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ABSTRACT

There is still debate regarding the origins and implementation of treble guitar notation: pedagogical treatises indicate that such notation was normative already by the early nineteenth century. Guitarists’ development throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, especially at the level of writing and playing contrapuntal music, was not accompanied by a substantial notational advancement that would emphasize counterpoint. With few exceptions, the appropriateness of single-stave treble guitar notation has remained unchallenged since the nineteenth century; no pedagogies have previously been written that would systematically instruct students how to read multiple staves, or clefs other than treble. As a result, a majority of Western-trained musicians up to the present day consider single-stave treble notation an inherent, immutable component of reading guitar music. Such a conception seems like a radical change from that of the nineteenth century: Fernando Sor and Ferdinando Carulli (notable nineteenth-century pedagogues) advocated guitarists’ familiarization with both the double stave and orchestral scores.

The purpose of this treatise is two-fold: first, to revalorize counterpoint (one of the main features present in the “classical guitar” musical corpus), and to assert the guitar’s viability as a contrapuntal, score-reading instrument. And second, to supply a clef and score reading pedagogy for guitarists, which could in turn promote and facilitate the recognition of counterpoint in both solo and ensemble playing. This treatise is divided into three parts: in the first part I affirm the necessity and feasibility of guitaristic-notational exploration beyond the single treble stave. I discuss nineteenth and twentieth-century pedagogies and their treatment of counterpoint and music reading, as well as possible ramifications of implementing score reading with the guitar. In this first part I also outline a pedagogical methodology, considering the music I edited for the present work; I include sample lessons, which an instructor could use to begin teaching students how to read clefs and scores of up to four parts.

The second part of this treatise consists of two sections: first, a clef-reading pedagogy for the treble, bass, soprano, alto and tenor clefs. This pedagogy is based on Georges Dandelot’s clef-reading model, and is applied to positions I, III, V, VII and X on
the fingerboard. Second, a collection of 138 score reading studies in different clef and stave combinations. I edited these pieces from solo works by Fernando Sor, Mauro Giuliani, Matteo Carcassi and Dionisio Aguado, and provide critical commentary for my editorial work as part of this section. I chose the pieces that comprise these studies considering works that are relatively simple to play on the guitar: the pedagogy thus emphasizes reading rather than technique.

The treatise’s third and final part consists of twenty-one beginning-level trios, which I arranged from solo guitar works by the aforementioned composers. This last section is designed to promote an appreciation and understanding of contrapuntal music at the early stages of learning, and is a contribution to the still-growing corpus of guitar ensemble music.
PART I: TOWARDS AN
IMPLEMENTATION OF CLEF AND
SCORE READING WITH GUITAR
CHAPTER ONE: BACKGROUND

I have for some time been fascinated by Giorgio Vasari’s account regarding how, in the midst of civil unrest in Florence in 1527, a bench was thrown from atop the Palace of the Signoria by a struggling mob, which broke an arm of Michelangelo’s David into three pieces. Vasari mentions how he and Francesco Salviati, both very young at the time, ignored the ongoing combat, picked up the fallen pieces of the arm and stored them until the statue could eventually be fixed under the patronage of Duke Cosimo de Medici.1 The fact that a mob showed signs of violence or neglect for art is not what fascinates me about Vasari’s story; I am moved, instead, by the audacity of the two friends who, ignoring the turmoil, picked up the pieces and patiently waited until the time was right for the work to be mended. I wonder: had the two friends not stored the broken pieces, would we now think of the David the same way we think of the Venus de Milo, or the Coliseum? I invite the reader today to consider something which, in my opinion, is another “broken arm” in the cultural history of the West. Unlike the arm of a statue, whose absence we can notice at a glance, this other missing element is a bit more elusive: a tradition, a mode of thinking from a different time, captured in books and in music which gathered dust for almost two hundred years. The present document reflects my belief that we are currently living in the right moment for this once-neglected element to be affixed back into the body of works from which it should never have been separated.

*****

It took me several days before I could muster the courage to ask my guitar teacher what exactly he meant when, during his commentary of a colleague’s performance, he mentioned that there was “a bit too much guitar playing.” As a freshman in a New York conservatory program, it was difficult for me to think that “guitar playing” was in any way not optimal—I was, after all, spending several hours a day with the instrument, and a few more reading about it and fantasizing about becoming a great guitar player. Once I decided the maestro’s idea was eluding me, and proceeded to ask for clarification during

---

our private meeting the following week, he had a chuckle and told me: “In Bach, as in
Sor, Giuliani… if you don’t bring out the different voices of the counterpoint, all you
have is ‘guitar playing’.” Years later, I remember that episode with the kind of nostalgia
experienced by one who was made aware of his own callowness. As I came to understand
my teacher, the extent of one’s contrapuntal playing distinguishes accurate note-playing
from genuine musicianship. Even though counterpoint was still new to me at the time, I
discerned that my implementation of it stood as a measure of my own resourcefulness as
a performer. “Counterpoint,” said the maestro during one of our following lessons, “is
what makes the guitar a better instrument than, say, the flute. A flutist may not say so, but
I say so.” He was dead serious.

Just as serious, though more allegorical (perhaps even Kafkaesque) was Édgar
Valcárcel, my Peruvian theory teacher, when he introduced me to species counterpoint a
few months earlier. Seated at the piano, his hands with motile flexed fingers over his
head, he used to tell me about the importance of playing Bach chorales and my
counterpoint exercises at the piano. In the cottage with windows facing the westernmost
part of the Andes, where he met his students, Valcárcel explained: “The fingers, they are
antennae that inform your ear, together with your eyes and mind. It’s all connected, like
the notes in the counterpoint.” His teachings, which at the time I learned and exercised on
the piano, and whose relevance I hadn’t yet observed in my own guitar playing, were a
very present memory as I navigated the conservatory’s library searching for contrapuntal
guitar music, as my guitar teacher suggested I do. The works of Fernando Sor and Mauro
Giuliani (mainly their short one or two-page pieces), were a staple of my musical diet. I
definitely saw the counterpoint on the page, though it has taken me a lot of hours in the
practice room (even up to the present day) trying to get my fingers to metamorphose into
the contrapuntal antennae proposed by Valcárcel.

To further develop my harmonic use of the guitar as a way to exercise my
musicianship, I took (as part of the core guitar curriculum at the Manhattan School of
Music) Mark Delpriora’s “Fretboard Harmony” course sequence, which Delpriora
designed to substitute for the conservatory’s keyboard harmony course required of
guitarists. During weekly meetings, Delpriora guided us to exercise different elements of
theory on the guitar, such as scales, chords and their inversions, figured bass, etc. I
remember thinking, as I worked through two lines of music in the Corelli sonatas which we read for class, how different it felt to play two lines of music on the guitar, and how surprisingly feasible it was. At this time I became interested in Sor’s pedagogical Method, from which Delpriora would sometimes pick harmonic exercises for us to work on throughout the week. As I read Sor’s method I grew fascinated with the author: I had mainly heard of him because of the Twenty Studies edited by Segovia, as well as some of his fantasies and sets of variations, though I had no idea of his totalizing approach to guitar instruction, which emphasized the importance of understanding theory and harmony.

It is perhaps the reverberations of the Enlightenment in Sor’s method that I personally found most groundbreaking: questioning what we are taught; personally pursuing a musical-technical question until we are satisfied with a reasonable answer. He emphasized, for example, being well acquainted with different fingering possibilities, versus simply accepting someone else’s fingering of a piece; the importance of finding a comfortable seating position, which allows the player to maintain balance in accordance with human anatomy; carefully taking note of the harmony in a passage of music one is to accompany, whether to reduce a piano part or to add a guitar part to an orchestral piece (he gives as an example a segment of The Creation by Haydn). Questioning the traditional treble-stave used to notate guitar music, Sor proposed in his Fantasy Op. 7 a dual stave system, in which the lower stave consists of the bass clef and the upper stave alternates between the alto and treble clefs. The dual stave system also offered a more convenient means to notate counterpoint, which is present in Sor’s guitar music in up to five voices.

I was somewhat taken aback after reading Sor’s pedagogical output, particularly when contrasting what he taught in the nineteenth century to my early guitar schooling. Unlike Sor’s suggestions of questioning and experimenting in order to arrive at a logical conclusion that makes sense for each player, I was initially taught from within a tradition endorsed by Andrés Segovia (and by the people who regarded him as an archetype on which any aspiring guitarist should be modeled). Within such a tradition, students were
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encouraged to inform their technique and musicianship mainly with Segovia’s performance style, repertory and recordings; experimenting with one’s seating position, with fingering alternatives, etc., was seen as eccentric and, to an extent, “worse” than the Segovian norm. While Segovia did play a central role in popularizing the guitar to a world audience in the twentieth century, his revalorization of the guitar didn’t emphasize the detailed study of earlier pedagogical treatises. Instead, Segovia was promoted as the “father” of “classical guitar”: his choice of repertoire (which, to be fair, included a substantial number of works he commissioned from his contemporaries) became canonic, and his pedagogical choices became normative. Perhaps even the promotion of the guitar as “classical guitar” did the instrument a disfavor, generating a split in the twentieth century between many guitar traditions and the Segovian school of thought.

Although Segovia was hailed as the leading figure of the “classical guitar” movement in the twentieth century, he certainly wasn’t alone. There is a continuum of guitarists who carried different nineteenth century traditions and schools of thought into the twentieth century, including figures such as Francisco Tárrega, Emilio Pujol, Miguel Llobet, Regino Sainz de la Maza and Agustín Barrios. A substantial part of the early twentieth century pedagogical work, however, focuses on aspects of technique and doesn’t treat the guitar as a vehicle to exercise musicianship to the extent that Sor’s work does. Sor’s scientific impetus regarding the different aspects of guitar playing wasn’t an exception in the history of the guitar either: Dionisio Aguado’s pedagogical method leaves evidence of a similar drive—Aguado even designed and manufactured an ergonomically-friendly tripod with which to hold the instrument.³

An intriguing musicological question still open for exploration is in what ways, sometime between the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, guitar pedagogies shifted their emphasis from harmony and musicianship to technique. Although such a question contains many variables, it is worthwhile to note that by the twentieth century entire bodies of works (largely out of print and nonextant) were relegated to short compendiums. An example includes the large body of pedagogical music written by Sor: out of the 121 works (not counting the many short pieces that could be used as study

pieces), Segovia compiled and edited a set of *Twenty Studies* by Sor.\(^4\) This volume, liberally edited by Segovia in terms of fingering and expression (and lacking Sor’s statements on pedagogy or musicianship), was enthusiastically received by those who wanted accessible student music. Segovia’s edition eventually acquired canonic status, and many regard it as representative of Sor’s output.

Others have taken important steps in the twentieth century to bring forth the guitar’s harmonic role in cultivating a well-rounded musical core.\(^5\) Mark Delpriora, for example, focused his Fretboard Harmony class on exercising a guitarist’s harmonic and contrapuntal thinking as part of the core theory curriculum at an American conservatory. Most students in music programs nowadays experience a core curriculum consisting mainly of common practice theory and musicianship, usually with the piano as the sole harmonic instrument. Felix Salzer and Carl Schachter explain the importance of such a core curriculum: aware of the disuse of earlier Western musical idioms in the creation of new works, the authors compare the study of past musical traditions to that of a dead language, studied for intellectual purposes only. Nevertheless, the authors explain, there exists “a considerable number of young musicians who are anxious to deepen their understanding of the music that… constitutes the bulk of their repertory,” just as there are also emerging composers who study works of the past as “an invaluable help in attaining craftsmanship regardless of their particular mode of expression.”\(^6\)

In order to understand that “bulk” of the Western repertory, students in musical institutions are expected to be reasonably familiar with harmony and counterpoint, and to proficiently identify various elements of such practices aurally. Of course such elements of musicianship can be pursued to multiple extents: music programs require different levels of proficiency of their students, and individual students place varying personal demands upon themselves. Like athletes who either maintain a relaxed attitude towards training as opposed to pushing themselves beyond their comfort zone, musicians always have the option to explore resources beyond what is required of them by their institutions

---

\(^4\) Andrés Segovia, ed. *Twenty Studies* by Fernando Sor (1945; repr. New York: Hal Leonard, 1995). The preceding total number of pedagogical works by Sor was calculated by considering Sor’s Opp. 6, 29, 31, 35, 44 and 60.

\(^5\) I will be surveying some of these works in next chapter’s literature review.

and instructors. It is thus difficult to define a limit to the types of resources that may help students master the musical craft. In the guitar literature, for example, there are vast numbers of books that provide diverse technical drills for how to construct and play scales, or how to construct different kinds of chords, etc. One area of guitar pedagogical publications that hasn’t seen such amplitude of resources, however, is that of clef and score reading studies for the solo guitarist.

Guitar notation has traditionally consisted of a single stave in treble clef, where sounds are notated an octave higher; much modern guitar music has adopted the convention of using a “lower octave” treble clef for clarification. Thus, when Sor originally published his Fantasy, Op. 7, it looked like this (in contrast to standard notation):

![Example 1. Sor Fantasy, Op. 7, mm. 9-10. In original vs. standard notation.](image)

Even in Sor’s time, guitarists were so uncomfortable reading such notation that an alternate edition in standard notation appeared just a few years later. Despite Sor’s commitment to introduce an alternative notational system, the fact remains that guitar music is still being published in one stave in treble clef. This occurs despite some apparent benefits of Sor’s proposed notation: most important for this study, the dual system allows for more clarity in displaying the different voices of the counterpoint. Such advantage, though, is not motivation enough for players to familiarize themselves with
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the alternative notation. Moreover, guitarists would have to teach themselves clef and
dual-stave reading in order to proficiently decode Sor’s notation. To my knowledge there
is yet no method that guides students in using the guitar to read clefs, or a body of clef
scores designed with the intention of being played specifically on one guitar. Those
factors alone may deter even enthusiastic students wanting to implement an alternate
notational system into their guitar studies, thus rendering the idea not much more than a
fantasy.

Structuring a pedagogical approach through which to venture outside of the
normative notational system would remove a barrier that currently confines
guitar notation, and by extension the way guitarists conceive of the act of reading and
playing music. Who is to tell whether by teaching guitar students to read in two staves
(the way, for example, a piano student would learn from early on) a reconceptualization
of the process of music-making with the guitar would eventually occur? Reading
different lines of counterpoint notated separately could provide an incentive for guitarists
to seek the necessary technical resources with which to interpret the counterpoint, and to
implement artistic decisions based upon the relative importance of the different lines.

Arguably the importance of studying counterpoint lies in the fact that such a
venture can illumine our understanding of melody and harmony, in both the solo and
chamber settings. Joel Lester has discussed how, even though modern musicians tend to
associate counterpoint with species counterpoint in the tradition of Johann Joseph Fux
(1660-1741), the instruction of counterpoint involving the isolation of “different types or
species of voice interactions goes back at least to the early sixteenth century.” Charles
Rosen has also discussed the role of species counterpoint as a main pedagogical tool in
formal compositional training in the eighteenth century. Rosen notes that harmony was a
subject which “was informally picked up by experience or by reading the few theorists
who tried to deal innovatively with the subject,” and was a subject that only started to
precede counterpoint in formal musical study early in the nineteenth century. The

8 The latter is particularly relevant, if we consider that even a proficient guitarist who picks up a random
non-guitar score could quickly become frustrated by how the work is not technically “playable” on the
instrument.
9 Joel Lester, *Compositional Theory in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press,
1994), 26, original emphasis.
importance of species contrapuntal training, adds Rosen, goes beyond the manipulation of multiple voices to provide a system with which to conceptualize writing single melodic lines: “the successive notes of a melody are conceived as dissonant or consonant to one another.”\(^{11}\) Furthermore, this foundational contrapuntal conception of the melody “is what enabled Bach to write music for solo violin or cello, using for long stretches only a single unaccompanied line.”\(^{12}\)

J. S. Bach’s own contrapuntal conception of an unaccompanied melody is illuminated if we compare the single line of his violin Sonata in D-minor (BWV 964) with his own arrangement for keyboard (BWV 1003). The following example illustrates this notion, as seen in mm. 11-14 of the Allegro in BWV 1003 versus 964:

![Example 2. J.S. Bach, Allegro from BWV 1003/964, mm. 11-14.](image)

Moreover, Rosen asserts that Bach’s *Well-Tempered Keyboard* was simultaneously a piano method par excellence and a vehicle through which many of the great pianists-composers learned “the contrapuntal realization of harmony in a purely practical way.”\(^{13}\) Rosen contends that the absence of such contrapuntal-pianistic training may have impacted one nineteenth century composer’s conceptualization of harmony and counterpoint in unique ways.

\(^{11}\) Ibid. 553.  
\(^{12}\) Ibid.  
\(^{13}\) Ibid. 555. Rosen mentions Beethoven, Schumann, Mendelssohn and Liszt as users of the work.
In his discussion of Berlioz’s compositional style, Rosen mentions how Chopin criticized Berlioz’s unorthodox contrapuntal melodic treatment—where such treatment was based primarily on harmony, as was favored in Berlioz’s Parisian musical education. Rosen observes how Berlioz’s distinct (not to say “‘wrong’”) approach to harmony and counterpoint has been linked with his use of the guitar as a harmonic instrument, where “the guitar encourages thinking of harmony in blocks, while every pianist is physically aware through the muscles of the hand and arm of the movement of independent voices.” Paradoxically, here Rosen confirms a popular bias related to guitar notation—how it is chordal and contrapuntally indistinct, versus the contrapuntal rigor to which pianists are exposed—, simultaneously suggesting that it is this alternative psycho-kinesthetic harmonic understanding that made Berlioz unique.

Rather than focusing upon instrumental idiom and ignoring contrapuntal rigor, one of the aims of my project is to emphasize the contrapuntal nature of a body of idiomatic guitar works. The advantages of such an approach go beyond intellectual dexterity, suggesting also an array of possibilities for guitarists. By venturing beyond standard notation and further internalizing counterpoint through score reading, guitarists could perhaps be as likely (or, as Rosen suggests, as capable) as pianists to pursue large-ensemble composition and/or conducting. What is more, considering how score reading may allow guitarists to explore diverse music-making alternatives, proficiently playing scores could potentially result in an even higher caliber guitarist-musician than what may be produced at present.

