is quite dramatic. Sonata No. 14 in *Cravistas Portuguezes* demonstrates ties more closely related to the archaic trends of the *sonata da chiesa* and *da camara*, where by virtue of its slow initial movement followed by a dance-like *allegro*, lies in the Italian persuasion. The Portuguese *fuga* elicits some degree of caution in its analytical approach as it is more related to the Italianate form that Scarlatti used than those of Northern Europe.
Seixas’s hands, the *fuga* shares not only similar qualities to the Italian model, but is also embedded within Seixas’s propensities of his bipartite sonatas and possesses deep emotional expression. Although lacking the apparent ease and natural contrapuntal facility of other European fugues, they are nonetheless beautiful examples of idiomatic writing and intriguing examples of how more homophonic two-part decorative voice structures balance one another in an overall bipartite form.  

Kastner’s primary objective in developing an analytical approach to Seixas’s music, favoring some parameters over others, consists of understanding his role in the development of European eighteenth-century music as a whole rather than mere identification as a local Portuguese hero. Without overstepping boundaries of excessive praise or discounting meritorious contributions as modest assessments, he hoped that the book could provide a place of worth justly attached to Seixas’s namesake. By 1950, three years after the publication of *Carlos Seixas*, Kastner had stated in *Cravistas Portuguezes II* that:

> one must not overlook the evolution or autochthonous music in Portugal. Furthermore, one can trace the influences of other Italian masters, partly prior to Domenico’s sojourn at Lisbon.  

Kastner notes how his considerable amount of time and effort into Seixas research has resulted in a popular reception of both volumes of the *Cravistas*. Among the fruits of these extensive research efforts are the discovery and inclusion of the sonnet composed by António Pereira in 1742, “Upon the death of the famous harpsichordist, José Antonio Carlos,” as well as Vieira Lusitano’s engraving. Similar to the first volume of *Cravistas*  
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Portuguezes, all compositions that appear in the second volume were never printed before.\textsuperscript{109} See table 2.2 for the table of contents of Cravistas Portuguezes II.

**Table 2.2: Cravistas Portuguezes II (1950).**  
**Table of Contents.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedro de Araújo</td>
<td>Tento do Segundo Tom</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frei Jacinto</td>
<td>Sonata re-menor – d-moll</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos Seixas</td>
<td>Sonata La-maior – A-dur</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata a-menor – a-moll</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata fa-menor – f-moll</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minuete Fa-maior – F-dur</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata sol-menor – g-moll</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata Do-maior – C-dur</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata Do-maior – C-dur</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata do-menor – c-moll</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata do-menor – c-moll</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata la-menor – a-moll</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata Si bemol-maior – B-dur</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata sol-menor – g-moll</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonata mi-menor – e-moll</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fuga la-menor – a-moll</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{109}Ibid.
In *Cravistas Portuuezes II* (henceforth CP II), Kastner is more emphatic in his opinions concerning an appropriate comparison between Seixas and Scarlatti:

[Cravistas Portuuezes II] chiefly aims at showing what is typical of him and the differences between his way of composing and that of Domenico Scarlatti, also in how far his musical forms went beyond the latter’s. Possibly in *Cravistas* I have shown a more amiable Seixas than appears in this volume. However, I particularly desired to reveal his thorough individuality and to show in how far he remained faithful to his Portuguese mentality and characteristics, notwithstanding Italian influences and especially that of D. Scarlatti. He by no means blindly followed in the footsteps of the Neapolitan.\(^{110}\)

He interprets the lesson/encounter between Seixas and Scarlatti in a rather interesting fashion: (a) that Seixas demonstrated himself as a superior composer but a lesser keyboard virtuoso; and, (b) that the encounter was not a one-time event. Kastner also maintains that Seixas remained one of Scarlatti’s principal three pupils until he left for Spain (the other two were the Spaniard Francisco António Soler and the Irishman Thomas Roseingrave). He asserts that each of these three pupils treated the sonata according to different structural principals, and it is erroneous to assume that Scarlatti brought the Italian bipartite sonata to Portugal as compositions of Pasquini were already known there before his arrival at Lisbon. Referring to the Sonata in A-flat Major as evidence of Seixas’s superior craftsmanship, he states that in “many respects Seixas’s forms considerably surpass those of Scarlatti. … Seixas divides his work into three movements, each of which has the same motif-root — the beginnings of the cyclical form.”\(^{111}\)

\(^{110}\)Ibid.
\(^{111}\)Ibid.
Admiring the Iberian predilection for an enormous palette of harmonic traditions including “piercing dissonances as well as harmonic stravaganze,” Kastner defends Seixas’s use of daring harmonies as well as the “jerky modulations” imported from Pasquini. In Sonata No. 7 (CP II), not only does Seixas excel above Scarlatti in his exploitation of motifs in an enormous bipartite sonata of 380 measures (in which the ratio is 133:247), but his “splitting of the diminished seventh-chord and its use as arpeggio were unknown to Scarlatti.” In terms of modulations, Sonata No. 12 richly outdoes itself in a manner unusual even for Seixas’s own advanced harmonic palette. In Sonata No. 14, Seixas flagrantly employs folk rhythms and figurations that are distinctly Portuguese. According to Kastner, neither in “Scarlatti nor [in] Soler do we find such an affable and jovial tone; even when drawing from folklore they both remain aristocratic and aloof.” Kastner’s ideas and approaches to Seixas provide some rather new startling interpretations about his compositional processes. He believes that Seixas’s theoretical studies were halted prematurely in his youth and that he was never able to complete them later on in life because of time constraints. Further, he was a master improviser and due to this gift, in some instances his music reflects what was conjured up in a moment’s notice. He explains:

It is difficult for present-day students of his works to determine whether certain curiously sounding passages are due to his carelessness or are mistakes of the copyists of that time. … He was not always able to dominate his abundant flow of inspiration and probably did not take the trouble to perfect what he had once written.112

\footnote{112Ibid.}
Although CP II is intended for a variety of keyboard instruments, Kastner specifically points out that the piano is an important consideration. The pianoforte may have been introduced to Seixas by his patron and friend, the Infante Dom Antonio de Bragança, who received the first printed compositions specifically dedicated to the instrument by Lodovico Giustini da Pistoia. In these sonatas, certain factors of taste and “creative collaboration” must be elicited from the keyboardist in regard to tempo and articulation in connection with a specific keyboard instrument. A clavichord, for example, will require slower articulations than a harpsichord. In addition, “creative collaboration” is required from the keyboardist in determining how to fill in harmonies of more sparse two-part writing such as found in Sonata No. 5. He notes that some may consider his “filling-in rather bold,” yet from the perspective of harmonic practice in the Iberian tradition preceding Seixas and beyond, “such filling-in should not be applied to less chromatic and simpler sonatas; the latter should be played in a more discrete and commonplace manner.” The last “sonata,” a fuga (CP II), is noted as unconnected to the genre’s tradition in other European countries. For Kastner, combining bygone epochs and genres, this fuga is a curious intermingling of the decadent tento and primitive bipartite sonata, demonstrating the indigenous development of music from Araujo to Seixas and even later. Here we have a chapter of the history of music on the outskirts of the classical triangle Italy, Germany, France, of more importance as historical document than its intrinsic musical values.\footnote{Ibid.}

Looking back at Kastner’s editorial suggestions in Sonata No. 5 (CP I), it can be seen that his dynamic markings and their attendant phrase groupings demonstrate how he
may have had a rather specific keyboard instrument, a “Landowska-type” harpsichord, as preferable to the pianoforte. There is an overall measure count of sixty-one (with a ratio of 28:33 concerning both halves respectively) in this sonata. Whether or not Kastner personally knew Landowska or any of her pupils during the early 1930’s, he shows a clear influence of her predilections for brisk registrational changes (by means of pedals and/or double manuals), in measures 19-28 in the first half, and 56-61 in the second part of the sonata. In contrast, the dynamic markings in the first movement of Sonata No. 8 (CP I) point more towards the piano. Here the \textit{subito} dynamic markings are not interrupted once they are instigated and flow along a trajectory that favors the piano’s more uniform timbres and long-range variability in its capabilities of gradual dynamic change.

Following along later analytical approaches from Kastner’s \textit{Carlos Seixas} (1947), as well as in CP II (1950), descriptive analysis of select sonatas reveals the relationship of other changes, some bold, others more discrete, that are reflective of his considerable time and research into Seixas’s life and compositions since 1935. For example, Sonata No. 5 (CP II) shares many similarities to the eighth sonata of CP I, as they are both multi-movement and present in their slow sections a certain \textit{empfindsam} mood that may be said to resonate with the \textit{saudades} of the Portuguese soul. In Sonata No. 5 (CP II), the total measure count of the first movement is fifty-nine (with a ratio of 23:36 relating to both sides of the double bar), and provides considerable contrast in phrase groupings, cadences, and harmony. In this instance, Sonata No. 5 (CP II) is far removed from the square phrasing of Sonata No. 5 (CP I), a decidedly more complex universe, where
longer uninterrupted phrases on both sides of the double bar flow along a trajectory of practically invisible cadences and their attendant phrases. Regardless of whether or not Kastner specifically intended this sonata for either harpsichord, piano, or organ, or even a more universal piece that could be adapted at will depending on the performer’s circumstances and situation, the complete lack of dynamics in this newer edition shows some degree of paradigm shifts and preference for other parameters, especially the filling-in of textures.

While this new detached objectivity could be seen as an indicator of a more modern musicological approach, his newer attention to texture contradicts that. Although dynamic markings are absent in CP II, his filling-in of the two-part textures present a remarkable, conspicuous change in 1950. The presence of these “fillings-in” are, as warned, bold, and as example 2.1 reveals (measures 42-45), are representative of an unflinching conviction of an interpretive approach free of any apologies or reticence. Seixas as an Iberian innovative force in contributing to the more developed, “mature” European sonata (meaning a multi-movement structure), nonetheless admits more archaic ties to the trends of the sonata da camara, where the moderato initial movement can segue to a dance-like allegro minuet. Perhaps the connection diminishes more in its character than its multi-movement reference, as its affable and jovial tone avoids Spanish or Italian aloofness of aristocratic affectations.
Completing the collection of Seixas’s compositions in CP II is the *Fuga* in A minor. Again, devoid of any dynamic markings, it may be intended for a variety of keyboard instruments. Although in some respects it behaves in ways similar to the more modern concept of the fugue in its possession of a subject-like motive that opens both sections of the bipartite form, and even in one instance displays a quasi-stretto (see example 2.2), it shares closer ties to the “primitive” bipartite sonatas from Seixas’s pen. As Kastner points out, this Portuguese *fuga* shares some kinship with the Italian *fuga* in its more homophonic textures and two-part decorative voice structures that balance one another, and the presence of “jerky” modulations within the bipartite form owing at least some influence to Pasquini\textsuperscript{114} (see example 2.3). However, it is in the expressive realms where this tento-like composition truly stands apart, behaving as a sonata-like composition that incorporates many functional aspects where tonality, bipartite structure, phrasing, and cohesion, among other features, are skillfully blended.

\textsuperscript{114}Ibid.
In 1950, Kastner was entrenched in paradoxes. After extensive research and scholarship spanning well over a decade, some analytical approaches changed, while others were boldly introduced. One of the most significant changes is a backing away from certain parameters, requiring “creative collaboration” from the performer/listener, and advocating other newer, stronger approaches and counsel to others. Kastner may have left out the dynamics in Sonata No. 5 (CP II) as well as the Portuguese fuga, perhaps even contributing to some degree of ambiguity in his arguments concerning organology, but one thing remains unambiguous, paramount, and emphatic in the year 1950: the comparison of Seixas to Scarlatti demands an assessment in which the native Portuguese is far from “blindly following within the footsteps of the Neapolitan,” and is
remaining faithful to his Portuguese heritage and compositional processes. As will be recalled, Kastner went as far to say that in terms of form and function, Seixas went “far beyond the latter.”\textsuperscript{115}

Formally and functionally, Seixas’s compositions from both volumes of the \textit{Cravistas} reveal an eighteenth-century European spirit unmistakably Portuguese, yet embodied as an Iberian in a time and epoch of sundry influences of varying degrees throughout Europe, England, and beyond. They are cohesive, sinuous, enigmatic in their phrase groupings, flow seamlessly, and in the case of the \textit{Fuga} and bipartite sonatas, are just as “indigenous” as the tento, batalha, or xácara. Seixas is exemplary as a Portuguese composer in both genre and compositional processes that by very virtue of their “disconnect” with Europe makes him all the more quintessentially “Seixas” and Portuguese.

\textsuperscript{115}Ibid.
During the years of Kastner’s research for the *Cravistas Portuguezes*, Ralph Kirkpatrick (1911-1984)\(^{116}\) had been conducting research on Domenico Scarlatti, which culminated in 1953 with his book *Domenico Scarlatti*.\(^{117}\) He visited libraries and archives throughout Europe including London, Paris, Rome, Naples, Bologna, Parma, and Venice, and considered his research activities in Spain as paramount. He viewed Scarlatti’s life as subject to the whims of royalty, and his professional relationship to Dom João V as one of the King’s principal conquests. The acquisition of Scarlatti was made possible in part by Dom João V’s partial subsidization of the crusade against the Turks in 1716, and subsequently, Lisbon was elevated to a patriarchy. Extant relics of Lisbon’s glory, such as the royal coaches, the furnishings of the Chapel of St. John of São Roque, and even more importantly the Mafra Palace, testify to a tremendous Portuguese legacy.

In developing an analytical approach to cope with the abundance of Scarlatti’s keyboard sonatas, he first began a project in 1943 of trying to produce a sequential chronology, a project lasting well into four years. He surmised that dates associated with Scarlatti-related manuscripts of Dona Maria Bárbara, the Queen Consort of Spain, were directly translatable into the dates in which they were composed towards the end of the
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composer’s life. He notes that in 1953, no one had ventured in such an undertaking, that “at present [there is] no evidence to controvert the astounding hypothesis that most of the sonatas date from the very last years of Scarlatti’s life, for the most part from 1752 onwards.” Manuscripts relating to the famous *Essercizi per Gravicembalo* proved to hold some aura of mystery in his chronological enterprise, however, and he pondered as to whether they might have been written for Dom João V in Lisbon before Scarlatti’s departure for Spain. In the end, he surmises that they were indeed composed in Spain under the employ of the Portuguese King despite his relocation; in addition, there appears to be a connection between Scarlatti’s knighthood and official capacities as instructor to Dona Maria Bárbara and the circumstance of his simultaneous Portuguese employment.

Regardless of whether the *Essercizi* were written earlier in Portugal or later in Spain, Kirkpatrick is more emphatic in his conviction that the sonatas should be performed in pairs, as not only do they appear that way in the Venice and Parma manuscripts, but Italian contemporaries such as Francesco Durante also advocated a “pairing practice” in performance settings. Until 1953, he reveals that he is one of the few to advocate this practice, and notes that almost without exception, the pairwise arrangement of the Scarlatti sonatas has been overlooked by modern editors. … In arranging the sonatas in suites Longo felt the need of a larger tonal organization beyond the limits of the single sonata, but apparently failed to realize that such an organization had already been provided by Scarlatti in his coupling of the sonatas in pairs. The real meaning of many a Scarlatti sonata becomes much clearer once it is re-associated with its mate.\(^{118}\)

\(^{118}\)Ibid.
In his comparison of Scarlatti to Seixas, he used both publications of the
*Cravistas* as well as Kastner’s book, *Carlos Seixas*. Citing the lesson/encounter between
them, he interprets the “giant” aspect of Seixas’s deportment at the keyboard as more
allegorical than literal, that “hardly did Scarlatti see Seixas put his hands to the keyboard
than he recognized the giant by the finger so to speak and said to him, ‘You are the one
who could give me lessons.’”\(^{119}\) Similar to Seixas, Scarlatti’s legend is visually
perpetuated through an engraving—a lithograph by Alfred Lemoine in 1867. Also
similar to Seixas is the attainment of Scarlatti’s Knighthood status, although in Scarlatti’s
picture, the cross of the order of Santiago is conspicuously absent, the lack thereof
demonstrating that the original painting took place after Scarlatti was 50 years of age.
Though Kirkpatrick’s interpretation of the lesson/encounter between Seixas and Scarlatti
remains allegorical, his assessment of Seixas’s abilities as a composer are decidedly
literal. Perhaps the most important factor to consider in comparing the two composers is
to use Seixas’s compositions as a calibrating tool for better understanding Scarlatti’s
“unified consistency” as well as “perfection of form and the balance of tonal scheme” in
his oeuvre. As a yardstick, the few instances in which “parallels” of the two composers
do occur demonstrate that Seixas only rarely obtains Scarlatti’s consistency, tonal and
formal perfection, a “fact” that may have changed had the Portuguese composer not died
tragically at the age of 38. Succinctly, Kirkpatrick concludes:

developments in form in the pieces of Seixas seem to antedate those of Scarlatti.
One might be tempted to think that their influence was mutual. By comparison
with Scarlatti Seixas remains a provincial composer. His music is full of lyricism,
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brilliant ideas, and many of the same Iberian characteristics that appear in Scarlatti, but it never achieves Scarlatti’s unified consistency.¹²⁰

Iberian characteristics that the “provincial” Seixas shares with Scarlatti would include musical textures that shy away from sustained three- and four-part textures, as well as a propensity in fugal writing to compose bass lines that function in a continuo capacity as more decorative than functional, with subjects dispossessed of “dynamic force.” As an extreme anomaly, the Iberian characteristic of multi-movement keyboard works do exist in Scarlatti’s case as evidenced by a two-movement toccata in manuscript 58 from Coimbra.

Besides the “fact” that most of Scarlatti’s compositions were composed towards the end of his life, had he also died at a similar age to Seixas’s untimely passing, he too would have shared a similar fate of being judged as having a lackluster keyboard oeuvre. One of Kirkpatrick’s most daring assertions is his theory that Scarlatti had to undergo a “second adolescence” at the age of forty in order to obtain his full compositional processes of “inner intensity, fecundity, and driving force that we call genius.”¹²¹ This adolescence was largely made possible by the liberation he obtained from his father’s passing; until that time, he was only imitating his father’s influence as well as popular musical trends. By the time of the Essercizi, Scarlatti was 53 years of age and freed from the shackles of his father’s dominance in musical style, not to mention the pandering’s of lesser contemporaries trapped in popular musical trends. Thus, the keyboard compositions composed during Scarlatti’s first naïve adolescence were more along the
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lines of Seixas and similar marginalized talents, “the kind of works which many minor composers might have been writing throughout their lives.” He concludes that the emancipation Scarlatti received on his father’s passing were the only means possible by which the last twelve sonatas could signify the full range of genius and maturity of a composer 67 years of age. These sonatas were composed during a time of indoor confinement of precarious health where an absence of official court duties provided opportunity to put to pen what previously existed only in the world of improvisation.

Only in the limited organ works of his second adolescence does he betray some amount of “nostalgia” for his first adolescence; unlike his harpsichord music, the organ works possess connections to more bygone traditions, notably the long-held sonorities of vocal music in the *stile antico*. In these more unrepresentative works, one encounters his wilder harmonies, transpositions, unconventional doublings, and parallel octaves and fifths removed from his more usual arrangement of tonal structure and thematic statements. In some instances, such as sonatas 287 and 288 from the Parma manuscripts, he clearly indicates a double-manual instrument, a true rarity in his keyboard output. He notes that Scarlatti’s organ music in general has few pedal indications and is conceivably realized on either harpsichord or organ.

The music of Scarlatti’s second adolescence is unequivocally for harpsichord and is most often recognizable by its two-voice skeletal structures that are at times filled in with chords or broken harmonies. Kirkpatrick emphasizes that his harpsichord registration is written into the music, where textures and their attendant sonorities are often manipulated by how many notes sound simultaneously, which speed up or slow
down the composition’s overall motion. The sound effects from these written-in
registrational effects are remarkable at times, where even in *Esercizio* K. 24, an early
piece, Kirkpatrick sees “a miracle of unparalleled sound effect … the harpsichord, while
remaining superbly and supremely itself, is made to imitate the whole orchestra of a
Spanish popular fair. It is no longer a solo instrument; it is a crowd.”\textsuperscript{122} Form and
structure are directly related to this unique practice where heavy textures are more
attuned to intensity and thinning textures (mostly two-voice, seldom chordal) occur after
the establishment of a sustained harmonic rhythm. Not surprisingly, the harpsichords
Kirkpatrick believes were favored by the emancipated, mature Scarlatti were single-
manual instruments with limited registrations (with only two stops at eight-foot pitch, one
delicate and the other more forceful). He concedes that some sonatas may have been
intended for two manuals, such as sonatas 109 and 110 from the Venice manuscript,
where indications in letters of gold indicate double-manual hand exchanges and voice
crossings; further, other sonatas that might have been conceived on a single-manual
harpsichord are nonetheless more easily executed on a double manual, such as Sonata K.
39.

Although Dona Maria Bárbara possessed pianofortes while Scarlatti was in Spain,
it may be surprising to note that an increased range in the late sonatas does not
necessarily dictate that the early pianoforte was the intended instrument. The Queen’s
instruments possessing the widest ranges were harpsichords, not pianofortes. This
greater range is argued in favor of the premise that the steady “change in range
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corroborates in some measure the hypothesis that the dates of the later manuscripts more or less coincide with the actual dates of composition.” The five extant pianofortes that she owned came from Florence, Italy, and at least one of them was constructed by Ferrini in 1731, a pupil of Bartolomeo Cristofori, who is credited with the invention of the pianoforte in 1701. Kirkpatrick goes as far to surmise that Scarlatti personally knew Cristofori in Italy before emigrating to the Iberian Peninsula. In Spain, the early pianoforte had a decidedly different role than the harpsichord, as it was more of an accompanimental instrument than a soloistic vehicle for keyboard sonatas. He felt that it was the lack of color in the bass that made it most agreeable as a *basso continuo* instrument, and thus, those earliest sonatas containing a bass resembling an un-realized *continuo* in a smaller range might be indicative of the early pianoforte. Pertinent sonatas include Scarlatti’s “abnormal” multi-movement toccata containing a minuet as a secondary movement (K. 80), found in the Coimbra manuscript fifty-eight. He deduces that in early sonatas such as these there “is nothing that raises them above the level of a Pollaroli, a Greco, or a Zipoli. … It’s hardly even recognizable. […] There is little in this piece that does not take us back to Scarlatti’s very beginning as a keyboard player, as a youthful admirer of Corelli and Pasquini.”

Paramount to Kirkpatrick’s analytical approach in grappling with the enormous oeuvre of Scarlatti’s 500-plus sonatas is placing early “lower-level” compositions such as the Toccata and Minuet K. 80 in a chronological timeframe. These early minuets serve as markers of his rudimentary, though talented, years that gradually improved to the
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maturity of his second adolescence. In the mid 1940’s, Kirkpatrick relates how he began wrestling with his chronological enterprise to near completion in 1949, only to arrive at strong misgivings in which he considered throwing all of his work away. At the heart of his dilemma was how he could logically integrate his chronological paradigm with the details of Scarlatti’s life. Besides the second adolescence paradigm, a critical aspect of the chronological developmental sequence was the formation of an analytical approach applicable to all of his mature works, the “crux” analysis. The crux analysis stems from a laborious classification and systematic approach that resists the establishment of rules “that Scarlatti himself does not break or to define categories that he himself does not demolish.” The analytical model needed to conform to a system of averages in which a “synthetic sonata” was created, essentially an amalgamation of the most salient features of the mature sonatas. Among these salient features is a binary structure halved by a double bar, where the first half clearly establishes a tonality that will close at the first double bar, arriving at this closure by sequences of “decisive cadences.” The second half commences where the first half’s tonicity terminates, and it too must close with just as clear and “decisive cadences” as the first half using primary melodic material. The manner in which Scarlatti utilizes his primary melodic material to conclude his second half (in which it almost always contains some degree of semblance to the original, unadulterated theme) is the common thread by which the foundation of the crux analysis depends.

