Appendix

Francesco Stradivari and his Salabue violin

Given the willingness of late-eighteenth-century collectors and dealers to falsify labels and modify instruments, and given the lack of respect for the creative artistry of craftsmen of the calibre of Stradivari, Guarneri, Bergonzi, and Guadagnini – artistry which should have been held sacrosanct – it is sometimes only with difficulty that certainties of manufacture and authorship can be established to everyone’s satisfaction. Even with a violin maker who apparently made very few instruments the uncertainties often outweigh the certainties by a wide margin, and such a situation exists with some of the instruments made by, or attributed to, Antonio Stradivari’s eldest son, Giacomo Francesco.

Two of Francesco’s early violins, label-dated 1707 and 1716, are illustrated by Simone Sacconi, and were listed on the Cozio.com website with the identification numbers 4993 and 4992. The website also identified a 1713 violin (no. 6345) with the label Franciscus Stradivarius cremonensis filius Antonii faciebat Anno 1713, a cello (no. 4453) labelled Sotto la disciplina di Antonio Stradiuario F. in Cremona 1733, the Le Besque violin (attributed to the year 1742 by Cozio.com but ‘has a Stradivari label of 1734’), and the Petersen violin which the website attributed to circa 1740 despite the label: Antonius Stradivarius Cremonensis Faciebat Anno 1734. The Tarisio.com website (in August 2014) illustrated just five violins by Francesco: the Oliveira (1730), un-named (1732), Humser (1740), Salabue (1742), and the Le Besque (1742).

The Petersen violin, with its one-piece back plate, may be the violin identified in an 1816 inventory, drawn up by Count Cozio di Salabue, of instruments to be sold in Milan:

Elenco ragionato della collezione d’instrumenti da corda de principal autori celebri cremonesi e della loro scuola, de quali se ne propone la vendita in Milano [...].


Annotated list of the collection of string instruments of the principal celebrated Cremonese makers, and of their school, which I am proposing [planning] to sell in Milan.

Another [violin] of the late Francesco Stradivari, son of the aforementioned Antonio, esteemed no less than him, of good normal mould, red varnish, undamaged, one-piece back, not so refined in workmanship but of good voice and [...?], estimated at 80 ongari, with a label of his father of 1730/4.

Although the Cozio.com website did not list a 1717 violin by Francesco Stradivari just such a violin is described by Count Cozio in his aforementioned ‘Stradivari’ inventory of 1774-75, and the Count

---

1 Sacconi (1972) pp. 112-113.
2 ‘[Made] under the teaching …’
3 In addition to these five Francesco Stradivari violins the Tarisio.com website identified ‘eighteen other properties’ but these were not illustrated on the website.
4 BSCr, LC, ms. Cozio 82; not transcribed by Renzo Bacchetta. Count Cozio has initially recorded the label-date as ‘1730’ but has then overwritten his ‘0’ with a ‘4’. Given the Count’s habit of changing labels, the alteration of ‘0’ to ‘4’ may be rather more than just the correction of a slip of the pen. In his ms. Cozio 41 (of 1774-75) Count Cozio describes an Antonio Stradivari violin and identifies the label date as ‘1730’; he then overwrites the final numeral with a ‘4’.
5 Cozio.com website accessed June 2013.
concludes his description of the violin with the comment è del figlio (‘is of the son’), an attribution which most likely refers to Francesco (see below, and Plate 32):

"Fondo intiero, bosco di vena larga, diversamente machiate, con un groppo a man[o] sinistra sopra i C sinistro, con un tasello quasi inmeso verso man[o] diritta verso il poreto [pometto?]..." With the comment è del figlio, a likely attribution to Francesco (see below, and Plate 32). One-piece back, wood with wide flames, various spots [stains?], with a knot on the left above the left C, with a patch situated towards the right, towards the tail-pin, the [neck]-button is almost circular, the wood of the neck is slab-cut, the scroll is outlined – above [on the surface of?] the front plate to the right of the fingerboard there are various spots on the front plate, the f-holes are beautiful but the front plate is not so neat, and the varnish is pale... The label is like the others, except it was cancelled by me, and the stamp [monogram] is half outside the edge of the label, 1717, one-piece side, is of the son.