It is worthwhile noting that, as valuable as score reading may be to develop a richer understanding of the Western repertory, such practice in and of itself is not necessarily a measure of one’s worth as an artist. There have been many great instrumentalists who did not read clefs or play scores at the piano (or the guitar, for that matter). Furthermore, many great guitarists have developed intuitive understandings of different musical traditions, which allowed them to exploit the instrument’s expressive capabilities, even with no formal knowledge of Western music theory. Peruvian guitarist Raúl García Zárate (b. 1932), for example, created an entire repertory of traditional

14 Ibid. 552.
15 Ibid. 555.
Andean guitar music through an innate understanding of melodic motion and harmony, without the use of notation. As part of my own graduate student experience, I had the good fortune of spending several semesters in FSU’s South American ensemble, Aconcagua, under the direction of Dr. Dale Olsen. I took it upon myself to transcribe works of traditional artists spanning the Afro-Peruvian, Andean, and Nueva Canción genres. Ironically, despite the fact that much South American music features a high degree of rote communal memorization, I had to rely on Western notation to outline the different musical parts on a score, in order to be able to share my transcriptions with my peers.

Also at the border between Western classical and traditional South American music, Alberto Ginastera’s vision of traditional Argentinean guitar music escapes the standard guitar notational system. To notate the “Finale” of his Sonata, Op. 47, Ginastera uses one stave in treble clef to notate thick chords; he adds an extra system line where he notates extended techniques, such as different types of strums and percussive effects. American composer Robert Beaser has also contemplated the limitations of a single stave to notate counterpoint on the guitar, and thus uses a dual stave in the opening of his solo work Notes on a Southern Sky. Even the music of Bach—already well circulated in guitar arrangements in standard guitar notation—has been subject to scrutiny outside of the normative notational system: Alfredo Sanchez, in his arrangements of Preludes and Fugues from the Well-Tempered Clavier, makes use of a dual-stave system (with both staves in treble clef).

The above examples suggest that contemporary composers and arrangers are venturing beyond standard notation to accommodate their ideas on guitar music. If we consider some ways in which the current standard acts as the norm, we may see how the
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16 The case of Andean music is particularly interesting for the present discussion: for political reasons, much of the ancient Andean musical system was destroyed upon the Spanish conquest; Andean people were forced to fit their music into a Western framework. In this manner, the panpipes, quenas (flutes), and charangos (small lutes) which now constitute central elements of what is known as Andean music are all tuned to a Western scale; the pitches which comprise Andean music may thus be notated on the Western stave. See Robert Murell Stevenson, The Music of Peru: Aboriginal and Viceregal Epochs (Washington: Pan American Union, 1960).


system that regulates it contains some clues as to its destabilization. Tradition has been promoting for over two hundred years a body of works notated in a single-stave in treble clef; publishers disseminate such works to teachers, who teach them to their students, some of who become teachers, etc. In this manner, there is no real incentive for any of the parts involved to embrace an alternative notation.\textsuperscript{20} By creating a work that introduces clef and score reading to guitarists there exists an alternative which involves consumer and producer: publishers could increase sales by marketing music in alternative settings to a new market of proficient score readers, for example. Moreover, at this point we can only speculate regarding the impact of the publishing industry on future generations of score-reader guitarists interested in chamber and large ensemble composition and/or conducting.

It is my purpose in this treatise to provide a catalyst for such changes. Aware of my own deficiencies in clef and score reading a few years ago, I designed exercises for myself, all of which involved music that I found technically simple; my goal was for the exercise to be a mental rather than a technical one. The exercises consisted of a differentiation of the lines of counterpoint present in nineteenth century music, which I gathered from the collected works of composers such as Sor and Giuliani.\textsuperscript{21} I arranged the different lines of counterpoint according to how difficult I wanted the exercise to be, according to number of staves and clefs: two staves in treble clef were on the easier extreme, as opposed to four staves in alto, soprano, tenor, and bass clefs on the opposite extreme.

For the present body of studies, I expanded my original idea and gathered over 100 works, which I edited and arranged as exercises in the manner outlined above. Because of their number, all such exercises are in Part II.B of this treatise, following a series of preparatory studies in clef reading on the guitar (Part II.A). In the Apparatus for Part II.B I list the sources from which I assembled the music from Part II.B; I also delineate my editorial procedures and offer critical commentary. Furthermore, aware of

\textsuperscript{20} As the reader will understand, I am restricting the present discussion to pitch and rhythm notation on a pentagram, given that other widespread notational systems such as tablature (itself popular before the current standard system) don’t offer a visually striking way of reading counterpoint, nor a skill which may transfer to other non-fretted instrumental contexts.

\textsuperscript{21} This research began in my freshman year, during my search for works with which to exercise my contrapuntal playing.
the still budding role of ensemble playing at an early instructional level, I am providing as an addendum in Part III a set of solo pieces that can work well when performed by multiple players (all in standard notation), in the form of twenty one beginning-level trios. My choice of literature has largely to do with my musical upbringing. The teacher who taught me to avoid “guitar playing” and to value counterpoint also encouraged me to navigate Sor’s and Giuliani’s archives as sources of simple, didactic-yet-beautiful music. The score reading studies that I provide here, and the didactic possibilities that they offer, promote thinking beyond the presently-taught norm, both in terms of notation and of the current nineteenth-century canon. Such ideas of questioning the standard and applying reason to resolve musical-guitaristic issues are what drew me initially to the pedagogical works of nineteenth century composers. For that reason I consider the approach I propose, beyond the notational novelty which may initially seem most obvious, a revitalization of a set of principles, which place value in the well-rounded development of the musician and the individual.

In his discussion of critical editions, James Grier asserts that a critical edition’s purpose is “to transmit the text that best represents the historical evidence of the sources.” Grier prioritizes the edition’s “clarity in the presentation of information,” such that users can immediately grasp and relate the different elements articulated by the editor, whether in the original setting or in modernized notation. In my own edition, the use of multiple staves to notate guitar music highlights counterpoint, and thus presents it to a much clearer extent than could be achieved with only one stave. Arguably the immediate accessibility of my edition to guitarists is limited by the use of clefs. Grier himself contends that most modern readers are comfortable only reading the treble and bass clefs, and editors “are not serving their audience well” when using C-clefs when preparing modern editions of earlier works. While this is undeniable, given guitarists’ traditional training in the treble clef, my edition seeks to supplement a void in the literature, which goes beyond ease of reading. That is, my chosen settings are meant to be

---

22 Because of these archives’ large volumes, a bulk of the music they contain is unfamiliar to most guitarists.
24 Ibid.
25 Ibid., 161. Grier gives as an example the use of C-clefs in preparing a modern edition of Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony.
initially uncomfortable to read for novel clef and score-reading guitarists—such is the pedagogical intent behind them. Moreover, the use of clefs may illuminate compositional aspects not previously considered in nineteenth-century guitar music. The overall absence of ledger lines in my SATB setting of Sor’s arrangement of “God Save the King,” for example, highlights Sor’s experience as a vocal teacher, and suggests an intention of having the arrangement performed by four singers.\(^{26}\)

In the present edition I’ve taken into consideration Grier’s suggestion of leaving only the text in the main body of the edition, placing the apparatus at the end.\(^{27}\) Furthermore, I’ve taken into consideration Grier’s discussion regarding the appropriateness of facsimiles to convey notational nuances better than lengthy descriptions in the critical apparatus.\(^{28}\) Thus I have avoided discussing in the Apparatus every voicing decision involved in the separation of a solo work into multiple staves: the differences between the original setting and my own can be noted immediately by glancing at the facsimiles I consulted (all available online without charge).\(^{29}\)

In his article “Portraits in Beams and Barlines: Critical Music Editing and the Art of Notation,” Mark Clague discusses the way critical editions work on multiple socio-cultural levels; he argues that notation “reveals more about musical practice than what pitches to perform and in what rhythm,” and how musical editing constitutes a form of cultural criticism with political resonances.\(^{30}\) He also explores how critical editions raise sociopolitical issues, and advocates for critical editions which (despite the economic forces at hand) will open up the text and empower others to make their own readings. Considering also Clague’s citation of James Grier—to whom scholarly editing may be regarded as a political statement, and a force capable of shaping the canon—, it behooves me to consider how my editorial choices reflect my own values regarding guitar pedagogy.\(^{31}\) The works that I edited here reveal a personal bias; my former teacher regarded them as summits of nineteenth-century guitar music, and inculcated his passion in me. The way I separated the contrapuntal lines emphasizes both my own view of

\(^{26}\) See Study 136 in Part II.B of this treatise.  
\(^{27}\) Grier, *Critical Editing*, 157.  
\(^{28}\) Ibid., 159.  
\(^{29}\) The online sources of all the works used in the creation of Part II.B are listed in the Apparatus.  
\(^{31}\) Ibid., 45.
counterpoint as a key feature of nineteenth century music, as well as the value which I place on being able to recognize it, read it and play it from different notational settings. Moreover, my approach values not only historical practice of counterpoint: it also emphasizes the importance of guitarists’ intellectual engagement with the act of making music. Instrumental performance is a physical-intellectual challenge, which requires both technical and intellectual limberness. My edition thus emphasizes the preparation of guitarists as complete musicians, equipped with a know-how transferable to other areas of music-making (and more fully prepared to reap the rewards of their musical education).

Furthermore, my approach values the Western canonic contrapuntal tradition, yet questions the norm as it applies to the standard notational system used in guitar music. In *A Poetics of Postmodernism*, Linda Hutcheon contends that postmodernism is “a critical reworking” of past forms; she considers how postmodernism’s contradictory nature “works within the very systems it attempts to subvert.”32 Moreover, she argues how postmodern art “asserts and then deliberately undermines” the very systems it deals with—systems which were initially developed in response to artistic and cultural necessities, and which are not “natural, given, or universal.”33 Taking Hutcheon’s idea into consideration one could say that the editions contained in this work seek to question the norm, but do so within the Western notational system. Rather than trying to do without the Western notational system for guitar music, I instead propose through my editions to free it from a unilateral, normative approach.

I couldn’t help finding a correlation between the current guitar-normative notational system and Judith Butler’s ideas on gender identity. To Butler, “gender is an identity tenuously constituted in time, instituted in an exterior space through a stylized repetition of acts.”34 That is, gender is not defined by tangible physicality or by tradition, but rather through the repetition of specific actions over time. If the reader will indulge the analogy, it becomes possible to argue that the present normative system is precisely normative because of the way it continues to be repeated within the world of guitar

---

33 Ibid., 13.
34 Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York: Routledge, 1999), 140, original emphasis.
music. Thus the alteration of such repetition—through the use of alternate notational settings, for example—could possibly unlock the current status quo, the “gender” of the guitar’s notational corpus.35

As part of my own problem-solving strategy, I have enjoyed consulting Robert Dilts’s neuro-linguistic programming “logical levels” hierarchy.36 The idea is that different elements of our neurology flow from the most personal and internal to the most external, thus for any change to manifest itself it needs to cascade from the innermost part of the person to one’s environment. The levels are (from most internal to most external): purpose, identity, beliefs, values, capabilities, behaviors, and environment. Applying this model to the situation at hand, we could say that the current environment shows that guitar music is mostly notated according to a standard. Since the present work seeks to alter that “environment,” then we need to revise the behaviors of those who make up the “environment,” namely guitarists and publishers of music. Such behaviors are limited by their own capabilities (e.g. publishers would perhaps print in alternative settings if there were a market of guitarists proficient in decoding them). In this manner, this work provides a resource with which to exercise guitarists’ reading capabilities beyond the current standard.

Doing some self-examination and going further up Dilts’s pyramid, the present project stems from my own values regarding music and pedagogy. Those values came to be through a series of beliefs which I developed over years of learning from my college teachers; over years of reflecting upon Maestro Valcárcel’s ideas regarding how one is to morph into a being whose senses are fully aligned with the act of making music. Those beliefs are built on the foundation of my identity—that of a lover of science and the humanities—, which is framed by what I believe to be my purpose in this world. Rather than communicating my own purpose, I will instead invite the reader to consider what is his or hers.

Moreover, an argumentative evolutionary biologist could perhaps contend that the current notational standard is comprised of an excellent meme complex, an idea that, like a strong gene or a virus, has achieved enough cultural momentum as to be able to proliferate despite conscious attempts to regulate its use. See Richard Dawkins, “Memes: The New Replicators,” chapt. 11 in The Selfish Gene, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 189-201.

CHAPTER TWO:
LITERATURE REVIEW

The last two centuries of pedagogical literature for guitar trace an interesting history of notation and its realization of harmony and counterpoint. With few exceptions, guitar methodologies chart the notes on the guitar according to string and position, and provide students with simple pieces with which to exercise reading and thus learn the notes along the fingerboard. The twentieth century has seen a substantial development in the production of technical treatises, many of which build upon earlier methodologies to explore technique and its musical application on the guitar. There seems to be a fracture, however, between past and modern methods in terms of their valorization of harmony and voice leading, as well as their use of scores as an intrinsic component of guitarists’ musical experience.

In this chapter I will examine different aspects of nineteenth and twentieth-century guitar pedagogy, exemplified in works by Carulli, Sor, Aguado, Carcassi, Giuliani, Pujol, Carlevaro, Shearer, Bertoncini, and Marsters, Prasse and Welch. Considering works by Ferandiere and Doisy, I will comment on the still-active debate regarding the origins and implementation of treble notation for guitar music. I will then consider how different authors have taught the notes along the fingerboard, and to what extent their pedagogies have emphasized the role of harmony and counterpoint. I will also highlight what I consider to be a shift in pedagogical emphasis in the studio between the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, from theory and musicianship to technique.

Furthermore, I will examine Sor’s and Carulli’s ideas regarding piano and orchestral score use with the guitar, and consider non-guitar approaches to clef and score reading by Dandelot, Jacob, Lindenberg, Dickreiter, Taylor, Melcher and Warch, and Morris and Ferguson. By comparing early discussions of score reduction on the guitar to twentieth-century pianistic pedagogies, I will comment on the guitar’s viability as an instrument suitable for score reading, and on the necessity of a modern pedagogy for that purpose.

*****
The value of counterpoint as a guitar compositional tool was well established by the end of the eighteenth century. Using treble notation, Fernando Ferandiere’s treatise on the Spanish guitar charted the diatonic notes in first position, and provided a set of pieces with which to practice reading and interpretation.¹ Ferandiere argued for the compositional importance of counterpoint and observed that, in order to become a composer, one must be able to write cadences, phrases, canons, inversions, fugues, and four-part counterpoint (where each part “has its own clef in which it is played or sung”).² Ferandiere viewed counterpoint as a resource with endless compositional possibilities, which separates true composers from amateurs, and which informs musical enjoyment by allowing the distinction between music and “noise.”³

Despite Ferandiere’s valuation of counterpoint, his guitar notation did not emphasize voicings with consistent stem differentiation or precise note durations. The development of treble guitar notation is still under academic scrutiny; no consensus has yet been reached regarding its origins and implementation. Javier Suárez-Pajares has asserted that the earliest extant example of guitar treble notation is found in Pablo Minguet e Yrol’s 1754 tutor on the five-course guitar.⁴ Furthermore, Suárez-Pajares has discussed the gradual development of treble notation in order to accommodate the polyphonic resources that guitarists implemented in their own compositions.⁵ James Tyler has suggested that the adoption of treble notation for guitar music may have resulted from the early guitar being considered “a higher ranged instrument,” as well as from a possible shared background between early professional guitarists and violinists.⁶

² Ibid., 82. He refers to the SATB setting for vocal music, and to the two treble, alto and bass clefs setting for instrumental music.
³ Ibid., 83-4.
⁴ Javier Suárez-Pajares, “The rise of the modern guitar in Spain,” in Music in Spain During the Eighteenth Century, ed. Malcolm Boyd and Juan José Carreras (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 229; Pablo Minguet e Yrol, Reglas y advertencias generales que enseñan el modo de toñer todos los instrumentos mejores y más usuales, como son la guitarra, tiple, vandola, cythara, clavicordio, órgano, harpa, psalterio, bandurria, violin, flauta traversa, flauta dulce y la flautilla (Madrid, 1754; repr. Genève: Minkoff Reprint, 1981). Minguet e Yrol was a Spanish polymath, who also wrote treatises on subjects including magic (sleight of hand), dancing, chess, and eyeglasses.
⁵ Suárez-Pajares, “The rise of the modern guitar in Spain,” 230-1. According to Suárez-Pajares, guitar stave notation developed largely because of guitarists acquiring the technical and musical resources to play polyphonically; tablature, which preceded stave notation, didn’t emphasize the role of polyphony in guitar music.
Considering Tyler’s remarks and Ferandiere’s discussion of clefs, Suárez-Pajares has posited instead that the development of early guitar stave notation may be better explained by late eighteenth-century conventions regarding the use of the treble clef for instrumental music.\(^7\)

By the nineteenth century, guitarists were striving to find a balance between instrumental idiom and a notation which would reflect their musical ideas on the stave. Dionisio Aguado asserted in his 1825 tutor that Federico Moretti and Fernando Sor were among the first guitarists whose notation manifested (through consistent stem orientation and proper note duration) distinct contrapuntal parts in the music they wrote and played.\(^8\) Furthermore, even before Sor proposed a dual-stave for guitar music in his Fantasy Op. 7, Charles Doisy had suggested in his 1801 tutor a dual-stave system to notate music for the lyre-guitar (whose tessitura is similar to the modern guitar’s).\(^9\) Notice Doisy’s use of the F-clef on the third line, as shown in Example 3.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{example3.png}
\caption{Doisy, proposed notation for the lyre-guitar, from \textit{Principes généraux de la guitare}, p. 72.}
\end{figure}

\(^8\) Dionisio Aguado, \textit{Escuela de Guitarra} (Madrid, 1825), 1; Suárez-Pajares, \textit{Reglas}, 231-2. See also Federico Moretti, \textit{Principios para tocar la guitarra de seis órdenes, precedidos de los elementos generales de la música} (Madrid, 1799) and Dionisio Aguado, \textit{Méthode complète pour la guitare} (Paris: Richault, 1826), http://www2.kb.dk/elib/noder/rischel/RIBS0016-1.pdf.
\(^9\) Charles Doisy, \textit{Principes généraux de la guitare à cinq et à six cordes, et de la lyre} (Paris: Doisy, 1801), 72, http://img.kb.dk/ma/umus/doisy_princ.pdf. Doisy discusses primarily the five-string guitar (equivalent to the modern guitar’s first five strings). His discussion of the six-string lyre-guitar is restricted to a short subsection (5 out of 146 pages).
An example of Doisy’s proposed lyre-guitar notation may be found in Example 4, in a voice and guitar setting.