The crux occurs in both halves of the sonata at critical junctures of sometimes firm, other times more ambiguous moments of resolution, preceded by tensions between
primary melodic material, tonality, and their attendant modulations. The harmonic
landscape is by no means a secondary feature to be trifled with, and regardless of how
thematic material may experience its tension and/or resolution, the two are inextricably
intertwined in terms of their inter-connected importance. Kirkpatrick relates:

to talk of Scarlatti form in terms of thematic material divorced from tonal context
is as much of a heresy as to talk of pure line or linear counterpoint as divorced
from harmonic context in the fugues of Bach. In the same way that the fugues of
Bach are saturated with an all-pervading sense of *basso continuo* harmony, the
sonatas of Scarlatti are permeated with a sense of tonal relations. ¹²⁴

The analogy to Bach may be indicative of Kirkpatrick’s agenda in placing Scarlatti on par
with all great European Baroque composers by arguing his mature output as just as
unified and consistent as any contemporary corpus of work. By showing an integrated
consistency in an enormous oeuvre, his sonatas are no longer unwieldy, “provincial,” or
naïve, like so many of his contemporaries, such as Pollaroli, Greco, Zipoli, or even
Seixas. His mature genius is resplendent in a consistent form that is a later development,
in which “only the pieces in binary sonata form can be considered to point to Scarlatti’s
subsequent development.”¹²⁵

The antithesis of the crux analysis would be an analytical approach that
Kirkpatrick describes in his assessment of Scarlatti’s earlier works, such as his minuet
from the multi-movement sonata found from the Coimbra manuscript fifty-eight. (See
example 2.4).
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As a product of Scarlatti’s first adolescence under the influence of popular Italian musical style (including musical influences of his father), he asserts that “these movements would appear to be relics of Domenico’s sojourn in Portugal.” As a youthful trifle, one of the only merits of this “Portuguese” minuet would be as a yardstick in demonstrating how far he would later advance, signifying “tendencies that Scarlatti later discarded, or that became largely unrecognizable in his later works.” Besides the presence of this minuet in an “abnormal” multi-movement form, he notes that other sonatas in Scarlatti’s youth, such as K. 85 and 82, lack double bars in their first movements, are erratic in their changing of major and minor double thirds, and contain “chromatic alterations of certain obvious intervals.” The bass line in particular
demonstrates that this minuet is more in agreement with a basso continuo accompanying role, in which the top line indicates more a solo instrument than a melodic entity specifically designed for a keyboardist’s agile right hand. In the unlikely event that this composition was meant as a solo keyboard piece, it is possible that its two-voice textures were to be filled in like so many other “simple” keyboard compositions of this time.\textsuperscript{126}

Prior to the publication of \textit{Domenico Scarlatti}, William S. Newman (1912-2000)\textsuperscript{127} was immersed in his own scholarly research relating to the Baroque sonata. \textit{The Sonata in the Baroque Era}, published in 1959, represented two decades of research and was the first book of its kind dealing with an overall history of the sonata during this time.\textsuperscript{128} He admits that his book is in no way objective, that all musicologists, including Kirkpatrick in his book \textit{Domenico Scarlatti}, must admit and submit to the historical bent that has been elected. His “subjective” book, a landmark of the 1960’s, is devoted primarily to music analysis geared towards a broad discussion of his “sonata idea.” In descriptions of how musical processes arise in relation to the unfolding of music, be it related to motive, texture, or harmonic rhythm, he acknowledges that the “present approach is based on an attempt to observe musical form in action, —that is, to see it as a generative process determined by its materials.” Part of his methodology in ascertaining a working generalization of the Baroque sonata is to track as closely as possible the nomenclature of the genre according to a specific composer, ignoring popular
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assumptions by examining trends within the sonatas themselves—“now it is the sonatas that are allowed to determine the trends, and not the trends of the sonatas, as it were.”

Coming from a successful performance and compositional background, Newman felt bombarded by the obsessive paradigms of the mid 1950’s bent on positioning Baroque sonatas as the starting point of an evolutionary phenomenon:

I was becoming increasingly aware of fallacies in the ‘evolutionary’ approach, an approach nowhere more labored than in sonata historiography, although it can be valid enough within any one phase of development. Repeatedly the first object of existing studies on early sonatas turned out to be not an exposition of the music on its own terms but an evaluation of it based on the extent to which it anticipated the eventual ‘sonata-allegro’ form.

Among these fallacies was the concept of polyphonic lines in instrumental sonatas as designated for a specific part to a specific instrument, a practice in actuality being more of an exception than a common practice. He considers the Baroque instrumental sonata as an international commodity originating from northern Italy in the seventeenth century spreading primarily to Austro-Germany, England, France, and among other more marginalized locales, such as the Iberian Peninsula and Scandinavia. Eventually, by the turn of the eighteenth century into the mid-eighteenth century, other cities in Italy, notably cities in the south, were also contributing to this international commodity. Consequently, it comes as no surprise when Newman observes that the sonata was also linked to the great musical centers of his principal regions of Europe, and that its popularity was due to the publishing industries of these cities. He notes, however, that as
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important as the sonata was by the mid-eighteenth century, it still paled in comparison to song and opera, as evidenced by music printing statistics.

Beyond the generalization of the Baroque instrumental sonata as an international commodity, Newman struggled with how the sonata could be further defined as he developed his analytical approaches. The formal landscape of the sonata in this era was too variegated to permit a single formal method, and at last he resolved to simply associate six traits he considered central to all sonatas in this epoch. Most instrumental Baroque sonatas are:

1. Instrumental;
2. Either solo or chamber works;
3. Usually multi-movement;
4. Absolute music;
5. Embodying at least some type of broad structural design; and
6. Purposely aesthetic and/or diversionary.\textsuperscript{131}

Although the solo keyboard sonata fits within these six traits, Newman contends that not until the end of the Baroque era did the solo keyboard sonata become popular. Most instrumental sonatas prior to the mid-eighteenth century utilized the keyboard merely as a \textit{basso continuo}, and composers such as Domenico Scarlatti are “borderline notables” that prove exceptional to the norm. Admittedly, the \textit{basso continuo} could double at times with some instruments in conceivably more soloistic capacities, but so too could doublings occur in a sonata’s “soloistic” lines and parts.

\textsuperscript{131}Ibid.
Arcangelo Corelli serves as the perfect yardstick in defining the sonata’s predominant identity in the principal centers of Europe. Using Corelli as a calibrating tool is as central to Newman’s analytical approach as Scarlatti is to Kirkpatrick’s; his methodology begins with select comparisons of European composers to Corelli’s sixty Sonatas Opp. 1-5, composed between 1681 to 1700. Admitting that solo keyboard sonatas are more outside of Corelli’s sway, the rest of the instrumental sonatas are under

[…] the influence of Corelli, direct or indirect, and the inevitable mutations in his styles and forms that began even before he died, define the most significant trends of the sonata during the late Baroque era. […] Most independent of the Corelli influence were the keyboard sonatas that now appeared in increasing numbers, although still only sporadically.132

By demonstrating how publishers in major cities such as Walsh in London were printing Corelli’s music at almost the same time as his Op. 5 appeared in Rome, he argues the centrality of Corelli’s international fame and influence. He reminds the reader that in Corelli’s solo and trio sonatas, the bare textures of the continuo were typically filled in by the accompanying instrumentalists. On the other hand, in solo keyboard sonatas, the means by which these bare textures were filled in is evidenced in some degree by the transcriptions made by Pepusch; his transcriptions in these solo keyboard sonatas are often attached with a didactic purpose presenting curious mixtures from the most barren basso continuo skeletal structures to more elaborate fillings-in. These curious mixtures spur him into a difficult quandary of textural descriptions which he attempts to summarize as “a distinctive musical texture in search of a name, a texture that lies
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somewhere between the familiar but loosely limited types called ‘homophony’ and
‘polyphony.’”133

Continuo instruments such as the guitar, cello, lute, and keyboard begin to assume
more soloistic capacities towards the mid-eighteenth century. For Newman, solo
keyboard sonatas specifically begin to free themselves from their continuo roles around
1740, although selected keyboard instruments such as the clavichord almost never had
any role in this change. Solo clavichord sonatas are practically non-existent, and in those
rare instances where a solo keyboard sonata was intended for the clavichord, it would
undoubtedly be confined to performance spaces of a very intimate nature (recent
evidence has proven some of these assertions false, as mentioned later in this
dissertation). Although Newman is aware of multi-movement solo keyboard sonatas of
the Iberian Peninsula applicable to his discourses on texture, motivic play, phrase
grouping, and incipits, he nonetheless deems it appropriate to postpone any discussion of
the keyboard sonatas of these countries, “including the keyboard music of Carlos Seixas,
the Portuguese contemporary of Domenico Scarlatti,” as these compositions are less of a
Baroque phenomenon and more of a pre-classic trend. Both Spain and Portugal are
removed from the three great musical centers of Europe during the Baroque era and
consequently slower to receive Corelli’s publications than cities like London.

Newman makes a passing reference to the remote locale of colonial America and
lightly touches upon analytical suggestions to marginalized composers like Francesco
Durante. In doing so, his objective is to “outline only the predominant methods, styles,
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and trends,” delineating these composers and their works as less indicative of the Baroque. Besides Durante, other special cases include Thomas Augustine Arne (1710-1778), a direct English contemporary of Seixas, who wrote an important pedagogical harpsichord work, *VIII Sonatas or Lessons for the Harpsichord*, as well as a keyboard concerto. As marginalized a case as Arne may be, Newman nonetheless concedes that the publication of these pedagogical sonatas in 1743 may be a contributing factor to the great flowering of solo keyboard sonatas on continental Europe in the mid-eighteenth century by such esteemed composers as Bach’s elder sons. Durante is not an important contributor to this great flowering, but as a comparative tool by virtue of his mediocre output, he is nonetheless very useful in showing the greatness of contemporaries, notably Scarlatti. As he points out, both Durante and Scarlatti are direct contemporaries, coming from the same city, and most likely met in Naples or Rome in Pasquini’s and Zipoli’s musical circles. Their respective creations of the *studii* on Durante’s part, and Scarlatti’s *Essercizi*, are a direct correlative in virtuosic pedagogical keyboard works.

That Domenico Alberti’s (c. 1710-1739) music made it to America through the hands of English organists later in the eighteenth century would come as no surprise to Newman, as he notes in his second installment of his series relating to the “sonata idea,” *The Sonata in the Classic Era: The Second Volume of a History of the Sonata Idea*, that Alberti’s native city was to eventually rise from its lowly status to a major crossroads of musical dissemination in Europe. A direct contemporary of Seixas, Alberti shares many characteristics besides a tragically curtailed life, in that his keyboard works stem
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from both native traditions as well as foreshadow later eighteenth-century trends. He cites Alberti’s “motivic techniques” and textures as those qualities stemming from earlier Baroque tendencies, and his more consistent multi-movement schemes and appearances of quasi-recapitulations as leading the way to the classic sonata’s more well-defined ternary forms.

As an imported Italian talent, Newman considers Scarlatti a “vital link” in connecting Italy with Portugal and Spain, where he is best contrasted with the two most important native Iberian contemporaries, Seixas and Soler. Scarlatti, Seixas, and Soler, in spite of their own individual styles and idiosyncrasies, nonetheless owe much to a more prevalent European style that composers such as Durante, C. P. E. Bach, and Rameau exhibited. Regarding Seixas specifically, he notes that scholarship and publications are limited and tied almost exclusively to Kastner. Drawing upon Kastner’s and Kirkpatrick’s research, Newman contributes a few new insights into Seixas scholarship, one example being his commentary on the lesson/encounter between Seixas and Scarlatti as “contradicting” the notion that Scarlatti was indeed Seixas’s teacher as the ambiguities in source material seem to illustrate a high significance to Seixas’ abilities. Such “contradictions” place Newman in a quandary in his pairing of Seixas with Scarlatti: on the one hand, the “fact” remains that Seixas is clearly a lesser composer, while on the other hand, the evidence provided by Kirkpatrick and Kastner concerning the lesson/encounter indicates an important “reciprocal relationship” where Seixas inspires the visiting Scarlatti—not the other way around. In the end, he resolves the quandary by leaning towards Kirkpatrick’s assertions that the younger “Lisboan”
Scarlatti was more of a diamond in the rough than a polished genius, and eventually in Spain he would rise above his early mediocrities to create a wondrous corpus of superior works. Thus he concludes in his pairing with Seixas and Scarlatti, that if the best sonatas from throughout the production of each are compared, there can be little disagreement that Scarlatti ultimately went well beyond Seixas in nearly everything their sonatas have in common—technical exploitation of the instrument, sound effects, melodic scope, harmonic daring, structural diversity.\textsuperscript{135}

Newman’s comparative methodology in reaching this conclusion is achieved in part by summarizing six similarities in both composers’ keyboard works:

1. Binary designs;
2. Angular motives;
3. Distinctive rhythms;
4. Consistency in the repetition of motives;
5. Chromatic harmonies;
6. Preference for thinner, predominantly two-part textures.

The early “Lisboan” qualities of Scarlatti, those musical souvenirs imparted by Seixas on the young Italian-born protégé, demonstrate no small degree of influence from the native-born Portuguese composer. Such qualities, testaments of a remarkable individual as well as a unique product of a Portuguese heritage, serve as a stylistic marker for at least five qualities as intrinsically “Seixas:”
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1. Preference of minor keys over major keys, (a ratio of 5:1);
2. Preference towards composing slow movements possessing a “direct and “open” expressive manner, (especially adagios);
3. Distinctive manipulation of primary melodic material;
4. Practice of adding second minuets;
5. Use of “folk elements of almost naïve rhythmic and melodic charm.”

As much as Seixas may stand apart stylistically from Scarlatti in these early “reciprocal” years, Newman cautions that it is “risky to specify anything by Seixas as not occurring at least somewhere in all of Scarlatti’s amazingly varied output.” In this now controversial assessment, his only resources available on Seixas were both volumes of the Cravistas Portuguezes. As recent research has shown, even with limited glimpses of Seixas’s contemporaries in the Cravistas such as Frei Jacinto, one can nonetheless begin to piece together a vast unfinished puzzle, demonstrating a wonderfully variegated Portuguese landscape of eighteenth-century keyboard compositions. During the 1960’s, as rare as published keyboard works were for Portuguese composers of the first half of the eighteenth century, publications of native-born Spanish composers were even more scarce. At the time of Newman’s publication in 1963, he cited knowledge of only a single keyboard sonata by a native-born Spanish composer prior to Soler, Vicente Rodriguez (c. 1685-1761). Padre Antonio Soler (1729-1783) stands as Spain’s “chief native composer of sonatas in the eighteenth century,” as modern publications of noted predecessors, including those of his teachers, José Elías, as well as José de Nebra, are unavailable. Thus, it may be conjectured that with the later appearance of keyboard
works in modern editions of José Elias and José de Nebra, not to mention additional works of Seixas and his contemporaries, followers of Newman would re-consider the importance of the Iberian Peninsula as more than a marginalized locale in its contributions to the “High Classic Era” sonata paradigm.
2.3 – Portugal: Reconsidering a Marginalized Locale

Salwa El-Shawan Castelo-Branco and Manuel Carlos de Brito relate that in Portugal during the mid-twentieth century, among the most significant events for the Portuguese concert-going public was the creation of the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation in 1956. One of the hallmarks of its first years was the creation of the Gulbenkian Orchestra (formerly known as the Chamber Orchestra).\textsuperscript{136} Besides the Gulbenkian Foundation, other major musical institutions were initiated during the years of Portugal’s \textit{estado novo}, including the National Symphony Orchestra. Interest in Seixas’s music increased during these \textit{estado novo} years, and one of the most important new scholarly contributions to emerge was the 1967 dissertation by Klaus Heimes, \textit{Carlos Seixas’s Keyboard Sonatas}.\textsuperscript{137} Heimes notes that from a musicological standpoint, Iberia has been viewed as a marginal locality, that the peninsula has been relocated to “no more than a backwater of artistic development, […] that Iberian music progressed in a somewhat insular if not to say provincial fashion.” His dissertation was the first to acknowledge Kastner’s sudden publication of eighty sonatas of Seixas in the tenth volume of \textit{Portugaliae Musica} (hereafter PM 10).

Although a major portion of the dissertation is devoted to descriptive analysis of selected sonatas from PM 10, Heimes makes it an essential part of his agenda to redefine as well as provide a more balanced assessment of keyboard music of eighteenth-century


\textsuperscript{137}Klaus Ferdinand Heimes, “Carlos Seixas’s Keyboard Sonatas” (Ph.D. diss., University of South Africa, 1967).
Iberia. His argument focuses on the discussion of various compositions of notable eighteenth-century Iberian keyboard composers, including the Spaniards Nebra and Soler. Heimes notes that the publishing of PM 10, alongside other modern editions and discoveries of manuscripts from Iberian composers such as Blasco de Nebra, has provided a remarkable new assessment on Iberian keyboard music that can no longer sustain the outdated paradigms of Kirkpatrick and Newman. As he points out, the conception of Portugal as a “marginalized” country, not to mention Seixas as one of its principal eighteenth-century “provincial” composers, demands a reassessment in terms “that it can no longer be said that Portugal lies ‘way behind the Pyrenees’ as regards her participation in the development of Western art.”\textsuperscript{138} The abundance of these new modern editions brings unprecedented opportunities for a new breed of musicologist specializing in this extant flowering. This new musicological niche provides a means by which Portugal can enjoy its rightful status in the history of eighteenth-century music.

There is an important development to consider in the publication of PM 10, part of which involves the pioneering efforts of musical figures like Ivo Cruz in an epoch Heimes refers to as a “consciência nacional.” This national consciousness helped create the impetus in searching for eighteenth-century keyboard manuscripts that were so vital in publications such as PM 10 decades after World War II. The war did have an impact on delaying publications, notably the second volume of the \textit{Cravistas}, although by the time of PM 10, a more stable political situation allowed for Kastner to serve as a leading researcher and editor of the \textit{Portugaliae Musica}. With an almost reverential appreciation,

\textsuperscript{138}Ibid.
Heimes reveals that he asked permission of Kastner before embarking on his dissertation, noting PM 10 as “the most comprehensive publication, [...] and the one which surpasses and actually dates all previous publications about Seixas.” He concedes that by the 1960s, Newman was the leading authority on scholarship associated with the sonata of the eighteenth century, and though there are other notable contributions by musicologists such as Blume, Apel, and Georgii, Newman stood above everyone else. However, because Newman’s views are the most influential, his opinions and assessments of Iberian eighteenth-century keyboard music are understandably an issue of concern, especially when entrenched in outdated, misinformed paradigms relating to Seixas.

For Heimes, the enormous amount of this outdated, erroneous information and assumptions about Portugal demand the formation of a new identity with a fresh musicological legitimacy, naturally gravitating towards Seixas scholarship. Of the many benefits in committing to this new calling is his redefinition of the pairing between Seixas and Scarlatti, comparatively examining such sundry features as style, texture, and technical bravura. A closer examination of the corpus of Seixas’s keyboard works reveals not only that he was able to move beyond the “Italianisms” so prevalent in the eighteenth century, but also that his works display remarkable qualities, completely different from anything Scarlatti wrote. He notes that Seixas’s most technically demanding sonatas surpass the virtuosity of Scarlatti, this alone providing sufficient evidence to support the notion that at least while Scarlatti was in Portugal, Seixas was the undisputed virtuoso, not the other way around. Differences of bravura notwithstanding, it
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is the brevity of Seixas’s lifespan that is one of the more intriguing aspects to consider. It is the absence of, not the existence of a single dated manuscript that makes scholarship into Seixas’s seemingly erratic qualities as wondrous as the forms and molds he bequeathed to Scarlatti. The absence of dated musical sources makes it even more important for future dialogues and inquiries to be “based on a greater number of firmly established historical facts” rather than erroneous misconceptions and unfair, popular paradigms.

The provincial, naïve qualities associated with Seixas are due in large part to a problem of limited source material. Heimes hypothesizes that if Newman had access to PM 10 at the time of his publications, “it goes without saying that an additional 55 sonatas [would] provide a much larger scope for comparison of Seixas’s and Scarlatti’s technical resources.”140 One element that Newman would have noticed is the increase in slow movements in Seixas’s sonatas, a feature that he found remarkable even within the limited supply of music he had access to with the Cravistas. Kirkpatrick did have access to additional sources of Seixas’s music besides the Cravistas, notably the manuscripts in Coimbra which contained sonatas of both Scarlatti and Seixas, yet lamentably he remained firm in his conviction that Seixas was not only a “provincial” composer, but similar to Newman, felt that Seixas was a composer unable to achieve the unity and consistency of someone as great as Scarlatti.141

Although Kirkpatrick utilized Seixas’s supposed inconsistency as a yardstick to catapult Scarlatti to ever great heights, he also used his chronological methodology in

---
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manuscript research in like manner. Presumably from the Coimbra manuscripts, Kirkpatrick ventured to establish a chronology of Seixas’s sonatas, aimed at establishing that his best sonatas were written after Scarlatti left Portugal.¹⁴² This chronology is critical in defending his second-adolescence paradigm, as it would be disastrous if Seixas’s “best” works were known to be composed as a youth in Coimbra before Scarlatti’s Lisbon arrival. Concerning Kirkpatrick’s knowledge about Seixas’s inconsistencies and chronologies, Heimes laments how such wounds and injustices could be published; in dismay, he expresses his incredulity over how Kirkpatrick could have even produced such a chronology based upon manuscript research. He is emphatic that no one, including Kastner, has been able to successfully pinpoint the date of a single composition from Seixas’s oeuvre; in point of fact no one really knows what Seixas wrote while Scarlatti was in Lisbon.¹⁴³ Besides the difficulties of dating Seixas’s manuscripts, even the most rudimentary biographical facts are likewise connected to a labyrinth of perilous intricacies, which in many instances demand decades of research. Even with the formation of a single biographical fact, Kastner, as the leading expert on Seixas, has at times altered or changed his views as new source material, namely manuscripts, have surfaced over time. Examples of Kastner’s changing views, both biographical as well as editorial decisions in modern publications, include a reassessment of Seixas as a pupil of Scarlatti as well as the placement of dance movements as additional movements (notably minuets) based on key relationships in multi-movement sonatas in PM 10.

