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Recent Research about the Voboam Family and their Guitars*

Florence Géreau

In France, during the first half of the seventeenth century, guitars were primarily imported from Italy and Spain, with relatively few instruments being owned by Parisian musicians.1 By mid-century, however, the guitar had become increasingly popular, as its advantages in comparison to the lute—including reasonable cost, simple tuning, and ease of learning—won for it a growing number of devotees, especially among amateurs. As the writer Pierre Trichet noted about 1640.

The guitar or guiterre is a musical instrument widely used by the French and Italians, but even more by the Spanish, who were the first to make it fashionable. . . . Nevertheless, one can find in France courtiers and ladies who try like monkeys to imitate the Spaniards, showing clearly that they enjoy foreign things more than natural and domestic ones. . . . Because who does not know that the lute is the proper and familiar instrument for French people and that it is the most pleasant of all musical instruments? . . . In any case, some people from our nation abandon it completely to adopt and learn guitar playing. Isn’t it because it is easier to play well than lute . . . ? [ . . . ] [It must be ranked among modern instruments.]

This statement testifies clearly to the beginning of a vogue that would continue to develop for the rest of the century. Marin Mersenne’s severe judgment of only a few years earlier (that the guitar “sounds rather like a cauldron and always seems to groan”[ii]) was already out of date.

The guitar’s fortunes were no doubt helped by Cardinal Mazarin’s decision to bring the Italian virtuoso Francesco Corbetta to Paris in the mid-1650s as teacher to the young Louis XIV. Even the composer Jean-Baptiste Lully, another Italian immigrant, “began with that instrument . . . [and] for the rest of his life remained attached to playing it.”[iii] In 1656 Corbetta composed several “Entrées de guiterres” for Lully’s early ballet-mascarade La Guérite du temps.[iv] and in 1674 he dedicated the second volume of his collection La Guiterre royale to the king, one of many books of guitar music that were published during his long reign.[v] The instrument was also part of the education of the “children of France” [“enfants de France”] as shown in a painting by Gaspard Netscher (1639–1684) that depicts Louis XIV’s mistress Madame de Montespan (1641–1707) playing harp in the company of their young son Louis-Auguste de Bourbon, the Duc du Maine (1670–1736); the boy is using a very small guitar proportioned for him.[vi]

Many paintings and engravings from the seventeenth century attest to the dissemination of the French guitar in a variety of social contexts. Antoine and Mathieu Le Nain have left group portraits of young people playing a guitar with other instruments (pochette or lute) and a singer.[vii] Augustin Quesnel, Abraham Bosse, and François Mazot are among numerous artists who showed women from high society playing the guitar for entertainment, while Charles Garnier, in creating an official medallion portrait of
Louis XIV as Protector of the Arts in 1672, shows a French guitar along with a violin, a musette, and several viols. The instrument’s role at court reached a climax in 1688 when François Puget showed a group of official musicians singing and using a guitar in addition to a French theorbo, pochette, bass viol, and base de violon.\(^5\)

There followed several decades of decline, beginning at the time of François Campion (c. 1685–1747),\(^4\) before the guitar enjoyed a further period of favor during the second half of the eighteenth century. The latter is well illustrated by painters of *fêtes galantes* such as Antoine Watteau, Nicolas Lancret, and Jacques-André Portail, who place the instrument in the hands of lovers. It also appears in still lifes by artists such as Jean-Baptiste Oudry (himself a very good guitarist and collector of thirty precious guitars) and in portraits of the aristocracy by Jean-Marc Nattier and Louis Carrogis dit Carmontelle, which show the social context in which the guitar was used and demonstrate the durability of its fame among noble amateurs. In fact, many models represented in the visual arts closely resemble the instruments made by the Voboam dynasty.\(^1\)

The first evidence concerning guitar making in France comes from around 1640, contemporary with the remarks by Trichet quoted above. The most important sources of information are inventories of the possessions of various instrument makers, from which we can gain some idea of what their guitars were like as well as the quantities in which they were made. Three such inventories, of the workshops of Faure Préponnier (1638), Jean Desmoulins (1648), and Jacques Dumesnil (1663), have been discussed in a pair of recent articles and can serve as a representative sample.\(^1\)

At the time Préponnier’s wife died in 1638, his stock included 112 lutes (the majority described as old rather than new), 108 mandores (also a mixture of old and new instruments), and 63 guitars. The latter fall into three categories of price, ranging from those with decoration in ebony and ivory (valued at 10 *livres tournois* each), through those with ebony ribs (6 or 7 *livres* each), to plain ones (the majority, worth barely one *livre* apiece).

A decade later, an inventory taken after Desmoulins’s death offers some very specific details about the development of guitar making in Paris in the middle of the seventeenth century.\(^1\) Among 170 lots totalling 354 instruments, all plucked, we find 59 guitars, varying not only in size (several are described as “small”) but also in shape (lots 123 and 146 are “guitares luthées” with arched backs). Their values range widely, depending on the materials used and the degree of decoration applied, from one *livre* or less all the way up to 35 *livres* for an instrument made of ebony with inlays of ebony and ivory and a red leather case (lot 125). Others of intermediate price include a pair of plain guitars (“guitares communes”) at 3 *livres* each (lot 140); instruments made of cedar at 6 *livres* or with ebony ribs at 8 *livres* (lots 136–37); a guitar with ebony ribs, a cedar back, and the neck covered with ebony for 12 *livres* (lot 126); and fine instruments such as one with ivory inlay valued at 16 *livres* (lot 128) and another like it with the addition of a fingerboard inlaid with tin—like some surviving French pochettes—at 22 *livres* (lot 127). Further
decorative options included mother of pearl (lot 143), godrons (oval motives in shape of a pod, lots 134–35
and 142), and pistagne, a diagonal-pattern ebony and ivory inlay often used at the edges of soundboard,
back, fingerboard, rose, and on the front side of the peg-box (lot 125). In addition to being a maker himself,
Desmoulins evidently also dealt in old and imported instruments, with this part of his stock including two
Italian guitars each valued at 8 livres (lots 129–30).

The workshop of Dumesnil, as inventoried in 1663, contained only 158 instruments, among which
bowed strings (of both the violin and viol families) slightly outnumbered plucked strings.xiv Most of the
latter were lutes, but there were also two guitars, listed without any descriptive details and grouped together
with two cistres for a total value of only 50 sols. The additional presence of “28 soundboards for guitars in
pine wood,” “40 pieces of cedar wood un-worked, with 5 pieces of the same wood a bit bigger,” “four
forms, half for lutes and half for guitars,” and “13 hollowed roses [rozes enfournées] of which 9 [are] gilded
and 4 plain” permits us to conclude that Dumesnil worked in the same tradition as Desmoulins, with more or
less elaborate roses and using an inner mould for some of his guitars. In this case, however, the written
evidence is supplemented by a unique guitar bearing the signature “J. Du Mesnil / a Paris 1648,” now
preserved in the Musée de la Musique in Paris.xv It has a vaulted back made of eleven ribs of cedar (?),
with ebony sides and pistagne decorations surrounding the table, fingerboard, and gilt rose.

Although the great majority of surviving guitars from seventeenth-century France were made by
members of the Vivon family, before focusing on them I would like to mention briefly several other
instruments, mainly by provincial French makers who until now have remained in the shadow of that very
famous dynasty. These guitars fit particularly well with the examples described in archival documents;
probably the earliest is a small guitar by Jean Christophe, made in Avignon in 1645.xvi It has a vaulted
back of fine ebony ribs, with a decoration of alternating diamonds in ivory and ebony appearing both on the
 ebony ribs and on the back of the neck. The rose is surrounded by an inlaid design consisting of
semicircular motives in ivory and ebony. Another important small guitar, signed by François Sarailac in
 Lyon, is now at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C., and has an arched back of cedar, ebony
sides with ivory inlays, and a neck veneered with ebony and ivory in a checkerboard motive.xvii

An anonymous instrument, very similar in style to the one by Sarailac, with a vaulted back made
of many ebony ribs inlaid with ivory, was restored and published ten years ago, but with an unbelievable
pedigree, having been too hastily attributed to a German maker on the basis of its technique of
construction,xviii which in fact matches perfectly with French methods used during this period. Following
publication of the restoration report by R. E. Bruné, Robert Lundberg proposed to compare it with an
instrument formerly kept at the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna. Although he had difficulty reading
the handwritten label of the latter (“Jean frère Rue s./Martin […] à Paris 1667”),xix Lundberg correctly
identified it as a French instrument dating from the mid-seventeenth century.x
Finally, we must mention what is apparently the only surviving instrument by the maker Robert Chéron, who was active in Paris during the second half of the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{xxi} Now preserved in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (46.34.73), it bears the mark “Rober Cheron a / Paris rue dauffine / 1[6]94.” The sides are made of ebony with ivory inlays, while the flat back is ornamented with rich arabesques of ebony, walnut, and mahogany (?) inserted into a clear wood, recalling the style of the luxuriant guitar dated 1667 by Jean Frère mentioned just above.