EXAMPLE 4, Doisy, example of dual-stave lyre-guitar notation, from *Principes généraux de la guitare*, p. 72.

Much like Sor’s proposed dual-stave notation, Doisy’s didn’t materialize into a trend amongst guitarists. Although different aspects behind the development of treble guitar notation (such as the mechanisms that made it normative) are still a matter of debate, the literature shows that such convention was already well-established by the nineteenth century. Furthermore, nineteenth-century pedagogical treatises reveal a strong emphasis on harmonic and contrapuntal thinking—despite the notational limitations imposed by the single stave, which may initially seem most striking.

I started my own musical studies with one of the most frequently used methods from the canon: Ferdinando Carulli’s *Complete Method for Guitar*. It explained the musical rudiments and communicated basic elements of guitar technique. To teach the notes on the fingerboard, Carulli first charted the diatonic notes in first position, and provided a set of reading studies in C-major; he implemented a similar approach for the study of major and minor keys with up to one flat and three sharps. In the second section of his method book, Carulli used a similar pedagogy to teach the notes in

---

positions IV, V, VII and IX. The method’s third section consists of teacher-student duos.

Until I reached the graduate level, I was under the impression that Carulli’s music didn’t strive to highlight counterpoint on the page, compared to other nineteenth century composers such as Sor. I remember playing studies from Carulli’s method, which didn’t differentiate the melodic lines with upward and downward stems—as was the convention already in the eighteenth century. The following passage is an example from Carulli’s Method, which I played as a child:

Example 5. Carulli, Andante from Metodo completo per lo studio de la chitarra, mm. 1-8.

A recent examination of some of Carulli’s non-canonical works provided new insight into his voice leading and contrapuntally-informed musical thinking, despite the seemingly non-contrapuntal notation. Carulli’s 1825 treatise on harmony applied to the guitar was intended for amateurs wishing to understand the basic elements of harmony and voice leading, with the goal of deriving guitar accompaniments for vocal works. In it, Carulli discussed intervals, chords (up to dominant seventh chords) and proper voice leading. Perhaps most interesting is Carulli’s understanding of chords and voice leading as they relate to the guitar: he discussed arpeggiation as an idiomatic resource through which one can manifest harmonic motion on the guitar. Notice how Carulli outlined a four-part harmonic progression in his treatise through the use of arpeggios:

---

12 Ibid., 44-53.
14 Ibid., 25-6.
Carulli clearly constructed his arpeggios with voice leading in mind. Thus his harmonic treatise challenges the notion that nineteenth-century guitar music was not rigorous in its use of voice leading. It suggests instead that, when informed by theory, works for the guitar use the instrumental idiom to manifest structural voice leading and counterpoint. Furthermore, Chapter 10 of Carulli’s harmonic treatise illuminates how block-chord and arpeggiated nineteenth-century guitar music was conceived to outline four-part harmonies. Considering possible combinations of tempo and meter, Carulli suggested different arpeggio figurations through which to express four-part harmony; each is associated with a tempo, and potentially (or by extension) with a mood.\(^\text{15}\) Some examples include the following:

From the perspective of performance practice, if Carulli’s arpeggio-tempo figurations reflect conventions from the period, such a chart is a valuable tool for deriving the tempo from nineteenth-century guitar music which may lack such specification. As will become

\(^{15}\) Ibid., 25.
apparent, Carulli’s guitaristic application of harmony and voice leading reached beyond the limits of guitar music: it also allowed him to peruse vocal, piano and orchestral scores.

In his *Method for the Spanish Guitar* Fernando Sor also proposed the usefulness of keeping tonal context in mind when developing a basic technical-musical understanding of the guitar.\(^\text{16}\) Reminiscent of Renaissance mathematician Camillo Agrippa’s geometry-based fencing theories, Sor included geometry-informed anatomical diagrams to support his methodology.\(^\text{17}\) Sor charted the location of the notes along the fingerboard, yet didn’t discuss a specific procedure for their memorization; he assumed reading proficiency, and provided instead resources to develop a sense of tonal context with the guitar.\(^\text{18}\) He emphasized the importance of proper voice leading, and discussed how understanding thirds and sixths will allow guitarists to interpret music through an awareness of “the base and other parts of the harmony.”\(^\text{19}\)

Sor’s discussion of voice leading brings up socioeconomic issues relevant to our understanding of nineteenth century guitar music. In a very detailed scenario Sor described how, upon his arrival to Paris, he became acquainted with publishers’ demands for easy guitar music for the amateur market. He soon “discovered that easy meant incorrect, or, at least, incomplete,” and noted how guitarist-composers were pressed to write in a manner often lacking compositional rigor, disregarding their own artistic preferences.\(^\text{20}\) Sor proposed that guitar compositions should be “both easy and correct,” in order to satisfy the publishers’ requirements while elevating the quality of guitar music at the time.\(^\text{21}\) Like Carulli, Sor suggested that a close understanding of harmony on the guitar could enable players to derive accompaniments from piano and/or orchestral scores.\(^\text{22}\) Moreover, Sor revealed his intention to publish a treatise, like Carulli before him, “*On Harmony applied to the Guitar.*”\(^\text{23}\)

\(^\text{17}\) Ibid., 10-22.
\(^\text{18}\) Ibid., 18-9. In Chapter 4 I will describe one of Sor’s harmonic exercises, and how it serves as a preparatory drill for clef and score reading.
\(^\text{19}\) Ibid., 27.
\(^\text{20}\) Ibid., 43, original emphasis.
\(^\text{21}\) Ibid., 44.
\(^\text{22}\) Ibid., 33.
\(^\text{23}\) Ibid., 36.
A friend of Sor’s, Dionisio Aguado also valued harmony and counterpoint in beginning guitar pedagogy. In his *Nuevo método para guitarra*, Aguado charted the diatonic and chromatic notes in first position, as well as the remaining notes on the first string. With this background, he introduced the student to intervals and triads, and discussed the remaining notes on the fingerboard as “equivalent sounds” of notes in first position.\(^{24}\) He commented upon how the guitar would be easy to play if it made use of a single melodic line, yet harmony and counterpoint render it an instrument which “should and can successfully represent the interplay of two or more voices at one time.”\(^{25}\) Aguado noted the guitar’s performance-notation interplay, mentioning how playing each contrapuntal part “requires double the care,” and “must therefore be written separately” within the stave.\(^{26}\) Like Sor, Aguado advocated developing one’s knowledge of the fingerboard through harmonic practice, and thus included in his text a section titled “Ideas on familiarity with the note-range of the guitar.” This section contains a series of exercises designed to develop one’s understanding of tonal context with the instrument, through the use (via transposition along the fingerboard) of intervals, chords and their resolutions.\(^{27}\)

Matteo Carcassi’s canonic *Méthode complète pour la guitare*, Op. 59, reveals a guitaristic approach built on a foundation of harmony and voice leading. To simplify the study of arpeggios, for example, he outlined the voice leading.\(^{28}\) Exercise No. 8 follows:

\(^{25}\) Ibid., 23.
\(^{26}\) Ibid.
\(^{27}\) Ibid., 146-62.
Example 8. Carcassi, Exercise No. 8 from *Méthode complète pour la guitare*.

Carcassi thus displays a conceptualization of guitar idiom that is based on harmony and voice leading. He also acknowledged that playing multiple lines of music presents an added difficulty for beginners, thus requiring focused finger independence in the right hand. Furthermore, Carcassi suggested familiarization with the fingerboard by establishing harmonic associations with different positions. He charted the notes in first position, and then provided a set of short review pieces. He also explored higher positions along the fingerboard (IV, V, VII, IX), associating each with a key, such as E-major with IV, G-major with VII, etc.

Mauro Giuliani’s *Method for Guitar*, in the author’s own words, was intended "for those who already have mastered the first elements [of guitar playing], and who now desire to perfect themselves without the help of an instructor.” Thus Giuliani didn’t discuss learning notes on the guitar. Instead, he provided exercises for the right and left hands, exercises in articulation and ornamentation, and a series of progressive studies. Through his left hand studies Giuliani reveals a harmonic approach to developing left

---

29 Ibid., 38.  
30 Ibid., 20-35.  
31 Ibid., 59-67.  
hand dexterity: the short exercises are comprised of melodies in thirds, sixths, octaves and tenths, in either C, G, D, or A-major. Furthermore, the studies from Parts 3 and 4 of his Method clearly implement articulations and ornaments among the different contrapuntal parts. Part 1 of his method consists of 120 arpeggio studies based on a I-V-I progression, which he outlined in the first study; these arpeggio studies may thus be understood as an idiomatic application of rigorous voice leading, as exemplified above by Carulli and Carcassi.

Nineteenth-century guitar pedagogies have been extensively used in the twentieth century; it is not uncommon to find reprints and modern editions of nineteenth-century methods in the catalogs of nearly every major publisher of guitar music. Andrés Segovia himself recommended Aguado’s tutor for beginning learners. Pedagogical innovations in the twentieth century focused, to a large extent, upon the development of technical dexterity and its application to performance and musical interpretation. These technique-based pedagogies assumed reading proficiency and a thorough understanding of the fingerboard, which one could have obtained by studying earlier pedagogies as those reviewed above. Representative examples of this twentieth century school of thought include Emilio Pujol’s Escuela razonada de la guitarra, based on the pedagogical principles of guitarist-composer Francisco Tárrega (1852-1909). In four volumes, Pujol discussed the technical mechanisms and interpretive principles required to be an effective performer. He provided numerous examples and short studies through which to implement his concepts. Pujol also included a concise review of the historical development of guitar notation, from the earliest extant tablatures printed in sixteenth century Venice, to the current notational system.

33 Giuliani, Method for Guitar, 17-32.
35 Emilio Pujol, Escuela razonada de la guitarra: basada en los principios de la técnica de Tárrega, vol. 1, 1956-1971 (Buenos Aires: Ricordi, 1956), 59-71. Pujol cites Rafael Mitjana’s La Musique en Espagne (1920), commenting on how it reproduces the earliest extant work in modern guitar notation (a contrapuntal piece by Padre Basilio). Miguel García, also known as Padre (“Father”) Basilio, was one of Dionisio Aguado’s teachers. See also Rafael Mitjana, La música en España: arte religioso y profano (Madrid: Centro de Documentación Musical, 1992), 301-2, and Graham Wade, A Concise History of the Classic Guitar (Pacific, MO: Mel Bay, 2001), 68.
Aware of his text’s technical emphasis, Pujol highlighted the importance of guitarists developing an interest in non-guitar music—which he considered an essential component of a well balanced musical “psychology.” Likewise, he viewed technical study as just one component of a musical education which also included solfege, harmony, analysis and history. To aid students in their understanding of theory, Pujol discussed and diagramed transposable major and minor intervals along different pairs of strings. Pujol reviewed the entire fingerboard through his short studies: in Volume 2 he charted the notes in position I, and provided a series of scales and short studies in that position. In Volume 3 he charted the notes as of position XIII, and discussed the practice of scales along the length of each string, as well as how to finger triads along the fingerboard. Unlike Sor and Aguado, Pujol treated these exercises as technical studies (to discuss fingerings, shifts, etc.) rather than as a way to develop harmonic awareness on the guitar.

Uruguayan guitarist Abel Carlevaro also made important strides in technique-based guitar pedagogy in the twentieth century. He intended his anatomy-informed School of Guitar to supply the literature with a pedagogy that went beyond “the fundamental shortcomings of the traditional guitar school” in regards to technique and interpretation. Carlevaro assumed reading proficiency and familiarity with the fingerboard, and focused on the development and acquisition of the mechanisms which comprise guitar technique. He explained that an efficient technique was essential for those who aspire to become great interpreters of music, and clarified that technique should always be at the service of musical ideas. Moreover, he discussed how to analyze a piece of music in order to determine the technical elements best suited to express its structure and harmony.

To American pedagogue Aaron Shearer, technique was an element ideally studied in conjunction with theory and musicianship. Shearer’s Learning the Classic Guitar
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36 Ibid., 15.
37 Ibid., 17.
38 Ibid., 53-9.
39 Ibid., vol. 3, 94-5.
41 Ibid., 20.
42 Ibid., 136.
series is thus divided into three parts, which discuss technique (Part One), musical reading and memorization (Part Two), and performing (Part Three). Shearer specified that Parts One and Two were intended to be used simultaneously, such that students could acquire their technique along with their general understanding of music.  

Part Two systematizes musical reading with guitar, in order to facilitate a thorough memorization of the notes in first position. To achieve this, Shearer discusses musical rudiments, emphasizing the study of rhythm away from the instrument; he then teaches the notes in first position, string by string. Following the discussion of each note, Shearer provides numerous short student-teacher duos. Shearer’s note-learning methodology relies on repetition: the numerous studies strive to facilitate a firm stave-guitar correlation through repetition, such that students may eventually decode notation “automatically.” Shearer remarks how the thoroughness of such note-learning strategy imposed space limitations for Part Two, hence the study of first position only. Shearer also valued guitarists’ understanding of theory applied to the guitar: he supplemented his *Classic Guitar Technique* series with a volume on introductory music theory applied to the guitar.  

Outside of the canon, the Class Guitar Resources *First and Second Year Guitar* series offers a unique pedagogical approach, which integrates technical and harmonic training within a group setting. Drawing from a variety of musical traditions, Nancy Lee Marsters, Leo Welch and Edward Prasse teach notation as part of a classroom discussion, which includes topics such as rhythmic strumming, tablature, blues and rock styles. The *First Year* volume includes elements of theory, such as chord construction and transposition on the guitar. This first volume teaches how to read music in first position by gradually introducing the notes along pairs of strings (6-5, 4-3, 2-1). To facilitate study and memorization, the authors include a set of short reading studies after reviewing each new set of notes. The *Second Year* volume provides further musical and technical
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44 Ibid., 3. I understand Shearer’s use of *automatic* to mean “without the use of comparison or mnemonics.”
45 Ibid., introduction. Aaron Shearer passed away in 2008, before expanding his pedagogy to the instrument’s higher positions, as he suggested also in the Introduction to Part Two. The approach he uses in Part Two suggests an interesting model to learning the notes in any region of the guitar, still open to exploration.
resources, and expands students’ knowledge of the fingerboard. The authors review the diatonic notes on each string, and discuss movable scale patterns to facilitate learning the notes in positions II, V and VII. After reviewing the scale in each of these positions, the authors include short reading studies to develop reading proficiency. Following their discussion of the expanded knowledge of the fingerboard, the authors introduce elements from different musical styles, discuss scales and chords, and elaborate the text’s ideas by means of guitar ensemble music.

Another contemporary pedagogical work, Gene Bertoncini’s *Approaching the Guitar* is intended for jazz guitarists wishing to improve their understanding of tonal context with the instrument. Bertoncini discusses the notes along the fingerboard in terms of scales and tonal context, through a conceptualization of the fingerboard according to position and along the length of the string. With this in mind, Bertoncini explains intervals, chromatic, major, minor and modal scales, chords and harmonization. He makes his study relevant to guitarists by suggesting guitaristic applications of the theoretical component, such as arpeggiation of chords and voicing possibilities of chords along the fingerboard. Bertoncini provides a series of exercises to develop one’s understanding of tonal context with the guitar. He suggests, for example, playing scales along each string, playing scale patterns in different positions, and outlining scale degrees 1-3-5-7 along each string in different keys. He also recommends writing random sets of notes in different keys and then playing them in order to exercise one’s knowledge of the fingerboard. Bertoncini provides a comprehensive introduction to harmonizing with the guitar, and assumes a fair knowledge of the fingerboard—or perhaps assumes, like Sor, that the student will develop such familiarity through harmonic practice with the guitar.

Of the authors and methodologies reviewed thus far, only Aaron Shearer devotes substantial space to the memorization of notes on the stave and on the guitar. His pedagogy makes use of extensive repetition (via short study pieces) to establish mental-physical relationships between a note on the stave and its location in first position. The other texts that promote fingerboard familiarization do so either through the inclusion of studies in positions beyond the first, or through tonal-contextual practice with the guitar.
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Yet most pedagogies omit in their discussions how the student is going to form a notation-instrument connection: for the most part they trust that students will eventually form the necessary connections for themselves, and proficiently read music in any position given enough practice. There is, of course, nothing inappropriate about learning to read music on the guitar through the conscientious reading of short, accessible passages—most guitarists have achieved reading proficiency that way for over two hundred years. The element of chance, however, strikes me as less than optimal: most pedagogies seem to suggest that students should read simple passages until they become proficient readers of music with varying levels of complexity. Just like Carlevaro proposed specific mental-physical procedures to consolidate technical resources on a subconscious level, could a similar principle be applied to the study of reading music on the guitar?

Georges Dandelot’s treatise on the study of clefs provides a systematized model for memorizing the notes of each clef. His approach may provide the guitar literature with an alternative both to studying different positions along the fingerboard, and to studying multiple clefs with the guitar. Dandelot’s methodology focuses on the memorization of the notes for each clef. He proposes that proficient reading involves instant decoding from the stave, devoid of additional steps like transposition. To achieve this, Dandelot suggests learning four or five notes along the stave, which will serve as points of reference: intervallic comparison will allow the reader to decode the remaining notes—instantly, with enough practice. Thus the student who memorizes a G on the second line will be able to tell that a lower neighbor is an F, and that note a third higher is a B. In Chapter IV I discuss how Dandelot’s model can be applied to the guitar to facilitate clef study and note memorization on the fingerboard. In Part II.A I implement Dandelot’s principle to the study of the treble, soprano, alto, tenor and bass clefs in positions I, III, V, VII and X.