¹⁴²Ibid.
¹⁴³Klaus Ferdinand Heimes, “Carlos Seixas’s Keyboard Sonatas.”
One of the areas in which Heimes greatly advanced the scholarship on Seixas is keyboard organology. He notes that Portuguese composers in the eighteenth century favored the clavichord as an important instrument in composition and performance. His assessment that “the clavichord was more than a mere convenience; it was, quite on the contrary, the only keyboard instrument which, like the traditional guitar, harp, and vihuela, allowed the Iberian musician to remain in direct contact with the string” goes hand in hand with a startling revelation that the entire oeuvre of Seixas’s keyboard works is playable on the clavichord. Although admittedly many of Seixas’s works are more easily executed on double-manual instruments, pupils of Seixas with access to only a clavichord could have benefitted just as much as Seixas’s more affluent students with double-manual harpsichords. Portuguese organists in general were not paid enough to purchase a harpsichord, though they could buy clavichords to be used at home in preparation for their ecclesiastical duties as well as composing. Seixas as a professional organist of means proves more the exception than the rule in his access to a variety of keyboard instruments. It is not surprising then when Heimes looks for and finds “the unmistakable stamp of the clavichord” in certain sonatas such as Sonata No. 41 and Sonata No. 49, as well as the minuets in Sonata No. 42, which, by virtue of a very intimate style and textural tendencies (especially a stylized *Siciliano*), is linked to the clavichord.

Though the clavichord is an important instrument in connection with Seixas’s keyboard works, Heimes advocates caution in delegating works as specifically for organ. Though titles on manuscripts may contain “per organo,” such as those found in Coimbra
manuscript fifty-seven, more than one keyboard instrument may be a possibility in their performance. Sonatas such as Sonata No. 35 are “inconceivable on the organ,” while others, such as Sonata No. 48, Sonata No. 74, and Sonata No. 76, present better idiomatic possibilities. Whether or not the latter three sonatas are indeed specifically for organ, they do present remarkable contrast to the rest of Seixas’s sonatas in their tento-like presence of quasi-subject-like motives amidst loosely imitative and “mildly contrapuntal” material. The range of Seixas’s organs is not provided for in Heimes’s dissertation, although he does note that Kastner was able to ascertain that many of Seixas’s keyboard students owned double-manual harpsichords with a compass of over four octaves.\footnote{Ibid.}

Another important contribution of Heimes’s changes to Seixas scholarship is the emergence of a new “chronology” that is divorced from paradigms of teleological growth and worth and tied more to the musical phenomenon ensconced in Seixas’s continuum of known and hinted-at dimensions of compositional processes and musical style. His new “chronological” twist is admittedly Newman-inspired, where one end of his continuum is representative of Seixas’s “blind alleys” that do not contribute towards the “High Classic Era” sonata, and the other end denoting Seixas as a futurist that not only contributes but also foreshadows later eighteenth-century trends.

Heimes’s panoramic view of Seixas’s keyboard works as a narrative, grounded primarily in the Baroque, demonstrates another aspect of Newman’s influence in the attention he garnishes towards motives and phrase structure in Seixas’s sonatas. He concludes that if “we now look back over the story of the structural changes in Seixas’s
sonata movements, it would appear that, put in a nutshell, it is the story of a formal balance gained, and lost again.”145 His continuum-bounded narrative posits that within these structural changes, the stylistic variances and compositional processes are so varied (to the point of contradiction or incredulity that Seixas could even have written such works) in Seixas’s surviving 120 sonatas, that Machado’s original number of 700 sonatas is not an eighteenth-century exaggeration, but a fact. He proceeds in his descriptive analysis of the sonatas seeking as many elements of homogeneity in groupings of sonatas, where Seixas in some instances can be seen as a futurist, or in other instances as bipolar, or more “freakish,” wandering down “blind alleys.” This ambitious narrative includes discussion of the “da capo” relations of the two minuets in Sonata No. 14, noting these relations as looking forwards to later classical phenomena. Many other instances of futuristic propensities abound in his minuets such as those in Sonata No. 65 and Sonata No. 66; the minuet of Sonata No. 41 in particular is noteworthy, as its stylistic qualities suggest the transformation of a Baroque minuet’s suave character to later scherzo-like stylizations. Representing more than two-thirds of his entire output, the very preponderance of so many minuets as secondary movements demonstrates a composer more in line with foreshadowing later classic tendencies than deviating from them.

Continuing onwards with his narrative, Heimes summarizes other futurist qualities in the sonatas where some demonstrate a “budding ternary form,” a “clearly defined restatement of the incipit,” continual reassertions of “second theme group(s),” and “tonal plateau(s)” at significant juncture(s) in selected sonatas in relation to their
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position to the double bar. Seixas’s “freakish” polar dichotomy to his futuristic propensities can be found in his Sonata No. 76 (the Fuga from Cravistas), where inner modulatory wanderings deviate despite their adherence to “norms” of dominant and tonic guideposts present at the double bars. Concerning the fiendish technical difficulties found in certain sonatas, he deems it appropriate to compare this aspect to Scarlatti’s bravura:

occasional bravura was, as to Beethoven, merely incidental to a particular range of musical expression, and Seixas could only allow himself to indulge his brilliant abilities as a performer on the rare occasions when he wrote sonatas for other resourceful keyboard players, or for his own use. Scarlatti on the other hand is not to Beethoven, but like Liszt, whose bravura was an indispensable part of artistic creativeness, and this inclination was nursed and brought to full-bloom by the condition of the service as Dona Maria Bárbara's tutor [...] In the several decades of his service it was Scarlatti's principal obligation to provide this extraordinarily gifted pupil with keyboard music which had to be at once entertaining and technically stimulating.\(^\text{146}\)

The presence of norms in Seixas’s sonatas might make the bravura or modulatory anomalies less “grey” if not for the “strangeness” so intrinsically attached to these parameters. For example, the presence of empfindsam tendencies in slow movements utilizing seemingly common empfindsam devices (fragmentation of numerous rests, diverse rhythms, and ornaments) nonetheless veer towards more shadowy passageways, taking the performer/listener into alternative realms so intrinsically “Seixas” that even a comparison to his contemporary Scarlatti yields no fruit whatsoever. These sensitive qualities popularly reside in Seixas’s slow movements, unique assemblages of such expressive intensity that a newer portrait emerges as “intimate, even romanticizing, and more personal than Scarlatti’s.” These sensitive facets of Seixas’s uniquely variegated

\(^{146}\text{Ibid.}\)
oeuvre, occurring often in secondary movements, are mostly undivided (with exception to three that have a double bar line and bipartite structure) and almost always modulate.

Anomalous bravura, *empfindsam* propensities juxtaposed side by side with late eighteenth-century foreshadowings, all just tantalizing bits of Seixas’s unique portrait, prompt Heimes into wondering if all extant sonatas may be pieced together in a more living, organic fashion, where “the formal structure of a musical organism is determined by the interrelationship of two governing factors: material and tonality,” or if some kind of topological terrain of zeniths and/or valleys might be describable. Further, he questions if in “their entirety, his sonata movements are rather like the supporting arch of the bridge, never quite reaching the heights at either side, but indispensable to the passage from peak to peak.” Regardless of if/how they may be likened as a whole, he concedes that such an organism presents one of the most fascinating specimens for examination from a musicological standpoint, where it “is precisely the unstableness of Seixas’s stylistic period which makes a structural analysis of his sonata movements so interesting.”

The variegated organism of Seixas’s keyboard works may well have been a significant contributor to the instability of his epoch, as so many of his quirks reside within the secondary movements. Besides the intimate and romantic *adagios* and/or multitude of minuets in these secondary movements, something akin to a more “ethnic” version of a triple-meter dance might occur such as a Portuguese *giga*. A *giga* from Seixas’s pen may possess Italianate features, including compound time and quick running passages, but true to form, it will delightfully deviate in some way, perhaps choosing to
defiantly rebel by utilizing the more common aspects of a bipartite-first movement’s propensities. Such propensities could involve the interaction of phrase and melodic material and/or how musical material is presented twice in relation to the initial double bar.

In Seixas’s sonatas, Heimes deems the propensity of initial material in the first half of the sonata to be stated twice as a “thematic announcement.” At the point of the double bar, he suggests that there is a semblance of the early idea of a “development” occurring after the first double bar, although because this material is not a true development section as thought of in the “High Classic Era” sonata, the term “adventure section” is employed. If/when the thematic announcement occurs directly after the double bar line, he further delineates this circumstance as a “principal announcement.” Concerning symmetry (if indeed there is symmetry at both sides of the double bar lines), he calls this phenomenon a “vertex.” In both the first and second vertex, brief material that precedes these instances are best delineated as “pre-vertex” and “post-vertex,” as they are too far removed from traditional associations and paradigms of the transitions of “High Classic Era” sonatas. A pre-vertex may be so illusory in its nature that identifying clear cadences (often juxtaposed in sequential patterns) is best relegated to “tonal departures [that] are remarkable enough,” Sonata No. 54 serving as a prime example. Material preceding clearly identifiable cadences, as opposed to being coined a pre-vertex, is deemed as a “cadential modulation.” Cadential modulations most often occur towards the end of a bipartite sonata movement, although in rarer instances they can also be found
before the first double bar of the sonata. If they are also associated with significant melodic material, they are further defined as “plateau modulations.”

Although plateau modulations are non-complementary in their tonality to appearances on either side of the initial double bar, it would be incorrect to assume that within bipartite sonatas there is an absence of symmetry. As Sonata No. 47 and Sonata No. 50 demonstrate, there are at times symmetrical elements associated with their respective vertices, although these melodic and structural similarities in the bipartite structure nonetheless are atypical of the “High Classic Era” sonata. These atypical tendencies, referred to as “motivic mosaic patterns,” are well documented in Sonata No. 10, where the phrase structure functions in establishing a harmonic framework relative to the entire piece. As unstable as some of these “motivic mosaic patterns” may be in relation to their phrase groupings in Sonata No. 10, other sonatas exhibit within their variegated phrasing schemes remarkable hierarchical balances such as Sonata No. 37, Sonata No. 28, and Sonata No. 42.

The balanced phrasing of Sonata No. 6 presents a unique problem in its conflicting tempo and genre designations, as the same piece is copied differently in three extant manuscripts. Of the three different manuscript copies at the National Library and the Ajuda Palace Library, two possess a designation of “allegro,” while the other contains the inscription “minuet.” Heimes published Kastner’s opinion concerning this minuet that it “loses much when played as a calm minuet.” Kastner favored an analytical approach identifying it as more of a first movement than a secondary minuet. Heimes
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concurs with Kastner that this movement does behave more like a first movement than a minuet, yet he concedes that there are minuets of many tempo designations, as far ranging in speed as presto. If this composition is viewed as a minuet, it “is a highly emancipated version of the Minuet, a version, to be sure, which has left its origins far behind, which has brought about an artful synthesis of the principles of the sonata movement and the rhythmical characteristics of a dance form.”148

The quandary of analyzing this “emancipated” minuet, stemming in large part from determining its status as a specific genre (based on the relationship of tempo and/or dance-like functions), is not a new concern. One year after Heimes’s dissertation, Felix Merino writes his dissertation on the tentos and tientos of Iberia from the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries,149 and addresses similar issues pertinent to these genres. The ambiguities of tientos/tentos for example are not only related to specific organological factors (including fretted stringed instruments like vihuelas as well as organs), but to the impact of changing times and regional influences. Merino is not concerned with demonstrating a chronological perspective on how a genre in the early eighteenth century might or might not be contributing to a mature “High Classic Era” paradigm, but desires a perspective on how the differing “flavors” of the specific genre (through the time of its inception to its eventual demise) were presented under diverse composers on both sides of the Iberian Peninsula.
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From the earliest known examples in the sixteenth century to the eighteenth-century, the tiento/tento developed in a way similar to the batalhas, in which these genres were later mixed in, so much so that eventually identifying the genre was barely possible. The late tiento/tento possessed in its mixed state obvious organological characteristics, including the writing in of pedals for organ as well other compositional features. Tientos of the Spaniard Juan Cabanilles for example, display virtuosic figurations, echo effects, and other later Baroque tendencies akin to such removed genres as overtures and concerto-grossi. Iberian composers of the late seventeenth century, including Miguel López, usher in multi-sectional aspects to the structure of the tiento, as if they were trio-sonatas.\footnote{Ibid.}

Correa, as a Portuguese predecessor to Seixas, possesses lighter musical qualities in his tentos and foreshadows future trends including an abundance of sequential material. An abundance of sequences in his tentos may be seen as a remarkable departure from the previous dominance of the heavy Italian ricercares, where this Italian genre was intertwined with the origins of the Portuguese tiento. In the earlier days of the seventeenth-century Portuguese tentos, composers including Pedro de Araujo drew upon two principal collections, the Libro de Obras and Libro de Cyfra. Portuguese tentos, like those of Spain, would eventually fuse from these earlier manifestations to other later genres and influences. In the case of Portugal, the batalha is also a notable influence, in which its original distinctions of long-note values, simultaneous double-subject
expositions, loose polyphony, stepwise figurations, and the augmentation of themes, give way to later Baroque tendencies.
2.4 – Amalgamations

Heimes’s analytical approaches are marked by a decided paradigm shift that acknowledges much of the viewpoints of an older musicological vanguard, yet also peers forward to newer musicological perspectives that are to a large extent based upon new manuscript discoveries and modern editions. What he sees as a new calling in reassessing Iberian keyboard music during Seixas’s epoch provides not only a broader perspective in understanding the wealth of neglected repertories in the mid-eighteenth century, but presents a newer methodological approach that selectively acknowledges the pioneering efforts of his predecessors while also refuting some of their antiquated scholarship. Such a newer methodology harkens to many of the organological controversies of his era that argued for and against the piano versus the harpsichord in performance and recording.

Example 2.5 illustrates such an amalgamation in musical analysis of Seixas’s Sonata No. 10.
Example 2.5. Carlos Seixas, Sonata No. 10, first mvmt.

*PM 10.*
Newman’s assumptions of what constituted good exploitation of a keyboard’s range and idiomatic writing stemmed from notions that the clavichord in the eighteenth century was more of a rarity and limited to the northern European countries, particularly Germany. These assumptions effected his conclusions based upon analytical approaches in repertoire of contemporaries of Seixas such as the studii of Durante, and consequently the clavichord was overlooked as a serious organological consideration. The hazards of Newman’s approach may be said to have nudged Heimes into identifying those sonatas of Seixas that are best suited to the clavichord; his identifying the secondary movements of Sonata No. 41, Sonata No. 42, and Sonata No. 49, a good case in point.\footnote{Klaus Ferdinand Heimes, “Carlos Seixas’s Keyboard Sonatas.”} The presence of common empfindsam devices, including fragmentation of numerous rests,
diverse rhythms, and ornaments, not to mention their intimate setting in a slow tempo, demonstrate that these expressive compositions were just as much a reflection of Seixas’s unique compositional thumbprint as Durante’s \textit{studii}. A good example of Seixas’s sensitivities well-suited to the clavicord is illustrated in the following example 2.6.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Example 2.6. Carlos Seixas, Sonata No. 49, fourth mvmt.}
\end{center}

\textit{PM 10.}
By the year 1968, Heimes was able to identify approximately one hundred original keyboard works of Seixas as an incredible opus of enormous compositional and stylistic variance. Basing his analytical approaches and paradigms on the decades of pain-staking research of musicological pioneers such as Kastner, Kirkpatrick, and Newman, he demonstrated how Seixas could simultaneously embody some of the most fashionable elements of an Italo-Iberian tradition alongside an intensely personal, even visionary compositional process and style that was just beginning to be re-evaluated by a larger, better informed musical community. As an organism of the most fascinating dimensions, Seixas’s keyboard oeuvre, and to a lesser extent specific analytical paradigms and approaches devoted towards his music, was to prove paramount in the contribution of his now ubiquitous status as one of Portugal’s most important composers.
Chapter 3

3.1 *O Ultramar* in Retrospect (1969-1994)

Albeit centuries of friendship with England, Portugal remained neutral during the Second World War. Even if Portugal had ever entered the war, there is doubt which side it would have taken, as Salazar himself was more attracted to fascist ideas than to liberal democracy. Nonetheless, his pragmatism and the Portuguese neutrality facilitated the settling of thousands of refugees escaping poverty, fleeing persecution, or looking for more favorable places for doing business. One of these was the Armenian millionaire Calouste Sarkis Gulbenkian, who arrived in Portugal in 1942, remaining there to the end of his life in 1955. Following his will, a foundation was established in 1956 dedicated to foster charity, education, arts, and science. Under the direction of José de Azeredo Perdigão, the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation functioned as a *de facto* Ministry of Culture, initiating a series of groundbreaking editorial, artistic, and scientific initiatives. These initiatives help project an image of Portugal as a country of paradoxes, both modern and traditional, both provincial and cosmopolitan, thanks to its particular history tied to maritime exploration and the resulting contact with civilizations in all corners of the world. It was not a coincidence that this specificity had already been a cornerstone in Oliveira Salazar’s *estado novo* (new state), where his views centered on Portuguese nationality and its role in the modern world.
Lawrence Graham’s 1977 article *Is the Portuguese revolution dead?*, published after a lecture series at the University of Texas devoted to the politics of southern Europe, cites important changes in Portugal from the twilight of the *estado novo* era to the years just before and after the *Carnation Revolution* of 1974. During the Salazar dictatorship, the government was run by an elitist faction who prevented citizens outside of the ruling class from participating in political affairs. From a social perspective, especially in rural areas, Graham notes that life continued during the *estado novo* era as it had for centuries, and one of the only ways for a citizen to move up the social strata was to travel abroad, make one’s fortune, and then return to Portugal, where life among the upper crust could be enjoyed. Many Portuguese foreign nationals living abroad were centered in African colonies such as Angola and Mozambique, and as Norrie MacQueen explains, helped contribute to a prominent mid-twentieth-century paradigm that the colonial presence was just as much a force of a modern twentieth-century “destiny” as the antiquated empire of Lusitanian holdings centuries before. Despite the ever-increasing presence of controversies from both within Portugal and abroad, the holding of its overseas empire, the *ultramar*, remained central to the *estado novo* as a flourishing epoch. With the passage of time, such an identity became increasingly difficult to maintain as three simultaneous wars in Guinea-Bissau, Angola, and Mozambique were proving to be
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uncontrollable; in fact, by 1966 in Guiné-Bissau alone, three years after the war began, 30,000 troops were already deployed.\textsuperscript{155}

The events of the April 25, 1974, \textit{Carnation Revolution} not only affected the colonies in Africa, but also produced profound social and political changes in Portugal itself, with important repercussions in the reshaping of a Portuguese national identity. Quite suddenly, the Revolution placed the country under an international spotlight, redefining not only the political map of West and Central Africa, but in establishing the country’s importance in Europe as more than a peripheral nation. Lawrence Graham concluded that three years after the revolution, Portugal’s new image in Europe went from being a country merely clinging to its antique roots, to a vibrant, flourishing nation, thanks to the drastic changes brought about by the \textit{Carnation Revolution}. One such change was the presence of six and a half million voters (out of a total population of nine million) participating in the presidential elections of 1976.\textsuperscript{156}

At that time, in light of such drastic changes, Graham admonished that Portugal should consider placing its highest priorities on modernization, moving ahead from the difficult aftermath of the African conflicts, and focusing upon a stronger European presence. Graham advocated the economy be blended into newer “mixtures,” both within and without, where in relation to the broader European market, the accomplishment of successfully integrating returning nationals from Africa, the \textit{retornados}, would bolster solidity and growth. As the colonies of Africa were relinquished, so too was the role of Portugal’s military presence at home, especially in government and political affairs.

\textsuperscript{155}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{156}\textit{Lawrence S. Graham, “Is the Portuguese Revolution Dead?”}
Graham observes that in 1977 as many as 800,000 retornados “constitute a particularly onerous burden both economically and politically, since these people who have lost everything place the burden of guilt on those who led the Revolution that destroyed their African world.”157 The plight, perils, and difficult circumstances that these retornados faced both in Africa and in Portugal has been the subject of much scholarship, debate, and literature.

In a 1995 article,158 Luís Madureira draws upon contemporary Portuguese literature while discussing the later years of Portugal’s African colonies. Lobo Antunes, a retorno himself, is noted by Madureira as one of the most important authors of this era, as a chronicler of the African colonial wars. Nonetheless, Lobos’s representations, like those before him, present Africa and Africans as a “trope,” constructions contributing to Portuguese epics that are more in line with historical presentations as discoveries, which “in turn [are] the discrete yet persistent seductiveness which the ideological residues of Portugal's fragmentary empire exercise upon (post) colonial metropolitan narratives.” A redefinition of Portugal’s identity in the context of a broader European community, which was due in large part to these colonial wars, was more easily accepted by other European countries, which likewise dealt with losses related to colonial wars.159

As Madureira explains,

in the Salazarist period, the constructions of Portuguese ‘identity’ which accrued to themselves an unquestioned hegemonic status were those which emphasized a national ‘specificity,’ a specific national difference. This distinguishing feature of Lusitanian identity finds its most cogent expression in the myth that the
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Portuguese sense of nationhood is (paradoxically) grounded on a temporally confined spatial displacement: the ‘voyages of discovery.’¹⁶⁰

Madureira describes a gradual flux of a changing attitude where the “specificity” of this Lusitanian identity from the end of the estado novo changes in the 1970s to a more critical stance. Eventually, this identity would be relocated to a “myth” of the ultramar, and those still clinging to the myth would be associated with backward thinking. From the early 1980s onwards, “coinciding broadly with an increasingly pro-EEC national politics—the ‘discoveries’ are converted into a kind of telltale genetic print, ensuring Portugal's appurtenance to the ‘family’ of former colonial powers (its current international partners).”

To a certain extent, another musical type of discovery ran parallel to this period of political transformation. It was a movement first of affirmation, then redefinition of the Portuguese musical identity, materialized in the collection *Portugaliae Musica*, which the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation started publishing in 1959, three years after its creation. The collection follows the Monuments of Music general editorial principles, but rather than following a sequence based on period, genre, or composer, its fifty-two volumes, published from 1959 to 1999, were arranged according to what seems to be the need to fill conspicuous voids in Portuguese music history. At the same time, the collection was a statement to the world that Portugal also had a musical heritage that comprised a noteworthy output of polyphonic, operatic, symphonic, and keyboard works, genres around which the canon of Western music was formed while unjustly ignoring Portugal.

¹⁶⁰Ibid.
While at first influenced by the nationalist views of Salazar and Perdigão (although their political ideals were rather divergent), and later catching up with the most recent developments in musicology, the Foundation’s changing editorial choices and methods could be regarded both as a mirror and a compass of musical and musicological trends in Portugal during the last six decades. Although still the most important publication series for Portuguese modern editions of historical repertoire, the Portugaliae Musica is still behind the times in terms of its schedule, due to a lack of uniformity in editorial standards, and that all editors, among Portugal’s finest musicologists, act upon their own respective initiatives. As well, Portugal’s lack of an organized musicological institution such as Spain’s Institute of Musicology has made things difficult for the publication of historical repertoire beyond the Portugaliae Musica.\footnote{Gérard Béhague, “80 Sonatas para instrumentos de Tecla, ed. by M.S. Kastner,” Notes 25/3 (March 1969): 587-89.}

In 1969, when Portugaliae Musica completed ten years, Gérard Béhague published a short assessment of the series’ editorial principles in his review of Santiago Kastner’s edition of Seixas’s sonatas (PM 10). Béhague hailed the series as a landmark, presenting “the most serious attempt to meet current needs of revealing Portugal’s musical heritage, while observing the conventional editorial principles.” He was intrigued, however, with inconsistencies he perceived from Kastner’s previous publications, namely Cravistas Portuguezes. For example, the minuets from Cravistas appear as new movements to different sonatas in PM 10 and prod Béhague into wondering why “in the face of the evidence now presented by the editor, […] minuets originally assigned as parts of given sonatas in Cravistas Portuguezes find their places
now in different pieces.” The minuet in f Minor of the first *Cravistas* was mysteriously added as the first minuet to Sonata No. 42, prompting Béhague to inquire “why did Kastner include in ‘Tocata No. 4’ (G minor [*Cravistas I]*) a minuet in A minor, which is now replaced by another minuet (G minor [Sonata No. 55]), while the minuet in A minor of *Cravistas* disappears completely in this new edition?” In the absence of any explanations from Kastner, Béhague is forced to conjecture that scholars must “conclude that in Kastner’s earlier edition he was mistaken about some sixty extant separate minuets, or that he had knowledge of only one manuscript source (cf. Sonata No. 11, Ln MM 338). Thus the present edition clears up the earlier contradictions and becomes the only reliable modern source.”162

Besides expurgating some minuets and restoring others to their correct places in PM 10, Kastner’s editorial approach has changed considerably. Comparatively, there is a dearth of dynamic indications and ornament realizations in favor of a quasi-*urtext* approach. From Kastner’s admission that it was still impossible to establish a chronology of Seixas’s sonatas, all sonatas are arranged chromatically starting with C Major. However, as Béhague noticed, this edition left many questions unanswered.