All these examples have been rather systematically ignored by modern studies of the guitar during the baroque era, being in a way cast into obscurity by the long shadow of instruments bearing the name of one or another member of the Voboam family, a dynasty that has come to epitomize Parisian (and virtually all French) guitar making of the seventeenth century. Even today, their models are probably the most often copied by luthiers who base their work on instruments of that period, which is not at all surprising if one recalls that Voboam guitars remained in fashion all the way to the end of the eighteenth century. This is borne out not only by iconography but also by the inventory of goods that were seized during the French revolution from condemned persons and emigrants and entrusted to Bartolomeo Bruni in 1794, which includes one guitar by Alexandre Voboam.\textsuperscript{xxii} A long century of oblivion would then follow, separating this period of active use from one in which Voboam guitars became the object of historical studies.

\textit{Rediscovery of the Voboams}

Although the different members of the Voboam family were the most important makers of French guitars, they remained largely obscure until the late nineteenth century, and even then made only a few brief appearances in standard reference works on lutherie. In 1886, George Hart mentioned just one maker with the name Voboam, placing his activity between 1700 and 1735.\textsuperscript{xxiii} Seven years later, Constant Pierre listed eight instruments bearing the names of either Alexandre or Jean Voboam;\textsuperscript{xxiv} even by 1922 Lügendorff did not know about any more,\textsuperscript{xxv} nor did René Vannes in 1951.\textsuperscript{xxvi} Then, in the 1960s and 1970s, a new impulse for research was provided by the rapidly-growing modern revival of all kinds of instruments for early music. Anthony Baines was the first to identify René Voboam’s work,\textsuperscript{xxvii} thanks to the guitar given by the Hill family to the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford.\textsuperscript{xxviii} Harvey Turnbull,\textsuperscript{xxix} and a few years later Tom and Mary Anne Evans,\textsuperscript{xxx} made handsome contributions to our knowledge of the specific work of three different family members, René, Alexandre, and Jean Voboam.

For the past twenty-five years I have been studying the Voboam workshops in an effort to reconstruct the family’s genealogy (see table 1) and to list their production.\textsuperscript{xxxi} I have been able to locate and study directly twenty-five signed instruments\textsuperscript{xxxii} (see table 2), and to deduce from this corpus and from available archival documents that at least four (but probably five) different people named Voboam were specialist makers of guitars in Paris between 1630 and 1730. Based on an analysis of their individual styles I have also proposed attributions for three unsigned instruments, though a number of assumptions remain more or less conjectural.
In 1988, the catalog of an exhibition that I organized on Parisian instrumentals and instrument makers provided a first opportunity to give a report on my research; this included identifying three makers with different first names, sketching their biographies, and providing a systematic catalogue of instruments preserved worldwide and referenced by documents or publications. The list itself was accompanied by a table of measurements, diagrams of marks and signatures, and illustrations of morphologic details such as pegbox profiles, inlay work, and rib joint(s). Eight years later, I felt the need to publish a supplement, partly in response to a biographical article by Sylvette Milliot and Hélène Charnassé and partly as a result of the discovery or study of four more instruments. A further analysis of maker’s marks and styles led me to propose a new division of the extant guitars among different family members, as well as a new genealogical tree.

Most recently, the invitation to present a short paper at the 2002 Annual Meeting of the American Musical Instrument Society, focusing on six Voboam guitars preserved in the United States, gave me an opportunity to reconsider their place within the total output of the dynasty, and moreover led to the unexpected discovery of some new information to support my latest genealogical hypothesis, which is published here for the first time. The present article also allows me to make use of dendrochronological studies recently undertaken by John Topham, as well as investigations of wood species and even some x-ray photography performed at my request by colleagues at several museums. Finally, I will propose the attribution to René Voboam of three unmarked instruments, including the so-called Rizzo guitar at the Royal College of Music in London.

**Biographical Data**

The Voboam family of guitar makers appears to have been active in Paris from 1630 to 1730. The spelling of their name varies considerably, with some documents giving variants such as Voboume, Vauboin, Vauban, Vauboyet, Vobuan, Vogant, and Roboam.

**René Voboam (before 1606–before 1671).** The genealogical chart of the Voboam family (table 1) shows five makers spread over three generations. The first is René Voboam, who was the son of Claude Voboam, a teacher, and of Antoinette Miller. At least as early as 1631 he was known as a master instrument maker, for he is described as such in a document he signed in December of that year, acknowledging a debt of 69 livres tournois to Jean Desmoulins, the most prominent lute maker in Paris in the first half of the seventeenth century; as a result, his name is mentioned in Desmoulins’ post-mortem inventory of (August 11, 1648). René Voboam signed another such document (for 100 livres tournois) one month before marrying Marguerite Loyer in July 1633, at which time he was living in the faubourg Saint Marcel in Paris, rue Neuve Sainte Geneviève, paroisse Saint Médard. The couple would eventually have five children, two sons (Jean and Nicolas Alexandre, both instrument makers like their father) and three daughters (Marguerite, Marie, and Claire). In 1638, working now in the rue Saint-Honoré, paroisse Saint-
Eustache, René accepted Jacques Prévost (the son of an instrument maker), and in 1639 also Dimanche Drouin, as apprentices.\textsuperscript{xix}

**Alexandre Voboam (؟-c. 1679) and Nicolas Alexandre Voboam (after 1633/before 1646–after 1692/before 1704).** As will be discussed more fully below, it appears that the Voboam family included two men named Alexandre. One of them was active as early as 1652, as shown by no fewer than three surviving guitars bearing the signature “Alexandre / Voboam /Paris 1652” on an ivory plaque on the front of the head. The other is Nicolas Alexandre Voboam, who married Anne Bourdet in January 1671 and who is identified in their marriage contract as a master instrument maker (“maître faiseur d’instruments”) and as a son of the late René Voboam.\textsuperscript{xx} He was then living in the “rue des Arcis, paroisse Saint Merry” and was not able to write or sign his name; his brother Jean Voboam [Vauboiier], likewise “Maistre faiseur d’instruments de musique à Paris,” was his witness.

Because René Voboam and Marguerite Loyer were not married until 1633, it seems unlikely that any son of theirs could have made—and signed with his own name—the three guitars dated 1652, by which time he presumably would have been no older than eighteen;\textsuperscript{xxi} therefore, they must be the work of someone from René’s own generation, who may or may not have been his brother. This hypothesis is strengthened by the existence of three guitars made during the second half of the 1670s that are signed “Alexandre Voboam Le Jeune,” implying that their maker wished to distinguish himself from an older person of the same name. Although we have absolutely no documentary information about this elder Alexandre, we may tentatively conclude that he had died by 1680, because from then until 1692 there are four more extant guitars signed simply “Alexandre Voboam,” as if there were no longer any need to specify which of two people was responsible for their creation.

Until 1680, the younger Alexandre was not able to read or to sign his name on documents, such as the record of a “mutual donation” with his wife.\textsuperscript{xxii} But in 1681 he signed for the first time “A” and “VoBoam” on an official inventory\textsuperscript{xxiii} and in 1682 he signed “A. voboam” on a marriage contract.\textsuperscript{xxiv} The final documentary evidence for Alexandre’s business activity appears in Abraham Du Pradé’s *Livre Commode contenant les adresses de la ville de Paris*, published in 1691 and a second time in 1692. Under the section “Maîtres pour la Guitare” we read (on page 63): “Le Sieur Alexandre Roboam fait des Guitarras par excellence et fait des castagnetts en perfection.” He must have died by June 1704, when Anne Bourdet is described in a document as “the widow of Nicolas Vauboon.”\textsuperscript{xxv}

**Jean Voboam (after 1633/before 1646–c. 1692).** The first mention of Jean Voboam’s name in a document occurs in connection with his presence as witness at the marriage of his brother Alexandre in 1671,\textsuperscript{xxvi} and two years later he served in the same capacity at the marriage of Edmé Flond.\textsuperscript{xxvii} The earliest surviving instrument bearing his name is dated 1676. His signature, very firm and elegant, appears in the minutes for
the marriage of his sister Claire Voboam in 1680, where he is identified as “Jean Vauboam me [— maître?] feseur d’Instruments de musique a Paris, frere.”