Although the current canon doesn’t consider the guitar as a primary instrument for the study of clef and score reading, evidence suggests that such practice may have been

51 Ibid., 2-3. This procedure assumes proficiency in interval counting. Dandelot suggests preparing oneself to use his method by counting ascending and descending intervals from different starting pitches.
commonplace in the nineteenth century. We know that Carulli, Giuliani and Sor composed chamber and orchestral works, and Giuliani and Carulli published concerti for guitar and orchestra.\textsuperscript{52} Sor’s non-guitar output includes operas, ballets, symphonies and string quartets.\textsuperscript{53} Furthermore, around 1820 Carulli published a book of solfege and vocalization with easy guitar accompaniment.\textsuperscript{54} Carulli’s purpose was to incorporate vocal work in a text that would feature the guitar’s harmonic and accompanying capabilities: to his knowledge, no one had yet written a solfege study with guitar accompaniment. He observed that potential users of his text included guitar teachers not trained in figured bass, and amateur guitarists wishing to study solfege—the latter being a substantial segment of guitarists, commented the author.\textsuperscript{55} Carulli thus kept the guitar accompaniments “as simple as possible,” such that users of his text could read the vocal and guitar lines simultaneously.\textsuperscript{56} As an example, consider exercise No. 5, which introduces a combination of quarter and eight notes:

\begin{center}
\textbf{Example 9. Carulli, \textit{Solfèges et vocalises}, No. 5.}
\end{center}

Compared to Exercise No. 5, Nos. 50 and 51 exemplify the type of progress which Carulli intended for his students, both in terms of vocal-instrumental ability and in two-part score reading. Fragments of Exs. 50 and 51 follow:\textsuperscript{57}

\textsuperscript{52} See Carulli’s Opp. 8 and 140, and Giuliani’s Opp. 30, 36 and 70.
\textsuperscript{55} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{56} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{57} Exercises No. 50 and 51 may be found in Appendix A in their full length.
In the conclusion of his treatise on harmony, Carulli reaffirms his valuation of harmonic training on the guitar: to allow students to derive vocal accompaniments from piano and orchestral scores, and to construct accompaniments for melodies which didn’t yet have them.\(^{58}\) Among the works which Carulli used to illustrate his theory are Romagnesi’s “Le Lutin” (for voice and piano), D’Alayrac’s “Romance de Nina” (“Quand le bien aimé reviendra,” an aria with orchestral accompaniment), and an aria from Mozart’s *Marriage of Figaro* (“Voi che sapete che cosa e amor,” with orchestral accompaniment).\(^{59}\) Notice that Carulli explains his preference for arpeggiation to replace sustained notes (Appendix C, see Carulli’s footnote to m. 4), and for textural simplicity (Appendix D, see Carulli’s footnote to m. 1).

\(^{58}\) Carulli, *L’harmonie*, 27. Carulli mentions in his conclusion that such accompaniments could be either constructed by amateurs, or provided to them by their teachers. It is not clear if he foresaw amateurs reaching a harmonic and score reading proficiency such that they could produce these accompaniments on the spot.

\(^{59}\) See Appendixes B, C and D. Carulli cites D’Aleyrac as the composer of the “Romance de Nina.” The *Grove Music Online* entry for “Nicolas-Marie Dalayrac [D’Alayrac]” uses a different spelling of the composer’s name, whose production includes the opera *Nina* (1786). In his autobiography, Berlioz uses the same spelling as Carulli.
Beyond illustrating the arrangement of guitar parts from piano and orchestral scores, Carulli’s choices of examples for his solfege treatise may also inform our understanding of nineteenth-century vocal music. Let us consider, for example, Carulli’s inclusion of “Quand le bien aimé reviendra,” from D’Alayrac’s *Nina*. In an intense confessional narration, Hector Berlioz recounts in his autobiography how, during his first communion in an Ursuline convent, the female choir’s intonation of a heartfelt melody made him soar in musical-religious joy. Years later, he recognized the tune as *Nina’s* “Quand le bien aimé reviendra.” Moved with the memory of his “musical awakening” upon hearing this air for the first time, Berlioz spoke apostrophically to its composer: “Dear, dead d’Aleyrac! Even your name is forgotten now!” In such manner Berlioz informs our understanding both of a melodic style he considered perfervid, and of D’Alayrac’s popularity—already waned in 1848, about twenty years after Carulli published his solfege treatise. This example establishes a guitaristic-biographical correlation between Carulli, Berlioz and the nineteenth-century vocal repertoire, and informs us of public reception and the span of popularity of a composer such as D’Alayrac. Moreover, Carulli’s choice of vocal music to exemplify his accompaniment theory is particularly relevant to the history of the guitar and its music: not only does it inform us that nineteenth-century guitarists were interested in singing, but it also includes examples of works which potential users of his treatise could have found captivating.

Like Carulli before him, Sor also discussed the derivation of guitar accompaniments from piano and orchestral scores. In Appendix E I reproduce a fragment of an aria from *The Creation* by Haydn (“Nun schwanden vor dem heiligen Strahle,” “Now vanish before the holy beams”), from which Sor reduced the orchestral accompaniment for guitar. Like Carulli’s, Sor’s arrangement reveals his preference for a simple, idiomatic texture in the guitar part, which uses appropriate voice leading and considers the score’s bass, harmony, and moving parts. In mm. 3 and 19 Sor changes the original by dotting the eighth notes; he adds passing tones in the descending scale from

---

61 The inclusion of the air from *Nina* in Carulli’s harmonic treatise, and my own project, attests that the music of D’Alayrac’s is not forgotten, but is still alive in the minds of others who (like Berlioz before) love the guitar.
m. 10, and fills the harmony in mm. 4-5. Sor thus introduces variation in his reduction via instrumental idiom, without wandering far from the original passage. In his Method, Sor clarifies how he constructed this arrangement by considering not just the harmony and voice leading, but also different fingering possibilities along the fingerboard. Sor’s arrangements of airs from The Magic Flute, Op. 19, may provide further insight into his score-reducing procedures and preferences. Other notable nineteenth century examples of guitar arrangements of orchestral music include Giuliani’s potpourris of themes by Rossini (Opp. 119-124), and François de Fossa’s (1775-1849) arrangement of François-Adrien Boieldieu’s overture to Le Calife de Bagdad.

Beyond Carulli’s and Sor’s treatment of score reduction, other non-guitar texts may also inform guitarists’ understanding of the subject. Gordon Jacob asserted the importance of developing clef reading dexterity as a key to proficient score reading; he identified the alto, tenor and soprano clefs as particularly useful. The ability to decode the notes in the score, he added, allows one to perceive the music through one’s “mental ear,” rather than just having a general sense of the music based on melodic contour. Like Dandelot, Jacob recommended learning each clef on its own rather than relying on transposition, and suggested reading, writing and transcribing music in different clefs as a way to develop clef proficiency. Edouard Lindenberg also advocated familiarizing oneself with clefs to facilitate score reading. Additionally, Michael Dickreiter’s treatise on score reading provides a comprehensive introduction to the subject. He included guidelines for following the score, and provided examples ranging from Bach to Stravinsky.

Eric Taylor discussed how to go about reducing a score at the piano. His pedagogical approach may illuminate different aspects of score reading for guitarists, and challenge any modern preconceptions regarding the guitar’s viability in such an enterprise. Taylor pointed out that even with as many harmonic resources as the piano provides, it is not possible for one pianist to play every single note from an orchestral

63 Ibid.
64 Gordon Jacob, How to Read a Score (New York: Boosey & Hawkes, 1944), 12.
65 Ibid., 14.
66 Ibid., 13-4.
score. But he clarified that reproducing as many notes as possible is not what constitutes an effective reduction, but rather creating “the most accurate impression which can be achieved of the general sound of a score.” This notion challenges the idea that the guitar is not an appropriate score reading instrument because it cannot accommodate dense contrapuntal textures. Perhaps Taylor would value Sor’s and Carulli’s arrangements, as they in effect convey the “general sense” of scores based on harmony and melodic motion.

Taylor distinguished three skills that can facilitate score reading at the piano: proficiency in reading the treble, alto, tenor and bass clefs; proficiency in transposition, and a harmonically attuned “keyboard sense.” The latter skill refers to the ability to provide on-the-spot melodic harmonization of a passage; Taylor emphasized this skill because “playing from an orchestral score almost invariably demands not only the correct reading of notes but a simultaneous ‘arrangement’.” These three skills don’t conflict with what is feasible for a guitarist: a guitarist’s ability to read from a score is thus not conditional upon the instrument’s range and harmonic resources, but upon the instrumentalist’s musicianship. The pedagogical works reviewed in this chapter each employ different elements necessary to develop these basic score reading skills. Carulli, Sor, Aguado, Pujol, Bertoncini and Marsters et al. provide different alternatives to exercise harmonic dexterity on the guitar. Part II.A of this project contains a set of clef reading studies (precisely those clefs which Jacob distinguished as useful). Moreover, because they were derived from idiomatic guitar music, the score reading exercises from Part II.B also promote a “guitar sense” in regards to score reading, akin to the “keyboard sense” which Taylor emphasized.

Taylor discussed score reduction as at best an approximation of a score’s overall totality, given the physical limitations of reducing an orchestral texture to one instrument. There are, however, preparatory exercises in score reading, which could be feasibly played note by note at the piano. Collections such as those by Robert Melcher and Willard Warch, and R.O. Morris and Howard Ferguson are two examples. In *Music for Score Reading*, Melcher and Warch gradually introduce students to the practice of

---

70 Ibid., 8, emphasis mine.
71 Ibid.
reading multiple lines of music, as well as reading clefs and transposing at the piano. Their text also includes a set of orchestral scores with examples of possible ways to reduce them at the piano. Melcher and Warch suggest playing as many parts from the score as the student’s piano skills may allow, and progressively increasing the difficulty by reading more parts.\footnote{Robert A. Melcher and Willard F. Warch, preface to \textit{Music for Score Reading} (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1971), vi.}

R. O. Morris and Howard Ferguson’s \textit{Preparatory Exercises in Score Reading} prepares students to read scores at the piano through the practice of reading multiple parts (up to five) and transposing. Rather than treating their studies as one-time sight reading exercises, Morris and Ferguson suggest learning each study.\footnote{Ibid., iii.} Furthermore, they suggest playing parts with unfamiliar clefs separately a few times, before attempting to read the entire score.\footnote{Ibid., iii-iv.} In their preface, Morris and Ferguson discuss the importance of exploring the limits of one’s instrument and one’s own score reading capabilities.\footnote{Ibid., iv.} They observe that score reading proficiency is often perceived as “genuine wizardry” by the uninitiated, yet acquiring such a skill requires constant effort over years.\footnote{Ibid., iii.} They stress the fact that many who prefer simplicity and who seek fast results will be discouraged by the amounts of patience and practice required to achieve such proficiency. Those who pursue such study, the authors insist, may discover surprising rewards, even if they fall short of their initial expectations: students may find, they suggest, “that in failing to master all the intricacies of a Wagner score, they have unwittingly acquired the ability to read any string quartet with ease.”\footnote{Ibid., iv.}

The pianistic score reading pedagogies reviewed above make no apology for the likelihood that pianists will not always be able to faithfully reproduce orchestral scores. However, such practice, limited as it is by instrumental factors, is still a useful way to enhance pianists’ musicianship through their understanding of chamber and orchestral scores. Additionally, this exploration of musical-instrumental limits allows pianists to grow by engaging technical and mental resources that they probably wouldn’t have had

\footnotesize{\textit{Preparatory Exercises in Score Reading} (1931; repr. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), iv.}

\footnotesize{\textit{Music for Score Reading} (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1971), vi.}
to cultivate to such an extent otherwise. The guitar pedagogies reviewed in this chapter illuminate important developments in the instrument’s harmonic practice, and in the role of tonal thinking as an intrinsic component of guitar instruction. Some of these developments move beyond what might be considered traditional guitar pedagogy, yet they may inform the understanding of those who have been or are being brought up in that tradition. What is more, works from the nineteenth century suggest that guitarists from that period were starting to explore the guitarist’s potential to read dual-stave notation and orchestral scores. The present treatise strives to revive and expand that tradition as a way to rethink the guitar’s current use, and perhaps help shape its future music-making possibilities.
CHAPTER THREE:
LIMITATIONS AND SIGNIFICANCE

During one of our meetings, Maestro Valcárcel used an analogy to explain the importance of being physically involved in the musical process. He compared being a musician to being in a romantic relationship (the score being analogous to a framed picture of one’s partner). He said: “Would you be happy just having the picture sitting somewhere, and saying to people ‘Look, that’s my girlfriend, isn’t she beautiful’? No! If you are with someone, and care about the person, you could care less about the framed picture, because you would much rather hold her, and physically experience the miracle that she is!” He commented that the musical page is merely a representation of an act which should happen in the physical world, and come alive through one’s own hands.

Considering this early lesson, I’ve spent some time contemplating the implications of my proposed notational alternatives, and how they seek to escape the printed page to materialize through performance. This chapter addresses the significance of my project for guitarists and others who may benefit from the study of its music. I discuss some limitations I encountered when assembling the studies for Part II, and some challenges which a player may experience when using these studies. Understanding these conditions, and how I’m choosing to deal with them, could well make the difference between these exercises coming alive in the hands of players, versus being relegated to a purely visual reading.

The score reading studies in Part II.B assume early-intermediate technical proficiency on the guitar, as well as reading proficiency using the treble, bass, alto, tenor, and soprano clefs. Since many variables inform one’s sense of what “technical proficiency” means, perhaps examples can illustrate the technical level expected from a user of Part II.B. A student who can play through works of the caliber of Giuliani’s Progressive Studies, Op. 51, or Sor’s Progressive Lessons, Op. 31, will not struggle technically to execute the works in this treatise.

On the other hand, the question of clef reading proficiency on the guitar is a bit more elusive, since there are no substantial works that teach clef reading to guitarists. I have thus elected to supplement this treatise with a body of exercises a guitarist can use...
to begin to read non-treble clefs on the guitar. These exercises guide the student in learning the unaltered notes of the diatonic C-major scale along the fingerboard, and take into consideration some of the guitar’s fingering properties, such as different positions along the fingerboard.\(^1\) That said, students are expected to have an understanding of diatonic and chromatic scales, particularly as to how they manifest within each string. With this knowledge, students will be guided to locate notes along the fingerboard in relation to other referential notes (e.g. where a D-natural is in relation to a C-natural—two frets away on the same string).

Although guitarists from different walks of life may be able to play through the studies in Part II, there is a question of utility: who represents the “target audience” for these reading studies? Who could benefit most from engaging in such an exercise? The answer, I believe, has to do with the desire to study score reading on the guitar, but is mostly influenced by the potential user’s level of comfort in reading nontraditional settings. How comfortable is the player reading guitar music in the standard notational system, and how willing is he or she to experience decoding music from an alternative setting? A concert-level performer, for example, would probably have to give up traditional instrumental practice time in order to engage in clef and score reading practice. Considering that a professional performer may not find reading a Sor miniature in three different clefs as rewarding as playing flawlessly a major concert piece, he or she may not have much incentive to study clef and score reading. Furthermore, the benefits of clef and score reading may not outweigh, for many players, the temporary discomfort and disorientation of struggling to read alternate settings of music, which is simpler than their concert repertoire.

A relatively new guitar student, on the other hand, may not yet have developed a bias for one notational setting versus another. At the earliest levels, students haven’t yet amassed a substantial repertoire which depends strictly on the use of one notational system. What is more, beginning students don’t necessarily correlate the standard notation with a more suitable or “better” way to notate music on the instrument (versus

\(^1\) Where “position,” as it is used in guitar pedagogy, is the area roughly delineated by four spaces on the fingerboard. The space closest to the head of the guitar designates first position, for example. Positions are conventionally notated in roman numerals.
any other system that the teacher may implement).² Patsy Lightbown and Nina Spada have discussed how children often lack the biases and social qualms which tend to hinder language acquisition in adults, and thus acquire second languages relatively easily.³ Like children striving to communicate, early music learners are still malleable, and thus may accept clef and score reading on the guitar as a way to get acquainted with its repertoire. I encourage pedagogues who may find value in the practice of clef and score reading on the guitar to introduce students to such practice as early as they think the student can handle the task.

Beyond guitar students and teachers, other musicians may also find value in the notational settings from Part II.B. Pianists studying score reading may be pleasantly surprised by the many ways guitar music can supplement well-known collections of pianistic preparatory score reading music.⁴ Pianists may also use this study as a vehicle to develop a better understanding of the guitar’s textural and contrapuntal possibilities: this is particularly relevant if we consider that Giuliani wrote a number of guitar-piano duets, or that Anton Diabelli wrote piano reductions of the orchestral part for Giuliani’s guitar concertos.⁵ Composers may also find value in a body of guitar works where the texture has been separated according to its counterpoint. Such a resource can be an aid to composers seeking to gain a better understanding of what is possible or idiomatic for the instrument. Similarly, theorists may find these settings valuable for teaching harmonic-contrapuntal settings of nineteenth-century guitar music. Perhaps one day a miniature by Sor may be used as an example in a theory class to illustrate rounded binary form.