Two years after Behague’s article, Heimes published *Zum Quellenstudium seiner Klaviersonaten*,163 which provided the most up-to-date information concerning Seixas’s manuscripts. One of the most intriguing aspects of this research is reference to the manuscript privately owned by Ivo Cruz, which is correlated in a table to all extant
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manuscripts: LN MM 337-338, (Biblioteca Nacional), LN MM 48-I-2 (Ajuda Palace Library), and LN MM 57-58 (Coimbra University). \footnote{Ibid.} Because Cruz had not released his private manuscript to the public at this date, the table can only reveal that among Seixas’s sonatas, at least twenty-one sonatas are unavailable for publication. Only years later would this manuscript finally be given to the National Library of Portugal for public use.

Besides newer Seixas editions to emerge upon the relinquishing of Cruz’s private manuscript, keyboard sonatas of other notable Iberian composers contemporary to Seixas begin to surface. The works of one such contemporary, the notable Spanish composer and pedagogue José de Nebra (1702-1768), are published in 1984 with an edition of selected keyboard pieces, \textit{Obras ineditas para tecla}, transcribed and edited by Rosario Alvarez Martinez. \footnote{José de Nebra et al., \textit{Obras ineditas para tecla}, ed. Rosario Alvarez Martinez (Madrid: Sociedad Española de Musicología, 1984).} Other editions of Nebra in 1987 and 1995 (\textit{Tecla Aragonesa I and III}), present more sonatas transcribed and edited by Roman Escalas \footnote{Joseph Nebra, \textit{Tecla Aragonesa I: Tocatas y sonata para organo ó clave}, ed. Roman Escalas (Zaragoza, Spain: Institucion Fernando el Católico, 1987).} and María-Salud Alvarez, \footnote{Joseph Nebra, \textit{Tecla Aragonesa III: Obras inéditas para tecla}, ed. María-Salud Alvarez (Zaragoza, Spain: Institucion Fernando el Católico, 1995).} respectively. By the early 1990’s, with publication of \textit{Aragonesa III}, José de Nebra’s importance as a keyboard composer of the Iberian Peninsula was firmly established by further publication of a full-length book \textit{José de Nebra Blasco: Vida y obra}, by Maa. Salud Álvarez Martinez. \footnote{Maa. Salud Álvarez Martínez, \textit{José de Nebra Blasco: Vida y obra} (Zaragoza, Spain: Institución «Fernando el Católico», 1993).}

Emergent publications such as these have had a profound impact upon mid-twentieth-century paradigms concerning the Iberian keyboard tradition. In Nebra, one
finds the presence of several multi-movement sonatas, minuets as secondary movements attached to bipartite first movements, and remarkable idiomatic works such as the Batalla de clarines, whose ornaments and bipartite structures in both first and second movements reveal fascinating registrational and performance implications. Further, Álvarez Martínez’s book provides not only a tremendous resource for all manuscript sources of Nebra’s sonatas, tocatas, and various keyboard works, but also a lengthy biography, catalog of complete works, and transcribed literary sources, including some accounts from Nebra’s own pen.

With the sudden appearance of Nebra’s keyboard works in modern publications, not to mention Seixas’s flurry of modern editions relating to the release of Ivo Cruz’s private manuscript, outdated viewpoints and erroneous conclusions are now in the process of being corrected. Had Nebra’s works and publications been available in the mid-twentieth century, not to mention the plethora of Seixas’s later publications, the Iberian solo-keyboard sonata would have received very different evaluations by mid-twentieth-century musicologists as more than anomalies. The obscurity of these repertories also paved the way for misconceptions that regarded the sonata with added minuets as a provincial custom, or even that the bipartite structure was the hallmark of a “borderline” notable, Domenico Scarlatti.

After Heimes’s article, a new DMA thesis by Brian Jerome Allison emerged in 1982 devoting much of its discussion to Seixas’s keyboard works.169 As the sole
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authoritative resource on Seixas’s keyboard works, PM 10 provides Allison with musical examples that support his discussions and arguments. His rebuttals to Kirkpatrick and Newman, based mostly upon Heimes’s dissertation and Kastner’s original 1947 book *Carlos Seixas*, accept nonetheless Kirkpatrick’s chronological paradigms and Newman’s teleological viewpoints of the “High Classic Era” solo keyboard sonata. For example, drawing upon Kastner’s admonitions that the bipartite sonata was a phenomenon of the Iberian Peninsula long before Domenico Scarlatti’s arrival, Allison discusses the prodigious length of the bipartite tenth sonata, comparing its length to the first movement of Beethoven’s late Op. 106 Sonata, demonstrating its unique qualities, among other bipartite sonatas, as present before Scarlatti’s arrival. The motivations of the discussion however implicitly accept Newman’s teleological High Classic Era “sonata idea” in which Allison concludes as well as concurs with Kastner that during this transitional period many combinations of tonality and musical material occurred, which led the way from the monothematic material on a simple tonal arch in the allemande (which Kastner suggests as a possible starting point for the development of the sonata idea) to the contrasting themes on different tonal levels as found in the sonata of the mature Classic period.

Responding to Kirkpatrick’s pejorative views surrounding the provinciality of the multi-movement sonata, Allison responds by citing examples of multi-movement sonatas by various composers as early as Salvatore in 1641 and Strozzi in 1687. However, Allison seems to be swayed by Kirkpatrick’s pairings theories, and argues that Seixas stands up to Scarlatti in Kastner’s “corrections” of PM 10, where “Longo’s groupings of the sonatas of Scarlatti were corrected by Kirkpatrick in his edition; likewise, Kastner’s
first editings of twenty-four Seixas sonatas in the *Cravistas Portuguezes* of 1935 and 1950 were corrected in the 1965 edition of the sonatas.\(^{170}\)

Allison is not completely swayed by the mid-twentieth-century conceptions of Kirkpatrick and Newman, as he is able to draw upon the most current research of Heimes’s more recent article *Zum Quellenstudium seiner Klaviersonaten*, as well as comment upon Heimes’s dissertation noting the clavichord’s importance in Portuguese keyboard works of the eighteenth century and its influence upon the more sensitive, slow movements of Seixas’s keyboard works. Allison’s insight into Sonata No. 49 is of particular interest from an organological standpoint in that it is suggests its five movements may be intended for specifically different instruments, the outer movements best executed on a harpsichord, with the second-to-last movement on the clavichord, and the middle movement(s) on the organ.

Two years after Allison’s thesis, it may be said that Portuguese musicology in general has been entrenched in its own mid-twentieth-century conceptions. In 1984, Manuel Carlos de Brito published *Musicology in Portugal since 1960*,\(^{171}\) describing how certain aspects of musicology were beginning to break free from established traditions, while others were continuing as they had for decades. Although no new volume of the *Portugaliae Musica* series has appeared since 1999, it still has a monopoly on the publication of monuments of Portuguese music. However, small inroads in publishing, many of which are from Kastner’s “disciples,” are beginning to emerge and branch off.

\(^{170}\)Ibid.

Indeed, eighteenth-century keyboard music is one of the strongest aspects of Portuguese musicology since the middle of the twentieth century. Other important forays of musicological research relating to the eighteenth century are related to opera and theater as well as seventeenth-century religious villancicos. These inroads and forays notwithstanding, Portuguese musicology has and continues to focus upon the music of Portugal. A shying away from musicological studies of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries remains a part of the “traditions” of Portuguese musicology that proves stubborn in changing. One of the most remarkable breaks in the later decades of the twentieth century from the mid-twentieth century in Portuguese musicology was the establishment of musicology as an academic discipline in 1980, with the creation of the Department of Musicology at the Universidade Nova de Lisboa. This institution offers a teaching degree (Licenciatura) as well as a M. A. degree in Musical Sciences (Ciências Musicais). Until that time, Portuguese musicologists were either self-taught or had to travel abroad for their training. For Brito, Portuguese musicology must become more emboldened in developing relations with a larger international musicological community, especially Spain, Brazil, and Latin America, where through such global contacts, “adequate access to current musicological literature must be secured.” Beyond the continued and appreciated support of the Gulbenkian Foundation, musicology should dare to step beyond in search of other avenues of support, where musicologists can further in their interactions and private research in a broader arena of collaboration.\textsuperscript{172}

\textsuperscript{172}Ibid.
Outside of Portuguese musicology, important keyboard reference materials from the United States during this time are Maurice Hinson’s *Guide to the Pianist’s Repertoire*\(^{173}\) (1987), as well as *Music for Piano and Orchestra*\(^{174}\) (1981). As a standard reference for solo keyboard and concerto repertoire in university libraries across the United States, Seixas’s keyboard works in Hinson’s books are summarized by the presence of two volumes, PM 10 and PM 34 (1980) which supersede the original *Cravistas* publications. Hinson says Seixas was “one of the most important Portuguese keyboard composers of the eighteenth century, [and] was probably a student of Domenico Scarlatti. Seixas’s sonatas differ from Scarlatti’s in their use of two themes.”\(^{175}\) Concerning Seixas’s concerto (reference is made to the PM edition only), Hinson describes its technical requirements as intermediate to moderately difficult and its style as “charming period writing that comes off well on the piano.”\(^{176}\)

It is interesting to note Hinson’s reference to the piano as well suited for Seixas’s concerto, as neither the preface of the PM edition nor the later Cruz edition mentions anything other than “cravo.” The circumstance that the emergent piano was now being accepted as a suitable instrument in keyboard music is due in large part to Kastner’s later research. He declared in his 1982 preface to *Sonatas para tecla do século xviii* that the early pianoforte was legitimately intended by Portuguese composers.\(^{177}\) Although there


\(^{175}\)Maurice Hinson, *Guide to the Pianist’s Repertoire*.


may be a dearth of biographical information on Seixas’s contemporaries, including Frei José de Sant’ana and Frei Manuel de Santo Elias, among others, their compositions occur at the exact time when the harpsichord, as well as the more communicative and expressive clavichord, would give way to the early pianoforte, the writing style of which, much more graceful and vertical, but not exempt from Alberti bass, tries to adapt itself to the sonorous conditions of the keyboard instrument with hammer mechanism, capable of producing fortes and pianos, or rather light and shade.\textsuperscript{178}
3.2 Early Eighteenth-Century Harpsichord Concerti of an Italo-Iberian Tradition: Francesco Durante and Carlos Seixas

From both a stylistic and historical standpoint, Francesco Durante’s Concerto for Harpsichord and Strings in B flat Major proves an interesting case study. Francesco Degrada served as editor in 1968 for a modern publication of it by Ricordi in Milan.179 With extended solo sections throughout, this concerto demonstrates that it is more than simply providing continuo to a concertante in the Italian style. The concerto begins with a rhythmic anacrusis that well defines an exuberant spirit in its quirky major key. Melodic material that returns after extended solos from the harpsichordist easily signals to the listener well-defined phrase structures and form. From the standpoint of its technical bravura, the eighty-two measures of the first movement abound with a variety of pyrotechnics, including rapid-fire hand crossings, vibrant mordents, and trills. To top off this virtuosity, a section of thorny double-sixth intervals in the right hand contributes to the varying textures that add to the exuberance of this joyful charisma. (See example 3.1)
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G. Ricordi, ed. Francesco Degrada.
The second movement is much shorter (eighteen measures), and it reaches a climax in the fifth phrase grouping (mm. 94-96), where both soloist and orchestra play together as equals. Durante fully exploits the range of the harpsichord at this juncture with large arpeggiated cadential gestures as dramatic in their appearance as their visual display. With exception to the final rolled chords provided by Degrada, at no point in the second movement does the harpsichordist serve in a basso continuo role. Marked *Grave*, it is a dramatic reversal to the exuberance of the first movement in its tonality of the relative minor. As dramatic as its character is, the means by which the movement begins where the harpsichordist is unaccompanied is even more pronounced. Initiating a series of seven wistful, melancholic iterations, the recurring gesture proves hypnotizing in its downward melodic flourishes above a chordal bass of closely stacked tertial sonorities. The dialogue of varying textures in the tutti responds, however, to the soloist in both ascending and descending melodic gestures. (See example 3.2)
Behaving in ways similar to the opening two movements, the third movement, marked *Allegro*, also has extended solos with brilliant technical displays. In a lively 3/8, the last movement is clearly a dance, possibly an Italian *corrente*. This jubilant finale, with repeats and the largest measure count (114; 34:80 measures of the binary structure), formally stands apart in its terminal capacity from the other movements. Bravura in the solo sections is marked by combinations of large intervallic leaps and double-sixths in the right hand atop single notes in the bass that are presumably to be filled in with various articulations and ornaments in accordance with repeats. From m. 182 to the coda in m. 209, akin to the importance of how soloist and tutti interacted in the fifth phrase grouping of the second movement, strings and harpsichord are at last united in a partnership of equals. However, in this case, the union is a raucous, often contrapuntal explosion of delight, which must inevitably come to an end after repetitive dominant-tonic oscillations.

One year after publication of Durante’s concerto with Degrada as editor, the first printed edition of Seixas’s A-major concerto was published in 1969. Pierre Salzmann edited, transcribed, provided basso continuo realizations, and wrote a brief introductory preface of it as the thirteenth volume of the *Portugaliae Musica* series. After a biographical sketch and comments on the keyboard concerto during the first half of the eighteenth century, Salzmann argued that the keyboard concerti of J. S. Bach and G. F. Handel, among other European contemporaries, most likely were unknown to Seixas. This being the case, the only contact that Seixas would have had in the keyboard concerto
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genre were the concertantes of Geminiani, Corelli, or Albinoni, where the harpsichordist was more accompanimental than soloistic. In light of this circumstance, Seixas could be viewed as an originator of the solo keyboard concerto in Portugal.

One year later, Ivo Cruz edited, provided basso continuo realizations, and wrote a preface for a performance edition of the same concerto under the auspices of the National Conservatory of Lisbon.\textsuperscript{181} Cruz concurred with Salzmann that Seixas’s concerto is important from a Portuguese historical standpoint, that “significant is the inclusion of the Concerto form in Seixas’s works — a form which, during the lifetime of the Portuguese composer, was still recent in European music and probably still unknown in this country.”\textsuperscript{182} However, Cruz’s motivation for this publication differs from Salzmann in that it was not directed towards scholars and researchers, but instead, it was “an edition which, while preserving the image and spirit of the work, proves of assistance for soloists, conductors, and orchestral players in its stylistic performance.”

Cruz provided a first-hand account of the concerto’s modern Lisbon première that occurred on February 13, 1933. In this concert, he performed as both soloist and conductor from the harpsichord. Prior to the premiere, Cruz notes that a stuffy and restricted climate, bent solely towards appeasing “scholarly curiosity,” was associated with performances of Portuguese classical composers. Acting in tandem with a team of other musicologists, Cruz helped eradicate these conceptions about early Portuguese music in:
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research [that] soon led us to the conclusion that Portuguese musical production in past centuries was, on the contrary, the living expression of true works of art conveying a message of human and aesthetic value which survives the erosion of time.

Proof that Seixas’s concerto, among other revivals of Portuguese early music, was far from being interesting only to scholarly curiosity, or lacking as an expression of true art, is provided in two reviews by Francine Benoit and Mário de Sampayo Ribeiro. As Benoit reminisced:

The whole audience hang on the faint chords of the harpsichord and its marvelously melodical line as if, with bated breath, today’s life had stopped altogether to allow one to breathe in more delightedly that other life which survived for two centuries on a piece of lined paper unexpectedly brought to light again by Dr. Ivo Cruz at the Ajuda Library.

Musicologist Mário de Sampayo Ribeiro recollected:

No one knew of the existence of this harpsichord Concerto which is being performed today. It was reserved for Ivo Cruz to unearth it at the Ajuda Library in a volume of toccatas whose author was briefly mentioned as José Carlos. Like all his other already performed works, this Concerto quickly came to the fore for its highly elaborate technique, its refined beauty and its sober structure.183

Having Durante’s concerto as its closest relative available in print, these first modern editions of Seixas’s concerto would inevitably have been placed in comparative terms. The editorial decisions of both Salzmann and Pierre can be traced to only one extant manuscript that contains this concerto which is located at the Ajuda Palace Library (P-La MM 48-I-2). Entitled Concerto a 4 con VV e Cimbalo obligato 18 Del Sig’: Jozé An.to Carlos, the copy (probably 1760’ss) is immaculate in its penmanship and performable as is. Although the title indicates the cembalo as obbligato, only in the first movement has the copyist specifically denoted this distinction; all other movements
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simply designate cembalo. This ambiguity is but one of many grey areas the modern editors had to navigate before publishing their respective scholarly/performance editions. Other examples include the vagueness of whether the harpsichordist should be tacet or actively involved during passages in tutti (the manuscript copy never indicates any bass/cello continuo during solos except for the second movement), or whether a cadenza should be performed in the second movement (there is a lack of a cadenza fermata), or whether the keyboardist should elect to either fill in textures or play the score as is. In short, this manuscript demanded a considerable degree of editorial sophistication, knowledge, and artistry to any editor willing to tackle it for modern publication.

Throughout all movements in the manuscript copy, the soloist is placed between the contrabassos and violini/violas. The filling-in of textures is also unique, as not a single filled-in texture is ever encountered in the right hand; in fact, all filling-in of textures is exclusively the domain of the left hand. Although there is no fermata on beat three of the penultimate bar of the second movement, the copyist has provided a fermata on the last rest before the third movement, the presence of which indicates the copyist clearly meant what was written, regardless of whether a cadenza was intended. The clear presence of recurrent tutti and unaccompanied solo harpsichord episodes throughout the first and last movements indicate this is not a concerto grosso but a true solo concerto in ritornello form. In the first movement, five ritornellos, with the help of five harpsichord solo episodes, modulate from A major to the dominant, to the relative minor, where after a very brief sojourn along D minor, all return to the tonic. The last movement differs not only in its length and number of ritornellos and episodes, but in the presence of a double
bar in the middle of the movement; assuming that the repeats are taken, there are a total of eleven ritornellos and ten harpsichord solo episodes. The ritornellos and episodes in the first double bar oscillate between the tonic of A major and the dominant; at the double bar, the parallel minor of the dominant ensues traversing to its dominant in B minor. Finally a return of the original tonic of A major once again explores, like the first movement, its relative minor of F#, before terminating in the original key of A major.

In this brief snapshot of the original manuscript, it is interesting to note how the first modern editors navigated these uncertain, challenging ambiguities of the manuscript source. With Salzmann as editor in 1969, much of the layout is true to the manuscript, including the placement of the harpsichord soloist sandwiched between the viola and bass, usage of the soprano clef in the bass in the second movement, brackets for suggested dynamic markings, and smaller note heads for continuo realizations of the harpsichord soloist and basses/cellos. There is also the presence of a fully realized keyboard continuo throughout all tuttis. Intriguingly, Salzmann chose to fully notate the continuo role of the basses/cellos during all solo episodes (with exception of mm. 16-17 in the first movement and cadenza in the second movement) in collaboration with the harpsichordist. The placement of two fermatas in the penultimate bar in the second movement before and on beat three indicate Salzmann’s conviction that a cadenza is necessary, despite the absence of it in the manuscript. The suggested cadenza is no more than a brief scalar flourish in A Major with ornamental filigree. (See example 3.3)

Cruz’s edition published one year later in 1970 provides a stark contrast to Salzmann’s editorial artistry. To begin with, the keyboard part, marked *cravo*, is relocated to the bottom of the score below the *violoncellos e contrabaixos*. There are no brackets or smaller note heads in attempting to delineate editorial suggestions from the original manuscript source. Editorial decisions include an abundance of articulations, assorted dynamics (including crescendos), slurs, rallentandos, etc. Another major contrast to Salzmann’s edition is the absence of any involvement of the basses/cellos during keyboard solo episodes. During the *tutti*, the keyboardist rarely participates, but when he does, it is grandiose, as can be seen at the endings of the first and last movements. Intriguingly, Cruz provides a double bar in the first movement, changing the number of ritornellos and episodes considerably, with no less than fourteen ritornellos and thirteen episodes. He also provides for a cadenza in the second movement, although unlike Salzmann’s dainty offering, it is a substantial contribution of fifteen measures where expressive melodic sequences, widely spaced arpeggiatic flourishes, and rich chordal sonorities (up to eight voices) are rolled between the hands. (See example 3.4)

*Concerto para Cravo e Cordas*, ed. Ivo Cruz.
Enigmatically, Cruz decided to change the rhythmic anacrusis of the first movement by reversing the two thirty-second notes with the sixteenth note in both the
tutti and solo keyboard episodes. His authority in providing “corrections” such as these rhythmic figures, alongside other editorial license (including the addition of a double-bar repeat in the first movement), is justified in the preface that:

in publishing this Concerto the purpose was not to produce a document for restricted circulation among scholars and researchers. The object was rather to help make it better known by means of an edition which, while preserving the image and spirit of the work, proves of assistance for soloists, conductors and orchestral players in its stylistic performance.\textsuperscript{184}

Cruz’s editorial artistry, striving to best serve a performing public, nonetheless provides such a contrast from both the manuscript and Salzmann’s edition, that comparative analysis to these sources becomes unavoidable. Likewise, Salzmann’s editorial decisions also demand comparisons, as his more sparse performance suggestions, brackets and smaller note heads for continuo realizations, which are economical and “faithful” in their approach, nonetheless are too distinct and demand similar investigative endeavors. Thus, in both cases, it is paradoxical that although they strove to be definitive, they are so remarkably diverse from each other that the original manuscript source becomes in itself just as viable as a scholarly or performance resource. Despite these remarkable divergences, in no way are the expertise and knowledge of a Portuguese Baroque performance practice that went into developing these editions to be seen as lacking in merit. Quite the contrary, these editorial manifestations present the first artistic interpretations of one of Seixas’s most well renowned compositions, and their very differences are just as important to consider in understanding the debates of performance versus scholarly editions of the late 1960’s and early 1970’s as the modern

\textsuperscript{184}Carlos Seixas, \textit{Concerto para cravo e cordas}, ed. Ivo Cruz.
interpretation and performance of this remarkable composition. Regardless of whether or not the addition of repeats, a cceli/bassi line throughout, fully realized cadenzas at various junctures of a movement, filling in of textures, among other editorial decisions, may be seen as controversial interpretations now, these endeavors are the unique thumbprints of an artistry stemming from source material that to this day still sparks debate. Further, these thumbprints bear witness to the motivations and agendas of a unique time and place in Lisbon, which was striving not only to solve the conflicts of performance and scholarship, but notions of a definitive reproduction of a single manuscript source. Without these modern editions, there would be little to no circulation for the public, not to mention a unique performance practice in Lisbon of the 1970’s of Seixas’s music, and this concerto might have become as obscure as Durante’s keyboard concerto.
3.3 Newer Solo Keyboard Editions (1975-1982)

In the decades following publication of PM 10 and the harpsichord concerto in A major, three new important editions of Seixas’s solo keyboard music emerge. Chronologically they are the *Tocatas e minuetes*, edited by Jorge Croner de Vasconcellos and Armando José Fernandes (1975), *25 sonatas para instrumentos de tecla*, edited by Kastner (1980), and *Ausgewählte Sonaten I-XXX*, in two volumes, edited by Gerhard Doderer (1982). The editorial decisions of these respective editors are just as representative of their epoch as those preceding them. In light of how long it took for publication of Seixas’s earliest editions, this flowering of newer editions in such a short time span demonstrates the popularity of his keyboard sonatas as well as new manuscript discoveries. Just as the two editions of the concerto and both volumes of the *Cravistas* and PM 10 demonstrated how the agendas of mid-twentieth-century musicologists were connected to editorial “artistry” and scholarship, so too would these newer editions establish how newer analytical approaches would have an impact in publication.