**Jean-Baptiste Voboam (after 1671—after 1731/before 1737).** The last maker in the lineage, Jean-Baptiste, is named simply “Jean” in some official documents—for example in November 1725, when as “former juryman of the guild of makers,” living in the “præau de la foire St Germain paroisse St Sulpice,” he participated in preparing the inventory after the death of the viol maker Nicolas Bertrand; or in July 1731 for an inventory of the estate of Pierre Véron. However, his full given name is mentioned in his son’s contract of apprenticeship in July 1740.

Until recently, the relationship of Jean-Baptiste to other members of the Voboam family was unclear, though it was known that he married Marie-Angélique Senallière around 1710. They had one son, Jean-Jacques, born around 1730, who began an apprenticeship in the workshop of the harpsichord maker Jean-Claude Goujon in 1740, when he was about “nine or ten years old.” This lasted only for a short period, however, because the contract was broken on April 20, 1741, thus bringing to an end to the activity of this dynasty of instrument makers. Marie-Angélique Senallière, who was identified as widow already in 1737, remarried in March 1742, taking as her new husband Pierre Alexandre Aveline (1702–1760), “graveur du Roy.”

A hitherto overlooked inscription on the outside of the 1680 guitar by Alexandre Voboam in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston has now provided an unexpected new piece of evidence. In the middle of the back of the instrument, written with pencil in a quite clumsy handwriting, appear two words that can be read as “senelière aveline.” The juxtaposition of these two surnames suggests that this instrument passed from its maker to Jean-Baptiste’s remarried widow, which further suggests that Jean-Baptiste was Alexandre’s son, and therefore was born no earlier than 1671.

**The Instruments**

Twenty-six guitars (and two violas da gamba) signed by a member of the Voboam family are known today, and a further three guitars can be attributed to Jean. Most of these twenty-nine guitars are preserved in public institutions—especially, as one might expect, in Paris—but several are still in private hands.

Although museum-owned instruments are normally easily available for study, there are nevertheless significant difficulties to be overcome in obtaining complete and updated information about them, for example concerning the age and species of wood used. Because the presence of a soundhole rose renders the interior of many instruments essentially inaccessible, advanced investigative techniques such as x-rays and endoscopy are required to study their internal construction; yet to date very few guitars have been carefully examined either in this way or by skilled maker-restorers, with the result that only rarely is any kind of a detailed written report available giving information of this kind. Even after many
years spent gathering information on these instruments, I must acknowledge that the following descriptions are often not based on scientific analysis and should therefore be regarded as provisional. An additional obstacle to understanding the instruments as they were originally built is that many of them have undergone subsequent modifications, such as conversion to a more modern setup with six strings, sometimes including replacement of the soundboard as well as the bridge.

All Voboam guitars are (or were originally) characteristic of the seventeenth century in having five double courses, a flat back (except R4), similarly narrow proportions, and parallel bracing running from one side to the other, both above and below the soundhole. In most cases they still have a plaque on the front of the head bearing the maker’s name and a date, a three-dimensional rose made of several layers of paper stamped with decorative patterns, and a bridge flanked with ebony mustaches (fleursons). Additionally, the soundboard, fingerboard, head, and rosette are often decorated with a diagonal pattern of inlaid ivory and ebony. Although no instrument in a “common” or ordinary style by René is preserved, it is nevertheless clear that all members of the family built both standard-model guitars (with backs made of strips of cedar, walnut, or more exotic woods, inlaid with ebony and ivory, and sides often of ebony) and also more deluxe instruments whose tortoiseshell-veneered bodies were enriched with mother-of-pearl in complex geometrical patterns such as diamonds, quatrefoils, fleurs-de-lis, and chevrons. Each maker of the dynasty had his own design for the head and his own characteristic pattern of inlaid work. Three of these more highly decorated instruments are still preserved with a period case, stamped with coats of arms that serve to confirm their aristocratic provenance.

**René Voboam.** Only one guitar (listed as R1 in table 2), now in Oxford’s Ashmolean Museum, is known bearing the name of the family patriarch, written on a small mother-of-pearl plaque on the front of the head together with the date 1641 (figs. 1–2). Tom and Mary Anne Evans give the following clear description of this instrument:

The spruce of the top has an exceptionally fine grain. The binding to the top and back, soundhole and fingerboard edges, and the inlay to the bridge, is made of ivory and ebony... The sides and back are covered in panels of tortoiseshell, divided by narrow strips of ebony and ivory. The small quatrefoil inlays to the back are made of mother-of-pearl. The decorative pattern of the back is echoed on the rear of the headstock, which is similarly veneered. Tortoiseshell is also used as a veneer to the back of the neck, in a houndstooth pattern with ivory and ivory dividing stripes. Overall, the guitar shows the combination of refined design and proportions with consummate craftsmanship and a lavish use of rare material.\(^{\text{iv}}\)

A recent dendrochronological analysis by John C. Topham confirms that the maker used wood that had been allowed to dry for up to fourteen years.\(^{\text{viii}}\)

Four other guitars can be attributed to René on the basis of their distinctive style. The first of these, preserved in Nice (R2), was extensively transformed during the nineteenth century, a process that involved
modifications to the head resulting in the loss of the cartouche on which the maker’s name and the date normally appear; other changes made to the instrument include a new soundboard and bridge, added metal frets, and the removal of the original rose.\textsuperscript{18} The attribution to René Voboam is therefore based more on technical and ornamental details than on proportions, which can vary even among instruments by the same maker as well as among different members of the Voboam family (see fig. 3 and table 3). A comparison of this instrument with the one in Oxford reveals that the floral inlay pattern on their fingerboards is very similar and that both instruments have backs and ribs veneered with strips of tortoiseshell arranged in patterns: chevrons on the back (two “systems” on R1, four on R2, as shown in fig. 4) and herringbones on the neck (six motives on R1, compared with four on R2).

A second instrument, despite bearing only the family surname (and the date 1668), is likewise attributable to René Voboam based on decorative similarities (R3). This was part of Charles Petit’s collection\textsuperscript{18} and remained the property of his heirs until 1987, when it was restored by Rosyne Charles (Paris) and Simier Le Riddér (La Châtre). They reconverted the head, which had been altered in the late nineteenth century for six single courses, to accept five double courses, basing their work on one of Jean Voboam’s heads. Subsequently, the instrument was sold in Paris in 1997.\textsuperscript{19} The back of its neck is very similar to R2, while the back of the body is veneered with four strips of tortoiseshell that are separated by three rows of double chevrons identical to the motive decorating the centerline of R2 (fig. 5).

An anonymous guitar preserved in the Musée d’Art et d’Histoire in Geneva has a vaulted back of ebony, unlike all other Voboam examples, but the outline of its head is identical to R1 and the fingerboard and neck are decorated in a manner very similar to R2 (fig. 6). For these reasons, I propose to attribute this instrument to René Voboam (R4). Finally, I suggest that a guitar in the Royal College of Music, London (fig. 7)\textsuperscript{20} is also a candidate for attribution to René (R5). The outline of its head is identical to R1 (fig. 8), and the sumptuous quatrefoil motives on the fingerboard and front of the head of R5, while used much more extensively than on R1, recall the appearance of this ornament on the latter instrument. The crown of fleurs-de-lis surrounding the rose indicates that this guitar was probably made for someone within the royal circle. In my 1988 catalog I attributed it to Jean Voboam with a date of c. 1680, while emphasizing the presence of details recalling the work of René.\textsuperscript{21} John Topham’s recent dendrochronological dating of this instrument, showing that the wood of its table was cut no earlier than 1647, lends even greater support to a revised attribution to René Voboam rather than his son.\textsuperscript{22}  

Alexandre Voboam [L’aîné] and Alexandre Voboam Le Jeune. Three guitars are known bearing the name Alexandre Voboam and the date 1652 on an ivory plaque on the front of the head (fig. 9). The first (A1) is built in a very plain style, with a back made of two pieces of cedar separated by a thin line of boxwood and ebony inlay, and ribs of ebony.\textsuperscript{23} The outline of its head is the same as that often used later by Jean Voboam in his instruments dated between 1676 and 1690 (fig. 10). A second guitar from this year (A2) is again simply made, though here both the back and ribs consist of multiple cedar strips separated by
lines of contrasting inlay; its head shows the same outline in Jean’s style.\textsuperscript{32a} The third (A3), however, already has all the typical details constituting what one could call Alexandre’s “classical” style, including a back made of five strips of clear wood separated by four wide lines of ivory surrounded by ebony, and diagonal inlay (called \textit{pistagre} in historical documents) in ebony and ivory around the edges of the soundboard and fingerboard as well as in the middle of the head’s front (fig. 11).\textsuperscript{32b} Unlike the previous two, this guitar uses Alexandre’s own pattern for the head, whose outline features a central motif of brace or bracket, two symmetrical points, and two halves of a circle (fig. 10).