As we saw in Chapter I through Charles Rosen’s discussion of Berlioz’s guitar-influenced harmonic conception, notation has an affect on the musicological study of

² The way, for example, a beginning piano student wouldn’t question the appropriateness of using the dual stave in order to play music on the instrument.
³ Patsy Lightbown and Nina Spada, *How Languages Are Learned*, 3rd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 32. A child, for example, may be motivated to learn a language in order to partake of games with other children, and thus be willing to make mistakes which are a natural part of learning a new language. On the other hand, adults may suppress communication in a formal class setting, for example, out of fear of embarrassment, or out of caution regarding their grades.
⁴ R. O. Morris and Howard Ferguson, *Preparatory Exercises in Score Reading* (1931; repr. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996); Robert A. Melcher and Willard F. Warch, *Music for Score Reading* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1971). Furthermore, musicians who play primarily single-line instruments (e.g. flutists) may use the piano (or the guitar) along with the present treatise, to exercise contrapuntal playing and score reading.
⁵ See Giuliani’s Opp. 30, 65, 68, 91 and 92, for example.
composers and their works. The present study may thus inform musicologists regarding some of the guitar’s compositional possibilities, as well as the capabilities of nineteenth century guitar composers, through their implementation of counterpoint. Ethnomusicologists may also value arrangements such as those contained here, if we consider how the guitar plays a major role in different musical traditions as both a solo and as an accompanying instrument. Beyond understanding the guitar’s musical-cultural role in specific contexts, understanding the guitar’s use of counterpoint may be an illuminating way of bridging the guitar’s traditional-popular use with its Western legacy.\textsuperscript{6} Furthermore, even though nineteenth-century guitar composers may initially appear to fall within a “classical” tradition, much music written by the likes of Sor and Giuliani could serve as a pathway from which to study specific national traditions. Giuliani’s Op. 125, for example, is a collection of Irish dances arranged for solo guitar.\textsuperscript{7}

The life of Fernando Sor also poses interesting musicological questions, as his musical education took place in Catalonia, Spain, yet he published much of his guitar music in France and Great Britain while in exile. Shaped geographically and politically by the Napoleonic invasion of Spain (1808), Sor’s production raises issues of identity.\textsuperscript{8} Was Sor’s inclusion of the British national anthem within a collection of studies published in London, for example, a marketing ploy, or a sincere demonstration of his assimilation of British cultural elements, or both?\textsuperscript{9}

The works edited in this treatise promote diverse musical and cultural discussions of the guitar and of nineteenth-century music. To frame my own use of these works, I begin by considering some challenges, which I encountered in preparing Part II. The innovative notational settings which I propose provide an equally-novel set of conditions regarding their use. The inclusion of clef reading exercises for guitar is a means of

\textsuperscript{6} Fernando Sor, \textit{Method for the Spanish Guitar}, trans. A. Merrick (London: Cocks and Co., 1832; repr. New York: Da Capo, 1971), 26. Arguably, any chord-based guitar accompaniment, whether plucked or strummed, manifests harmonic-contrapuntal interplay at some level. What composers like Sor advocated, however, was a deliberate use of the guitar’s harmonic capabilities, keeping in mind common practice rules of harmonic motion.

\textsuperscript{7} Brian Jeffery, \textit{Fernando Sor: Composer and Guitarist}. 2nd ed. (London: Tecla Editions, 1994), 12. Sor initially supported French revolutionary ideals, and worked as an administrator during the Napoleonic occupation of Spain. This earned him the appellation \textit{afrancesado} (“frenchified”), a derogatory term used to discriminate against those who supported the French over the Spanish national cause. Upon defeat of the French, Sor, like many afrancesados, went into exile out of fear of political and personal retribution.

\textsuperscript{8} See the Maestoso section in Sor’s Op. 6, No. 10.
facilitating the use of the score reading studies (as it is also a first attempt at filling the
gap in the literature). For practical reasons I am restricting the study of each clef to the
memorization of certain “points of reference” along the fingerboard, and to the practice
of locating selected diatonic intervals in relation to these points of reference.\[10\] Having
studied where the diatonic notes of C-major fall on the guitar in relation to the clefs
studied, students can then use their knowledge of scales and intervals to calculate the
location of the remaining notes. If I had an unrestricted amount of time to further
elaborate the clef reading exercises, I would add sections in the other positions, in
different tonalities and in faster figurations.

The score reading studies from Part II.B are also a first attempt to supply the
guitar literature with such exercises.\[11\] These studies are limited to short (one to two-page)
works by Fernando Sor, Mauro Giuliani, Dionisio Aguado, and Matteo Carcassi. From
the works of these composers, I decided to include those in which I perceived the
counterpoint to be most distinct. My search for exemplary works focused on music in
which different voices display melodic motion beyond the presence of accompanying
basses.\[12\] In an effort to emphasize reading over recollection from previous studies, I have
decided not to include those compositions by Sor which appear in Segovia’s Twenty
Studies edition.\[13\] My survey of the above-mentioned composers has uncovered beautiful
works from which I derived the studies in Part II.B. My effort is by no means exhaustive
or totalizing; it simply reflects my own exploration of a body of works and the selection
of some, which I found appropriate for my own purposes.

Technical challenges may arise if guitarists navigate beyond the “finger-friendly”
studies I have assembled, and venture into playing other, non-guitaristic scores on the
instrument. I am aware that the guitar’s six strings (and the eight fingers with which
many guitarists make music) offer multiple limitations in terms of voicing options and
contrapuntal possibilities. The present study is not, however, a lament over the musical

\[10\] The positional options I chose, because they are restricted to four frets per position, limit the availability
of notes to study. I selected the intervals for study which allowed the most substantial access to notes per
position.

\[11\] Even though Sor made use of a double stave and three clefs in his Fantasy, Op. 7, he didn’t provide
novices with a means to gradually build up proficiency as to comfortably read its notational setting.

\[12\] I decided to include a number of “melody with sustained bass” exercises as the simplest reading
exercises in each notational setting

possibilities that the guitar cannot manifest; it is, instead, a celebration of the guitar’s technical resources, which allow for its production of music in thus far unexplored notational settings. It is difficult to say at this point in history where the limits may lie in terms of using the guitar to read non-guitar scores. This treatise is a first exploration beyond the boundaries present in treble guitar notation; it seeks to both elevate the current music reading level and to provide a starting point for further studies in guitar clef and score reading.

Despite the limitations that guitarists might encounter when implementing these studies in their musical practice, multiple benefits await those who engage in such work, as discussed in this Chapter and in Chapter 1. The significance of the present study lies in the extent to which exploring alternative notational settings can empower musicians to develop a closer understanding of the guitar and its music. Furthering one's knowledge of counterpoint through the guitar is not necessarily an end in itself, but a gateway through which to explore new repertoires, musical settings, and music-making possibilities. By providing non-guitarists with a tool to further understand the guitar’s idiom, this project also invites composers and musicologists to consider some of the musical forces that have made the guitar one of the most recognizable instruments in today’s global musical panorama.
Maestro Valcárcel once told me the two ways children learned how to swim during his youth in the Andean city of Puno: “You could sign up for swimming lessons, and learn step by step. More often, though, one of your friends would push you into the pool, and as to not drown, you had to learn.” Rather than “pushing guitarists into the pool” of clef and score reading (and risk disorienting and losing them in the process), I will discuss steps students can take to make best use of the material assembled in Part II. I will first present some mental drills to develop clef reading proficiency through interval recognition. Next I will guide the student through an exercise recommended by Sor, which promotes thinking in terms of tonal context as a way to get acquainted with the fingerboard. I will then explain how the preparatory clef reading studies from Part II are organized, and how to go about implementing their practice. My hope is that armed with this knowledge, the student will be motivated to jump into the water and swim, not for survival, but for pleasure.

IV.i. Mind over string: preparatory mental drills

Considering how many Western classical instrumentalists transmit and learn music by decoding notes on a page, one could argue that such performance is most often preceded by the act of reading music.¹ Neurological circuits relay information from musicians’ eyes to their brains, spinal cords and a series of nerves and muscles along their bodies, allowing them to see a note on the page and play it on their instrument. Therefore the act of reading music “on one’s instrument” is fundamentally a mental process rather than a physical one. It is thus my intention to outline in this chapter a few considerations which may help students organize the task of reading music starting from simple idea units, and building progressively towards more challenging reading tasks. The following maxim has made my musical life simpler, both in the practice room and

¹ I am of course restricting this discussion to Western classical music. As mentioned in Chapter I, many traditions transmit music by rote memorization, improvisation, and non-Western notation.
when studying music away from the guitar: if one cannot think it, one cannot play it. One may consider for example how impractical it would be to ask a young child to read out loud a chapter from *Don Quixote* if the child is still struggling to read individual words.² It is therefore not surprising that if one has trouble decoding individual notes from the stave, one will find the act of reading a passage of music to be extremely challenging.

The question then arises as to which fundamental skill to exercise in order to facilitate locating notes along the stave. George Dandelot suggests that memorizing a few specific notes along the stave is the simplest path to developing the habit of decoding the notes in any given clef.³ These selected notes one memorizes serve as reference points; in order to decipher what a non-referential note is, all one has to do is compare its placement to that of the nearest reference point. For example, if one knows the location of a G on the stave, then a note immediately above it is an A; a note two positions below the G is an E, etc.

Example 11. Locating notes on the stave with reference points.

At its base, the ability to decode the notes along the stave is also the ability to name notes in leaps, or intervals. It will benefit students to become proficient in articulating the names of the notes (A, B, C, D, E, F, G) in different interval permutations in ascending and descending order.⁴ A first lesson designed to introduce students to intervallic counting might look like this:⁵

* * * * *

² Reading a book, for example, is evidence that one has unconsciously mastered the various tasks behind reading, to the point where one doesn’t stop to think about whether a letter is a “d” versus a “b,” or a “q” versus a “p.”
⁴ Since I’m writing this treatise in the United States, I am using the English names of the notes. Throughout my childhood and teens I used solfege syllables exclusively; now I use both systems interchangeably.
⁵ See Dandelot, *Manual práctico*, 3, for a version of this exercise using solfege syllables.
Preparatory Lesson # 1: The Order of the Notes

- **Ex. 1:** Name the notes in seconds (i.e. in succession), in ascending order: A-B-C-D-E-F-G-A-B-C…

- **Ex. 2:** Name the notes in seconds, in descending order, G-F-E-D-C-B-A-G-F-E…

- **Ex. 3:** Name the notes in thirds, in ascending (A-C-E-G-B-D-F-A-C…) and descending order (G-E-C-A-F-D-B-G-E…).

- **Ex. 4:** Name the notes in fourths, in ascending (A-D-G-C-F-B-E-A-D…) and descending order (G-D-A-E-B-F-C-G-D…).

- **Ex. 5:** Name the notes in fifths, in ascending (A-E-B-F-C-G-D-A-E…) and descending order (G-C-F-B-E-A-D-G-C…).

Say these exercises out loud; remember you are just articulating the names of the notes (as opposed to singing the actual pitches). Keep a steady rhythm, using a metronome if possible; go as slow as necessary to clearly articulate each note, and increase speed gradually. Once you become good at naming the notes in the suggested intervals, you can practice these exercises using a rhythmic figure. For example, you can use triplets and stress every third pitch (e.g. in ascending seconds: A-B-C-D-E-F-G-A-B-C…). You could also use dotted figures, syncopation, etc. This is a mental exercise, which you may practice away from the guitar throughout the day.

* * * * *

It is also useful to practice naming the notes of the chromatic scale. Students can also vary the difficulty of these next two exercises by adding rhythmic figures, and/or gradually increasing tempo. A second lesson might look like this:

* * * * *

Preparatory Lesson # 2: The Chromatic Scale

- **Ex. 6:** Name the notes of the chromatic scale with sharps, in both ascending (A-A♯-B-C-C♯-D-D♯-E-F-F♯-G-G♯-A-A♯…) and descending order (A-G♯-G-F♯-F-E-D♯-D-C♯-C-B-A♯-A-G♯…).

- **Ex. 7:** Name the notes of the chromatic scale with flats, in both ascending (A-B♭-B-C-D♭-D-E♭-E-F-G♭-G-A♭-A♭-B♭… and descending order (A-A♭-G♭-G-B♭-F-E♭-E♭-D♭-D♭-C-B♭-B♭-A♭-A♭…).
The better students become at these exercises, the easier it will be for them to locate notes on the stave and on the guitar. Furthermore, this preliminary work with intervals will be helpful once students move beyond elementary reading and get into theoretical aspects such as chord construction on the guitar. The next two sections of this chapter build on the skills exercised by the above mental drills, with the aim of promoting a systematic cognizance of the entire fingerboard.

IV.ii. “Vertical” and tonal knowledge of the fingerboard

The guitar’s tonal grid is not laid-out in a single individual sequence; instead, a web of equivalent sounds offers an interesting set of conditions. On the guitar there are seventy-eight possible locations from which to play pitches (notes with specific frequencies), between the open strings and the twelfth fret. Within these seventy-eight possibilities, there are only thirty-seven distinct pitches; the rest are equivalent sounds, repetitions along different strings. This is in contrast to the keyboard, for example, where each pitch is allotted one key, and where pitch classes occur in a repeating twelve-key pattern. The guitar’s plurality of options compounds the challenge of fingering a piece of music: it is not just a matter of which finger of the left hand to use when playing a pitch; one also needs to decide which occurrence of the pitch to play.

For this reason, students’ musicality will benefit from enriching their awareness of the different equivalent sounds along the fingerboard, string by string—what I call a “vertical” knowledge of the fingerboard. Even though much music on the guitar can be played in first position, becoming familiar with the entire tonal palette along the length of the fingerboard will allow students to consider multiple fingering possibilities. Such possibilities are an asset not only in terms of instrumental color, but also in terms of uncovering practical fingerings which may, for example, facilitate playing fast passages.

---

6 Joseph N. Straus. *Introduction to Post-Tonal Theory*, 3rd edition. (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2005), 3. A pitch class, on the other hand, designates all the instances of a note (e.g. pitch-class G).

7 This terminology is different from that used by Bertoncini, who designates work along the length of the string as horizontal.

8 Each string offers a different timbre for the pitches it contains, despite the pitches occurring elsewhere on the fingerboard. Guitar instruction often overemphasizes reading music in first position. This pedagogical boundary can potentially create a handicap for learners, by establishing a “comfort zone” in which to exercise one’s music reading. This section seeks to supplement a fixed comfort zone with a malleable one.
It is thus engaging one’s mind through different instrumental-theoretical drills that may promote fingerboard familiarity, rather than mnemonics.

In his *Method* Sor discusses the importance of acquainting oneself with the notes along the fingerboard. He observes that learning the notes on the guitar through an understanding of tonal function significantly enhances guitarists’ instrumental knowledge and musicianship. Mere note-placement memorization and mechanical score reproduction, adds Sor, are more the workings of a “note player.” Sor delineates a very helpful exercise with which to familiarize oneself with the notes along the length of each string, while sharpening one’s tonal-instrumental understanding. Sor’s exercise takes into account “every note with respect to its place in the key, and not as an isolated sound” whose placement on the fingerboard one would simply memorize. A lesson to prepare for this exercise might look like this:

**Preparatory Lesson # 3: The Chromatic Scale on Each String**

Ex. 8: To prepare for Sor’s exercise, first practice playing the chromatic scale along the first twelve frets of each string. This is a mental exercise rather than a technical one; engaging yourself with the chromatic order of the notes is more important than just playing through the length of the string at a fast tempo. Practice articulating the names of the pitches as you do this exercise (both speaking the names and singing them), at a comfortable enough tempo for you to name each note as you play it. The following example spells out the chromatic scale along each string; Roman numerals indicate frets/positions. Although the following scales are notated with sharps, you should also practice articulating them in terms of flats.

---

10 Ibid., 20.
Example 12. The chromatic scale, on all six strings up to the twelfth fret.

Fingering along each string with fingers 1-2-3-4, from position I-IV, then V-VIII and then IX-XII, will allow you to practice playing scales with as few shifts as possible.

* * * * *

In his *Method*, Sor suggests playing “over every string for the whole length, considering the open string under different relations—namely, as tonic, or the first note of the key, as second, third,” etc. Part of Sor’s illustration of the exercise follows:

Example 13. Scale construction, taking the open fifth string as a different scale degree.

A lesson guiding the student to implement this exercise might look like this:

* * * * *

---

11 Ibid., 19.
12 Ibid., Plate III.
Preparatory Lesson # 4: Sor’s Fingerboard-Acquaintance Exercise

- Ex. 9: Take each open string of the guitar to stand for each degree of the major scale; consider what each key would be. Pick one of the keys and sing the tonic; starting from the open string, play each major scale up to the twelfth fret. You should strive to finger these scales within only two positional shifts beyond your starting position. Make sure to say and/or sing the names of each note that you play, including flats or sharps, as they may correspond to the scale you’re playing.

If your guitar is in standard tuning, you have thirty-five scales to compute for this exercise. Once you become dexterous at working the scales with the open strings you could consider, for example, how this exercise would change if you tuned a string up or down half or a whole step. How would the exercise change if you take as the different degrees of a scale not the open strings, but the notes on the first or second fret of each string?

* * * * *

Sor suggests playing the scales in this exercise “with facility, but without rapidity.” He adds that by engaging in this exercise, one will obtain both “a knowledge of the finger-board” and an understanding of the tonal possibilities of every note on the guitar.13

IV.i. Analog and digital thinking: reading clefs with the guitar

The following mental experiment may illustrate a key distinction in step-by-step versus instant calculation: the mathematical operations \([1+4+5+4+6], [30-3-2-1-4], 2\times10, 5\times4, 40/2\) and \(100/5\) all equal 20. An important distinction, however, is that the multiplications and divisions yield results without having to compute several additions and subtractions individually: the results simply appear in one’s mind.14 A substantial number of methodologies teach reading music and locating notes on the guitar through

13 Ibid., 20, emphasis mine.
14 Richard Bandler has used examples similar to this one in his seminars, to illustrate a basic modeling paradigm within the discipline of Neuro Linguistic Programming. People who are experts at something usually “are aware that they know,” yet are often unaware of the step-by-step processes that allow them to perform actions which others may consider extraordinary. See Richard Bandler and John Grinder, The Structure of Magic: A Book About Language and Therapy, Vol. I (Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior Books, 1975), and Carmen Bostic St. Clair and John Grinder, Whispering in the Wind (Scotts Valley, CA: J & C Enterprises, 2001).
approaches that I find akin to adding and subtracting—an “analog,” step by step process, versus an instant, “digital” one.

To teach music reading, most pedagogies rely on a combination of rote memorization, step by step counting, or mnemonics. For example, students can be shown that the third line of the stave, when paired with the treble clef, designates a B; that the space immediately below it designates an A, etc. Perhaps the instructor would separate the stave into different segments, and teach a few notes each week. A mnemonic-based approach would teach that the spaces along the stave with a treble clef spell out the word “face.” Learners would be expected to refer to these mnemonics enough times until the entire stave is memorized.

Guitar pedagogy often deals with the act of learning the notes on the instrument with similar rote memorization. As discussed in Chapter II, some methods introduce the student to one, two or three notes in first position per string, one string at a time. Others teach the chromatic scale in first position, and supply study pieces such that the student can gradually learn the diatonic notes in C-major in first position. Others simply point out all the notes throughout the fingerboard, and trust that the disciplined student will learn to conjugate different fingering possibilities on his or her own. Sor’s own proposed system promotes awareness of accidentals and tonal relations, yet doesn’t provide a system to commit all the notes to memory other than through repetition.