An important new voice to emerge in supplanting these older paradigms was Jan La Rue, who interestingly was the same scholar to review Newman’s chapter on the “High Classic Era” composers of Vienna. His 1970 *Guidelines for Style Analysis*\(^\text{185}\) acknowledges prevalent paradigms while also advocating newer approaches in analyzing musical style that are applicable to eighteenth-century music and other epochs. Unlike Kirkpatrick or Newman, he avoids the championing of any single composer as a
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yardstick comparative tool. Perhaps analogous to Newman’s questioning of the utility of an evolutionary approach in examining the history of the sonata idea and searching within the qualities of the sonatas themselves to break free of antiquated views, LaRue also states that “it must be emphasized repeatedly that each piece is in some respects a law unto itself, requiring the analyst to adjust the general framework of examination to bring out characteristic features of a specific composer.” LaRue concurs with Newman in a cautionary standpoint from viewing evolutionary perspectives in musical style, yet nonetheless notes:

> Although the history of musical style cannot be viewed as a straight-line evolution, despite occasional circlings and false directions a steady morphological development can be traced along two general lines: enlargement of dimensions and functional specialization of material. Much like geographical explorers, composers discover new lands and sample their novelties long before the new country is fully settled. The history of style repeats over and over this cycle of discovery and gradual control of new dimensions and fresh effects.186

LaRue’s newer approaches in analyzing musical style boldly reconsider the elements of a composition’s dynamics, timbre, and texture as equally significant to melody, rhythm, and harmony. He questions the very identity of the chord itself, where under such stances a “crisis” of identity occurs asking if it is plausible to now define a “chord” as simply how many sounds are simultaneously occurring. From such radical new perspectives, it is asked, “when is a chord?” Concerning the bipartite first-movement structure of the eighteenth century, LaRue suggests that no longer should there be a need to adapt all instances as needing to fit some form of “ternary expectations.” It is best to simply distinguish what the individual bipartite example is doing, regardless if
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at the first double bar some type of main articulation is associated with a firm cadence.

Freed from these ternary expectations, aspects to be questioned within the bipartite structure could be determining a “central articulation,” or ascertaining if thematic material is homogenous and/or contrasting in its ideas, or simply identifying the composition’s “modulatory rhythm,” “chordal rhythm,” and “key rhythm” in tandem with the peaks and valleys of melodic tessitura, pitch, texture, and rhythm inter-relationships. In a particular opus such as Seixas’s keyboard works, employing LaRue’s model may be applicable to more than just his bipartite first movements, especially in concern to a refined approach to these “rhythmic” concepts; it may be more advantageous to look beyond the general harmonic rhythm and more towards progression rhythm, modulatory rhythm, as aspects of the harmonic-rhythmic module. In addition, there could be an approach to ascertaining “melodic density,” determining how much melodic activity there is in a piece where thematic relationships between movements change in their varying articulations.

Analogous to Heimes’s narrative of attempting to envision all of Seixas’s keyboard sonatas as a single organic entity, LaRue also advocates “seeing” the “trees,” so to speak, of a large forest of compositions in a composer’s oeuvre. Utilizing this process, seeing Seixas’s keyboard works from the trees to the forest would involve being able to manage data in the most simplistic fashion. LaRue cautions, however, that it is all too easy to get bogged down in unmanageable data, where the “branches and leaves” of individual sharps and flats, accidentals, etc., can obscure the larger picture.

\[187\] Ibid.
Consequently, he suggests five categories of initially organizing data into sound, harmony, melody, rhythm, and growth. Thus, in Seixas’s keyboard works, identifying the smaller level of his melodies, or simply defining how the melody moves and curves (simple, compound, complex), sets up an easy platform of arrangement and management for later use as comparative guideposts in the larger peaks and valleys of his variegated keyboard terrain. Finally, from these five levels of organization, LaRue advocates identifying the point in which there is the strongest ties of correlation and their connection to one another, the point of concinnity.188

From attempting to ascertain a concinnity within Seixas’s keyboard works, the analyst is manipulating and examining data through centuries of change in a process that is walking a tight rope between objective and subjective paradigms that constantly guess towards the inner expressive world of his aesthetics. However subjective such a concinnity may be, it will nonetheless be cognizant of how these aesthetic changes have been dealt with in modern editions and scholarship through time. Heimes’s narrative is of particular interest, in that it was foreshadowing the radical changes in analytical approach in the decades following his dissertation, not to mention how editorial license would be impacted in performing and critical editions. The thumbprints of the various editors of these newer editions are tied to sundry controversies dealing with an incredible amount of data in both manuscripts and previous editions and necessitated quite a degree of artistic license and executive authority from them. In their artistic sophistication, these editors addressed a dichotomy of two opposing worlds in performance versus critical editions, where the demands of
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performer and scholar alike inevitably resulted in a number of differing publications. It is in these far-ranging divergences that I regard these editions just as essential to understanding the music of Portugal as the manuscripts themselves.

Around the time of these publications, John Caldwell wrote his influential book *Editing Early Music*, describing exemplary aspects and protocol for publication of modern editions of early music. In context to the analytical approaches of LaRue, this book provides a more focused insight into what was considered ideal in editorial license and authority of musical editions. He explicitly excludes issues of source studies, notation or paleography, his objective geared primarily towards professionals well versed in their respective musicological research and ready to begin working on a modern edition. He advocates that ideal editions should be trustworthy, performable as is, and not distort the intentions of the composer, the centuries-old problems of copyists and their whims are simply absent as the practice of copying by hand is made obsolete by the presence of the modern copier and printer. When there are several editions of a work in addition to the primary source such as a manuscript, the editor must assess each and every edition, and if necessary, the construction of a stemma is well advised, although in most cases, the primary source usually stands out as the most constructive.

As performance editions that are both trustworthy, and playable as is, the *Tocates e Minuetes* (henceforth *Tocatas*), *25 Sonatas para Instrumentos de Tecla* (henceforth PM 34), and *Ausgewählte Sonaten I-XXX* (henceforth *Organica Hispanica*), represent a time period of just over a decade. In a comparative overview of these editions, it is rare to
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encounter reference to previous modern editions in editorial criteria, though reference to primary source materials is always provided. All possess a clear layout of the musical score, and with exception to the *Tocatas*, generally avoid additions of performance markings such as articulations, slurs, dynamic markings, and filling-in of textures not present in the manuscripts. The copious performance suggestions of the *Tocatas* truly set this edition apart from the rest, and can be said in their performance-oriented interpretations to provide a unique vista into how Seixas was being taught and performed in Lisbon during the 1970’s and beyond. As students of Colaço, both Vasconcellos and Fernandes represent a direct line of pedagogy associated with the first modern revivals and premieres of Seixas’s music in the early twentieth century. From such a standpoint, the *Tocatas* bear witness to not only Seixas’s keyboard performance pedagogy of the last three decades of the twentieth century, but also today, as their edition is still a popular resource at the National Conservatory of Lisbon.

The publication of the *Tocatas* occurred during the turbulent years of the *Carnation Revolution* of 1975. Ivo Cruz had persuaded Vasconcellos and Fernandes to embark on this edition after he donated his privately owned manuscript to the National Library of Lisbon (P-Ln CIC 110). In the preface to the *Tocatas*, it is noted that very little was known about this manuscript before entering the collection of Cruz, other than the condition of its being owned by the family of the Dukes of Loulé.\footnote{Carlos Seixas. *Tocatas e minuetes*, ed. Jorge Croner de Vasconcellos and Armando José Fernandes (Lisbon: Ministério da educação e investigação científica secretaria de estado da cultura e educação permanente direcção geral dos assuntos culturais, Biblioteca Nacional de Lisboa, 1975).} Prior to the National Library’s acquisition, as will be recalled, Heimes and Kastner could only use
this manuscript for reference and bibliographic purposes, not for publication of a new edition. The twenty-five toccatas in this edition, as well an appendix of seven additional minuets, present the first modern printing of this important manuscript.

Vasconcellos was interested in the music of Seixas long before this publication. As early as 1937, the interest is manifested in an original composition, *Tocata I a Carlos Seixas*. Years later, this toccata would join two others in publication. Because Alexandre Rey Colaço was his early keyboard instructor, it comes as no surprise that this first composition would bear the dedication to Seixas. His later studies were with Nadia Boulanger and Alfred Cortot, among others, in Paris. Eventually, he would return to Lisbon and join the faculty of the National Conservatory of Lisbon, in addition to working with Portugal’s national radio and a ballet company, *Verde Vaio*.192

There are remarkable insights into the editorial license of this newer edition by perusing Vasconcellos’s original compositions that would otherwise not be available from the edition of the *Tocatas* alone. For example, the filling-in of textures and repeats in these original compositions share a kinship to the editorial license encountered in the *Tocatas*. Even though Vasconcellos adheres to a neoclassical harmonic vocabulary in his first toccata of 1937, the two-voice texture in the right hand over an unadorned single line in the bass demonstrates a strong connection to the manuscript CIC 110. Beyond the textural similarity, Vasconcellos’s quirky phrase groupings in a bipartite structure also show an affinity to Seixas’s musical style. Although the second toccata, written five years later, also possesses a bipartite structure, it does tend to differ more in its texture. It
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is more in line with the performance suggestions of the newer edition of the *Tocatas* than the original manuscript with a predominantly four-part texture equally balanced between the hands. (See example 3.5)
Vasconcellos’s associate editor was Armando José Fernandes, who studied with many of the same teachers, notably Colaço and Boulanger, and also worked with the national radio and taught at the National Conservatory of Lisbon. In an original composition by Fernandes, *Prelúdio e Fuga* (1943), he reveals a harmonic language, idiomatic approach, texture, and melo-rhythmic syntax far removed from Vasconcellos’s compositional style, yet in his dynamic contrasts and emotive gestures of contrasting and careful slurring, makes significant statements of the *empfondsam* style in Seixas’s slow movements. (See example 3.6)

\[\text{Mvt. III [m. 70-77]}\]

\[\text{Da capo [al Fine]}\]
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With these original compositions as an insight into the editorial decisions of the *Tocatas*, the performance suggestions appear less of an anomaly in an era where an austere, economical approach to performance suggestions was the norm in keyboard publications. The closest relative to the *Tocatas* will not be found in the *Portugaliae Musica* series, but the edition of the harpsichord concerto with Cruz as editor. In the Sonata No. 11 in D Major from this newer edition, one will immediately recognize the textures of Vasconcellos and the slurring of Fernandes in their original compositions. Beyond the abundance of these slurs, an *ad libitum* cadenza can also be found.
Regarding articulations, the elaborate ornamental trills between the top and middle voices and a rich filling-in of textures elicit curiosity as to what the original manuscript source contains. This composition is labeled as *Tocata 20a* in the manuscript, where the minuet, attached as a secondary movement, also appears as a stand-alone composition in another manuscript (P-Ln MM 338), entitled *Minuette*. In the CIC 110 manuscript, the presence of the marking 8 as underneath a walking bass, often of intervallic thirds, is filled in with a continuous string of octaves, and most likely the logic behind the designation of *Pomposo* which is not in the manuscript. (See example 3.7)
*Tocatas e minuetes*, ed. Vasconcellos and Fernandes.
Orig. P-Ln CIC110, p. 74-76, *Toccata 20a*. 
From a comparison of the manuscript to the *Tocatas*, it can be seen that one of the most difficult obstacles in editing is encountered directly after the first double bar. Sharp and natural signs are literally indistinguishable from one another in a rhapsodic placement scheme that bespeaks a variety of modulatory and tonal possibilities. In light of such cryptic notation, reading through the manuscript at this juncture provides quirky natural-minor sonorities and tonalities in some instances, while other readings of the same passages provide just as plausible renditions of more harmonic-minor flavorings. The editors chose the latter over the former and, interestingly, decided to delete the second measure after the double bar, presumably to fit better within the syntax of their chosen phrasing and tonalities. Other examples of editorial intervention in the first movement include the filling-in of textures in mm. 50-55 in the octaves, the *ad lib.* cadenza written out underneath the fermata at m. 62, and the brilliant oscillating trills between the top and middle voices in mm. 67-72.
From a two-part texture in the manuscript, the secondary movement, a minuet, is transformed into an almost exclusive three-part texture, which, on rare instances, branches into four voices. In the minuet of manuscript MM 338, the original copyist provided insights into the filling-in of textures by writing in double octaves and step-wise parallel fourths to be played the second time after the first repeat. Beyond the filling-in of these textures by these modern editors, their legato slurs, subdued dynamics, and graceful sigh motives indicate a minuet more in line with a Siciliano than a more raucous minuet. As editors, they were faced with the idiosyncrasies of two different copyists from the manuscripts, and had no modern editions to consult. Divergences in the manuscripts include two additional measures at the beginning in manuscript MM 338, that when repeated, create a quirky phrase structure. Seen as a mistake, their omission in the other manuscript presents a logical phrasing scheme of predominantly one and two-bar question and answer phrases. In any event, by electing the copyist of CIC 110 over MM 338, in relation to these extra bars, the editors were spared the difficulties of how to treat the first and second endings. (See example 3.8)
Example 3.8. Carlos Seixas, *Sonata No. 11, Minuet*. 
*Tocatas e minuetes*, ed. Vasconcellos and Fernandes. 
Orig. P-Ln CIC110, p. 77, *Minuet*.

Responding to criticisms and complaints that modern editions have been “meager and almost abbreviated” in their approach, they note their boldness in providing a fully realized continuo to the bass along with phrasing and liberal dynamic markings, including crescendos and diminuendos. In the same vein as Cruz’s concerto edition, this edition is meant for performance, by both pianists and harpsichordists, who will need to
adapt the editorial suggestions to the idiosyncrasies of their respective instruments, and as advised, “should anyone consider this too bold, he would kindly take the trouble to consider, compare, and verify.”\textsuperscript{194} They believe that the title of this manuscript has great significance to the form and performance practice of these toccatas as a specific genre, different from, and not to be confused with sonatas. Entitled \textit{Tocatas de Joze Antonio Carlos de Seixas} in the CIC 110 manuscript, these toccatas are almost always a two-movement composition (exceptions in this volume include the \textit{fugas}), with a minuet as an attached, secondary movement. In performances, the minuet should not terminate the performance, but always segue (da capo) to a repetition of the first movement. They explain:

It is intuitive, even in the absence of an indication, that although the minuet is sometimes derived from motives of the toccata, it is not probable for the work to end with a movement, however charming, of moderate tempo and of comparatively very reduced dimensions. In relation to the toccata, the minuet should fulfill the usual function that the trio, or a second minuet, fulfills towards the first minuet. Thus, the global structure of the toccata will result clearly distinct from that of the sonata, and its use as a general title for this collection comes fully justified, as in it no sonata appears, if by this designation we mean that structure of the pre-classic sonata.

Five years after the \textit{Tocatas}, Kastner presented his version of the CIC 110 manuscript as PM 34. As the latest installment of the PM series devoted to Seixas’s keyboard music, it was supported by the Gulbenkian Foundation, and as the logical continuation of PM 10, follows the ordering of sonatas by chromatic ascent. In comparison to the \textit{Tocatas}, there are many divergences of editorial practice, one of which is reflected in the title, 25 \textit{sonatas para instrumentos de tecla}. He believes there is

\textsuperscript{194}Ibid.
nothing to be distinguished between toccatas or sonatas, and from an organological standpoint, they can be played on either harpsichord, clavichord, organ, or early pianoforte. Further, he makes no mention of a “da capo” practice relating to minuets as secondary movements. However, the most conspicuous divergence between these editions is the absence of a realized continuo part in PM 34. As will be seen, the *Tocatas* stand as the only edition to dare in such an undertaking, all subsequent editions, including PM 34, will follow and gravitate towards a mix between urtext, diplomatic, and performance editions.

Although Kastner does not mention a specific performance practice relating to the minuets as secondary movements, he sees a French influence by virtue of their large quantity. Beyond the presence of French stylistic elements conveyed, for example, through the dotted rhythms of his first symphony (a probable connection with the French overture), there is no documental evidence linking Seixas to contemporary French composers. However, it stands to reason that, given the Portuguese fascination with French courtly life, Seixas must have been aware of French musical style, forms, and genres. Seixas’s irregularity in phrase lengths may be seen as the epitome of great taste in relation to avoiding ready-made formulas along with the amateurish employment of commonplace figures in dances such as the minuet. Kastner argues:

> In my view the irregularities in the structure of phrases and musical periods in the music by Seixas are primarily due to the fact that in the binary sonatas he was tired of confining himself to the original dance-forms as well as to the constant repetition of relatively short musical motives. Apart from giving rise to some
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pedantry, this regularity could lead to an excessive accentuation of the Study or Exercise aspect, mainly considering the mechanism of hands and fingers. The almost constant repetition of musical motives compressed in small quantities of measures makes the music by numerous emulators of Seixas somewhat asthmatic and narrow-chested. In good French they are called *compositeurs de soufflé court.* This is a common stain on much keyboard music of the 18th century.

Anxious to avoid obvious repetitions, Kastner consciously left out any minuet that was previously published in PM 10. Perhaps in a response to Béhague’s criticisms, he makes note of editorial decisions concerning the attachment of minuets in this newer edition. Apparently, because of the whims of the original copyist, manuscripts often contain varying combinations of secondary movements. When comparing differing manuscripts he notes:

the same ‘binary’ piece, entitled Sonata or Tocata and followed by a Minuete, we find that, if the two movements are not connected by a clear common motive or theme, the copyist followed his own choice, hitching any Minuete to the preceding Sonata with an identical tonality as the only link. So in various sources the same Sonata appears followed by a different Minuete.

Kastner points out that in many instances these sonatas are representative of the evolutionary product of the *tento,* which gradually transformed from Seixas’s early age to the end of his life. As binary sonatas, they can be summarized in two castes: (1) repeat signs denoting two distinct sections in which motives of the first part are reiterated in the second part in modulations of the dominant, subdominant, and parallel keys to eventually resolve in the home key; and, (2) a clear-cut binary structure in absence of repeat signs with first and second sections joined together amidst greater development of motives.\(^{196}\) He also argues that Seixas, along with contemporary Iberian keyboard composers,
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maintained the stamp of their heritage and were far from being simply a branch of composers imitating Italian forms and trends. He emphatically declares:

We ardently reject the frequently proclaimed idea that the implantation on the Iberian Peninsula of the commonly called ‘Binary Sonata’ for keyboard instruments was due to the intervention of Domenico Scarlatti. No! When Domenico disembarked in Lisbon in 1721, both the Iberian nations knew of and used the pattern of this ‘Sonata,’ ‘Tocata,’ ‘Obra,’ or ‘Exercicio’ for keyboard, and they had already established forms, techniques and processes, which are not to be considered as sheer imitation of the favorite patterns of the great Domenico Scarlatti.  

Comparing the same Sonata No. 11 in D Major from the Tocatas that appears in PM 34 (Sonata 5), it can be seen that the editorial “artistry” of Kastner reveals an interpretive approach just as remarkable in its contrasts as to his own earlier editions of the Cravistas and PM 10. To begin with, unlike his previous editions, PM 34 is much more urtext in terms of its performance suggestions. Not a single slur, fingering, articulation, or dynamic suggestion is provided for in Sonata No. 5. Those few performance suggestions that are provided for are indicated with brackets, and include indications of m.s. and m.d. for left- and right-hand subdivisions, a tempo of moderato, filled-in left-hand chordal sonorities, and fermatas. Although all of the notes with the 8va indication in the manuscript have been realized without brackets, all other single bass notes that have been rendered as octaves are contained within brackets. At one of the most difficult sections of the first movement to interpret from the CIC 110 manuscript (at the initial double bar), Kastner diverges considerably from the Tocatas. Here he does not delete the second measure after the double bar, but provides for both natural minor and harmonic minor tonalities by placing cautionary accidentals above selected notes in
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question. With such a cautious approach, he has obviously avoided any suggestions of a


cadenza which the \textit{Tocatas} had provided. (See example 3.9)
Example 3.9. Carlos Seixas, Sonata No. 5, first mvmt. (selections).
*Portugaliae Musica 34*, ed. M.S. Kastner.
Orig. P-Ln CIC110, p. 74-77, *Toccata 20a.*
Although Kastner does not provide the elaborate sequence of thirty-second-note trills oscillating between the upper voices that the *Tocatas* do, curiously he chooses the exact same means of notating the ornaments as a trill with a dotted half note tied to a dotted eighth note. With such careful attention to illustrating editorial additions by his use of brackets in most instances, it is interesting to note that these trills have no editorial commentary. There are other editorial oddities to be sure, including in m. 85 the *ossia* of F-sharp octaves in the lowest register of the keyboard, where nothing of the sort is indicated in the manuscript.

In the secondary movement, the *Minuete*, Kastner questions if it might have been composed by Francisco Xavier Baptista. The presence of the same minuet in two manuscripts, one of which contains predominantly works of Seixas, seems to suggest however that it was more likely Seixas, and not this later contemporary. Kastner follows in the footsteps of the *Tocatas*, also eliminating the two extra bars in this minuet, as well as providing any suggested filling-in of textures by the eighteenth-century copyist in manuscript MM 338. His *urtext* approach lacks a tempo marking, articulations, filling-in of textures and presence of slurs, and as such, impacts performance practice. Whereas this minuet in the *Tocatas* clearly denotes a lyrical, *Siciliano* character, Kastner’s editorial artistry places the choice of tempo directly upon the performer. As an extreme, though plausible performance rendition based upon the PM 34 edition, the tempo could be played at *presto*, as the two-part texture is technically undemanding. In addition, the articulations could be realized in the most crisp *staccati* possible, with inclusion of occasional brilliant accents (especially regarding the thirty-second-note grace notes), and
sparse ornamentation on the repeats. Indeed, if the performer is to play the minuet without any filling-in of textures on an instrument with a rapid decay such as the harpsichord, it makes more sense to play it in this extreme contrast of tempo and character. (See example 3.10)

The next major edition of Seixas’s keyboard sonatas after PM 34 appears in 1982. Comprising thirty sonatas in two volumes (seven\textsuperscript{198} and eight\textsuperscript{199} of the \textit{Organica Hispanica} series), Gerard Doderer served as editor. Unlike the \textit{Tocatas} or PM 34, the purpose of this edition was not to simply publish newly found works, but to present a sampling from all of Seixas’s keyboard works. Based upon all known manuscripts, including manuscript CIC 110, they are decidedly \textit{urtext} in their approach with critical notes and commentary in the appendices. Published outside of Portugal in Germany, the title clearly indicates organ, harpsichord, and piano as suitable. In his preface, Doderer provides a biographical sketch of Seixas that includes details on Scarlatti’s residence in Portugal, and describes his works as having been written:

with Lusitanian spirit and sensibility: one recognizes the atmosphere of a country marked by a mild Atlantic climate, and by a certain proud elegance together with the elegiac yearning of a people opposed to a strict formalism. ... A leaning towards the use of successive modulations is joined by a definite liking for the dance-like, manneristically ornate and playful minuet; exuberant runs alternate with an often lyrical treble melodic line. Thus emerges a charmingly ornate, graceful and ‘gallant’ music, with moments of real pre-Romanticism.