A guitar preserved at the National Music Museum in Vermillion, South Dakota (A5) presents the same specifications. Microscopic examination by John Koster reveals that the back is very probably made of five strips of native French juniper separated by wide ebony and ivory lines in intarsia (fig. 12).\textsuperscript{32c} The ribs are ebony with wide ivory inlays, while the back of the neck is veneered with ebony and has six wide ivory lines. The joint at the bottom of the instrument is decorated with a wide trapezoid-shaped ivory line (fig. 13). The head has the pattern typical of Alexandre’s work, with \textit{pistagre} in the middle of the front (fig. 10) and four wide ivory lines on the back (fig. 14). The rose in A5 is also typical of Alexandre’s work; the \textit{pistagre} surrounding the soundhole is the same as along the soundboard and fingerboard but has one extra ebony inlay (fig. 15).

It is noteworthy that all these characteristics match those of a guitar preserved in the Musée de la Musique in Paris that is signed “Alexandre Voboam Le Jeune, 1676” (A3; figs. 9 and 16),\textsuperscript{32d} as well as a still later example from 1680 preserved in Boston (A5) that is once again marked simply “Alexandre Voboam” (fig. 17).\textsuperscript{32e} A comparison of the latter two instruments strikingly illustrates the homogeneity of guitars bearing this name, whether with or without the added words “Le Jeune.” They share the same overall proportions and disposition of decorative inlay around the soundboard and rose, along the neck, and on the front of the head. The backs of both are made up of five strips separated by four wide ivory lines surrounded by ebony inlay, all inserted in intarsia; the ribs are of ebony with two wide ivory inlays. The joint at the bottom of the ribs (fig. 13) and the decoration of the neck heel are also quite similar, as is the \textit{pistagre} decoration surrounding the roses (fig. 15). The instrument in Paris has five ivory inlays at the back of the head while that in Boston has only four, like A5 (1670) and A19 (1692); a further similarity between A5 and A19 is that both have backs made of the same wood, a kind of \textit{Juniperus}.\textsuperscript{32f}

These observations tend to raise doubts about the theory presented above, that an earlier Alexandre Voboam, of the same generation as René, could be the author of the earlier instruments signed simply “Alexandre Voboam”\textsuperscript{32g} the very uniform style of guitars dating from 1652 (A3), 1670 (A5), 1676 (A13), 1680 (A15), and 1690 (A18) argues against their having been made by two different people.\textsuperscript{32h} The “classical” style of work signed with the names Alexandre Voboam—using sides of ebony with ivory inlays, back of cypress or cedrus with ebony/ivory/ebony inlays, and featuring ebony and ivory \textit{pistagre}—seems to have remained essentially unchanged from 1652 until 1692, the date of his last known guitar, preserved in the Musée de la Musique in Paris (A19; figs. 18–19). Exceptionally, the interior of this
instrument is accessible due to the absence of the original rose, allowing us to see the one-piece construction of the neck and heel-block, known as a “Spanish block.”

But several other styles may also be found associated with this same name. One of them could be considered as “common,” despite the clearly masterful sense of proportion and finish, as exemplified in the very unusual double guitar preserved in the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna (A8, fig. 20). A report written by Stephen Barber and Sandi Harris on January 21, 1997, indicates that.

The larger guitar is very similar in size and shape to other guitars by Alexandre Voboam, and the design of its rose uses shapes and punched patterns familiar from his other work. The sides are of figured, quarter-sawn walnut. . . . The back is made from cypress, with four sets of inlaid stripes which go all the way through the cypress, in ebony/cypress/ebony. . . . Both necks appear to be of maple, and are veneered with ebony; one interesting point at the heels is that both have been veneered after the back was glued to the sides (fig. 13), suggesting the usual Voboam method of making the neck-heel-block in one piece. . . . Both bridges seem to be original, made of ebony and embellished with separate moustachios. . . . Both rosettes are surrounded by simple inlaid rings of ebony and bone.

Emphasizing its completely original condition, Barber notes also that “The two guitars comprising this instrument were probably intended to be played at 'e' and 'a' pitches, a useful transposing interval . . . for a continuo player or accompanist who wanted to be able to switch rapidly between two pitches.” The musical interest of this double instrument is inverse proportion to its simplicity, suggesting that it was made for a musician rather than a wealthy dilettante.

Another variety of guitar, which we might call the “decorative” model, is exemplified by the 1682 instrument preserved in the Musée de la Musique and belonging to the Musée de la Renaissance in Écouen (A9; fig. 21). This uses inlays with motives of contrasted arabesques, in which one can notice a greater complexity of structure and decoration; the back is made with eight strips of precious wood (probably Dalbergia) separated by ivory/ebony/ivory inlays. Lambrequins, or cut-outs, are veneered on the back side of the neck, at both sides of the head, at the neck-heel, and at the joint of the ribs (fig. 13). In this instrument the heel-block of the neck is in the so-called French style, quite flat and semi-cylindrical in shape; its original nail was later replaced by a wooden dowel. We can also observe linings along the side, which are also present in A15.

One other instrument, even more luxurious than the foregoing, testifies that the family at least occasionally had special orders of a nature to justify the use of red-stained tortoiseshell, thus placing Alexandre’s craftsmanship in the tradition of René Voboam and foreshadowing the exceptional models made by Jean and Jean-Baptiste. The head of this guitar (A14; figs. 22–23) bears an ivory plaque inscribed “Alexandre Voboam Le Jeune,” together with a date that has been transcribed as 1649 but surely must be read as “1679,” since this is the only decade in which the qualification “Le Jeune” is found. The instrument’s front is nearly identical to the “classical” models described above, with typical diagonal inlay
pattern in ebony and ivory surrounding the soundboard, the rose, the fingerboard, and placed on the front side of the head. Only the back and the sides of the instrument reveal a luxuriant decoration in the form of red-stained tortoiseshell strips separated by more narrow strips of ivory, ebony and tortoiseshell. The back of the neck and head are inlaid with narrow strips of tortoiseshell separated by narrow doubled sandwiched layers of ebony and ivory. The rose is lacking and the bridge is not original, nor are the metal frets.\textsuperscript{xxviii}

Interestingly, this specific model is depicted in the elegant presumed *Portrait of Mademoiselle de Chérolais, Louise-Arme de Bourbon, duchesse du Maine (1676–1753)* painted in 1731 by Jean-Marc Nattier (1685–1766) (fig. 24), of which several copies are known.\textsuperscript{xxix} The daughter of Henri-Jules de Bourbon, Prince de Condé, in March 1712 she married Louis-Auguste de Bourbon, Duc du Maine (1670–1736), the illegitimate son of Louis XIV and Madame de Montespan. In this painting she is shown playing an instrument decorated with pistagne in the style typical of Alexandre and using veneered tortoiseshell for the body.

**Jean Voboam.** The seven instruments by this maker presently available for study share several features, which may therefore be taken as typical of his work. First of all, the inscriptions on four of the plaques (J1, 2, 7, and 8) match Jean’s signature as found on an archival document connected with the marriage of his sister Claire in 1680.\textsuperscript{xxx} Secondly, the outline of his peg boxes is individual (fig. 26), replacing the semicircle used by Alexandre with a rectangular form, except on J2. Finally, Jean decorated the edge of his roses with a diagonal inlay pattern more complex than Alexandre’s, using “broken” and alternating lines (fig. 27). In at least three of Jean’s guitars (J1, 1676; J4, 1683; and J8, 1690) the neck and heel block are once again made of a single piece of wood; linings are visible in J4.