Based on the surveyed material, Dandelot’s method is the only one which challenges the use of acronyms and the aridness of rote memorization. Applying his ideas to the guitar, I have devised a set of exercises to learn the notes considering a series of points of reference in five different positions along the fingerboard (I, III, V, VII and X). Students will first commit to memory up to five prescribed notes (i.e. “points of reference”) in each of those five positions: following Dandelot’s methodology, the points of reference I use in Part II.A will always consist of the notes C and G for the treble and

---

15 An acronym to learn the order of the guitar’s strings (sixth to first), for example, is “eat all day, go buy everything.”

16 The methodology I propose here is an application of Dandelot’s model to the guitar. Students will benefit from studying Dandelot’s text to exercise their overall music reading proficiency.

17 I chose these positions based on my own pedagogical preference in terms of fingering music. Ideally, guitarists should be proficient in fingering music in any position.
C-clefs, and of the notes F and C for the F-clef. After memorizing the points of reference in each position, students are then to exercise themselves in decoding the non-referential notes (the referential notes’ diatonic neighbors, thirds, fourths, etc.) within the position, aiding themselves with their knowledge of intervals, scales, etc. This procedure takes place for each of the clefs studied here (treble, bass, alto, tenor, and soprano). An introductory lesson to use the treble clef studies from Part II.A may look like this:

**Preparatory Lesson #5: Learning the Notes With Reference Points**

In this section, you will be guided through a process to learn the diatonic notes along the guitar through the application of reference points in five different positions along the fingerboard. Consider, for example, how this method applies to the study of the treble clef, which notates guitar music in the standard system, and which you may have already mastered. The reference points to learn per position are the following:

Example 14. Points of reference for the treble clef, in positions I, III, V, VII and X.

The studies you will encounter are designed such that you don’t have to get out of position with your left hand. Thus if you are prompted to play a reference point’s neighboring tone, you are to consider the available options within that position on the fingerboard. For example, consider the above reference points for fifth position (V). When an exercise asks you to play those notes which are a second away from a reference point, you would have to play them as follows, as to not leave position V (reference

---

18 Dandelot, Manual práctico, 2. Dandelot asserts that the function of reference points is for the learner to link each clef with a fixed set of notes along the stave. Dandelot mentions that the first point of reference is “evidently” provided by each clef (G for the treble clef, F for the bass clef, etc.). He doesn’t specify, however, whether his choice for the remaining points of reference seeks to emphasize tonal relations (e.g. V-I in C-major for treble and C-clefs). In Part II.A I use Dandelot’s prescribed reference points for each of the clefs studied, and simply apply his pedagogy to different positions along the fingerboard. I don’t discard the possibility that an analogous methodology could be developed in the future, which would prescribe other reference points in order to explicitly emphasize tonal relations in varying keys.
points are “highlighted” with white noteheads with a dot in the center; non-circled Arab numbers designate left-hand fingering):

![Example 15. Locating and fingering notes relative to points of reference, in position V. White noteheads differentiate the reference points.](image)

As a guideline, you can implement the fingering principle of *one finger of the left hand per space*. Notice that some of the tones which are a second away from the point of reference occur on the same string, while others occur on a neighboring string. In order to guide your thinking towards intervallic relations, you will have to locate the neighboring tones without shifting position. Does the non-referential note occur on the same string or on a different one? If on the same string, how many frets away is it from the point of reference?

* * * * *

As shown in the above example, reference points will be highlighted in different instances with white noteheads with a dot in the center, in order to serve as a memory aid. These studies do not take rhythm into account; students should play each exercise as slowly as necessary to clearly articulate each note. There will be times where a finger is repeated across the fingerboard: in the above example, finger 4 plays a C in the eighth fret of the first string, and then plays a C in the same fret on the sixth string; the same thing happens later between sixth and second strings. In the context of fingering a piece of music as to allow clear phrasing, legato and speed, such fingering would be preposterous. In this case, however, because the intention is to locate notes through a stave-fingerboard relation, this is an acceptable option. When a finger needs to play two consecutive notes on different strings, I suggest playing the first note, then lifting the finger and shifting across to the other string.\(^{19}\) However, if students are confident that

\(^{19}\) That is, repeating the finger instead of using a different one to play the next note on the same fret.
their fingering abilities will not throw them off position, they should feel free to experiment.

The numbering for the preparatory clef reading studies will start anew for each clef. Subheadings will announce in which position to play the ensuing studies. At the beginning of each new position students will be shown the points of reference and the non-referential notes studied. Because of the available options within a four-space span on the fingerboard, not every note between the lowest and highest reference point will appear in every exercise. As can be seen in the above example, the B on the third line doesn’t appear, even if it is a neighboring tone to the referential C: to play it, one would have to extend beyond fifth position, and play the B on the fourth string, or extend below fifth position and play the B on the third string. To aid students in their use of the studies, there will be additional indications throughout Part II.A, such as which intervals are to be studied and which points of reference are to be considered.

Part II.A provides tools for learning the notes along the fingerboard for each clef. This first attempt at systematizing clef reading on the guitar does so with notes of the diatonic C-major scale. The preparatory scale exercises along the length of the string will supplement students’ knowledge of the fingerboard, and allow them to implement their knowledge of clefs to the score reading exercises in Part II.B (which make use of different keys and thus require students to know the location of accidentals).

IV.iv. The metamorphosis: introduction to the score reading studies

In his Method, Sor outlined the components of a two-stave system for guitar notation, which makes use of treble, alto, and bass clefs.20

20 Sor, Method, Plate XXII.
Example 16. Sor’s division of the guitar’s range into three clefs.

An advantage of this system is that, by establishing the notation as a fixed range, there is little room for confusion: the low E on the bass clef is always the low E on the sixth string. Arguably, such fixed system does not facilitate reading non-guitar scores, as these may require the reader to consider the lowest point in the score, and relate it to the available range on the guitar.

For this reason I propose that, when reading the scores from Part II, students should first scan the entire work to determine what the highest and lowest notes are. For example, consider the theme from Aguado’s Op. 10, No. 5, a single-line reading study, arranged here in bass clef:


Adopting a malleable-octave mode of reading, guitarists have the option to play this passage in three different octaves. Which one to use? Does the passage have to be played taking the low F as the F on the fourth string in first position, or as the low F on the sixth string? (The latter is the setting that Aguado chose for this passage). For the purpose of developing mental flexibility while reading the studies from Part II.B, I suggest that students not worry about what the “correct” octave is in order to play a passage. Instead, I encourage them to develop their intuition and decide which octave range would be the
most fitting for a passage. Consider that, although every score from Part II.B has an “ideal” setting—that in which the composer wrote it—not all of the scores students may encounter will have been derived from guitar settings.

To illustrate the importance of scanning the entirety of a work to decide which octave to play it in, consider mm. 1-16 Sor’s Op. 60, No. 2, which I arranged as follows:


If students were to take the initial G to be the low G on the sixth string, they would run into problems on m. 16, where there is a lower C. Thus if students initially scan the entire work for low points, they will realize that a convenient range in which to play the study would be (in standard notation):


Such is a technically-simple solution, idiomatic for the guitar, accessible especially to those who start playing in first position; it is also the octave in which Sor notated this piece. Scanning each score in Part II to select the most appropriate octave will exercise critical thinking as an instrumentalist and a reader of music. The goal is to choose a setting which yields the simplest technical alternative. I arranged these score reading studies from relatively-simple music. Thus, if students are struggling to play a passage, they should pause and consider an alternative octave and/or fingering.

In order to promote flexibility in score reading (to facilitate the reading of non-guitar scores), students should also regard the different lines of music as malleable in
their octave relationship. Consider, for example, mm. 1-8 of Giuliani’s Op. 73, No. 9, which I arranged as follows:

Example 20. Giuliani, Op. 73, No. 9, mm. 1-8. In treble (lower-octave) and bass clefs.

Once students notice the lower octave indication for the treble clef, and realize there is a third between the lower two notes, they can play the passage as follows:


If students disregard the lower octave indication, and attempt to play the passage with an interval of a tenth between the low B and the D in m. 1, the result will be impractical, let alone physically impossible to play:


Wherever I transposed octaves in the scores of Part II.B I indicate the octave change on the clef. I encourage students, however, to experience playing alternative
solutions in terms of octave range, wherever feasible. The octave indications are meant to enhance students’ awareness of how music written in guitar-unfriendly settings can be made playable, if transposed to a different octave.

It is a good idea for students to look back at the preliminary clef reading exercises, and practice playing these studies in different (higher or lower) octaves, wherever possible. Additionally, short segments from different lines from the score reading studies can also be used as octave-transposition studies. Becoming proficient in reading scores with the flexibility of transposing octaves will facilitate the exploration of non-guitar scores, beyond the guitar works found in Part II.B.

The score reading studies in Part II.B are ordered first by number of staves, then by the clefs used, and finally by progressive difficulty. Students will begin their study by reading single-line melodies in the bass, alto, tenor, and soprano clefs. The two-stave work begins with ten studies in which both lines of music are notated in treble clef. Consider, for example, the following two-stave arrangement of Giuliani’s Op. 50, No. 12, which doesn’t seem like too much of a departure from standard guitar notation:

![Example 23. Giuliani, Op. 50, No. 12, mm. 1-7. In two treble clefs.](image)

The other two-stave exercises include the following clef combinations: treble-bass, treble-alto, treble-tenor, alto-bass, soprano-tenor, soprano-bass, tenor-bass, and alto-tenor.

Different levels of reading difficulty are explored through the studies in three staves. Here the reader may notice Sor’s experience as a voice teacher: most studies in this section are written by him, and could be easily sung by three singers. Consider, for example, the beginning of Sor’s Cantabile, Op. 31, No. 10:

---

21 I decided to include these studies in order for students to familiarize themselves with two-stave reading, without the added complexity of clefs.

The different clef combinations in this section include two treble clefs plus either bass, alto, or tenor clef; treble-alto-bass; alto-tenor-bass; soprano-alto-bass; soprano-tenor-bass, and soprano-alto-tenor.

Finally, there are six studies notated on four staves. My research didn’t yield as many works as those on two and three staves. Perhaps this indicates that the four-voice texture may be an extreme occurrence within the nineteenth century guitar style. I decided to limit the settings of four-part scores to string quartet parts (two treble, alto, and bass clefs), and to a soprano-alto-tenor-bass setting. I chose these settings such that students may find a practical application of their score reading skills through the further reading of string quartets and/or vocal music. As in the case of Sor’s Op. 31, No. 10 students should notice the vocal quality of the music in the four-part studies (all of which come from compositions by Sor). Consider, for example the beginning of Sor’s Cantabile, Op. 43, No. 3:


22 Consider, however, how the texture in the introduction to Sor’s Op. 4 suggests five parts. I decided to arrange them in a string quartet setting, by including two voices in the “viola” part.
There is considerable room for flexibility in the use of the present collection of studies. Students could use the different parts of a score, for example, as spoken or sung solfege exercises (in the style of the preparatory clef reading exercises from Part II.A), or could play each part separately to rehearse fingering options. Furthermore, students could play different pairings from different parts of a work. For example, in a soprano-alto-tenor-bass setting, students could play the outer voices, then the inner voices, then soprano with tenor, etc. The studies can also be used as theory exercises in which to mark chord progressions, cadenzas, etc., or even as memory exercises.

Students can let their creativity run free, and therefore discover the musical-intellectual wealth residing in these studies. Aside from serving as a path from which to exercise clef and score reading skills, the scores from Part II.B contain what I consider to be some of the composers’ most beautiful music. Students are about to embark on a venture that will affect them physically and neurologically beyond the act of reading music with the guitar. The guitarist’s hands are about to transform into antennae through which to perceive not just the musical forces present in specific works, but also an entire mode of thinking about music—a centuries-old cultural tradition, to which each student is an heir.
PART II: PREPARATORY

EXERCISES IN CLEF AND SCORE

READING WITH GUITAR*

* A note to users of the electronic version of this work: pagination in Part II.B is designed with a right and left side in mind, to facilitate or avoid page turns.
About the clef reading studies (Part II.A)

I designed the studies from Part II.A in such manner that they combine the study of the diatonic notes on the stave with the study of different positions along the fingerboard. The clefs to be studied are treble (G on the second line), bass (F on the fourth line), soprano (C on the first line), alto (C on the third line) and tenor (C on the fourth line). Since there is no precedent of a systematic guitar study of clefs other than treble, I am designating the range in the other instances based on the guitar’s tessitura.

Even though in Chapter IV (Part I) I propose a malleable-octave approach to reading clefs as part of score reading, for the purpose of study I am designating a specific octave to all the clefs in this Part’s clef reading studies. The following chart specifies the location of middle C (C₄) for each of the clefs studied in this section:

Example 26. Location of middle C (C₄), in each of the clefs studied in Part II.A.

The study of each of the above clefs will be divided in five positions: first, third, fifth, seventh and tenth. Students shouldn’t stretch beyond the four-space span of each position; open strings are to be used in the first position studies only. The study of each position is designed along similar lines, which include:

1. Designating the notes to be studied in the position. I’m prescribing the location of the set of notes to be studied according to the clef and position on the fingerboard. The location of each note will be specified according to string (indicated with a circled Arab number) and space/fret (indicated by a Roman numeral).
2. Study of the reference points. These reference points are specific notes along the stave (and along the fingerboard), intended as a fixed memory aid when learning how to read the notes in a clef. They are to be committed to memory before proceeding: the entirety of these exercises is designed with this principle in mind. Following Gerorge Dandelot’s model, reference points consist of pitches G and C for the treble, soprano, alto and tenor clefs, and pitches F and C for the bass clef.
3. Studies in seconds. Only reference points and notes a diatonic second from them are included.

4. Studies in thirds. Only reference points and notes a diatonic third from them are included.

5. Study of notes a diatonic second above or below reference points. No reference points are provided.

6. Study of specific intervals relative to reference points. For each position there will be a set of studies consisting of melodic intervals (seconds, thirds, etc.). They will be notated as eighth notes; *each pair of eighth notes (beamed together) contains one reference point*. The designation of these intervals as eighth notes is not intended as a tempo reference; students should pay attention to the grouping regardless of speed.

   In components 3 and 4 above, reference points will be “highlighted” with white noteheads in certain instances. In such a manner the student will have a study aid as he learns non-referential notes in each position. Once students have mastered reading in each position, they may multiply their study alternatives by reading the eighth note groupings in positions other than those specified, or by reading such studies from other clefs and mentally substituting the specified clef for a different one. Numeration for the studies starts anew for each clef studied.
II.A: CLEF READING STUDIES

1. The Treble Clef

1.1. Studies in First Position

Notes to be studied. Reference points are highlighted.

Studies 1 and 2 contain reference points only.

Studies in seconds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 3, 4 and 5.
All the notes in study 8 are a second away from one of the reference points (not indicated).

Studies in thirds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 9 and 10.
Notice the new point of reference (highlighted in studies 13, 14 and 15).

In studies 16-22, every pair of notes (grouped together) contains one reference point.
Study 23 consists of octaves.
1.2. Studies in Third Position

Notes to be studied. Reference points are highlighted.

Studies 24 and 25 contain reference points only.

Studies in seconds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 26 and 27.

Studies in thirds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 29 and 30.
All the notes in study 31 are a second away from one of the reference points (not indicated).

In studies 32-35, every pair of notes (grouped together) contains one reference point.
1.3. Studies in Fifth Position

Notes to be studied. Reference points are highlighted.

Studies in Fifth Position

Studies 36 and 37 contain reference points only.

Studies in seconds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 38 and 39.

Studies in thirds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 41 and 42.
All the notes in study 43 are a second away from one of the reference points (not indicated).

In studies 44-47, every pair of notes (grouped together) contains one reference point.
1.4. Studies in Seventh Position

Notes to be studied. Reference points are highlighted.

Studies in Seventh Position

Studies 48 and 49 contain reference points only.

Studies in seconds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 50 and 51.

Studies in thirds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 53 and 54.
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All the notes in study 55 are a second away from one of the reference points (not indicated).

In studies 56-59, every pair of notes (grouped together) contains one reference point.
1.5. Studies in Tenth Position

Notes to be studied. Reference points are highlighted.

Studies in seconds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 62 and 63.

Studies in thirds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 65 and 66.
All the notes in study 67 are a second away from one of the reference points (not indicated).

In studies 68-72, every pair of notes (grouped together) contains one reference point.
2. The Bass Clef

2.1. Studies in First Position

Notes to be studied. Reference points are highlighted.

Studies 1 and 2 contain reference points only.

Studies in seconds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 3 and 4.

Studies in thirds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 6 and 7.
Notice the new point of reference (highlighted in studies 8 and 9).

All the notes in study 10 are a second away from one of the reference points (not indicated).

In studies 11-15, every pair of notes (grouped together) contains one reference point.
2.2. Studies in Third Position

Notes to be studied. Reference points are highlighted.

Studies 16 and 17 contain reference points only.
Studies in seconds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 18 and 19.

Studies in thirds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 21 and 22.

All the notes in study 23 are a second away from one of the reference points (not indicated).
In studies 24-26, every pair of notes (grouped together) contains one reference point.

2.3. Studies in Fifth Position

Notes to be studied. Reference points are highlighted.

Studies 27 and 28 contain reference points only.

Studies in seconds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 29 and 30.
Studies in thirds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 32 and 33.

All the notes in study 34 are a second away from one of the reference points (not indicated).
In studies 35-38, every pair of notes (grouped together) contains one reference point.

2.4. Studies in Seventh Position

Notes to be studied. Reference points are highlighted.

Studies 39 and 40 contain reference points only.
Studies in seconds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 41 and 42.

Studies in thirds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 44 and 45.

All the notes in study 46 are a second away from one of the reference points (not indicated).
In studies 47-50, every pair of notes (grouped together) contains one reference point.

2.5. Studies in Tenth Position

Notes to be studied. Reference points are highlighted.

Studies 51 and 52 contain reference points only.
Studies in seconds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 53 and 54.

Studies in thirds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 56 and 57.
All the notes in study 58 are a second away from one of the reference points (not indicated).

In studies 59-60, every pair of notes (grouped together) contains one reference point.
3. The Soprano Clef

3.1. Studies in First Position

Notes to be studied. Reference points are highlighted.