Plate 32: BScr, LC, ms. Cozio 41

It seems likely that the 20-year-old Count was advised by someone – perhaps by Paolo Stradivari at the time of the Count’s purchase of the left-over instruments – that this violin was the work of Francesco, rather than Antonio.

---

6 BScr, LC, ms. Cozio 41.
7 The practical outcome of ‘cancelled by me’ is uncertain, but the Count’s phrase – ‘the label is like the others’ – when ‘the others’ in the first part of this ms. Cozio 41 inventory are all Antonio Stradivari violins, suggests that the label inside Francesco’s 1717 violin was an Antonio label. It is difficult to understand which part of such a label might be ‘cancelled’ (as opposed to ‘changed’ – cangiato); see also footnote 11. The evidence suggests that, whilst Antonio was head of the workshop, Francesco (and perhaps Omobono as well) were not allowed to put their own labels in any instruments which they made.
8 Count Cozio must mean that the lower-bout rib is in one piece, not that the entire rib ‘garland’ is in one piece.
Twenty-six years later, Count Cozio returned to his 1774-75 manuscript (Plate 32) and added an annotation to the left-hand margin:

[?] Valenza, 10 Luglio 1801: sì hà
[?] Valenza, 10th July 1801: I have it.\(^9\)

This annotation almost certainly relates to Count Cozio’s instrument inventory (ms. Cozio 42) of April 1801 – 8 Apr[ri]f Milano e seguenti – where a new descriptive text (translated below) exhibits close agreement (shown here underscored) with the text of 1774-75 (above):\(^10\)

[Top-left annotation]: Added 10\(^{th}\) July 18\([?]\) in Valenza, previously at Salabue. Label stamped with better seal [monogram], e stato riposto ['? and hidden'].

[Main body of text]: Antonius Stradiuarius\(^{11}\) 1717. The stamp [monogram] has been positioned half below the label.\(^{12}\) Strong voice, consistent and sonorous, but nonetheless a little rough.

Characteristics: very large mould [forma assai grande], with a mark at the head of the neck in the [peg-box] cavity P.G.; undamaged, varnish pale yellow: the workmanship is good, and good purfling. The front and back plates are arched; the back plate flames are wide and brilliant but irregular, with a transverse knot on the left above the C and two small [knots] towards the tail-pin. The neck-button is slightly more than two-thirds of a circle. The ribs are of matching wood and in one piece at the tail-pin. The front plate is like marble in the upper part on the right-hand side, and the f-holes are beautiful but not hollowed.\(^{13}\)

Fairly neat and tidy in the front plate of wide veins (see [?] old), the neck is slab cut and the scroll outlined in black.\(^{14}\)

In 1805 Count Cozio again returned to his 1774-75 manuscript (Plate 32) and added a second annotation to the left-hand margin:

[?] vendut[o] nel 1805 a M’ Durand dal libretto\(^{15}\)
[?] sold in 1805 to Monsieur Durand, as in the little book.

The Cozio archive, at the Biblioteca Statale di Cremona, contains a small booklet, ms. Cozio 83:\(^{16}\)

Vol. 2\(^{16}\) 1800 in 1805 Milano e 1800 in 1809
Specifica de primari autori de strumenti del tempo che hanno lavorato, estratto da biglietti originali veduti da me I A Cozio ne stessi istromenti, registrati nelle mie memorie Vol Primo e 3\(^{e}\) indi 1816.

---

\(^9\) The town of Valenza lies fifteen miles south-east of Casale Monferrato.

\(^10\) See Plate 12 for a photograph of Count Cozio’s description of the 1717 violin.