Like his brother, Jean Voboam worked in three major styles, which we may call classical, decorative, and “special orders.” The first of these is illustrated by the instrument dated 1690, preserved in the Musée de la Musique in Paris (J8), in which everything is more refined compared with Alexandre’s work.\textsuperscript{xxxi} The back is made of six strips of what is probably cedar, and the sides of ebony. A label placed inside the instrument reveals that in the early twentieth century the luthier Casimir Lalliet modified the original barring of the soundboard and reinforced the inner surface of the ribs.\textsuperscript{xxv} The guitar dated 1676, also in the Musée de la Musique (J1), exemplifies Jean’s decorative style in its use of arabesques, though only on the back side of the head (fig. 28), the neck-heel (fig. 29), and joint of the ribs. These arabesques recall in a certain way the guitar in the former Rothschild collections marked “Jean frere 1667” and the Robert Chéron instrument in New York.\textsuperscript{xxvi} The material of the back may be yew (as suggested privately to me by Joël Dugot, because of many small knots), and the ribs are as usual of ebony. The soundboard and the bridge are not original.

Two other instruments represent Jean’s work for members of high society, undoubtedly to special order in each case. The guitar dated 1681, preserved in Saint Petersburg (J2),\textsuperscript{xxvii} expresses very well this search of luxuriousness through the use of tortoiseshell, mother of pearl, and ivory (fig. 30). René’s
influence is clear, not only in the pattern and profile of the head (fig. 26), but also in the use of a herringbone pattern in the middle of the back and on the heel. Finally, the guitar dated 1687 at the Musée de la Musique (J5) represents a kind of pinnacle, showing how Jean transcends even Alexandre, caring for delicate details but always remarkably temperate. The pegbox outline, this time, is the same as that used by Alexandre in 1652 (A1), but a very small accolade covers the top (fig. 26), and the “broken” style of inlay is omnipresent (fig. 31). The instrument was acquired by the Paris Conservatoire in 1890 together with an eighteenth-century case covered with stamped leather bearing the arms of Marie-Thérèse de Bourbon Condé (1666–1732).

Jean-Baptiste Voboam. It is noteworthy that on all instruments by this youngest member of the family the name plaque gives only the surname (fig. 32), and moreover that on three late instruments (J-B8, 9, and 10) the script in which it is written matches Jean-Baptiste’s signature as found on archival documents of about the same time. The heads of his guitars are also distinctive for their outlines, which reveal his indebtedness to Jean while presenting a more voluptuous appearance (compare fig. 33 with fig. 26). And the younger man’s treatment of the decoration surrounding his roses shows real exuberance (fig. 34); some have considered them not to be original, but I believe that they express Jean-Baptiste’s genuine and personal style.

A comparison of the guitar dated 1697 in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (J-B3; fig. 35) with one dated 1699 in the Gemeentemuseum in The Hague (J-B4; fig. 36) reveals how this maker refines his style for exceptional orders. Using the same precious materials for all the veneered parts, the former combines geometrical motives with vegetal ones, using quatrefoils on the fingerboard, tulips around the rose, and arabesques in the center of the back and ribs and where the ribs join the neck heel (fig. 37). The latter instrument recalls the work of Jean (J5), notably in its use of a trapezoidal checkerboard effect on the fingerboard, but with each motive rendered more complex (compare figs. 31 and 36). Once again, a painting illustrates the social context in which such luxurious instruments were used: in a portrait attributed to Pierre Gobert (1662–1744) now preserved in the Musée des Beaux-Arts of TOURS (fig. 40), Madame de Charolais (1695–1758, the daughter of Louis III, duke of Bourbon-Condé, and Louis-Françoise de Bourbon) is depicted holding—in a very delicate playing position—a guitar that resembles the one in the Metropolitan Museum, especially in the quatrefoil decoration covering its fingerboard.

Finally, two guitars preserved in at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C. (J-B2 and 9, figs. 41-43) allow us to define Jean-Baptiste’s “classical” style and to observe his tendency toward greater massiveness, softer and more relaxed lines, and somewhat less precise workmanship. In this he is conforming to rococo fashion, reflecting a time during the Regency and the reign of Louis XV when the guitar lost its prominent place on the musical stage, leading this last representative of the Voboam dynasty to diversify his output by making viols as well (J-B8 and 10). One of the Smithsonian’s guitars (the undated J-B2, fig. 41) may be advantageously compared with the 1708 instrument preserved in the Musée
The ribs and back of the former are made of Spanish cedar (Cedrela odorata), while the latter has ribs of violetwood (Dalbergia caerensis), the back being cedar and the soundboard fine close spruce (Picea excelsa). The simplicity of J-B7 recalls the style of Jean Voboam, though all the edges are lacking in precision; the same influence is visible in the way the heel and the rib joint are decorated. In contrast, J-B2 multiplies all the motives but lacks elegance: its back is made of six strips (fig. 42), the ribs of four; its head, which in outline is quite similar to J-B3 and J-B4, has five double longitudinal ivory inlays on the back, while its front features a double system of “broken” inlay motives that are also present along the fingerboard and the around the rose. The general impression is of an esthetic of excess, a kind of sensory overload.\footnote{43}

The latest surviving Voboam guitar (J-B9) is also preserved in the Smithsonian Institution (fig. 43), and bears the same label and date (1730) as the bass viol belonging to the Conservatoire national des Arts et métiers in Paris (J-B10). This instrument shows quite small proportions, apart from the replacement pegbox dating from the very late eighteenth century. But what is unaltered and yet very new in this specimen is the wavy shape of the inlays, in Rococo style, that have been systematically applied to each part of the instrument (back, back of the neck, heel, and join of the ribs), as well as the mixing of semiprecious wood (Brazilian rosewood, *Dalbergia nigra*)\footnote{44} and tortoise shell (on the back of the neck).

In search of a more nuanced approach to the dynasty

The foregoing survey reveals that each maker of the Voboam family made three main kinds of guitars in the course of his career: relatively plain instruments (called “common” or “ordinary” in contemporary documents), for everyday musicians; more elaborate yet refined models (whose style we have called “classical”), intended for professional musicians or skilled amateurs; and deluxe instruments specially commissioned by aristocratic clients, for whom they were above all a mark of distinction. Surviving specimens belong mainly to the latter two types—naturally enough in light of their greater visual appeal—but surely this does not accurately represent the historical reality of the overall output of these makers. Lacking post-mortem inventories of their workshops, it remains very difficult to know how their production may have been divided between the different models; likewise, apart from one guitar attributed to René (R4), we do not know to what extent members of the family made arched-back instruments, which were more common in seventeenth-century France than is generally thought. But if our understanding of the Voboam family’s achievements is to this extent somewhat incomplete or distorted, the situation is much the same with other important guitar makers of the period, such as Tielke in Germany or the Sellas family in Italy.

We also find diversity with regard to several other structural aspects, not only among individual instruments but also among the different members of the Voboam family. Figure 44 shows a number of variations on a basically similar approach to soundboard boring without revealing any observable evolution for at least three of these makers during the course of their careers, at least based on observable
and unaltered examples. Similarly, in the minority of cases where the neck-mounting technique could be checked, it appears that this was usually done in the Spanish way (AJ3, AJ5, AJ8, AJ9; J1, J8; J-B2, J-B7, J-B9), but in some cases in the violin way, “à la française” (R5 and AJ6). And back thickness also varies, though within a relatively small range, at least insofar as this could be checked on the seven instruments preserved in the Musée de la Musique.xciv.

At the end of this new stage of our work, it becomes apparent how the defining characteristics of French guitar making, especially as practiced by the Voboams, have been described with an increasing degree of nuance since the pioneering work of Tom Evans a generation ago. And yet, even as the body of available instruments continues to grow, one must admit that many questions remain unanswered; despite the additional documentation gathered and analyzed in recent decades, there are still gaps in the evidence and therefore uncertainties in some of our conclusions. For example, in the realm of biography we still do not know whether Jean or Nicolas Alexandre was the elder son of René and Marguerite, and we remain in the dark as to when any member of the Voboam family entered the instrument-makers’ guild, in part due to large gaps in the series of the Archives Nationales for the period concerned.xcv Other puzzles are more directly connected to the instruments themselves and their musical uses. For instance, table 3 reveals considerable diversity in vibrating string lengths, from 614 to 711 mm (leaving aside the exceptionally large J3, with 760 mm), even among the minority of Voboam guitars for which this crucial dimension remains unaltered. This raises the possibility that some may have been built to play at higher or lower pitch standards than the others, but it is still too early to propose any hypothesis in this regard.xcvi