The D major sonata elaborated upon in examples 3.7 through 3.10 does not occur in the \textit{Organica Hispanica} series, but Sonata No. 29 does appear in previous editions and manuscript copies. In manuscript copies it is found in the Coimbra manuscript fifty-eight as well manuscript CIC 110, and in modern editions it was first published in \textit{Cravistas II}, then later in PM 10. Looking back at how Kastner changed in his editorial artistry between these first two publications, changes may be seen as marginal, with some

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{198}Carlos Seixas, \textit{Ausgewählte Sonaten I-XV (Orgel, Cembalo, Klavier)}, ed. Gerhard Doderer (Heidelberg: Süddeutscher Musikverlag, 1982).
\textsuperscript{199}Carlos Seixas, \textit{Ausgewählte Sonaten XVI-XXX (Orgel, Cembalo, Klavier)}, ed. Gerhard Doderer (Heidelberg: Süddeutscher Musikverlag, 1982).
\end{flushleft}
exceptions, such as changing in PM 10 the stand-alone Fuga from Cravistas II to a three-movement work with two secondary minuets. Marginal changes relate to accidentals, ornamentation, and notation, where in the Cravistas, double whole notes end both halves of the double bar where only whole notes sufficed in PM 10, and cautionary accidentals occur in mm. 10 and 38, as well as trills in mm. 12, 14, 26, and mm. 38-39 in PM 10. Other than these changes, the composition is essentially the same, with a tempo designation of Allegro and a cut-time signature relating to 4/2 time. (See example 3.11)

Doderer’s editorial decisions in contrast, at first glance, might appear minor, although they are significant. Those few changes from his editorial judgments such as pitch and rest values, among others, mark profound changes to the composition in both performance and in critical analysis. Among these changes are: (a) pitch changes in m. 16 (F# to F-natural in RH), m. 25 (A to B natural in LH), m. 28 (F# to F-natural last beat RH); and, (b) rest durations in the final notes of both double bar lines (from double whole notes to half notes followed by rests). The pitch changes in mm. 16 and 28 increase the modulatory rhythm characteristic of Seixas’s ever-twisting, sinuous quality of modulatory procedure, whereas the pitch change in m. 25 contrasts in its slower-paced modulatory rhythm, maintaining, at least for a small stretch, the stasis of the dominant cadence after the double bar. Although there is no designation for this composition as specifically for organ in *Organica Hispanica*, the elimination of the filled-in octaves in the left hand at m. 31 makes for a much easier legato. In addition, the change from a double whole note to a single half note in the final bars of both halves allow for easier registrational changes of a long-sustained sonorous instrument such as the organ in a large church space. The two manuscript sources, as could be expected, differ from one another in many respects. Corresponding to m. 16 in the modern editions, an F# is to be found in the CIC 110 manuscript, whereas an F-natural is to be found in the Coimbra manuscript. However, concerning the other pitch changes in mm. 25 and 28, both manuscript sources contain the same notes. Both manuscript sources differ in the time signature, as well as the duration of the final notes at both halves. The Coimbra manuscript begins the first four measures in cut time, then shifts to a 4/2 meter, whereas
the CIC 110 manuscript contains a strict cut time throughout. Concerning titles, the CIC 110 manuscript designates *Tocata 4a p a orgam*, whereas the Coimbra manuscript designates *Tocata 28 Fuga*.

Sonata No. 30 in *Organica Hispanica*, unlike Sonata No. 29, has only one manuscript source, the CIC 110 manuscript. In the newer editions, however, all three editors set about tackling this unique challenge in their respective editions. In the *Tocatas* it appears as *Fuga para orgão*, with a designation of *Molto calmo*. As to be expected, copious slurs and dynamic markings (including cresc. and dimuendos) are provided for, although in this instance, there is no attached minuet as a secondary movement. Interestingly, the filling-in of textures is not so pronounced, and the presence of brackets for the tempo of *Andante* indicate a closer kinship to the manuscript than other tocatas in the edition. Kastner’s editorial prowess in this same work moves him to title it in PM 34 as *Sonata lá menor –Fuga para órgão* (Sonata No. 22), with a tempo designation devoid of brackets as *Andante – Fuga*. As expected, it is very urtext in its approach, and akin to the rest of the sonatas in PM 34, lacks the slurs, and dynamic indications of the *Tocatas*. However, Kastner’s filling-in of textures is somewhat closer in a comparative analysis to the *Tocatas*. For example, from m. 38 to the end, a series of suspensions, with a thickening of textures that builds at brief moments to four voices (among predominant ebbs and flows of 2-3-part textures), is more similar in its filling-in than the D major sonata previously discussed. Beyond these more subtle differences in the filling-in of textures, pitch material is similar between these two editions, although Kastner replaces trills with the mordents in the *Tocatas*. 
Doderer simply designates this work as *Sonata XXX*, with a tempo of *Andante*. His critical commentary provides the original title found in the manuscript CIC 110 as *Tocata 33./ p.a orgão*, and the tempo designation *And e. fuga*. His layout is decidedly *urtext*, with no dynamic suggestions, slurs, or articulations. From a comparative analysis of all three newer editions, pitch is almost identical, although in m. 42 in beat three, the right hand leaps down to a C instead of an A after the tie. Other differences relate to ornamentation, where Doderer provides trills in m. 49, whereas in the *Tocatas* there are mordents, and in PM 34, there is no ornamentation at all. As to be expected, the filling-in of textures in this sonata is much less in the *Organica Hispanica* compared to the *Tocatas*, though is very close to PM 34. (See example 3.12)
These newer editions occur in a time period of Portuguese musical scholarship where the eighteenth century is slowly gaining more attention. An important study on Portuguese music history that is published in these later decades of the twentieth century is Rui Vieira Nery and Paulo Ferreira de Castro’s *Synthesis of Portuguese Culture*:
Of the more important arguments relating to the eighteenth century, their studies relating to Dom João V and the Patriarchal Seminary are of particular interest. They believe that this institution was not only a training ground for prominent composers, but also had an impact on the proliferation of important musical genres, which in turn influenced public taste. In the realm of sacred music, young children up to the ages of eight to ten who were deemed brilliant in musical promise (if castrated, older boys were also permitted), were inculcated in the rigors of the Seminary’s pedagogical regime. As important as the Seminary was in teaching and performing, Dom João V also sent talented protégés to study abroad in Rome, Italy. Seixas stands as a notable exception to this practice, and never traveled abroad. They do note how the sacred vocal works of Seixas are in no way to be discounted in relation to his other works, where his mass demonstrates the “same melodic inspiration and rhythmic force of his best keyboard sonatas.”

Concerning aspects of Seixas’s keyboard oeuvre, Nery and Castro reaffirm the importance of Kastner’s and Doderer’s research in a variety of aspects, especially in relation to the minuets. Regarding the lesson/encounter of Scarlatti and Seixas, they posit that Scarlatti may have been merely displaying affectations towards the royal family in declaring Seixas as the “Giant” to curry favor, yet unquestionably, such an assertion affirms that “the work of Seixas does not leave doubt as to the profound creative originality of this author and—by extension—of the Portuguese harpsichord school of
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this period.” They may be seen to disagree with Vasconcellos/Fernandes concerning nomenclature, as they consider the *tocata* and *sonata* as synonymous. However, they do align themselves with notions of Seixas as possessing more “simple” two-part forms as well as three-part structures that foreshadow the sonata form of the Classical era.

Organologically, Nery/Castro draw upon the scholarship of Doderer, and deem that it is difficult to assign specific instruments to his keyboard works, most of which are written for the harpsichord, clavichord, and organ. In relation to Kastner’s research, they stress the importance of Seixas’s orchestral works, including the *Overture in D Major*, and the *Sinfonia in B Flat*, as well as his harpsichord concerto as documenting some of the first appearances of these genres on the Iberian Peninsula.\(^{202}\)

After PM 34, Kastner also contributes in the later decades of the twentieth century to this new flowering of musical scholarship in Portugal. One of his last articles, *Sus inquietudes entre lo barroco y lo preromántico*,\(^{203}\) was published in 1988, and reminisces about his long life in musicology since 1932. In his earliest days, he notes the caution and hesitations of his assertions, not to mention the enormous time demands that his research required. It is only in these last few decades of the twentieth century that he has been able to witness a tremendous boon in musicology relating to Spain and Portugal. In a surge of new analytical studies and publications relating to Iberia, he comments upon a gravitation towards Scarlatti, which he defines as *Scarlattismo*. Such a fixation on

\(^{202}\)Ibid.

Scarlatti is analogous to the dominance of musicology devoted to J.S. Bach in Germany that overly championed him at the expense of other notable contemporaries.  At this later date in his professional career, Kastner is no longer shackled to any timidity about defending what may be seen as controversial in his many decades of research. The salient points of this article can be seen as a solidification of what were to become his most important assertions in a long career devoted primarily to Seixas. For example, in Spain, musical style and keyboard traditions in the first half of the eighteenth century predated the so-called influences of Domenico Scarlatti. He finds corroboration in this argument with Román Escalas in his edition of Jose Nebra’s *Tocatas y Sonata para Organo o Clave* (1987). Kastner can firmly assert at this juncture that Spain and Portugal were closely tied during Seixas’s life, and what marks a Spanish keyboard style and performance tradition, is directly relevant to Portugal. He maintains that in modern times, it is still impossible to firmly establish what instruments Seixas had at his disposal, although the Instrumental Museum of Lisbon possesses a few keyboard instruments from the eighteenth century.

Beyond the more general discussion of an Iberian keyboard tradition, Kastner specifically discusses selected sonatas of Seixas. He draws exclusively upon his own publications from the *Cravistas*, PM 10, and PM 34 for all citation and discussion. To begin with, there is an incredible amount of diversity in the first movements which follow the bipartite structure. Seixas is one of the earliest pioneers in composing multi-movement solo keyboard sonatas, and as such, it is important to examine the contrasting
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tempi between movements. Sonata No. 25 from PM 10 provides an excellent example where its varying tempi are Allegro, Adagio, Minuet. Formally, the first movement is clearly bipartite and has much symmetry amidst a variety of contrasting ideas. Texturally, the second movement is a dramatic contrast, where its two-voice texture is ornamented.

Kastner identifies 106 sonatas, eleven of which possess Empfindsamkeit qualities so intrinsic to Seixas’s pen. Sonata No. 43 from PM 10 for example, whose bipartite first movement is in a tempo of moderato, is among the most melancholic and heartbreaking of the sonatas. For Kastner, its sonorities and idiomatic exploitation stands on par with any German contemporary, including C. P. E. Bach. The secondary movement, a minuet in F major, foreshadows the elegance of Mozart’s minuets in Don Giovanni. Concluding his discussion on Seixas’s musical style, he notes that despite the presence of only a handful of sacred vocal manuscripts, they are nonetheless exemplary demonstrations of a well-honed mastery of vocal polyphony and style, and equal, if not surpass, many of his Italian contemporaries.206

Kastner’s obituary was written by Ivan Moody after his passing away in the summer of 1999 in Lisbon.207 He notes that Kastner’s last publications were more personal, yet only one fragment of his vast research. Much of his later work was unpublished, and simply written for discussion with personal friends. One of these articles was Manierismo en la Música de Teclado Ibérica siglos XVI-XVII, which was mailed to Moody for personal discussion. He notes that after Kastner died in his home on
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May 12, 1999, the funeral services held at the Orthodox cathedral were attended by a very large number of people including colleagues, students, and friends. Before his arrival in Portugal in 1934, Kastner’s studies began in his native London followed by periods of study in Amsterdam and Leipzig. It was his harpsichord studies with Juan Gilbert Camins and musicology training with Higini Anglès that were to provide the most inspirational. As a noted keyboard pedagogue and an expert in both harpsichord and clavichord, he was affiliated with the National Conservatory of Lisbon and his pupils came from all over the world.
3.4 Seixas, *Saudades*, and the Postmodern Paradigm (1995-2012)

The publication of *The Critical Editing of Music: History, Method, and Practice* by James Grier in 1996 has impacted the field in various ways. His discussion not only encompasses aspects of the editing process itself, but also raises questions on the editor’s authority. He goes as far as to say that editorial decisions are directly correlated to an editor’s social, political, and economical situation, and thus, in the pursuit of a definitive edition, an objective representation is impossible. As such, editing, as an interpretive endeavor, is far from being an exact science. In his historical overview of the opposing camps of urtext versus performing editions, he notes that a wide variety of conditions inevitably effect individual editions before they go to press. Relating how performers often have an impact on these editions, it is important to gauge how changing times and customs effect the portrayal of musical symbols and their semiotic values. In a retrospective appraisal of good and bad modern editions through detailed source studies and performance practice, modern and future editors will best adhere to four general principles of editing: (a) acknowledge that editing is critical in nature; (b) criticism, including editing, is based in historical inquiry; (c) editing involves the critical evaluation of the semiotic import of the musical text, this evaluation is also a historical inquiry; and, (d) the final arbiter in the critical evaluation of the musical text is the editor’s conception.
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of musical style, a conception that is also rooted in a historical understanding of the work.\(^{209}\)

Modern editions of Seixas’s music provide a wide panorama of the changing approaches to musical style and performance practice during the twentieth century. No matter how controversial or divergent these editorial manifestations may be in terms of historical propriety, especially in relation to the filling-in of textures, there is no question that the editors under discussion were accomplished keyboardists and that such skill was an important factor in determining and dating their choices.

In regards to Scarlatti editions, as a keyboardist and scholar, W. Dean Sutcliffe notes how a substantial amount of his scholarly insight comes from extensive periods of performance and countless hours of examining scores. In a modern, forward-looking methodology, Sutcliffe reveals how his election to include parameters of recording and reception histories in his decades of research for publication of *The Keyboard Sonatas of Domenico Scarlatti and Eighteenth-Century Musical Style* in 2003 were just as essential as his performing background.\(^{210}\) Concerning recording histories, Sutcliffe determines that in Wanda Landowska’s recording of Scarlatti’s Sonata K. 107, her slowing down for melismatic flourishes is indicative of her interpretation of trends in Spanish *cante jondo*. Other exaggerated effects by recording artists include Mikhail Pletnev’s inclusion of accents in accompanimental gestures to suggest elements of the Spanish dance, notably the *seguidilla*. By straddling performance and interpretive contexts of Spanish dance
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stylizations, Sutcliffe questions whether such perceptions are more portraits of the
performer than genuine Spanish musical style.

Another aspect related to the influence of popular dances in the Iberian
eighteenth-century keyboard repertory is the belief that the human body itself is “shaped”
in real time as the hands and physical gestures of the keyboardist contort themselves
during dance-inspired sonatas. In a literal sense, the physical necessities required in
realizing certain passages may help in defining a particular dance as well as providing
clues to dance choreography. Consequently, it is advantageous to search for those
sonatas requiring unique bodily expressions such as Scarlatti’s Sonata K. 327 in C
Major.²¹¹

The obvious and so many times ignored importance of the human body in shaping
musical composition and performance has been highlighted by Elisabeth Le Guin in her
2006 book Boccherini’s Body: An Essay in Carnal Musicology.²¹² It brought a much-
needed depth into the physical aspects of performance in a process she coined carnal
musicology. One of the most important aspects of this analytical approach involves
understanding a composer’s musical style in addition to the composer as a “living”
person through analysis of the physical state of the human body during performance.

At the heart of carnal musicology is the attempt to “bodily” understand an
eighteenth-century human’s condition. For instance, imagining how composers suffered
from illness and injuries in the eighteenth century without pain killers supports the notion
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²¹²Elisabeth Le Guin, Boccherini’s Body: An Essay in Carnal Musicology (Los Angeles: University of
California Press, 2006).
that a release from their pain could have been composing and playing a musical instrument such as the cello. From such a stance, in the most literal sense, performers of Boccherini’s cello music can experience aspects of what he felt during his compositional process through the act of studying and performing his music. Le Guin accordingly states that performers not only develop a profound connection to the composer, but literally “become” him through repeated bodily involvement in performance and study of the score. Inevitably, the performer undergoes such profound changes that a corporeal education initiates foreboding insights into mutual feelings, habits, and choices.

Le Guin relates how in 1993 a team of doctors from the University of Pisa, Italy, exhumed and conducted a postmortem on Boccherini’s body. It was determined from the coroner’s report that among the factors contributing to his death, including tuberculosis, his activities as a cellist were also linked. As morbid as it may be, such knowledge opens a new vista into Boccherini’s compositions, and in application of carnal musicology in this instance, the performer more easily feels an embodiment of his consumption. Freely admitting that carnal musicology is a subjective and volatile methodology, Le Guin nonetheless suggests that only through this approach can hidden clues to Boccherini’s wry stylistic features, his cadences that resonate to literal parts of the body, and even musical elements that anticipate an imminent death, be better detected.213

Seixas’s keyboard music also contains elements of bodily expression that demand research and investigation. Hand-crossings from both Scarlatti and Seixas provide an interesting arena of investigation where the distinct physical differences help in
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identifying the many layers and mixtures of musical styles in their respective sonatas. As Sutcliffe notes, in Seixas’s hand-crossings, they are at times more abrupt and not as elegant as Scarlatti’s, although what may seem to be an overabundance of hand-crossing as a virtuosic effect may be an artistic expression inherently present, inviting a challenge to “our priorities and perceptions from a hidden position of strength.”

In appreciating these hidden layers of musical style, Sutcliffe looks towards those aspects that have been traditionally seen as weaknesses. Erroneously, these supposed “weaknesses” of early-eighteenth-century keyboard sonatas, including a supposed overabundance of “cadences as musical syntax,” can be seen in not only works of Scarlatti, but in his contemporaries, including Marcello, Galuppi, Platti, and Seixas. All of these instances warrant a special degree of sensitivity to the unique temporal moment of musical style in this part of the eighteenth century. As Sutcliffe explains:

> It is difficult for us now to appreciate the vigor of 18th-century tonal language from this point of view – repeated cadential formations were new and an exciting thing, they must have given a sense of freedom. Our ears are more geared to 19th-century ideals, precisely when such considerations lead to a weakening of tonal logic.

The variance of musical styles in these composers are not to be ignored either, as Scarlatti tended to avoid the rather “standard diction of the Baroque sequence,” and Seixas had a marked predilection for slow movements.
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Sutcliffe notes that although there are still a few adherents to Kirkpatrick's pairing of sonatas and chronologies, most scholarship has been able to move beyond his outdated research:

What rendered Kirkpatrick's wholly traditional narrative rather incredible, if not absurd, was that he believed the dates of copying almost coincided with those of composition. … While sonatas undoubtedly were brought together to make pairs on the basis of key, the notion that they were also brought together on the much wider and less quantifiable basis of style and language, in both, seems highly unlikely … The very fact that each work carries the separate title ‘Sonata’ (of which this study has made much) in the primary sources alone is a great blow against the theory.217

Concerning keyboard organology, Kirkpatrick's original contributions are also debated. While Kirkpatrick has claimed that the harpsichord was Scarlatti’s intended instrument for most of his solo sonatas, and this opinion is still replicated once in a while, musicologists such as Sheveloff and David Sutherland point out that Scarlatti was a great advocate for the early fortepiano, and helped champion this instrument through extensive travels. Sutcliffe argues that in the eighteenth century various keyboard instruments were more homogenous in their sound qualities than what we might perceive today, and as such, there emerge paradigm shifts concerning Scarlatti writing sonatas for specific keyboard instruments. It is reasoned that although Scarlatti was acutely attuned to sonority and thus would not be indifferent to sound capabilities of particular instruments, it is nonetheless “difficult to imagine any keyboard composer, including Scarlatti, schizophrenically conceding first one sonata or group of sonatas for one instrument …”
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Misguided assessments regarding a “classical” style as time-bounded and geographically ensconced have inhibited an appreciation of the wide variety and value of compositions during the eighteenth century. As Sutcliffe laments, the “looming edifice of Classicism, so tightly defined and entrenched in its stylistic and aesthetic values, has made it very difficult to deal with the vast quantity of ‘surrounding’ music without a bad conscience.” The musicological consensus concerning the end of the Baroque period around 1720 and the beginnings of the Viennese Classicism in 1780 yielded “a period of uncertainty and transition of some 60 years, comprising most of the 18th century,” which gives the transitional period more decades than the actual Classical era itself.\textsuperscript{218}

These pitfalls of periodization are also expounded upon by Robert Gjerdingen in his 2007 book \textit{Music in the Galant Style},\textsuperscript{219} which also notes the importance of the performance perspective in approaching musical style of the eighteenth century. Providing an analogy in which the modern paradigm of “Baroque” is used to define eighteenth-century music epitomized by J. S. Bach and Classical” in a likewise manner to W. A. Mozart is as accurate as generalizing that all historical buildings are either Tudor or Colonial. Thus, Gjerdingen narrows and defines a newer approach in defining a \textit{galant} musical style by shifting focus away from entrenched nineteenth and twentieth-century paradigms. A key element of such shifting is to examine and interpret as best as possible the social and cultural milieu of our own modernity. By consciously acknowledging our modern-day sensibilities, we are able to prevent projecting such
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behaviors onto the past. Such pitfalls are easily witnessed in the movie industry that overly focuses on eighteenth-century drawings, clothing, and literary sources, yet simultaneously ignores behavioral, social, and cultural aspects, including the social graces and etiquette of day-to-day living. As an example, Gjerdingen provides a scenario in which a young man greets his mother with a “hello,” which from our modern-day vantage point is entirely natural, yet from an eighteenth-century standpoint is as out of place as a modern young man greeting his mother with “ahoy.” If in our modern day we are unconsciously, too easily projecting such behaviors dramatically with costumes, scenery, and quotations, logically, Gjerdingen proceeds to ask if we're doing the same thing in trying to understand eighteenth-century musical style by ignoring analogous “behavioral” aspects in music of the *galant*. He inquires:

Could composers have had, as their ‘principal object of attention,’ the acquisition of musical manners – ‘engaging, insinuating, shining manners’ – in order to give their works ‘full lustre?’ Could recognizing the prestige value of a ‘superior gracefulness’ in musical behavior have required that one ‘observe minute’ differences and ‘established models’ to which, over the intervening centuries, we have become less sensitive?

Gjerdingen draws upon modern scholars as well as his own research in asserting that:

a hallmark of the galant style was a particular repertory of stock musical phrases employed in conventional sequences. Local and personal preferences among patrons and musicians resulted in presentations of this repertory that favored different positions along various semantic axes – light/heavy, comic/serious, sensitive/bravura, and so on. But as long as the music is grounded in this repertory of stock musical phrases, I view all its manifestations as *galant*.  

