

Introduction

The first half of William Young's life has been little researched to date. It is assumed that he grew up in England and was already a recognised composer there. It is documented that he lived and worked in Innsbruck from around 1650 until his death in 1662 and that he was an extremely respected composer and gambist there.¹

From Young's time in Innsbruck we have a print of his *Sonate à 3 Viole*, which plays an important role in the history of viol music, since Young introduced therein the early form of the sonata in Austria.² Although we know little about his time in England, the sources for many of his works have survived in British libraries.

Thus the present collection of 21 pieces for two bass viols is based on manuscripts in the Durham Cathedral Library and the Bodleian Library in Oxford. The sources are:

Q1 GB-DRc D10 S. 162–175

Q2 GB-Ob MS. Mus. Sch. F. 573, ff 59v–68v

Q1 is a small part of the extensive collective manuscript D10 in Durham, which traces its origin back to Philip Falle and contains consort music for two Stringed Instruments and Basso.³ On 14 pages, it contains the 21 pieces published here in score form. There is no heading, but the composer *William Young* is given on the first page. The individual pieces have no heading and are not numbered. The instrumentation is not indicated, but it results from the context in D10 and from the fact that the music is notated in alto and bass clef and contains many chords that can only be played on the viol. Q1 contains bar lines, but only sporadically. Our black and white copy is poorly decipherable in places.

Q2 is also part of a collective manuscript, in this case from Oxford. It contains the second voice of the 21 pieces published here. On the left margin of

the first page is written *a 2 | with. Jounq | j.* The pieces do not have a heading, but most of them have an Arabic number. The order is the same as in Q1. Q2 contains bar lines throughout. Our copy is very legible.

A comparison of the two sources shows that the Oxford source Q2 is the more reliable of the two. The Durham source Q1, on the other hand, has some inconsistencies and errors, and there is evidence that Q1 was copied from Q2. We consider Q2 to be our main source, which we follow for higher-level matters such as numbering, time signature and bar division, bar setting and, above all, articulation. Of course, Q1 is our source for the first voice, as this voice is missing in Q2.

With this in mind, our edition follows the sources as closely as possible. Since Q1 has considerably more legato slurs than Q2, but we consider Q2 to be more reliable overall, we have quietly omitted several slurs in the first voice. In addition, we have silently adapted the length of the notes at the end and in repetitions to today's standard notation. Our accidentals apply to the whole bar. If we suggest accidentals that deviate from the original, they are given in brackets. All other corrections and annotations are listed in our Critical Report.

All indications suggest that these pieces date from Young's time in England, i.e. before 1650. They are extraordinarily different from each other, also in the technical demands, and show some rather ingenious harmonic turns that one would not expect at that time. Some passages also show that Young must really have been a viol virtuoso.

We like to thank Christian Zincke for the tryout of our edition.

Günter und Leonore von Zadow
Heidelberg, October 2021

¹ Stephen Morris, „William Young, 'Englishman'“, *The Viola da Gamba Journal* Vol. 1 (2007), p. 46–60 [vdgs.org.uk/journal]. Marc Strümper, *Die Viola da Gamba am Wiener Kaiserhof* (Tutzing 2004) p. 42f und p. 289f.

² William Young, *Sonata à 3 Viole* (Heidelberg: Güntersberg, 2021) G383 and G384.

³ *The Index of Manuscripts* der VdGS: 05 Durham [vdgs.org.uk/indexmss].