Although we will probably never know as much as we would like (especially considering the inevitably incomplete documentary record), ultimately the instruments themselves remain our best potential source of information. The present attempt to assemble a comprehensive catalog provides an opportunity to emphasize the need for systematic and scientific studies, especially of instruments in public collections, and for sharing the resulting technical knowledge with professionals who have spent a great deal of time with certain individual specimens.
*This article is an expanded version of my paper given during the Annual Meeting of the AMIS in Boston, June 2002. It has benefited from the suggestions of Thomas MacCracken and the two perceptive and knowledgeable anonymous readers of my original submission. Revising the manuscript in light of their comments has been a highly stimulating exercise, leading me to reconsider various contradictory or incomplete aspects of my work thus far and to bringing to light the fragility of certain stylistic comparisons. I am also indebted to very many colleagues, and would like to thank numerous collectors and collection keepers, conservators, makers, and restorers, for providing me with photographs, documentation, and permission to photograph and reproduce their instruments.
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Table 1. Voboam family tree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>René Voboam</th>
<th>Alexa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. before 1606</td>
<td>d. cir.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. after 1671</td>
<td>fl. 1641-1668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 19 July 1633 + Marguerite</td>
<td>fl. 1692</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Loyer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jean Voboam</th>
<th>Nicolas-Alexandre Voboam Le Jeune</th>
<th>Marguerite</th>
<th>Marie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. between 1634/1646</td>
<td>b. between 1634/1646</td>
<td>m. 19 Jan. 1671 + Anne Bourdet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. circa 1692</td>
<td>d. between 1692/1704</td>
<td>fl. 1673-1692</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fl. 1676-1692</td>
<td>fl. 1693-1730</td>
<td>m. before 1710 + Marie-Angélique Senallié (who remarried 16 Mar. 1742 + Pierre-Alexandre Aveline)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jean-Jacques Voboam
b. circa 1730
d. ?
Table 2. Instruments by members of the Voboam family. (Instruments known only from written documents are listed in italics)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Type, Date</th>
<th>Place, Collection, Number</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>1988/96</th>
<th>Catalog</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>René Voboam (b. before 1606 – d. after 1671)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Guitar, 1641</td>
<td>Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, Hill Collection, no. 40</td>
<td>René / Voboam / 1641</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2*</td>
<td>Guitar, undated</td>
<td>Nice, Palais Lascaris, Collection Gautier, no. 1785</td>
<td>[none]</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5*</td>
<td>Guitar, undated</td>
<td>London, Royal College of Music, RCM 32</td>
<td>[none]</td>
<td>XVI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alexandre Voboam [L’aîné] (d. circa 1679)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Guitar, 1652</td>
<td>Alessandria (Italy), private collection</td>
<td>Alexandre / Voboam, a / Paris 1652</td>
<td>XXII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Guitar, 1652</td>
<td>Paris, André Blossemet</td>
<td>Alexandre / Voboam, a / Paris 1652</td>
<td>XXIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Guitar, 1652</td>
<td>Sanderstead (UK), Harvey Hope</td>
<td>Alexandre / Voboam / Paris 1652</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Théorbo, 1661</td>
<td>Formerly Cakenberg, private collection (in 1922)</td>
<td>Alexandre Voboam / a Paris / 1661</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Guitar, 1670</td>
<td>Vermillion, SD, National Music Museum, NMM 4143</td>
<td>A, Voboam / 1670</td>
<td>XXXIV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Nicolas) Alexandre Voboam Le Jeune (b. between 1633/1646 – d. between 1692/1704)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1J</td>
<td>Guitar, 1673</td>
<td>Paris, Marquis de Lasignan, in 1783</td>
<td>Alexandre Voboam [sic] Lejeune</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2J</td>
<td>Guitar, 1675</td>
<td>Sanderstead (UK), Harvey Hope</td>
<td>Alexandre / Voboam / Lejeune / 1675</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3J</td>
<td>Guitar, 1676</td>
<td>Paris, Musée de la Musique, E, 1532</td>
<td>Alexandre / Voboam / Le Jeune / 1676</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4J</td>
<td>Guitar, 1679</td>
<td>New York, Jacques Français</td>
<td>Alexandre / Voboam / Le Jeune / 1679</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5J</td>
<td>Guitar, 1680</td>
<td>Boston, Museum of Fine Arts, 1993, 576</td>
<td>Alexandre / Voboam / 1680</td>
<td>XXXV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6J</td>
<td>Guitar, 1682</td>
<td>Paris, Musée de l’Orangerie, Musée de la Renaissance; on loan at Paris, Musée de la Musique, DE CL 9219</td>
<td>Alexandre / Voboam / 1682</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8J</td>
<td>Double Guitar, 1690</td>
<td>Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, C 57</td>
<td>Alexandre / Voboam / 1690</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9J</td>
<td>Guitar, 1692</td>
<td>Paris, Musée de la Musique, E, 980.2.295</td>
<td>Alexandre / Voboam / 1692</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jean Voboam (b. between 1633/1646 – d. circa 1692)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1</td>
<td>Guitar, 1676</td>
<td>Paris, Musée de la Musique, E, 1036</td>
<td>Jean / Voboam / a Paris 1676</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J2</td>
<td>Guitar, 1681</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, Museum of Theatre and Music, no, 892</td>
<td>Jean / Voboam / a Paris / 1681</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J3</td>
<td>Guitar, 1681</td>
<td>Sanderstead (UK), Harvey Hope</td>
<td>Jean / Voboam / 1681</td>
<td>XV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J4</td>
<td>Guitar, 1683</td>
<td>Lausanne, Musée Historique (on loan from pvt. coll.)</td>
<td>Jean / Voboam / A Paris / 1687</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J5</td>
<td>Guitar, 1687</td>
<td>Paris, Musée de la Musique, E, 1411</td>
<td>Jean / Voboam / A Paris / 1687</td>
<td>XVII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J7</td>
<td>Guitar, 1689</td>
<td>Paris, Musée de la Musique, E, 979.2.70</td>
<td>[Jean]Voboam / a Paris / 1689</td>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J8</td>
<td>Guitar, 1690</td>
<td>Paris, Musée de la Musique, E, 2087</td>
<td>Jean / Voboam / a Paris / 1690</td>
<td>XIX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jean-Baptiste Voboam (b. after 1671 – d. between 1731/1736)

| J-B1 | Guitar, 1693 | Paris, Musée de la Musique, E, 28 | Voboam / 1693 |
| J-B2 | Guitar, undated | Washington, Smithsonian Institution, no. 65,591 | Voboam / à Paris |
| J-B5 | Guitar, 1699 | Formerly Berlin, Staatliches Institut für Musikforschung, no. 142 ||
| J-B6 | Guitar, 1705 | Formerly London, Miss Pollard (in 1872) || Voboam à Paris ? |
| J-B7 | Guitar, 1708 | Paris, Musée de la Musique, E, 999,151 | Voboam / à Paris / 1708 |
| J-B8 | Viol, Pardessus, 1719 | Paris, Musée de la Musique, E, 998,111 | Voboam / à Paris / 1719 |
| J-B9 | Guitar, 1730 | Washington, Smithsonian Institution, no. 60,136 | Voboam / à Paris / 1730 |
| J-B10 | Viol, Bass, 1730 | Paris, Conservatoire National des Arts et Métiers, Musée des Techniques, no. 1606 | Voboam / à Paris / 1730 |


* These four instruments are attributed to René Voboam, see text.
† This guitar also bears an interior repair label: Jean frère St Martin / à Paris 1657.
§ Jules Gallay, Un inventaire sous la Ténébre: État des instruments de musique relevé chez les immigrés et condamnés par A. Brun (Paris: G. Chamerot, 1890), 201. (The name’s first name is not given.)
¶ Curt Sachs, Sammlung alter Musikinstrumente bei der Staatlichen Hochschule für Musik: Beschreibender Katalog (Berlin: J. Born, 1922), 166.