Thus, in light of a terrain of musical styles so varied as to encompass “tightly woven fugues, sacred masses with full chorus, complex orchestral works, grand scenes of
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serious opera, tedious pedagogical works, fantastic *bravura* works – everything, in short, to serve the diverse needs of the courts and wealthy homes of galant patrons,”

Gjerdingen hones in on his argument as to why it is so important to focus on the essence of the musical *galant* as an etiquette of social conduct in both normal and court life. He acknowledges that such a paradigm is a radical departure from older, popular notions of the *galant* musical style, which date back to the nineteenth century. In the nineteenth century, the *galant* would be more tied to impressions of courtly composers in their artistic solitary struggles, striving to advance the great meaning of art, while baring their tumultuous inner selves on their coat sleeves. Instead, for Gjerdingen “the notion that a sad piece by the court composer was about the composer’s sadness would have seemed just as strange as the idea that a tart sauce prepared by the court chef was about the chef’s darkness.” Arguing this stance from a compositional standpoint, Gjerdingen makes an analogy akin to how a figure skater employs a series of free-style “figures” in judicious sequences, be they “salchows, axels, lutzes, and camels.” In music, so too does the eighteenth-century composer employ like figures of a “quiescenza, fonte combinations, ponte,” in musical composition. These figures, or schemata, when recognizable, provide a remarkable new vista in appreciating a *galant* style where the listener was familiar with the sundry schemata in not only playing, but in listening as well.

A vital component of these schemata was the *partimento*, which Gjerdingen defines as an instructional bass line given to eighteenth-century accompanists that served as:
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a virtual ensemble that played in the mind of the student and became sound
through realization at the keyboard. In behavioral terms, the partimento which
often changed clefs temporarily to become any voice in the virtual ensemble,
provided a series of stimuli to a series of schemata… From seeing only one
feature of a particular schema – any one of its characteristic parts – the student
learned to complete the entire pattern, and in doing so committed every aspect of
the schema to memory. The result was fluency in the style and the ability to
'speak' a courtly language\textsuperscript{222}

The \textit{Romanesca} as one of the schemata of this \textit{galant} paradigm, though possessive of
varying \textit{partimenti}, nonetheless could be identified by many parameters whose origins
stem as early as the sixteenth century in Italy. The \textit{Romanesca} would eventually take on
characteristics in the eighteenth century where filling-in of texture is characteristic of
double thirds in the upper voice above a bass line whose contour rises and falls in fifth
relationships.

In the sonatas of Seixas there are very few instances where the manuscripts
contain a figured bass. One such example, \textit{Tocata 28} from the Coimbra manuscript fifty-
seven (PM 10:56, Cravistas II:13), a single-movement work in G minor, is legible with
all of its notes and figures. From this manuscript, it is conceivable that there were no
difficulties presented for Kastner in his modern editions, as \textit{Cravistas II} and PM 10
possess no deviations between them. An economical route was chosen in both of these
editions, where dynamic markings and possible suggestions for filling-in the textures was
avoided, although a suggested tempo of \textit{Allegro} in parenthesis and brackets was added.
The only symbols deliberately avoided in the manuscript were markings of \textit{P.o} and \textit{F.l},
placed above the staves in mm. 20-21, and mm. 30-31.
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From Kastner’s economical approach in transcribing these figures rather than providing extensive filling-in of textures, slurs, dynamics, and articulations, it may be said that such editorial practice is a reflection on how a later postmodern era tends to shy away from more elaborate editorial license. By foregrounding Seixas’s keyboard compositions in modern editions alongside an ever-changing paradigm shift of organological considerations, especially the importance of the fortepiano in Portuguese keyboard music in the first half of the eighteenth century, a decentralization of outdated views of the earlier to mid-twentieth century inevitably occurs. In place of these outdated views, a larger picture of Seixas’s music emerges, embedded within an Iberian keyboard tradition. It is in this larger picture that analytical tools as diverse as carnal musicology are most useful in going beyond the confines of the written score, placing music back into the bodies of performers, and excising simpler, pejorative viewpoints.

In 1995 David Sutherland provided a chronology of changing organological views for keyboard music of the eighteenth century starting as early as Kirkpatrick’s research in the mid-twentieth century to more modern times. In his article, *Domenico Scarlatti and the Florentine Piano*, he demonstrates how some outdated views and paradigms tenaciously hold on, stubbornly resisting change. He relates that after Kirkpatrick’s *Domenico Scarlatti* in 1953:

> for many years thereafter the question of Scarlatti’s instrument seem to be settled: Scarlatti played and composed for the five-octave, single-manual, 2 x 8’ Spanish harpsichord with Cyprus case and cedar belly, made in the Italian fashion (the
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Sutherland examines several rebuttals to Kirkpatrick starting with mention of Joel Sheveloff’s 1970 dissertation, moving to 1985 with Eva Badura-Skoda who later concurs with Sheveloff that the forte piano is equally as important as the harpsichord, and finally on to Stewart Pollen who suggests that the three extant Cristofori pianos are suitable not only for Scarlatti, but Giustini and Seixas’s keyboard music as well.

Sutherland notes that as early as the 1730’s, fortepianos from Florence were already in Lisbon, and importantly, one of the first compositions intended for the new instrument, Lodovico Giustini’s *Sonate da cimbalò di piano, e forte, detto volgarmente di martelleti* was dedicated to Dom Antonio de Bragança a Portuguese pupil of Scarlatti. On the dedication page of these sonatas, Sutherland points out that it is not signed by Giustini, but by a certain “Giovanni da Seixas,” whom Sutherland queries might be somehow related to Carlos Seixas. As Robert Stevenson has pointed out in 1968, both Barbosa Machado and Mazza contain biographical information on Giovanni, actually João de Seixas, showing that the connection, first ventilated by Rosamund Harding in her 1933 facsimile edition of Giustini, is highly improbable. Giovanni da Seixas was actually the Brazilian João Seixas da Fonseca, born in Rio de Janeiro in 1681, who moved to Italy sometime before 1732, where he was ordained Bishop and had Giustini’s sonatas printed and dedicated to Dom Antonio.225
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Regardless of the relationship between João Seixas da Fonseca and Carlos Seixas, the fortepiano in Portugal during the third decade of the eighteenth century was a popular instrument, at least in aristocratic circles. Decades after the early days of the martelleti in the 1730’s, a growing tradition for the piano becomes increasingly apparent, evidenced in part by three extant Portuguese pianos, one of which was constructed by Manuel Antunes in 1767. Armed with an arsenal of these newer organological considerations, Sutherland paves the way to change Kirkpatrick’s assumptions of the early pianoforte as merely an accompanying instrument during Seixas’ and Scarlatti’s lives. Besides this newer evidence, Sutherland re-examines a feature of one of the principal harpsichords of Dona Maria Bárbara that possesses a unique device for transposing, and questions why solo repertoire would have a use for this. It would be more logical for such a device to be used in accompanying, not in solo keyboard music.226

In the same year of Sutherland’s article in 1995, an influential reference book on keyboard literature by F. E. Kirby, *Music for Piano*,227 stubbornly resists incorporating findings of recent research. In Kirby’s section concerning early eighteenth-century keyboard music of Spain and Portugal, there is a marked gap of information on composers and their works in comparison to earlier centuries. Citing one of the principal composers for organ as Juan Cabanilles, Kirby notes that despite his organ works, there is relatively little information at the present time about the type and extent of keyboard music. It would appear that Domenico Scarlatti was the igniting spark, at least in the area of music for stringed keyboard instruments. … After Scarlatti
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we have a handful of composers, some of whom were his students, who were
influenced by him and follow in his footsteps.\textsuperscript{228}

Now seen to have been widely disputed and deemed erroneous, such assertions
nonetheless go in tandem with other outdated statements popularly cited, where Seixas is
placed along other Iberians, including Soler and Manuel Blasco de Nebra, as simply
following in the tradition of Scarlatti. One year after, another popular keyboard reference
is Stewart Gordon’s \textit{A History of Keyboard Literature: Music for Piano and its
Forerunners},\textsuperscript{229} which concurs, and basically reiterates what Kirby says in his section on
Spain and Portugal. However, Gordon is more specific about organological
considerations in Seixas’s keyboard music.\textsuperscript{230}

It would take a decade after these books for a major Portuguese publication
specifically devoted to stringed-keyboard instruments of Portugal to emerge by Gerard
Doderer and John Henry Van der Meer, \textit{Cordofones de Tecla Portugueses do Século
XVIII: Clavicórdios, Cravos, Pianofortes e Espinetas}\textsuperscript{231} that could finally lay to rest so
many erroneous assumptions. This book provides many starting points for research,
particularly its enormous quantity of instruments that are methodically described and
photographed. From the illustrations alone, one can easily peruse issues of range,
casings, strings, registration, action, among other details, related to stringed-keyboard
instruments of Seixas’s epoch to the middle of the nineteenth century. For example, an
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illustration of a clavichord built during the first quarter of the eighteenth century, catalogued with the number MM 406, can be seen to have one of its keys missing (A2) with a range of forty-seven keys. The verbal description notes that there is a short bass octave, and “judging by the cranking of the keys, this clavichord may have had a fretting system.”232 From the illustration it is obvious that this clavichord has been ravaged by the passage of time, yet its reddish-maroon interior delicately balances its green exterior, which together with its rectangular shape, lends important information regarding a Portuguese identity.

Concerning a general history of clavichord construction from the eighteenth century, Doderer expounds upon the interesting fact that manufacture of clavichords in Portugal lasted well into the nineteenth century. In comparison to Europe’s northern regions as far as Scandinavia, the clavichord’s importance in Portugal cannot be discounted. In fact, Doderer argues that Portuguese clavichord manufacturing outlasted the countries of Germany and Sweden by several decades. As clavichord construction continued from its earlier days in the eighteenth century to the nineteenth, it is interesting to note that manufacturing techniques changed little over time; further, it can be seen that the cases of clavichords from Portugal are always rectangular, and any other geometric shape such as a trapezoid will signify a foreign harpsichord. Although information about clavichord construction during Seixas’s life is still comparatively scant to later eras, this bit of information alone is a considerable boon in keyboard research.
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Concerning other stringed keyboard instruments, information is also limited, although some specific biographical details of instrument makers are available such as Manuel Antunes (1707-1796). Antunes was a direct contemporary of Seixas, who lived eighty-nine years. He was a resident of the parish Our Lady of the Incarnation and a member of the same professional guild of mechanical crafts as his father, Julião Antunes. Doderer notes that it is still unknown as to where Manuel Antunes learned the art of harpsichord building, although by the age of fifty-three, he had made an official petition to the King describing himself as a superior builder to gain a monopoly on manufacturing keyboards in 1760. On April 21st of that year, the king of Portugal approved Antunes’s request for a period of no less than ten years, although at least one instrument built during his appointment in 1767 received some assistance from his brother Joaquim José.233

From the written approval of the King, it can be conjectured that Antunes was no small talent, and that his innovations to keyboard instruments were a considerable improvement. In his declaration, the King formally acknowledges that instruments are often lacking, that:

> a new way of manufacture of those instruments has been presented to me by Manuel Antunes, master of musical instruments, a result of his invention, the action of the harpsichords with hammers being displayed and built in such a manner that it avoids the faulty improprieties experienced and unpleasantly filled by players, namely their jingling and lack of readiness of the keys, which voices either get mixed up and do not come off causing great harm or confusion, or make themselves imperceptible and the delicate fragilities of the melody are greatly obstructed technically: he asks me to give him the exclusive privilege of manufacture within a period of 10 years, in order to make the best use of the invention referred to and to protect it from similar products within the Kingdom or any instruments of the same fashion and type coming from abroad.234
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Following upon Antunes’s ten-year monopoly as keyboard instrument builder, the German-born Carlos Mathias Bostem enters the stringed-keyboard manufacturing business in Portugal. Among Bostem’s important contributions are the conversions of harpsichords to forte pianos, some of which are now at the Museum of Music in Lisbon. Bostem enjoyed success not only in his manufacture of instruments, but in his royal functions of instrument maintenance that garnered a hefty salary. As Doderer explains:

Bostem must have begun the real marketing of his instruments only in the 1770s: in this year the privilege of Manuel Antunes expired. In the Gazeta de Lisboa the sale of a fortepiano made by Bostem was announced together with his final address Rua da Emenda no. 17. Besides being responsible for the upkeep of the harpsichords in the royal palace from 1769 onwards for a fee of 6,400 réis a year, Bostem also took upon himself the function of ‘harpsichord player of the Royal Chamber’ for a salary of 3,200 réis a month.

In an article published in 2007, Doderer notes that some changes of Bostem’s instruments were made after he died. He seems to have carried very much in the traditions of keyboard building in Portugal while he was alive, yet in some aspects, he did not copy all of Antunes’s innovations. Doderer relates:

Bostem’s inner construction concepts, mechanic and soundboard system do not indicate greater differences compared with the preserved instruments from Lisbon builders before the last quarter of the 18th century. In this way, he kept on the proper Portuguese national tradition of string keyboard building. However, the escapement jacks of his original fortepiano (1777) are not as Manuel Antunes used them in the 1760’s, but are following the Cristofori outlay.\textsuperscript{235}

Intriguingly, of the four extant instruments of Bostem today, only one is playable, a spinet that dates from 1785, which is currently in the Museu Imperial in Petrópolis, Brazil. It was used for the soundtrack of *Chica da Silva*, a popular soap opera in Brazil.\textsuperscript{236}

In the same year of Doderer’s publication on stringed-keyboard instruments, Eleanor Selfridge-Field published the article *Domenico Scarlatti and the Florentine Piano*,\textsuperscript{237} which puzzles over why the newly invented instrument was not so popular in its native Italy for the first three decades of its existence. As she notes, it is remarkable that a publication of compositions specifically for the new instrument took as much time, and that:

> within the microcosm of Italian history, however, the Cristofori forte piano was all but stillborn. More than 30 years passed before any music for the instrument was published. Why was the instrument so ignored on its native soil? Why was its sound not found captivating?\textsuperscript{238}

Unlike Sutherland, Selfridge-Field concludes that the Brazilian priest João de Seixas da Fonseca “has no demonstrated relationship to the important Portuguese keyboard composer José António Carlos de Seixas (1704-42), who may have been a pupil of Domenico Scarlatti in the early 1720s.”\textsuperscript{239} She deduces that the probable reason for publication of these earliest sonatas by Giustini was the death of its inventor, Bartolomeo Cristofori in 1732.

In 2008, the renewed interest for early Iberian keyboard culture became evident in the two-day International Symposium of Spanish Keyboard Music “Diego Fernández,”

\textsuperscript{236}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{237}Eleanor Selfridge-Field, “The Invention of the Fortepiano as Intellectual History,” *Early Music* 33/1 (February 2005): 81-94.
\textsuperscript{238}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{239}Ibid.
held in Almería, Spain.\textsuperscript{240} New insights were provided by Stewart Pollen, who pointed out the relationship between dynamic indications and organology, by Michale Latcham, who brought “evolutionary” perspectives in relation to the historical overview of the instruments of Dona Maria Bárbara, and by Gerhard Doderer who focused upon Scarlatti and his relationship to Portugal. Doderer argued that there was an “immediate acceptance” of Cristofori’s early fortepianos in Portugal, whose presence demands that Carlos Seixas’s keyboard music should be regarded as intentionally conceived for the new instrument. In so much of Seixas’s music there is to be found the “expressive and aesthetic correlations in compositional procedures themselves and in a number of stylistic and functional keyboard elements.”\textsuperscript{241}

Musicologist João Pedro D’Alvarenga has been carrying out cutting-edge research on Seixas, and has recently published two articles, \textit{Carlos Seixas: Um esboço biográfico e uma leitura sintética da sua obra}\textsuperscript{242} (2006) and \textit{Some Preliminaries in Approaching Carlos Seixas’s Keyboard Sonatas}\textsuperscript{243} (2009). The first article brings a large amount of new data concerning the biography of Seixas, including the whereabouts of his address in Lisbon near the Church of St. Anthony in the Alfama district. Although the earthquake is known to have annihilated Seixas’s houses, a complex of residential and commercial buildings near the Church of Saint Anthony might very well be the location of his

\textsuperscript{240}Gerard Doderer, “Scarlatti and the Portuguese Connection,” \textit{Early Music} 36/1 (February 2008): 159-60.
\textsuperscript{241}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{242}João Pedro de D’Alvarenga, “Carlos Seixas: Um esboço biográfico e uma leitura sintética da sua obra,” \textit{Aguas Furtadas: Revista de Literatura, Música e Artes visuais} 10 (October 2006): 164-78.
destroyed houses. The archaic directions state that his houses were situated along the street formerly known as “Rua Direita de Santo António.” Guideposts to find this street include the “Arch of Consolation,” which goes along the right-hand side of his street, where if one looks along the entire length of the street to the north side, one may see “the houses of where the widow of José António Carlos lived.” See figure 3.1 for a photograph of this complex.
Figure 3.1: Possible location of Carlos Seixas’s destroyed houses.

D’Alvarenga’s second article provides the only complete cataloguing of Seixas’s works with a numbering system referencing all known manuscripts. To date, the total number of authenticated sonatas is acknowledged as ninety-four. D’Alvarenga arranges his numbering system chronologically and chromatically by key, with a table for each
sonata commencing with relevant data including the catalog number, descriptions of
movements, sources, and modern editions.\textsuperscript{244}

Newer editions of Seixas’s keyboard music relating to new manuscript findings
also show an awareness for new editorial methods and a new musicological environment.
D’Alvarenga’s publication entitled \textit{12 Sonatas}\textsuperscript{245} brings for the first time a selection from
the manuscript P-Ln MM 5015, held at the National Library of Portugal. This is one of
the oldest manuscripts of Seixas’s music that might conceivably have been copied while
Seixas was still alive. Beyond the duplications of sonatas from other manuscripts in MM
5015, there are also many that appear for the first time in this edition. As D’Alvarenga
notes in his preface:

\begin{quote}
The twelve sonatas here published, including eight previously unpublished – no.
2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11, and 12 – are the contents of manuscript MM 5015 of the
Originally entitled Tocattas per Cembalo del sig. r Giuseppe Antonio Carlo e
Sexas, it is an oblong volume of 23 folios, richly bound, dating from the mid-18th
century – if not the first, then certainly one of the earliest known Seixas sources –
originating at the Monastery of Santa Cruz, Coimbra, of whose library it became
part on the death of its first owner, Dom Jerónimo da Encarnação, an organist
who was professed monk in 1729 and died in 1780.\textsuperscript{246}
\end{quote}

D’Alvarenga’s editorial methods are accounted for in his critical notes, which for the
second sonata reads as follows: “1st mvt. No tempo indication. B. 15 u a’, f\#’, c\#’, d’, b.
17 l, crotchet: f\#, 2nd mvt, “Adagio” 3rd mvt “all.” Assai,” with incorrect 2/8 time
signature.”\textsuperscript{247} In the following musical example, relevant to these critical notes, mm. 1-

\begin{footnotes}
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22 of the first movement are provided, as well as mm. 1-13 of the last movement. (See example 3.13)


In a comparative overview between the manuscript and this modern edition, it can be seen that the two-part texture is left as is. Of the noted pitch adjustments, the transposition to a major second above show the most executive license, although a
modern keyboardist can easily decide between the two versions from the critical notes. The suggestion of *Allegro* in brackets is entirely appropriate for the first movement as the other two contrasting tempo indications for the ensuing movements of *Adagio* and *Allegro Assai* are provided for in the manuscript. The correction of a 2/8 time signature to the 2/4 signature is entirely fitting.

Following D’Alvarenga’s 1995 publication, the newest edition of Seixas’s keyboard music, drawing upon sonatas from all known manuscripts to date, is *24 sonatas para instrumentos de tecla*, edited by Motoiwa Yato. In his preface, Yato explains that a primary objective of the edition is to celebrate the 300th anniversary of Seixas’s birthdate. Like so many editors before him, Yato stresses the sensitivity of Seixas’s style in certain sonatas, a sentiment intricately woven into the fabric of his music that is likened to “saudades in twilight.” He argues that Seixas’s sonatas are so remarkable in expressing this Portuguese feeling, that they transcend barriers of time. There is a strong analogy in the way modern fado sensations, including Carlos Paredes and Amália Rodriguez, express their *saudades* with some passages in Seixas’s works, particularly in Sonata No. 5 and Sonata No. 15 (PM 15 and PM 42 respectively). Directed in large part towards a domestic Japanese audience, Yato enquires of his readers if such *saudades* are restricted to Portugal, if at least in some aspects, similar sentiments can be appreciated in Japan also. He suggests such sensitivities can be translated into a performance practice that avoids pedantic, mechanical renditions devoid of emotional

---
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display. In addition to manuscript sources, Yato reveals that he has consulted past modern editions as early as Kastner’s *Cravistas* and PM 10 to Doderer’s *Organica Hispanica.*

Sonata No. 1 in C Major of Yato’s edition proves to be the most popular of all of Seixas’s keyboard music by number of appearances in manuscripts and modern editions. Table 3.1 details a chronology of its first appearance in manuscript copies in the later eighteenth century to Yato’s edition. It can be seen that all manuscript copies differ from one another, the most radical variances present in the collection of minuets in the manuscript at the Ajuda Palace. For example, this earliest manuscript possesses a 3/8 time signature and lack of tempo markings. Comparing it to the other manuscript sources, it can be seen that primary melodic material before and after the double bars vary considerably in their use of bass versus soprano cleffs, lack of ornamentation, and varying of thematic material, register, and phrase lengths. In manuscript 338, an indication of *Allegro* is provided in a meter of 3/4 that differs as much in its measure count as its ornamentation, grace notes, and cleffs. (See table 3.1)

---
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### Table 3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Copyist/Editor</th>
<th>Manuscript/Edition</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Measure ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Ajuda 48-i-2. Occurs as one of the sonatas, (number 35 in the manuscript copy) with no secondary movements.</td>
<td>Probably 1760’s</td>
<td>28:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Ajuda 48-i-2. Occurs as one of 56 titled minuets.</td>
<td>Probably 1760’s</td>
<td>24:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Biblioteca Nacional MM 338. Occurs as Sonata No. 5, with no secondary movements in a collection of various sonatas by Seixas and other composers.</td>
<td>1774-75</td>
<td>28:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Kastner</td>
<td>Cravistas I. Appearing as Sonata No. 5 with no secondary movements.</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>28:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Kastner</td>
<td>PM 10. Appearing as Sonata No. 6 with no secondary movements.</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>28:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerard Doderer</td>
<td>Organica Hispanica I. Appearing as Sonata No. 1 with no secondary movements.</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>28:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motoiwa Yato</td>
<td>24 sonatas para instrumentos de tecla. Appearing as Sonata No. 1 with no secondary movements.</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>28:33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A perusal of all modern editions of this keyboard work indicates that the manuscript 338 is the principal source of reference for all editors with little to no deviations from the original manuscript source. The greatest differences in modern editions are to be found with *Cravistas I* where Kastner provided dynamic markings; later
he omitted these dynamics in PM 10. The economical route Kastner elected to pursue in PM 10 would be followed by all modern editors with minor editorial divergences. For example, in Yato’s edition, m. 45 and m. 50 after the double bar possess an extra pickup note in the bass cleff that did not exist in Cravistas I. Incidentally, these same measures in Doderer’s Organica Hispanica do not provide this pickup note. (See example 3.14)


To be sure, there are other minor variances in these modern editions, yet curiously in the seventy-six years since the 1930’s revival, an urtext approach attempting to synthesize all variants of this composition from the three manuscripts was never undertaken. All editorial artistry was laid forth in attempting to reproduce as best as possible the manuscript 338 while simultaneously avoiding the controversial legacies of Cruz and Vasconcellos’s performance editions.