Studies 1 and 2 contain reference points only.

Studies in seconds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 58 and 59.

Studies in thirds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 6 and 7.
All the notes in study 8 are a second away from one of the reference points (not indicated).

In studies 9 and 10, every pair of notes (grouped together) contains one reference point.

3.2. Studies in Third Position

Notes to be studied. Reference points are highlighted.

Studies 11 and 12 contain reference points only.
Studies in seconds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 13 and 14.

Studies in thirds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 16 and 17.

All the notes in study 8 are a second away from one of the reference points (not indicated).
In studies 19 and 20, every pair of notes (grouped together) contains one reference point.

3.3. Studies in Fifth Position

Notes to be studied. Reference points are highlighted.

Studies 21 and 22 contain reference points only.

Studies in seconds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 23 and 24.
Studies in thirds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 16 and 17.

All the notes in study 28 are a second away from one of the reference points (not indicated).

In studies 29-33, every pair of notes (grouped together) contains one reference point.
3.4. Studies in Seventh Position

Studies 34 and 35 contain reference points only.

Studies in seconds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 36 and 37.
Studies in thirds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 39 and 40.

All the notes in study 41 are a second away from one of the reference points (not indicated).
In studies 42-47, every pair of notes (grouped together) contains one reference point.
3.5. Studies in Tenth Position

Notes to be studied. Reference points are highlighted.

Studies 48 and 49 contain reference points only.

Studies in seconds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 36 and 37.

Studies in thirds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 53 and 54.
All the notes in study 55 are a second away from one of the reference points (not indicated).

In studies 56-60, every pair of notes (grouped together) contains one reference point.
Notes to be studied. Reference points are highlighted.

4. The Alto Clef
4.1. Studies in First Position

Studies 1 and 2 contain reference points only.

Studies in seconds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 3 and 4.

Studies in thirds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 6 and 7.
Notice the new point of reference (highlighted in studies 8 and 9).

All the notes in study 10 are a second away from one of the reference points (not indicated).

In studies 11-16, every pair of notes (grouped together) contains one reference point.
Notes to be studied. Reference points are highlighted.

4.2. Studies in Third Position

Studies 17 and 18 contain reference points only.
Studies in seconds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 19 and 20.

Studies in thirds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 6 and 7.

All the notes in study 24 are a second away from one of the reference points (not indicated).
In studies 25-29, every pair of notes (grouped together) contains one reference point.
4.3. Studies in Fifth Position

Notes to be studied. Reference points are highlighted.

Studios 30 and 31 contain reference points only.

Studies in seconds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 32 and 33.

Studies in thirds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 35 and 36.
All the notes in study 37 are a second away from one of the reference points (not indicated).

In studies 38-43, every pair of notes (grouped together) contains one reference point.
4.4. Studies in Seventh Position

Notes to be studied. Reference points are highlighted.

Studies 44 and 45 contain reference points only.

Studies in seconds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 46 and 47.
Studies in thirds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 49 and 50.

All the notes in study 51 are a second away from one of the reference points (not indicated).

In studies 52-57, every pair of notes (grouped together) contains one reference point.
4.5. Studies in Tenth Position

Notes to be studied. Reference points are highlighted.

Studies 58 and 59 contain reference points only.

Studies in seconds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 60 and 61.

Studies in thirds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 63 and 64.
All the notes in study 65 are a second away from one of the reference points (not indicated).

In studies 66-70, every pair of notes (grouped together) contains one reference point.
5. The Tenor Clef

5.1. Studies in First Position

Notes to be studied. Reference points are highlighted.

Studies 1 and 2 contain reference points only.

Studies in seconds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 3 and 4.
Studies in thirds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 6 and 7.

All the notes in study 8 are a second away from one of the reference points (not indicated).

In studies 9-14, every pair of notes (grouped together) contains one reference point.
5.2. Studies in Third Position

Notes to be studied. Reference points are highlighted.

Studies 15 and 16 contain reference points only.

Studies in seconds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 17 and 18.
Studies in thirds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 19 and 20.

All the notes in study 22 are a second away from one of the reference points (not indicated).
In studies 23-27, every pair of notes (grouped together) contains one reference point.
5.3. Studies in Fifth Position

Notes to be studied. Reference points are highlighted.

Studies in seconds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 30 and 31.

Studies in thirds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 19 and 20.

Studies 28 and 29 contain reference points only.
All the notes in study 35 are a second away from one of the reference points (not indicated).

In studies 36-41, every pair of notes (grouped together) contains one reference point.
5.4. Studies in Seventh Position

Notes to be studied. Reference points are highlighted.

Studies 42 and 43 contain reference points only.

Studies in seconds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 44 and 45.
Studies in thirds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 47 and 48.

All the notes in study 49 are a second away from one of the reference points (not indicated).

In studies 50-55, every pair of notes (grouped together) contains one reference point.
5.5. Studies in Tenth Position

Notes to be studied. Reference points are highlighted.

Studies in seconds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 58 and 59.

Studies in thirds. Reference points are highlighted in studies 61 and 62.
All the notes in study 63 are a second away from one of the reference points (not indicated).

In studies 64-68, every pair of notes (grouped together) contains one reference point.
II.B. SCORE READING STUDIES, ADAPTED FROM 19th CENTURY SOLO GUITAR WORKS

1. Studies in one stave

**Study 1**
Allegretto

Aguado, Op. 10, No. 5

**Study 2**

Carcassi, from Op. 59
Adagio espresivo

Study 5

Aguado, Op. 10, No. 1
Study 10
Sor, Op. 60, No. 3

Study 11
Sor, Op. 60, No. 10
2. Studies in two staves

Study 12
Giuliani, Op. 33, No. 2

Écossaise

Study 13
Sor, Op. 35, No. 1

Andante

D.C. al Fine

Fine
Study 14

Allegretto

Giuliani, Op. 50, No. 12
Allegretto

Study 15

Giuliani, Op. 50, No. 8

Maestoso

Study 16

Giuliani, Op. 139, No. 4
D.C. al Fine

Study 20

Sor, Op. 13, No. 4

Cantabile

1.

2.

7

12

17

138
Andantino

Study 21

Giuliani, Op. 51, No. 7

139
Waltz

Study 24

Aguado, Op. 8, No. 7

D.C. al Fine

141
Waltz

Study 28

Giuliani, Op. 57, No. 1 (excerpt)
Study 29

Andantino

Study 30

Allegro. Minuet.
Like a religious prayer

Study 31

Sor. Op. 31, No. 23
Religious march

W. A. Mozart, arr. Sor, Op. 19, No. 1
Andantino

Study 40

Giuliani, Op. 50, No. 9
Study 44

Andante

Sor, Op. 60, No. 14

1.

2.

16

21

157
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Study 46

Study 47
Giuliani, Op. 78, No. 3
Study 48

Waltz

Giuliani, Op. 57, No. 9
Andantino

Study 50

Giuliani, Op. 90, No. 7 (excerpt)
Study 52
Sor, Op. 12 (theme)
Maestoso

Study 59

Giuliani, Op. 51, No. 1

13

sf sf sf sf sf sf

19

sf sf sf sf
Andantino

Giuliani, Op. 50, No. 27

Study 61
Waltz

Study 62

Aguado, Op. 13, No. 5

Study 63

Sor, Op. 60, No. 5

175
Study 65

Giuliani, Op. 139, No. 3
Study 71

Lento

Sor, Op. 29, No. 21

\(\text{\textcopyright \textregistered}\) D

\(\text{\textcopyright \textregistered}\) D
Grazioso

Study 77

Giuliani, Op. 50, No. 4
Andantino

Giuliani, Op. 51, No. 10

Study 78

190
Waltz

Study 79

Giuliani, Op. 57, No. 5

7

13

Fine

Trio

18

25

31

D.C. al Fine
Andante

Sor, Op. 31, No. 2

Study 81
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Study 90

March

Sor, Op. 48, No. 1

202
Study 91
Sor, Op. 31, No. 3

Allegretto moderato
Écossaise

Study 92
Giuliani, Op. 58c, No. 3

Study 93
Giuliani, Op. 33, No. 10

204
Moderato

Study 95

Giuliani, Op. 62 (theme)
(This page has been left blank to avoid page turns.)
Study 100  
Aguado, Op. 10, No. 15
(This page has been left blank to avoid page turns.)
3. Studies in three staves

Study 101

Sor, Op. 60, No. 19
Minuet
Sor, Op. 8, No. 1

Study 104

Study 105
Sor, Op. 60, No. 9

217
Minuet

Study 106
Sor, Op. 5, No. 1

218
Allegretto

Study 110

Giuliani, Op. 72 (theme)
Andantino

Study 112

Giuliani, Op. 50, No. 21
Andantino

Study 113

Sor, Op. 31, No. 14
(This page has been left blank to avoid page turns).
Andantino grazioso
Giuliani, Op. 20 (theme)

Study 115
Andante
Sor, Op. 26 (introduction)

Study 116

Allegretto
Giuliani, Op. 47 (theme)

Study 117

230
Waltz

Study 118

Giuliani, Op. 57, No. 8

Trio

D.C. al Fine
Andante largo

Sor, Op. 28 (introduction)
Andante  

Sor, Op. 31, No. 8

Study 120

Fine

D.S. al Fine
Siciliana

Study 122

Sor, Op. 2, No. 6 (excerpt)
Allegretto

Study 125

Andante

Study 126
Waltz

Study 128

Sor, Op. 18, No. 1
Minuet
Sor, Op. 2, No. 4

Study 130

Study 131
Sor, Op. 6, No. 4
(This page has been left blank to avoid page turns).
4. Studies in Four Staves

Andante largo

Study 133

Sor, Op. 4 (introduction)
(This page has been left blank to facilitate page turns.)
APPARATUS FOR PART II.B

1. Sources

I consulted three sources to obtain digital copies of the nineteenth century facsimiles I used to derive the arrangements in the present edition:

- The Boije Collection, from the Statens musikbibliotek, The Music Library of Sweden. The collection is digitized in its entirety and available online as PDF files from the Music Library of Sweden’s internet portal. Following the abbreviation “Boije,” I will list the work’s catalog number within the collection.
- The Rischel & Birket-Smith’s Collection of guitar music in the Royal Library of Copenhagen. This collection may be searched through the Royal Library of Copenhagen’s internet portal, and items may be downloaded as PDF files. Following the abbreviation “Rischel,” I will list the work’s catalog number within the collection.
- The website Maurogiuliani.free.fr/en, a collection of public domain 19th century facsimiles of Mauro Giuliani’s music, in PDF format (abbreviated hereafter as MGF).

The following is a list of the works from which I arranged the studies found in Parts II and III (by composer, opus number, collection and catalog number):

**Dionisio Aguado:**
*Nuevo método para guitarra*.................................Boije 18
Op. 7.........................................................Boije 6
Op. 8.........................................................Boije 7
Op. 10.........................................................Boije 8
Op. 11.........................................................Boije 9
Op. 13.........................................................Boije 11

**Matteo Carcassi:**
Op. 59.........................................................Boije 1129
Op. 60.........................................................Boije 94

**Mauro Giuliani:**
Op. 1.........................................................Boije 136
Op. 2.........................................................Boije 167
Op. 6.........................................................Boije 168
Op. 9.........................................................Boije 169
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Op.</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Boije 229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Boije 170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Boije 233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 [Part III]</td>
<td>Boije 223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Boije 156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Boije 236</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Boije 139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Boije 140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>MGF†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Boije 238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Boije 175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Boije 240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Boije 158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Boije 191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Boije 143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Rischel 333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Boije 145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>MGF‡</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Boije 198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Boije 147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fernando Sor:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Op.</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rischel 685</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Boije 487</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Boije 488</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rischel 689</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Rischel 690</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Boije 462</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Boije 491</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Boije 466</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15a</td>
<td>Rischel 702</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15c</td>
<td>Rischel 705</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Rischel 707</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Boije 471</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Boije 474</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Rischel 718</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Rischel 720</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Rischel 722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Rischel 726</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Rischel 734</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Example 27. Maestoso from Sor’s Study, Op. 6, No. 10 (and first system line of No. 11). Portion of the Simrock edition’s facsimile (Rischel & Birkett-Smith’s Collection of guitar music, 690, the Royal Library of Copenhagen).

2. Editorial method

I have regularized the present edition in the following ways:

1. I have suppressed all left and right-hand fingerings, for the purpose of encouraging a reading of the scores without guitar-technical aid.
2. Except where noted, I have kept all the original articulations and slur markings.
3. Some of the consulted editions included slur markings for appoggiaturas and acciaccaturas, while most didn’t. Since slurring appoggiaturas and acciaccaturas generally represents the most idiomatic way to play them on the guitar, I have suppressed slur markings in all such instances.
4. I have added and/or modernized tuplets.
5. I have standardized tempo indications from the different languages. I use English wherever the composer used non-conventional indications in another language, and include the original indication in the critical commentary.
6. I have standardized beam groupings using Sibelius version 5.1.
7. I have standardized repeats, as well as D.C. and D.S. indications.

8. All harmonics are written with regular noteheads with an “o” above them; they are written at the pitch in which they occur, relative to the clef permutation and range used. I am thus not applying the modern convention of using diamond-shaped noteheads to designate harmonics, or providing the consulted editions’ fret indications.

9. Wherever I list another composer as the author of the source material arranged by a guitarist, the opus number I provide refers to the guitarist’s work.

10. The notational software numbers pickup bars other than those at the beginning of a work. All measure numbers in the critical commentary refer to the numbering used in the present edition.

11. All the works in this edition were originally notated on one treble stave (see Examples 27 and 28 above). Except when relevant to my choice of voicing for a specific piece, I will not discuss my choice of staves or clefs for each individual work. The free online availability of the consulted editions makes it practical to compare the original voicings with my own choices.

12. Dynamics in single-stave standard guitar notation are usually placed beneath the stave, regardless of counterpoint (see Example 26 above). Such layout makes it difficult to specify which voice, if any, is to be highlighted by a dynamic marking. I am here assigning each dynamic indication to the part I regard as prominent, inspired by Schoenberg and Berg’s use of the Hauptstimme indication. Regardless of my choice of a “main” part, the reader should consider the appropriateness of simultaneously implementing dynamic indications to other or all contrapuntal parts.

§ See for example Giuliani’s Variations, Op. 20, and Study, Op. 51, No. 3. The dynamic markings in those cases suggest the prominence of certain lines at different times, yet they don’t clearly highlight one versus another. One interesting example of clear dynamic designation for each contrapuntal part may be found in Giuliani’s Study, Op. 51, No. 7.
3. Critical commentary
(The numbering corresponds to the score reading studies from Part II.B.)

-1 (Aguado, Op. 10, No. 5): Aguado uses this study as a theme, which he varies in studies Nos. 6-12.

-2 (Carcassi, from Op. 59): This study comes from p. 13 of the consulted edition (p. 15 of the PDF file). Carcassi emphasizes that this study is intended to practice reading the notes with sharps and flats.

-3 (Aguado, Nuevo método para guitarra, Lección 21): Aguado points out that this lesson is intended to practice playing melodic seconds on two contiguous strings. I changed the A in m. 3 from a G in the consulted edition. Compare to m. 6, and to Aguado’s Op. 10, No. 1.

-5 (Aguado, Op. 10, No. 1): Aguado specifies that this study (along with Nos. 2-12) is to be played on the bass strings ("bordones"). Exercises 1-16 in this collection are intended for left hand study.

-8 (Carcassi, from Op. 59): This study is found in p. 12 of the consulted edition (p. 14 of the PDF file); it is grouped with two more exercises intended to facilitate learning the notes in first position.

-12 (Giuliani, Op. 33, No. 2): I added a sharp to the D on m. 3, beat 2. I changed the E in m. 16, beat 2, into a G.

-18 (Sor, Op. 47, No 1): Sor is making use of the guitar’s texture to seamlessly mingle both voices: the A from the pickup to m. 1 could arguably be placed on the lower stave, though I consider the A an essential feature of the upper melody. I removed the staccato from the second half of m. 2, beat 2.

-19 (Aguado, Op. 8, No. 5): I added the repeats between mm. 24-25, as well as the start-repeat before m. 33. The bass D in the downbeat of m. 15 is originally notated as a dotted half note; I added the tie in order to keep the two-part writing in the lower stave.

-20 (Sor, Op. 13, No. 4): I changed the quarter note rest in the last bar from an eighth note rest in the original. I suppressed the end-repeat indication in the final bar; there is no start-repeat indication.
-21 (Giuliani, Op. 51, No. 7): I replaced an E for a C in the second half of m. 6, beat 3, and replaced a G for a B in m. 7, beat 3. Compare the melodic contour in the upper voice in those instances to that of mm. 1, 2, 5 and 31.

-24 (Aguado, Op. 8, No. 7): I added an eighth note rest in the bass in m. 5, and removed the dotted indication from the E on the downbeat of m. 31. I also added an end-repeat indication to the final bar.

-25 (Giuliani, theme from Op. 6): I added the natural indication to the B on the third rather than fourth beat in m. 4. The way the consulted edition was printed, m. 4 includes beats 1 and 2 on one line and is completed in the next one, hence the possible misprint.

-26 (Sor, Op. 31, No. 1): The original setting for mm. 8 and 25 is one melodic line playing the G, which continues the melody from the preceding measures’ middle voice. I differentiate the G into different voices to imitate the piece’s opening gesture for the upper voice. Sor highlights proper left hand placement as this lesson’s main purpose.

-27 (Aguado, Op. 10, No. 17): Aguado intended this exercise (along with Nos. 18-22) as a right hand study.

-28 (Giuliani, Op. 57, No. 1): I do not include this waltz’s trio, which includes faster, more technically-demanding figurations. The consulted edition notates mm. 19-20 as having four voices; I notate instead this part in three voices, since there are only three active voices in the passage and not four (as is the case in m. 24).

-29 (Giuliani, Op. 98, No. 1): The consulted edition notates the D on beats 2 of mm. 5 and 6 as part of the upper voices. I chose to continue the preceding bass figuration, thus allowing the upper voices to ring for the duration of the beat. I changed the C-sharp and A-sharp on m. 7, beat 3, from a C-natural and G-sharp, respectively. The C-natural in m. 8 (as shown also in the original) suggests a misprint.