Table 3. Measurements of Voboam guitars.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Siglum</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3*</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>René</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>1641</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>(696)</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>(n.d.)</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>(655)</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>1608</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>(610)</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>(n.d.)</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>(685)</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11/13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>(n.d.)</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>(685)</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11/13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandre [L’aîné]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>1670</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>(665)</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Nicolas) Alexandre Le Jeune

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1657</th>
<th>1675</th>
<th>1680</th>
<th>1682</th>
<th>1690</th>
<th>1692</th>
<th>1697</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1676</th>
<th>1681</th>
<th>1683</th>
<th>1685</th>
<th>1687</th>
<th>1689</th>
<th>1708</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J1</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J2</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J3</td>
<td>(655)</td>
<td>(378)</td>
<td>(648)</td>
<td>(665)</td>
<td>(665)</td>
<td>(642)</td>
<td>(642)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J4</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J5</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J6</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J7</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J8</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J9</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jean-Baptiste

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1693</th>
<th>1699</th>
<th>1708</th>
<th>1730</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J-B1</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-B2</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-B3</td>
<td>(635)</td>
<td>(640)</td>
<td>(642)</td>
<td>(614)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-B4</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-B5</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-B6</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-B7</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Measurements appearing in parentheses have been altered.*
\[\text{In Madeleine Jurgens, Documents du musîter central concernant l'histoire de la musique (1600-1650) (Paris: 1967, 1974), 1,864 and 2,884, a table listing musical instruments owned by individuals shows lutes outnumbering guitars by a ratio of 10:1.}
\[\text{Pierre Trichet, Traité des instruments de musique (Paris, c. 1640; facs. ed. Geneva: Minkoff, 1978), 158–59: “La guiterre ou guiterne est un instrument de musique grandement usité parmi les français et italiens, mais encore davantage parmi les espagnols, qui les premiers l’ont mise en vogue. . . . L’on trouve n’antmoings en France des courtisans et des dames qui se rendant singes des espagnols tachent de les imiter, montrant bien qu’ils s’agréent plus aux choses étrangères qu’à celles qui leur sont naturelles et domestiques. . . . Car qui ne sait que le luth est propre et familier aux français et qu’il est le plus agréable de tous les instruments musicaux? Toutesfois quelques-uns de nostre nation le quittent tout à fait pour prendre et apprendre le jeu de la guiterre. N’est-ce pas à cause qu’il est plus aisé de s’y perfectionner qu’au jeu du luth . . . ? . . . [If] il faut nécessairement mettre au rang des instruments modernes. . . .”}
\[\text{Jean Laurent Lecerf de La Vielle de Fresneuse, Comparaison de la musique italienne et de la musique française (Brussels, 1704), 3:169 (“commence par cet instrument . . . [et] conserva le reste de sa vie de l’inclinaison à en jouer”).}
\[\text{Hélène Chramé, “Corbett, Francisque,” Dictionnaire de la musique en France aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles (Paris: Fayard, 1992), 180.}
\[\text{Composers of such collections included Antoine Carré (Livre de Guitare, 1671), Remy Médard (Pièces de guitare, 1676), Henry Greenerin (Livre de Guitare, 1680), and Robert de Visée (Livre de Guitare dédié au Roy, 1682; Livre de Pièces pour la Guitare, 1686).}
\[\text{Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, 1351 (painting on copper plate, dated 1671).}
\[\text{Pierre Rosenberg, Tout l’œuvre peint des Le Nain (Paris: Flammarion, 1994), nos. 6, 71, and 76.}
\[\text{Campion published Nouvelles découvertes sur la Guitare in 1705 and a Traité d’accompagnement in 1716.}


Extensive excerpts relating to musical instruments are transcribed in Massip, “Facteurs d’instruments,” 26, 28, and 30.

Dumesnil’s inventory appears ibid., 32–33; his lutes range in value from 2 1/2 to 10 livres, while a theorbo is listed at 6 livres and a bass violin at 20.

Catalog no. E. 31, described and illustrated in Gétreau, Instrumentistes et luthiers. 34 (no. 16). The signature appears on a label invisibly glued inside the instrument; the later rococo pegbox is the probable reason why there is today no other identifying mark on the outside.


Washington, D.C., Smithsonian Institution, National Museum of American History, Behring Center, Division of Cultural History, 60.1370. Willibald Leo Frh. v. Lütgendorff lists a kit dated 1678 and a bass viola da gamba dated 1711 by the same maker (Die Geigen- und Lautenmacher [Frankfurt am Main: Frankfurter Verlag, 1922], 2:437), though only the viol’s head survived World War II (see Irmgard Otto and Olga Adelmann, Katadog der Streichinstrumente [Berlin: Staatliches Institut für Musikforschung, 1973], 331).


In December 1637 the instrument maker Jean Frere was a witness at the wedding of Roland Boudon (Madeleine Jurgens, Documents du ministre central concernant l’histoire de la musique (1600–1650), vol. 1 [Paris, SEVPEN, 1967], 741); this implies that he was born no later than 1612, since only persons of legal age (25 years) were eligible to serve in this capacity. In 1662 he was renting a shop rue Saint Martin (Catherine Massip, Lavie des musiciens de Paris au temps de Mazarin [Paris: Picard, 1976], 130), and in May 1668 he married Marie Dumont in Saint-André-des-Arts (Yolande de Brossard, Musiciens de Paris. 1535–1792 [Paris: Picard, 1963], 128).

Robert Lundberg, “Who Made Marie Antoinette’s Guitar?” American Lutherie 21 (Spring 1990): 36. Subsequently, this guitar was returned to the Rothschild heirs and sold at Christie’s auction of November 17, 1999 (lot 18), where it was identified as a French instrument.

Robert Chéron is known from civil certificates between 1672 and 1680, when he lived near St André des Arts (see Yolande de Brossard, Musiciens de Paris 1535–1792 d’après le fichier Laborde [Paris Picard,
1692 he is mentioned (with one of his sons?) in *Le livre commode contenant les adresses de la ville de Paris* as “vendeur au détail des cordes de Rome, rue Dauphine & rûe de la vieille Boucherie.”


~Die Geigen- und Lautenmacher, 2:540.


~It was while I was engaged in preparing a concise catalogue of guitars in the Musée Instrumental du Conservatoire in Paris in 1979 that I initially became aware of the significant number of Voboam instruments preserved in that collection, and of their similarities and differences in details of construction, materials, signatures, and maker’s marks. See Florence Abondance, “Catalogue sommaire des guitares du Musée Instrumental du Conservatoire de Paris,” in *Guitares: Chefs-d’œuvre des collections de France* (Paris: La flûte de Pan, 1980), 307–17, at pp. 309–10.

~For one additional guitar (A4) I have seen only photographs.


~Paris, Archives nationales [hereafter AN], Minutier central [MC], Étude CXII, liasse 319. This part of the inventory was not included in the excerpts published by Massip.

This information is based on the marriage contract of Nicolas Alexandre Voboam, AN, MC, III, 661 (January 19, 1671): see Charnassé and Milliot, “Les Voboam,” 220. We have no evidence to determine the order in which these five children were born.


Ibid. While the register lists him as “Nicolas Alexandre Vauboyet,” the contract itself gives his name simply as “Nicolas Vauboyer.” Anne Bourdet’s father, Symon Bourdet, was also a Parisian instrument maker.


This is so even though the rules of the instrument makers’ guild indicate that masters’ sons did not need an apprenticeship and a masterpiece to be accepted in the guild, but had only to prove their “capability” (see Pierre, Les facteurs, 10–15). Because Nicolas-Alexandre is declared to be of legal age (25 years old) at the time of his marriage, he must have been born no later than the first two weeks of 1646.

AN, MC, XVII, 54 (August 26, 1680), cited by Charnassé and Milliot, 222, n. 10.

Inventory after death of his father-in-law (AN, MC, III, 697 [August 14, 1681]), cited ibid., n. 11.

Marriage of Jacques Bourdet (the brother of Anne Bourdet, Alexandre’s wife) and Anne Doublet: (AN, MC, III, 701 [March 22, 1682]), cited ibid., n. 12. The signature page of this document is reproduced ibid., 221.

Gérard, “René, Alexandre et Jean Voboam,” 57 and n. 31 on p. 73.

See above, p. 36. This means that Jean, like his brother, must have been at least 25 years old by this time (and thus also born no later than 1646), as only persons who had attained the age of legal majority were allowed to serve as witnesses.

Yolande de Brossard, Musiciens de Paris, 1535–1792, d’après le fichier Laborde (Paris: Picard, 1965), 284. On this occasion he is identified as a “musician.”

Paris, AN, MC, CXVII, 109 (February 21, 1680).

Sylvette Milliot, Documents inédits sur les luthiers parisiens du XVIIIe siècle (Paris: Société française de musicologie, 1970), 127, 131, 138–39. (This is very unlikely to be his uncle, Jean Voboam, who would have been at least 85 years old in 1731, and potentially as old as 97.)

Ibid.


AN, MC, XXXIV, 537 (March 16, 1742).