Appendix C is a transcription of this composition from the Ajuda Palace manuscript (P-La 48-i-2). It reveals that phrase grouping is considerably truncated and the melody not only alters in specific skips, but an entire re-writing of melodic content replaces certain key transitions such as in mm. 15-16. Harmonically, these same sections
explore more off-beat modal sonorities above a bass that lilts in its graceful quarter-eighth patterns towards the end rather than drive forward in repetitive quarters. This lilting change in the bass, along with the melodic repetition of transitional notes in more uniform two-bar phrasing as in mm. 15-16, may be seen as those elements contributing more to an elegant minuet than a driving toccata. Beyond a considerable reduction in measure numbers in both sections and re-writing of key phrases in certain groupings, the changes in register such as mm. 10-13, also produce quite a marked effect in performance considerations. In the 1960’s, when Heimes referred to this manuscript version in his dissertation as an “emancipated minuet,” with implications relating to a slower tempo, it can be seen that melody, harmony, range, and tempo indeed present important performance considerations. Whether or not this minuet should be played in a slower tempo, this manuscript provides a fascinating alternative for consideration in future editions. See appendix C.

Concerning the future for publication of Seixas’s compositions, at the time of this writing, at least one new edition is in progress, Seixas’s newly discovered Concerto in G Minor, edited by D’Alvarenga.251 The following excerpt of the first four measures reveal the same instrumentation as the A-major concerto, where a similar rhythmic figure of m. 2 and m. 4 is related to the anacrusis in both Seixas’s and Durante’s concerti. (See example 3.15)

251Carlos Seixas, Concerto a 4 com violinos e cravo, music manuscript, ed. João Pedro D’Alvarenga.
Besides Seixas’s Concerto in G Minor, at least one other keyboard concerto written in the eighteenth century has surfaced by José Palomino, a Spanish composer who worked at Lisbon’s Royal Chapel. The manuscript copy is at the National Library in Lisbon.252

From the perspective of a broader, Italo-Iberian tradition, Alberto Iesuè in his article Il concerto Italiano per tastiera nel XVIII secolo253 discloses that although a considerable number of early Italian concerti have recently surfaced, dating these manuscripts proves daunting. However, at least some concerti can be safely placed before 1750, such as the harpsichord concertos of Benedetto Platti and Giovanni Battista Martini. Still others may be placed in this time frame based on musical style (including


---

252 José Palomino, *Concerto: O sia quintet per cembalo o piano forte: con due violini, violetta e basso*, music manuscript, Biblioteca Nacional de Portugal, Lisbon (MM 209//1)

the concerti of Baldassare Galuppi), although this is much riskier. Thus, with the emergence of these concertos, a new paradigm begins to emerge concerning this genre in Italy and the Iberian Peninsula. With the opening up of new archives in Portugal, notably the Torre de Tombo in Lisbon, there are hopes that more keyboard works will emerge to confirm or change the established paradigms of musical style and genre.

Embarking upon a recording discography and reception history of performances of Seixas’s music in commercial recordings might also provide newer insights into re-shaping ideas of musical style. Table 3.2 provides a brief overview of selected recordings of Seixas’s keyboard music over the past forty years. From an organological standpoint, it can be seen that an incredible variety of keyboard instruments have been used, including the carillon. The editions used in these recordings have drawn upon Kastner’s *Cravistas* and PM 10, as well as later editions of the *Organica Hispanica* volumes. Because so many different instruments have been used, including historically refurbished instruments such as the Braga Cathedral organ in Portugal and the Cristofori/Gerrini 1730 fortepianos, a wide new field is available to musicologists wishing to explore these new dimensions of organological and stylistic possibilities. (See table 3.2)

---

Table 3.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performer</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Edition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Cook</td>
<td>Harpsichord Frank Hubbard, Double Manual, 2 x 8, 1x4</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Cravistas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerard Doderer</td>
<td>Organ Braga Cathedral</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Organica Hispanica, PM 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremilde Rosado Fernandes</td>
<td>Pianoforte B. Cristofori/G. Ferrini 1730</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Organica Hispanica, PM 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Débra Halász</td>
<td>Copy of 1734 Hass By Lutz Werum 2 8’, 4’, 16,’ lute and Buffer register, possibly pedals.</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>PM 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In table 3.3, a snapshot of selected festivals devoted to Seixas’s music reveal how within Portugal itself, both visiting and domestic artists are just as interested in Seixas’s music today as they were in the 1930’s revival. A considerable diversity of creative programming in these festivals reveals the unmistakable stamp and personalities of Lisbon’s cultural and musical leaders from the past fifteen years. For example, from the full-capacity audience at the new year’s concert at the Sé Cathedral in Lisbon in 2011 showcasing Seixas’s organ and choral works (João Vaz directing and performing organ),
to the avant-garde electro-acoustical performance “transcription” of Seixas’s *Harpsichord Concerto in A Major* in Cascais, Portugal with percussionist Hector Márquez Herrera performing to live audio commentary by Maestro José Atalaya, it can be seen that there are new approaches to modern concert programming and performance practice. At the International Musical Festival at the Mafra Palace, with Abel Chaves performing Seixas’s works on carillon a decade earlier, it can also be seen that Seixas is as varied and popular in transcriptions as he is in “authentic” instruments. (See table 3.3)

**Table 3.3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concert/Festival</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Performer</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gala Night Celebration Music Festival</td>
<td>Mafra Palace, Portugal</td>
<td>Organ Recital</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>David Cranmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Musical Festival</td>
<td>Mafra Palace, Portugal</td>
<td>Carillon Recital</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>José Francisco Gato</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Abel Chaves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Organ Festival</td>
<td>Alentejo region, Portugal</td>
<td>Harpsichord Recital</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cremilde Rosado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fernandes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Seixas in the Sunshine” British Harpsichord Society</td>
<td>Portimão, Portugal (Algarve)</td>
<td>Harpsichord students</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of Penelope Cave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festival Celebration of Iberian Roots</td>
<td>Cascais, Portugal</td>
<td>Percussion performances,</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marquez Herrera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concert of the New year</td>
<td>Sé Cathedral, Lisbon, Portugal</td>
<td>Organ performances</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>João Vaz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is ironic that at the time of this writing, most editions of Seixas’s music are out of print and unavailable. Adding further to this irony is the circumstance that most of the manuscripts of Seixas’s music that were for decades available only to a handful of scholars are now freely available online. Knowing that these editions are only available in a few select libraries, their value as modern-day “manuscripts” are suddenly treasured, rare glimpses into fading performance practices and cultural debates. They document how the debates and controversies of eras in the twentieth century are slowly disappearing into the fabric of an electro-globalized, post-modern time and space with new agendas, places, concerns, and leaders. It is in such a vanishing and disappearing act that the histories, agendas, and motivations of these editors, in their various epochs of controversies and influence upon one another, demonstrate how important geographical spaces and times are to be considered in ascertaining historical value.

Through examination of their views towards authenticity, and indeed the very notion of what they considered “facts,” glimpses into our own time and agendas can be better understood. Indeed, our modern editorial artistry is now ensconced in a cynicism that is more bent on proving that such bygone “facts” of a composer’s unmatched greatness, or clear delineation of an epoch and style were never truths to begin with. In the agendas (and rhetoric) of our time, it is no longer fashionable to pursue such “misguided” debates, leaving such controversies to be shelved. Only through the passage of time, perhaps like Mazza’s dictionary centuries before, may some of these debates be deemed worthy once again of revival after long periods of hibernation.
Conclusion

I recognize that my research is influenced by the priorities and agendas of my own time and place of origin, and that these have also shaped my views on Seixas’s life and music. In this dissertation, I have made several allusions to Portuguese *saudades* in connection with Seixas’s manifestations throughout the last three centuries. From such diverse examples as Vasconcellos’s reference of a *saudade* to the transferring of Seixas’s remains upon his death, to Kastner’s first analytical approach noting *saudades* in *Cravistas I*, to the Japanese *saudades* in Yato’s newest edition, it can be seen that the term is as complex in its inflections as its unique temporal aspects. Eduardo Lourenço in his book *Portugal como destino seguido de mitologia da saudade*\(^{255}\) elaborates upon such temporalities in connection with the utopic and paradoxically nostalgic movement of Sebastianismo, which has its origins in the death of King Dom Sebastião in Morocco in 1578. He connects this to the loss of thousands of lives who disappeared in the sea or in far-away lands as a consequence of the Portuguese colonial enterprise, not to mention the vanished glories of the past, and the fear of losing the national individuality in a unified Europe.

As a corollary to this paradox of juxtaposition of fear of loss and nostalgia through the passage of time, Vasconcellos’s use of the term illustrates how apprehension was immediately felt upon Seixas’s passing, that the greatness, the “nobreza” of Seixas, was at stake if his remains were not soon relocated. The *saudade* in this instance looks to

the future while simultaneously feeling the melancholy of the present and past. Kastner’s use of the term a century later, tied to the earliest writings concerning analytical approaches of Seixas’s music, is cognizant and apprehensive of the judgments of a far-flung future. Seixas’s *saudades* are more than sensitive qualities of his keyboard music, but a phenomenon intrinsically Portuguese. Yato, many decades after Kastner, again refers to the temporal aspects of Seixas’s *saudades*. His acknowledgement of Seixas’s unforgotten 300-year-old legacy bears testament that not all apprehensions of disappearance come to fruition. The melancholy of the Japanese *saudade* is alive in performances throughout Tokyo and Japan, where they celebrate a postmodern Seixas of melancholy, nostalgia, and sensitivity.

In the introduction of this dissertation, it was noted how a journey in trying to understand a “true” Seixas is inevitably tied to an ever-changing Seixas at the hands of numerous mediators. Though this dissertation has focused on only three types of manifestations, there are certainly others. One such manifestation could be related to D’Alvarenga’s admonition that an “oral” tradition during Seixas’s life dictated how certain passages, though notated one way, were to be played other than as written (according to organological contexts), yet in effect largely resided in Seixas’s mind. Such a newer manifestation, like the temporal and melancholic aspects of Portuguese *saudades*, encourages the continued contributions of future mediators of Seixas, while nonetheless noting how the past continually coalesces into an ever-present future.

In closing, I make mention to the inscription of this dissertation which I found written on the walls of the Lisbon subway (on the yellow line at the interchange with the
red line Saldanha stop). After several months of commuting, the words suddenly became conspicuous to me after being influenced by my research at the National Library of Lisbon. They magically seemed to capture in six words what so much of this dissertation has indulged in elaborating upon. I believe that what Almada Negreiros understands in himself in reference to the future, is just as applicable to all of these manifestations: Seixas has always been the future – until today.


Cruz, Ivo. *O que fiz e o que não que fiz*. Lisbon: Tipografia Guerra, 1985.


———. “Scarlatti and the Portuguese Connection.” *Early music* 36/1 (February 2008): 159-60.


———. *Tocattas per organo*. Music manuscript, P-Ln/Mss 337. Biblioteca Nacional de Portugal, Lisbon.


Appendices

Appendix A

Baltasar and Blimunda centers around the geographical location of Mafra, Portugal, and devotes considerable background into the later stages of construction of the Mafra Palace near the date of its consecration. Besides the central figures of the novel from whom the title refers to, Domenico Scarlatti also plays an important role in a narrative that blends a love story between the two protagonists, a flying machine, the dangers of the inquisition, and Dom João V and the royal family. Inevitably, the flying machine spells doom and disaster for almost anyone who comes into contact with it, as it represents, among other things, a heretical enterprise against the church.256

As the flying machine is covertly undergoing construction under the direction of a priest, Bartolomeu de Gusmão, who knows of mystical secrets and technical know-how in constructing such a device, Domenico Scarlatti is let in on the secret location where it is being built, and the Italian foreigner decides to bring his harpsichord to the workshop to provide a bit of background music. As Baltasar, Blimunda, and the Priest labor away on the machine, Scarlatti enjoys a rare privilege in knowing that only he is privy to this machine’s construction where the King himself, Dom João V is providing economical support for its construction.

Perhaps able to foresee that the machine has evil forebodings, Scarlatti gingerly approaches and touches the machine with the expertise of a keyboard virtuoso, and as he does so, it shivers. Interestingly, Scarlatti is one of the only central characters of the novel to survive either death or disaster by coming into contact with the machine. He inquires as to its mysterious “fuel” that enables it to fly and learns that the fuel source is none other than the captured souls of men converted into amber in globes. Padre Gusmão suggests that music itself might be able to be converted in a like manner to which a Scarlatti incredulously retorts to the good Padre, “Is that meant to be a joke, Much less of a joke than you imagine, Signor Scarlatti.”

As often as Scarlatti is present to provide a little “flying-machine-background” music, there are times when he simply cannot be present, and when Scarlatti’s harpsichord is not being played, Baltasar, Blimunda, and the Padre suffer from its lack—they feel there is no sadder place in the world. On the momentous, final day before the machine is ready to fly, the two lovers inquire about Scarlatti, his miraculous music, and his harpsichord—if found, might the harpsichord not serve as criminal evidence against Scarlatti—the hopeful Blimunda even ventures to ask, “will Signor Scarlet not be playing for us in the sky?”

Saramago at this point addresses the same issue as Mazza regarding the inferiority complexes the Portuguese suffer from in regard to visiting foreigners like Scarlatti. To begin with, Saramago assigns not only an astonishing, if not superior musical ability to the Italian, but phenomenal grasp of moral and spiritual knowledge as well. While immersed in a discussion concerning the holy Trinity, Scarlatti had made an analogy to
the Padre concerning the relationship of Father, Son and Holy Ghost that irked the good Padre, yet Gusmão could only counter the Italian in true defiance when freed in the air at the triumphant moment of the flying machine’s completion, when at last Baltasar, Blimunda and the Padre were shouting, hugging, and crying with joy, and as the air was gushing about, while joined in an embrace, “perturbed by the analogy the Italian had drawn when he had suggested that the priest himself was God, Baltasar his son, and Blimunda the holy ghost, and now all three of them were up there in the skies together, There is only one God, he shouted, but the wind snatched the words form his mouth.”

Regarding not only keyboard abilities but also competency in listening and cognition towards musical greatness, Saramago addresses how the art of hearing, seeing, and judging a musical “giant” is not only based upon geography, but cultural heritage as well. After hearing the “giant” Scarlatti play the harpsichord, Padre Gusmão ponders and subsequently inquires about whether or not anyone within ear shot could be so enthralled by the heavenly music making, that “even an Indian peasant from my native Brazil who knows still less about music than I do would feel enraptured by these celestial harmonies,” which elicits a cautionary response from the Italian that “the ear has to be educated if one wishes to appreciate musical sounds, just as the eyes must learn to distinguish the value of words and the way in which they are combined when one is reading a text, and the hearing must be trained for one to comprehend speech.”

Although Padre Gusmão upon hearing Scarlatti play is directed towards a wondrous inquiry into celestial captivation, others are affected in strikingly different ways. During the latest hours of the night, as Scarlatti plays for the priest, the music is
able to “silently” creep through the “openings and chimneys” to various people in Lisbon who hear the music, from the highest to the lowest in social class, “a prisoner of the Holy Office of the Inquisition who hears it from the depths of his dungeon grabs a guard by the throat and strangles him, … the vagrants and tramps hear it as they take shelter at Ribeira … [and] … hooded assassins hear it as they stalk the streets ready to kill,” eliciting their various respective responses.

Pedagogically, Saramago describes what a harpsichord lesson from Scarlatti might be like. Focusing primarily on the audience as well as the expectations of the royal entourage in attendance, Saramago details the very first lesson given to the Infanta, the nine-year-old daughter of Dom João V whose “stubby little fingers” are understandably laden with stage fright as the King, Queen, and a royal gathering of at least thirty people watch Scarlatti, who has been in Lisbon only a few months, conduct and finish the lesson. Eight years later, the lessons seem to have been successful, as the young Infanta “Maria Barbara has just turned seventeen, her face is as round as a full moon, pockmarked, as we already mentioned, but she has a sweet nature and as good an ear for music as anyone has a right to expect of a royal princess, the lessons she received from Maestro Domenico Scarlatti have borne fruit, and soon he will follow her to Madrid, whence he will not return.”

Saramago humorously purveys a conception that large numbers dumbfound the eighteenth-century Portuguese; in fact, Saramago questions their very abilities to even count. During the consecration of the Mafra palace, Baltasar and Blimunda continually witness the comings and goings of large numbers of laborers, and in their feeble efforts to
understand such a vast number of people, let alone the grandiosity of the Mafra project itself, engage earnestly in a thoughtful dialogue of comprehension. Baltasar exclaims, “They tell me that five hundred men have arrived in town, So many Blimunda exclaims in astonishment, and neither he nor she knows exactly how many five hundred make, not to mention that there is nothing in the world so imprecise as numbers, one says five hundred bricks just as one says five hundred men, and the difference between a brick and a man is the difference that one believes to exist between five hundred and five hundred.”

Although Mazza did not provide details for the exact location in which the “lesson” between Seixas and Scarlatti took place, Saramago decides upon the Mafra palace for the locale of this legendary encounter. Identifying the Infante as the “Viscount,” Saramago deliberately narrates this encounter in the most “Baroque” fashion possible, and like Mazza in his dictionary, leaves almost all of the details open to interpretation—perversely switching the “giant” role of Seixas to Scarlatti, where only the grandson, a restless sleeper is able to audibly witness the encounter,

very late that same night, that is to say, late for someone who goes to bed early, gentle strains of music penetrating the cracks in the door and the roof of the house, there must have been a deep silence in Mafra that night, if music played on the harpsichord in the Viscounts’ palace when the doors and windows were shuttered on account of the cold, and even when it was not cold, for the sake of decorum, was heard by an old man growing deaf with age, had Blimunda and Baltasar heard it, one might well have expected them to comment, It’s Signor Scarlet who is playing, for it is quite true to say that the giant is recognized by his finger, this we would not argue with, since the proverb exists and is altogether apt.

Beyond the discernment of the grandson, no one knows of Seixas as the true “giant” who played the harpsichord that fateful night in Mafra. It would have been more of a concern to Baltasar and Blimunda, who slept peacefully through the playing that
evening, to be distanced from the dangers of Scarlatti’s presence in Mafra (who might conceivably tie them to the functional, though now hidden flying machine) than to investigate whether or not a Portuguese harpsichord virtuoso was playing, not an Italian foreigner. The last strains of Scarlatti’s celestial music making to be heard occurs just before he is to follow his keyboard pupil, the Infanta Maria Bárbara, at the royal ceremony on the border of Spain and Portugal, as they are leaving for Madrid.
Appendix B

Howard Schott points out that in one of Landowska’s concert reviews in 1905 by Albert Schweitzer that his praise of her election to perform Bach on harpsichord was far from typical:

much ink was spilt and considerable energy expended by Landowska and her contemporaries in battling out what we now see to have been a non-issue, since the two instruments co-existed historically precisely because each serves to illuminate the beauties of the same music, with only a tiny minority of works expressly reserved for the domain of one or the other.257

Ruth Dyson sees prejudice against the harpsichord by the musical “establishment” in those earliest days of the revival that was to last well into the 1930’s:

it was still quite common to hear the harpsichord described by various jocular epithets of which the birdeage and the toasting fork and the permissive skeletons on a tin roof are fair examples.258

Indeed, as Timothy Bainbridge points out, as late as the year 1935, the first commercial recordings of J. S. Bach’s Well-Tempered Clavier, by Edwin Fischer, the Brandenburg Concerti, by Rudolf Serkin, and of Monteverdi’s madrigals, by Nadia Boulanger, were exclusively the domain of pianos, not harpsichords.259

It comes as no surprise then that Landowska in her concert tours prior to 1935 utilized both a modern piano and a harpsichord. Her earliest harpsichord incidentally utilized Pleyel’s 1889 model that lacked a 16’ stop.260 In her United States debut in New

260Howard Schott, “A Centenary Appraisal.”
York City in the 1920’s, despite having traveled with as many as four harpsichords, she persevered in giving recitals that featured both the piano (in works such as Mozart’s *Rondo alla Turca*) and the harpsichord (as a novelty encore, in works like Mozart’s Sonata K. 331). Not until her establishment of the *Ecole de Musique Ancienne* in Saint-Leu-la-Forêt, France in 1925, under the shelter of her own private recital hall of this housing-learning institution, would entire full-length recitals on the harpsichord take place. Usually occurring on Sunday afternoons, these solo harpsichord recitals now stand testament as some of the most influential events of the historical keyboard movement prior to World War II. Schott notes that in 1933 at these concerts, Landowska premiered Bach’s *Goldberg Variations* as a complete set in live performance on harpsichord and championed now standard repertoire in both recordings and performances including a complete recital of Scarlatti’s sonatas. Cheerfully, Schott concludes about Landowska’s bygone era in which the harpsichord was unjustly railed upon that “it is unnecessary to speak further about the opprobrious epithets applied to the unfamiliar sounds of the harpsichord at the time, now happily no longer current.”\(^{261}\)

Bainbridge emphasizes the importance of Landowska’s star status as a performer and pedagogue as essential in winning over the public to the newer strains of the harpsichord’s timbre and sonorities; he goes as far to say that “we may be sure the rehabilitation of the harpsichord into public and professional favor would have been a more lengthy affair”\(^{262}\) without this illustrious status. As a pedagogue, Landowska’s first teaching post began at the age of thirty-four in 1913 at the Berlin Hochschule für Musik.

\(^{261}\)Ibid.  
\(^{262}\)Timothy Bainbridge, “Wanda Landowska and her Repertoire.”
With the eruption of World War I, her German citizenship caused her to be placed on parole, curtailing her concert tours. As a harpsichord pedagogue she remained resilient in her teaching capacities and proved influential to the first generation of German harpsichordists including Alice Ehlers and Gertrud Wertheim. After World War I, she moved to France to initiate her *Ecole de Musique Ancienne*, where at the height of the school’s success, the library contained at least 10,000 musical scores, books, and an impressive collection of period keyboard instruments.²⁶³

One particular student at the *Ecole de Musique Ancienne*, Fraülein Lilye Karger, kept notes from her lessons with Landowska that are now preserved at the Royal College of Music in London.²⁶⁴ She divulges how Landowska insisted upon practicing technical exercises on the piano aside from regular harpsichord practice. In addition, Landowska advocated what is now considered a very controversial approach to registration with exercises conceived towards fast manual changes and pedal exercises designed to achieve rapid-fire changes of what Dyson exclaims are part of Landowska’s “sense of drama, her pianistic background, and her virtuosity with the pedals which almost equaled her virtuosity with the keys, [leading] her to produce some highly exotic and at times bewildering effects.”²⁶⁵

These notes provide a revelatory insight into pedagogical thought at a time just before the Second World War, standing witness to how such an event could force an esteemed institution such as this to close. The war resulted in countless scores and

²⁶³Howard Schott, “A Centenary Appraisal.”
²⁶⁴Ruth Dyson, “Bend the Finger at all Three Joints: A First-hand Record of Landowska’s Teaching Methods.”
²⁶⁵Ibid.
instruments being doomed to oblivion, not to mention Landowska narrowly escaping
with her life from the Nazis by fleeing to the United States, albeit with a brief stopover in
Lisbon.266
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Appendix C

Carlos Seixas, keyboard composition in C Major.
Orig. P-La 48-i-2, p. 53-54.