\(^11\) Count Cozio has underlined the letter ‘v’. According to the Hills’ facsimile label of 1717 (Hill (1902) between p. 216 and p. 217) a genuine 1717 Stradivari label would have had the family name spelled ‘Stradiuarius’. On 23\(^{rd}\) February 1823 Count Cozio wrote a description of a 1715 Stradivari violin (BSCr, LC, ms. Cozio 17) which includes: Il biglietto entro stante è originale col U dell’anno 1715 (‘The label presently within is original, with a ‘U’ [i.e. ‘Stradiuarius’] of the year 1715’). The Count’s writing of ‘Antonius Stradiuarius’ therefore appears to be an aide memoire created to remind himself of the falsity of the 1717 label which he had glued inside Francesco’s violin; perhaps this explains why Count Cozio, in 1774-75, wrote that he had ‘cancelled’ the label.

\(^12\) Renzo Bacchetta (Cozio/Bacchetta p. 212) erroneously transcribes Count Cozio’s sotto (below) as sopra (above).

\(^13\) Bacchetta’s transcription (Cozio/Bacchetta, p. 212) omits the word non in ma non incavate.

\(^14\) Translated from BSCr, LC, ms. Cozio 42.

\(^15\) Renzo Bacchetta (Cozio/Bacchetta pp. 201-202) uncertainly identifies the purchaser of the violin as ‘M. Ruvani(?).’ The pen-strokes crossing through the first descriptive text (ms. Cozio 41) would have been added by Count Cozio in 1805 to indicate the sale of this violin; see Plate 32.

\(^16\) Not transcribed by Renzo Bacchetta.
Volume 2: 1800 to 1805, Milan, and 1800 to 1809
Details of the prime makers of instruments, of the time in which they worked, [based on] examples of original labels seen by me, I A Cozio, in these instruments, registered in my notebooks Volume One and Three, 1816 onwards.

Within this booklet is a page on which the Count replicates a Francesco Stradivari label:

Franciscus Stradivarius Cremonenfis  
Filius Antonii faciebat anno 1717

Underneath this replication the Count has written:

De violini di d’autore di me I.A.C. L’uno venduto nel 1805 fondo intiero a M[onsieur] E. Durand mandato a Pariggi e L’altro io ritengo, e ritenuti i due biglietti dell anno 1742

Violins of this maker [owned] by me, I A C[ozio]. One sold in 1805, one-piece back plate, to Monsieur E Durand, taken to Paris, and the other I retained, and kept the two [Francesco] labels of the year 1742, one with his father’s stamp [monogram] badly impressed.

This statement confirms the sale, in 1805, to Monsieur Durand, of a violin which had been made by Francesco (almost certainly in 1742) but now contained a substitute, false, ‘Antonius Stradiarius’ label of 1717. On his return to Paris Monsieur Durand would undoubtedly have sold this violin as an Antonio Stradivari instrument. Only if someone queried the 1717 label – the letter ‘v’ in ‘Stradiarius’ – might the true authorship of the violin emerge.

With respect to these two 1742 Francesco violins (from which the labels were removed) Count Cozio wrote three commentaries. Firstly, under the general date-heading of 1816:

[...] two of his [Francesco’s] masterpieces, dated 1742, were acquired in 1775 by me, with those made by Antonio, from the merchant Paolo, brother of Francesco (who died in the same year). He [Francesco] cannot [however] have made so very few instruments, which were normally sold at the same price as standard violins made by his father ([this I know] as a result of a letter of this Paolo, 20th August 1775, sent to Signor Michelangelo Briatta, at the time the clerk to this nobleman).

In a subsequent Articolo 4:

[...] the undersigned [i.e. Count Cozio] who, in addition to acquiring [Antonio’s] instruments, patterns, and notebooks [memorie] in 1774, had the good fortune to find two

---

17 Count Cozio’s handwritten replication does not include a ‘long S’ after the letter ‘i’ of ‘Franciscus’ (but the Count does draw a particularly large and tall ‘S’ to represent the ‘long S’ of ‘Cremonenfis’). Note that Count Cozio clearly indicates that only the first numeral of the year-date is printed. See later in this Appendix for information about the label currently inside the Francesco Stradivari Salabue violin.

18 Here the Count has carefully placed ink-dots underneath the numerals 7, 4, and 2, which was his method for indicating which numerals had been handwritten rather than printed.

19 The current whereabouts and identity of this violin are unknown; this is all the more regrettable since it apparently had (and may still have) the letters P.G. in the peg-box.