Pierre Avéline, drawer and copper-plate engraver, is the author of “L’Enseigne de Gersaint,” an engraving after Antoine Watteau. He was provisionally accepted as a member (“agrée”) of the French Academy in 1737, but could not finish De Troy and Galloche’s portraits in time to be definitively accepted, and was expelled (“décu de son agrément”) in 1742, the year of his marriage to Angélique Sénallé. See the exhibition catalog François Boucher, gravures et dessins provenant du Cabinet des dessins et de la collection Edmond de Rothschild au Musée du Louvre (Paris: Musée du Louvre, 1971), 54-56.

I am grateful to Darcy Kuronen for generously including this detail among the slides he prepared to illustrate the earlier version of this article, read at that museum in June 2002.

Five more guitarists and one theorbo are known to have existed, based on mentions in written sources dating from the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries, but are not believed to be extant. One of the guitars was destroyed during World War II.

The relatively new discipline of dendrochronology has only recently been applied to musical instruments, while precise identification of woods often requires removing a small sample, which museums are understandably reluctant to allow. In what follows, I give Latin designations only in those cases where scientific analysis has been undertaken by the institutions owning the instruments in question.

Evans and Evans, Guitars, 32. This guitar is also described and illustrated in Boyden, Catalogue of the Hill Collection, 44-45 and pl. 40a-e.

John C. Topham, “A Dendrochronological Survey of Musical Instruments from the Hill Collection at the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford,” The Galpin Society Journal 55 (April 2002): 244-68, at pp. 260 and 265-66 (no. 27). The youngest dendrochronological date for both sides of the front is 1627, but it is possible, that a few years of growth rings were trimmed away as part of the manufacturing process.

Michel Foussard first pointed out the similarities between this guitar and R1 in his “Catalogue sommaire des guitares du Musée Instrumental de Nice,” Guitares. Chefs-d’œuvre des collections de France (Paris: La flûte de Pan, 1980), 271-92, at p. 291 (no. 2, with color illustrations on pp. 95-98). Josiane Bran-Ricei mentioned the “restoration” of this instrument by [Charles?] Theress from Mirecourt (who may have been the person responsible for its transformations in 1863) in her catalog entry in Béatrice Debrabandère-Descamps and Jean Forneris (ed.), La musique et la peinture. 1600-1900. Trois siècles d’iconographie musicale dans les publications publiques françaises (Nice: Musée des Beaux-Arts, 1991), 174-75 (no. 73); see also idem, “Guitares, luths et mandolines. Une exposition d’instruments de musique de la Ville de Nice,” Un siècle de musique à Nice. Nice Historique 97 (1994): 142-43.


Géreau, “René, Alexandre et Jean Voboam,” 62, 64.


Géreau, “La dynastie des Voboam,” fig. 5.

See Harvey Turnbull, *The Guitar*, 20 and plate 22a, c, d; at that time, this instrument was in the collection of W. E. Hill and Sons in London, and is probably the same as that formerly in the Charles Voillmot collection.

Private communication, July 2004. I am very grateful to John Koster for his help. See also the comparison of AJ3 and AJ5 below.


Analysis by John Koster (private communication, July 2004). The similarity between juniper and cypress explains the uncertainty that has long existed about the kind of wood used by Alexandre Voboam for the backs of his instruments. We can now exclude yew and cypress, although the latter is very similar to juniper, according to Koster one can observe “nodular rather than smooth end walls in the ray cells of juniper.”

This theory was first suggested by Charnassé and Milliot in 1992, on p. 222 of their article cited in n. 36 above.

The lack of uniformity in the signatures of these and other instruments (see fig. 9) is easily explainable if we remember that until 1681 Nicolas Alexandre Voboam could not sign his own name; presumably he needed help from someone else to mark his instruments, and in all likelihood several different people provided this assistance over the years until he became able to do so himself. Comparison of his signature
("A. Vobeam") on the marriage contract of his wife’s sister (see n. 43 above) with the surname found on
the name plaque on AJ6 (fig. 9) reveals that the latter must have been written by the maker himself.

Photographs taken during the restoration of AJ5 reveal the same model (I am very grateful to Darcy
Kurozen for providing copies of this documentation), and one can formulate an identical hypothesis for AJ3
based on the externally observable height of its heel.

Beschreibendes Verzeichnis. Publikationen aus der Sammlung für Plastik und Kunstgewerbe 3 (Vienna:
59, catalog no. C. 57.

My thanks to Dr. Rudolph Hopfner for sending me this report.

The soundboard of AJ6 is not original and has the following label: "Réparé par Savary Fils Luthier,
Rue Lavoisier N° 11 / à Paris année 1815."

Sotheby’s New York Galleries, Important Musical Instruments, June 13, 1983, lot 7. Because I have
not been able to examine this instrument (multiple inquiries to its late owner having remained unanswered),
the comments above are based only on photographs in the auction catalog.

Pierre de Nolhac, Jean-Marc Nattier, Peintre de la Cour de Louis XV (Paris, 1905), 61; exhibition
catalog From Watteau to David. A century of French Art (New York: Christophe Janat, Maurice Segoura,
22 April–25 June 1982), no. 11, repro.; Zurich, private collection; Selected French Painting 1700–1810
recently on the market with the Matthiesen Gallery (London) and Stair Sainty-Matthiesen Inc. (New York)
(1989). [PAGE OR ITEM NUMBER FOR LAST?]

Paris, AN, MC, CXVIII (August 26, 1680).

Prior publications of this guitar include Florence Abondance, La restauration des instruments de
musique (Fribourg: Office du Livre, 1981), 78–79; and Florence Géreau, “Watteau et la musique,” in
François Mourreau and Margaret Morgan-Grasselli, eds., Antoine Watteau (1684–1721). le peintre, son

Lalit’s label mentions that he had won a bronze medal at the Paris Exposition of 1900, thus providing
a terminus post quern for his work on this guitar.

See above at notes 20–21, respectively.

Georgii Blagodatov, Katalog Sobranija muzikal’nykh instrumentov Leningradskii Institut Teatra
Muziki i Kinematografii (Leningrad: Edition “Muzyka,” 1972), 106; Herbert Heyde,
Musikinstrumentenbau, 15.–19. Jahrhundert: Kunst, Handwerk, Entwurf (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel,

Tom Evans, “Les métamorphoses de la guitare,” in Guíares, Chefs-d’oeuvre des collections de
France (Paris: La flûte de Pan, 1980), 83–90, at p. 87, repro. 95; exhibition catalog Loisirs de princes au

The daughter of Henry-Jules de Condé, Mademoiselle de Bourbon was born in 1688 (one year after the guitar was made) and later married François-Louis de Bourbon Conti. The case has been modified, probably during the eighteenth century; originally it would have opened at the instrument’s lower bouts, like early violin cases.

See above, n. 48.

In 1988 I attributed both these instruments to Jean Voboam: see Gétreau, “René, Alexandre et Jean Voboam,” 68, no. XXIII and 70, no. XXV.


See my catalog entry in Joël Dugot and Laurent Espié, Un musée aux rayons x Dix ans de recherche au service de la musique (Paris: Musée de la Musique, 2001), 130-33, with illustrations in color.

Correspondance with Stephanie Paul and Scott Odell (November 29, 1979). The Latin denomination was provided by one of the anonymous readers of my article.

Topham (“A Dendrochronological Survey of . . . Three Collections,” 136 [no. 10], 145, 146) gives dates of 1578–1692 (bass) and 1579–1693 (treble) for the growth rings in the soundboard, which is consistent with the date of manufacture, and states that “The two sides of the 1708 guitar front match very well, suggesting same tree origin.”

The museum’s records describe the materials used as “Rosewood veneered spruce back and rosewood sides.”

This dimension ranges from 2.4 mm (AJ6, J7) to 3.5 mm or slightly more (for some areas of AJ9, J1, and J8). I am grateful to Joël Dugot, who frequently shared his knowledge and experience and gave me access to the collection on several recent occasions.

In the series Y 9306 to 9323, including the Registres des Jurandes et Maîtres des métiers de la ville de Paris (Chambre du Procureur du Ray), we checked systematically but unsuccessfully for the years 1613 to 1617; they are missing for 1612, as well as for 1618–1655 and 1659–1673. We also checked without success 1674–1676, 1677, and 1685–1688; 1694 to 1735 are missing.

Unfortunately, no French guitars by other makers of the seventeenth century have their original string length, making a comparison impossible. But a very similar range of string lengths is observable among the eleven Tielke guitars recorded by Günther Hellwig in his book Joachim Tielke: Ein Hamburger Lauten- und Violinsucher der Barockzeit (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Das Musikinstrument, 1980), 46. (Apart from one “Terzgitarre” with 478 mm, the other specimen vary from 610 to 715 mm.)