-30 (Giuliani, Op. 73, No. 9): I dotted the half notes on m. 14, and added the D on m. 29, beat 3.

-31 (Sor, Op. 31, No. 23): The tempo indication reads in French: “Mouvement de prière religieuse.”

-32 (Sor, Op. 8, No. 5): I added an end-repeat indication in the final bar.
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-35 (Sor, Op. 13, No. 5): I have restricted this arrangement to mm. 1-17. I added the B in m. 16 to complete the measure before the repeat. I added the first/second ending indications in mm. 16-17 (the original uses the eighth note B at the end of m. 16 as a pickup to the minor section).

-37 (Giuliani, Op. 50, No. 10): I separated the voices in m. 27 similar to how they appear in m. 25.

-38 (Sor, Op. 60, No. 6): I added the end-repeat indication in the final bar.

-39 (Aguado, *Nuevo método para guitarra, Lección 39*): The purpose of this lesson, as indicated by Aguado, is to practice sustaining the notes of one melodic part while other parts move. I removed the dotted indication from the D in m. 5, as well as from the G half note in m. 17.

-40 (Giuliani, Op. 50, No. 9): I changed the opening third (pickup to m. 1) to D-F from a B-D. Compare to mm. 4-5 and 12-13.

-45 (Giuliani, Op. 51, No. 13): I changed the lower voice in m. 36 to a G from a B-flat.

-46 (Giuliani, theme from Op. 110): This theme is a march from Luigi Cherubini’s opera *Les Deux Journées* (1800).

-48 (Giuliani, Op. 57, No. 9): I added the natural sign to the ornament on m. 12, beat 3.


-50 (Giuliani, Op. 90, No. 7): I have restricted this study to the initial minor section, mm. 1-19. I added the sharp indication to the G in the upper voice on the downbeat of m. 15.

-58 (Giuliani, Op. 57, No. 10): I’m excluding this waltz’s trio.

-60 (Giuliani, Op. 1c, No. 1): This study, as noted by Giuliani, is intended to exercise sustaining the bass notes while simultaneously playing the upper melody. I added a sharp indication to the G on m. 12, beat 3.

-61 (Giuliani, Op. 50, No. 27): I added slur indications to mm. 10 and 30. In each instance, the preceding measures suggest the appropriateness of slurs.

-62 (Aguado, Op. 13, No. 5): I added a start repeat sign after the Fine, between mm. 24-25.

-63 (Sor, Op. 60, No. 5): I added the sharp indication to the G in m. 3, beat 2. I completed the final bar by adding an eighth note rest.
-64 (Giuliani, Op. 71, No. 3): Trio from the Tempo di Marcia in the third Sonatina. I added the sharp indication to the G in m. 12. I have suppressed the trio’s ending indication to proceed back to the Tempo di Marcia (“Da Capo sino al Fine”).

-65 (Giuliani, Op 139, No. 3): The original is written throughout (i.e. doesn’t make use of a “D.C. al S.”). The only difference in the repeat in the original is that the repeat of m. 7 doesn’t have the slur written in. I added the cautionary natural to the A on the downbeat of m. 26. The original’s fingering (1-1 across second and third strings) suggests that the A is indeed natural).

-68 (Sor, Op. 48, No. 3): Although not labeled in the consulted edition as “No. 3,” this set of variations is found between Nos. 2 and 4. To keep the present arrangement technically accessible, I have included only the theme and first variation. The reader is advised that barlines and ledger lines are barely legible in the PDF file I consulted.

-69 (Giuliani, Op. 50, No. 31): I dotted the G on the downbeat of m. 9, and added an eighth note rest after the low E in m. 15, beat 2.

-71 (Sor, Op. 29, No. 21): This work was originally intended to be played using only natural harmonics. Sor indicates first the suggested fingering on the fingerboard with harmonics notation, and then the corresponding pitches (an octave lower). I’m basing this arrangement on the latter setting.

-72 (Giuliani, Op. 58b, No. 5): The eighth notes in beats 3 of mm. 5 and 6 are originally notated in the bass; I notate them as part of the middle voice, as in m. 4.

-74 (Giuliani, Op. 50, No. 20): I dotted the upper C on the downbeat of m. 18.

-75 (Sor, Op. 31, No. 11): I changed the low C on m. 13, beat 2, to a dotted quarter from a dotted eighth (there are no rests in the bass in m. 13).

-76 (Sor, Op. 35, No. 14): I added cautionary naturals in mm. 3 and 20, as well as an end-bar after the final rest.

-77 (Giuliani, Op. 50, No. 4): I added the eighth note rest to the lower voice in m. 14.

-78 (Giuliani, Op. 51, No. 10): I dotted the low C on m. 6, beat 2.

-79 (Giuliani, Op. 57, No. 5): I added the sharp indication to the F in m. 11.

-81 (Sor, Op. 31, No. 2): I changed the half note E in m. 3 from two quarter notes tied together (and tied to the E in the downbeat of m. 4).
-83 (Giuliani, Op. 139, No. 2): I added natural indications to the upper G in mm. 10 and 12. I repeated the E eighth note on the downbeat of m. 14, and added a quarter note rest on m. 16, beat 3.

-86 (Giuliani, Op. 57, No. 7): Trio from waltz No. 7. The horn-like figures (as indicated by “corni” in m. 1) lend themselves to textual clarity.

-89 (Giuliani, Op. 57, No. 6): This is the first phrase, mm. 1-8 (out of 16) from the trio of waltz No. 6.

-90 (Sor, Op. 48, No. 1): I added a G to the middle voice on m. 5, beat 2, and a slur in m. 7.

-97 (Giuliani, Op. 50, No. 16): I added slur indications to m. 2. Compare to mm. 4, 6 and 17.

-98 (Sor, Op. 31, No. 9): Starting in m. 9, the lowest bass note in every beat is simultaneously stemmed as an eighth and a dotted quarter. Here I retain the accompaniment’s presentation from mm. 1-6 throughout the piece.

-101 (Sor, Op. 60, No. 19): I added a sharp to the G on the downbeat of m. 22. I also tied the D in the upper voice in m. 4 (compare to final bar).

-103 (Aguado, Op. 11, No. 5): The contradances in Op. 11 display an ABA form; Nos. 3, 4, 5 and 6 make use of a D.C after the modulation, while Nos. 1, 2, 7, 8, 9 and 10 are written-through. In No. 5 there is a first part in C-major, then a modulation in F-major, then a recapitulation in C-major (the material from mm. 1-16), plus a D.C. The Fine is at the end of the first phrase (m.8). Thus the publisher used a combination of writing out the material and using a D.C. for eight measures in order to save space, and keep No. 5 to one page (like the other works in Op. 11). For this reason I have suppressed the C-major section after the modulation, and used a D.C. instead; I have also placed the Fine at the end of m. 16. I added the end-repeat sign at the end of m. 32.

-104 (Sor, Op. 8, No. 1): I changed the bass D in m. 10 to a half note from a quarter note.

-105 (Sor, Op. 60, No. 9): Sor highlights that lesson No. 9 is a variation of No. 8 (a chorale).

-107 (Sor, Op. 31, No. 5): I added the slurs in the upper voice in mm. 3, 5, 7, 9 and 20.
-108 (Sor, Op. 31, No. 10): Sor annotates that this study is intended to facilitate playing thirds and sixths. I dotted the bass D in m. 22.

-109 (Sor, Op. 31, No. 13): I changed the E on the downbeat of m. 8 to a quarter note from a half note. To adjust the voicing I changed the bass G on the downbeat of m. 45 to a dotted half note (in the consulted edition it is notated as a quarter, also beamed as an eighth note connected to the middle voice).

-111 (Sor, Op. 44, No. 11): I changed the B and F-sharp on the downbeat of m. 8 to half notes from quarter notes.

-112 (Giuliani, Op. 50, No. 21): I placed the sharp in front of the C in m. 4 (it appears on the line between the C and E in the consulted edition). I added a sharp indication to the C in m. 8 (replacing the natural sign in the consulted edition). The C-natural in the upper voice in m. 9 suggests the misprint in m. 8. I changed the A half note in m. 25 from a C.

-113 (Sor, Op. 31, No. 14): I dotted the B and G in the upper and middle voices on the downbeat of m. 12. I notated the G in the middle voice in mm. 11 and 27 using eighth notes (instead of sixteenth notes, as they figure in the consulted edition); I have notated those notes as they would sound when allowed to ring (such idiomatic realization was most likely intended by Sor).

-114 (Giuliani, Op. 46, No. 2): Subtitled “The Pansy” (“la Pensée”). I changed the low E on m. 27, beat 2, to a quarter note from an eighth note. I changed the low G on m. 44, beat 2, from what appears to be an A in the consulted edition. I added slur indications to the upper voice in mm. 5, 6 and 55. I notated the sixteenth notes in the upper voice in mm. 31, 37 and 38 as such (they appear as eighth notes in the consulted edition). In mm. 21-24 and 63-66 I divided in the two lower voices an eight note arpeggio, notated in one voice in the consulted edition.

-116 (Sor, Op. 26): Introduction to the variations on “Que ne suis-je la fougère!” I added the natural indication to the G on m. 1, beat 3. I moved the natural indication on m. 3, beat 2, from the A to the C in the middle voice.

-118 (Giuliani, Op. 57, No. 8): I changed the E in m. 31, beat 3, from an F in the consulted edition.

-120 (Sor, Op. 31, No. 8): I dotted the C quarter note on the downbeat of m. 11 (compare to m. 13). I also added an eighth note rest on the bass in m. 13.
-122 (Sor, Op. 2, No. 6): I have excluded the major section and recapitulation. I beamed the notes in m. 19, beat 2, as eighth notes (they appear as quarter notes in the consulted edition: two eighth note rests follow the bass E, and an eighth note rest and eighth note B follow the upper G). I added a natural indication in front of the C in the downbeat of m. 23.

-124 (Sor, theme from Op. 15a): Theme from a set of variations on “Les Folies d’Espagne.”

-125 (Giuliani, Op. 64): The theme is Giuliani’s setting of the traditional Russian air “Poschaluite sudarina” (phonetic transcription of “Пожалуйте, сударыня,” “Please, Lady”; the consulted edition doesn’t notate the title in Cyrillic or specify its meaning). The consulted edition provides lyrics in Russian (phonetic transcription) above the melody.

-128 (Sor, Op. 18, No. 1): I added slurs indications in mm. 12 and 22. I changed the Bass B in m. 31 to a dotted quarter from an eighth note in the consulted edition.

-129 (Sor, Op. 2, No. 1): I dotted the bass D in m. 13.

-130 (Sor, Op. 2, No. 4): I changed the slur in m. 16 to connect only the first two notes of the triplet (rather than all three, as shown in the consulted edition). Given the idiomatic first position fingering most likely intended by Sor, it is impossible to slur all three notes.

-131 (Sor, Op. 6, No. 4): I changed the bass C in m. 40 to a half note from a quarter note in the consulted edition (compare to m. 39). I added quarter note rests to the upper and middle voices in m. 39, beat 2. I also suppressed the sharp indication in front of the F in the middle voice in m. 25, beat 3; tied the low G between mm. 43-44, and added an end-repeat sign to the last measure.

-132 (Sor, Op. 31, No. 4): I switched the sharp sign on m. 7, beat 2, to the A from the C.

-133 (Sor, Op. 4): The last eighth note of the introduction serves as a pickup to the Rondo, and is here suppressed.

-134 (Sor, Op. 59): This portion is the Cantabile (major) section from the Marche Funèbre, plus the following phrase of the march’s theme. I suppressed the sharp sign in front of the eighth note F in the upper voice in m. 4, and added a flat sign to the A in m. 20. I eliminated the tie for the B in m. 45, beat 4, and the repeat indication at the end of m. 49.
-136 (Sor, Op. 6, No. 10): The Maestoso section of study No. 10 is a chorale arrangement of the British National Anthem, “God Save the King.” I switched the sharp sign on the downbeat of m. 20 to the C from the E. I added an end-repeat sign at the end.

-137 (Sor, Op. 19, No. 6): Another arrangement from The Magic Flute. I arranged the upper and middle voices in m. 9 from one melodic line (notated in eighth notes in the consulted edition). I added the articulations to m. 8.

-138 (Sor, Op. 43, No. 3): This piece is originally written-through, without the D.C. The only difference in the consulted edition between the first and second instances of the material from mm. 1-24 is that the first time through the quarter notes in the alto voice in m. 22 are not present. I included those quarter notes in the present edition. Sor indicates that the high A harmonic in mm. 51 and 53 (a natural harmonic infrequent in guitar music) is to be played on the fourth string, third fret.
PART III: 21 SIMPLE TRIOS,
ADAPTED FROM 19th CENTURY
SOLO GUITAR WORKS

*A note to users of the electronic version of this work: pagination in Part III is designed with a right and left side in mind, to facilitate or avoid page turns.
About the trios

This section is intended to supplement the ideas from Parts I and II, particularly in the area of early-level ensemble playing. The 21 trios† from this section were derived from solo works by Sor, Giuliani, Carcassi and Aguado, from which I separated the contrapuntal lines into different staves. Such textural changes produced a series of very accessible trios, suitable for students who can read melodies in first position, and who are starting to study the notes higher up along the fingerboard. Each player will mostly play a single line, though at times some pieces will require double stops. Although the works from which I adapted these trios were themselves meant for beginners, the trios may still be graded according to relative difficulty. I have thus ordered the set according to positional requirements for the top part, as well as overall difficulty. Guitars 1, 2 and 3 correspond to top, middle and lower staves:

- Guitar 1 will play notes up to the tenth fret.
- Guitar 2 will play mostly notes in the first and second positions.
- Guitar 3 will play only notes in first position.

A teacher or ensemble coach thus has the flexibility to assign students to different parts, considering each student’s reading level and ongoing improvement.

Critical commentary may be found in Part II.B of the present work: whenever a trio has a corresponding note in the apparatus, I indicate that in square brackets under the composer’s name and opus number. For example, the indication “[CC 105]” for Trio #2 (Sor, Op. 60, No. 9) means “annotations may be found in the Critical Commentary, in the Apparatus for Part II.B, under the note for Study 105.”

Although a majority of these works were published with fingerings, such fingerings needed revision upon the textural change — that is, all the fingerings in the set are my own. In the consulted editions, dynamic indications are usually written below the passage. I doubled such indications for the other parts wherever I thought they apply to the ensemble as a whole; I left the dynamic indication in one part, wherever I thought that part is the one the composer intended to highlight. I am using conventional guitar fingering indications for the right and left hands; Roman numerals indicate intended

---

† I am using the term trio in this case as an ensemble piece to be played by three players, rather than the contrasting section of a work — as seen for example in Giuliani’s Waltzes Op. 57.
positions on the neck (e.g. V is fifth position). Harmonics are notated with diamond-shaped noteheads, an “o” above the note, and a positional suggestion (where “Har. XII” means “Natural harmonic on the 12th fret”). Unless specified in the apparatus, I keep slurs and articulations as they appear in the consulted editions.

These trios may provide beginning students with a practical introduction to counterpoint. Despite the fact that each part of these pieces focuses on one melodic line, students should ideally pay attention to the interplay of the different parts of the ensemble. Besides this aural introduction to counterpoint, the fact that these trios were all derived from solo music provides beginners with a long-term goal: they can strive to play themselves “what three players played at the same time.” Moreover, the beauty of these works may be unfamiliar to novice players, and may perhaps encourage precocious students to navigate the available collections of nineteenth century music in search of both solo and ensemble music.
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21 SIMPLE TRIOS

Trio #1

Sor, Op. 60, No. 8

[Staff notation image]
Allegretto

Trio #3

Trad. Russian, arr. Giuliani, Op. 64 (theme)

[CC 125]
Trio #4
Sor, Op. 31, No. 14
[CC 113]
Trio #5

Andantino grazioso

Giuliani, Op. 20 (theme)
Trio #7
Sor, Op. 15a (theme)
[CC 124]
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Trio #11
Giuliani, Op. 50, No. 21
[CC 112]
Trio #12
Sor, Op. 31, No. 4
[CC 132]
Trio #13
Sor, Op. 26 (introduction) [CC 116]
Trio #14

Minuet

Sor, Op. 2, No. 1
[CC 129]
Trio #16
Sor, Op. 31, No. 5
[CC 107]
APPENDIX A:
"Solfege exercises, Nos. 50 and 51"

Ferdinando Carulli

Grave

voice with guitar accompaniment

No. 50

voice

guitar

No. 51

Allegro vivace

Siege subito

No. 51

* The fingerings are Carulli's.
APPENDIX B:
"Le Lutin"
Chansonnette

music by Rómagnesi,
guitar part by Ferdinando Carulli
edited by Gonzalo Gallardo

6

11
(Footnote by F. Carulli, translated from the original French by G. Gallardo)

*A (m. 4): The guitar is not able to sustain all the sounds, and this romance’s character is a bit slow. In order to enhance the guitar accompaniment, the violin part is replaced here by arpeggios; we will use a similar substitution in all other similar circumstances.
APPENDIX D:
"Air du Mariage de Figaro"
"Voi che sapete" (mm. 1-15)

Violin 1
Violin 2
Viola
Flute
Oboe
Clarinet
Bassoon
Horn in D
La Comtesse
Bass
Guitar

(Footnotes by F. Carulli, translated from the original French by G. Gallardo)

*A: In the impossibility of reproducing the melody from the winds along with the violins' arpeggio accompaniment, the guitar accompaniment contains the melody and the bass, which are the most important components in the ritornello.
*B: Here I took the system of the violins' accompaniment, yet not exactly, as to adapt it to the guitar's idiom, to facilitate its execution.

*C: The clarinet, the bassoon and the oboe are the important parts here; I gathered the essential notes, along with the marked motion of the violins, and adapted them to the guitar's idiom.
APPENDIX E:
"Accompaniment for The Creation"
"Nun schwanden vor dem heiligen Strahle" (Aria, mm. 1-19)

music by Joseph Haydn

edited by Gonzalo Gallardo

Andante

Horn in A

Oboe I & II

Flute

Bassoon

Violin I

Violin II

Viola

Uriel

Bass

Guitar

Andante

music part by Fernando Sor

guitar part by Fernando Sor
Nun schwanden vor dem heiligen Strahle
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