20 The BSCr, LC, ms. Cozio 41 inventory of 1774–75 does not contain any descriptions of Francesco Stradivari violins labelled dated 1742.

21 i.e. 1742. In fact, Francesco died the following year – 1743.

22 The Count’s phraseology – Non deve però averne fabbricati molto pochi … – is ambiguous.

23 Translated from Cozio/Bacchetta p. 44. The ‘nobleman’ is Count Cozio. The 20th August 1775 letter from Paolo Stradivari makes no mention of Francesco’s instruments being sold at the same price as those of his father; see Chapter 4.
violins of this Francesco Stradivari […] the small number of instruments that he made are admired just as much as those of his father.\textsuperscript{24}

In an historical document dating from 1823:

[…] those [instruments] made [by Francesco] between 1740 and 1742 are made as well as those of his father. The few instruments that [Francesco] left to Paolo, his [half-] brother – at his death – were sold at the same price as those of his father, [this I know] from correspondence between Paolo and Count Cozio.\textsuperscript{25}

*****

Another violin, label-dated 1730,\textsuperscript{26} which is associated with Francesco Stradivari, is described twice (\textbf{1A} and \textbf{1B}, below) by Count Cozio, with a third description (\textbf{2}, see later in this Appendix) including detailed measurements of, at first sight, the same violin. The first description is contained within an undated Cozio document titled \textit{Violini Stradivari da Registrarsi} which contains descriptions of five Stradivari violins, one label-dated 1731, all the others label-dated 1730. The Count’s description of the fifth violin is:

\textbf{Description 1A}

\textit{Biglietto bollato 1730, forma non così grande, fondo intiero, legno preso per asse, covine semicerchio con due ponte sotto al profilo (per tenere il fondo alle toppe) una per la parte superiore e l’altra inferiore, manico e fascie di legno come il fondo, rizzo senza contorno nero. Coperchio di legno bellissimo ondeggiante con un picciol tassello in esso al di fuori sotto le FF del bordone, le FF non incavate.}\textsuperscript{27}

Label\textsuperscript{28} stamped, 1730, not so large a type, one-piece back; the wood is slab-cut, the [neck] button is a semicircle with two [locating] pins underneath the purfling (to hold the back to the blocks) one in the upper part [of the body] and the other in the lower part; neck and ribs are of the same wood as the back [plate], the scroll does not have a black outline. The front plate is made of most beautiful wood, rippled, with a small patch within it [inserted from the] outside,\textsuperscript{29} under the $f$-hole on the bass side, the $f$-holes are not hollowed.\textsuperscript{30}

The second description appears within ms. Cozio 41 (1774-75):

\textbf{Description 1B}

\textit{Fondo intiero, bosco preso per asse, covino semicerchio con due ponte sotto il profilo una a basso e l’altra sopra manico e fasse compagni al fondo, risso senza negro, coperchio di}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{24}Translated from Cozio/Bachetta p. 47.
\textsuperscript{25}Translated from BScr, LC, ms. Cozio 4. The Count appears to have forgotten that he had already made a similarly-worded entry in his notebooks.
\textsuperscript{26}The Cozio.com website (accessed February 2013) did not list a 1730 Francesco Stradivari violin; neither did the Tarisio.com website (August 2014).
\textsuperscript{27}BScr, LC, ms. Cozio 40; see also Cozio/Bachetta, p. 199. The date when this description was written is likely to have been only very shortly before the writing of Description 1B since the latter appears in ms. Cozio 41.
\textsuperscript{28}But of Antonio, or Francesco?
\textsuperscript{29}A custom-made sliver of wood exactly filling a resin pocket in the plate. The same type of infill, but in a different location on the front plate, can be found on the Messiah violin (see Chapter 3 and Plate 8).
\textsuperscript{30}‘not hollowed’ indicates that the wood adjacent to the $f$-hole has not been thinned (made concave). For an example of hollowed wood, see the close-up photograph of the bass-side $f$-hole of the Messiah violin in John Dilworth, ‘Silent witness’, \textit{The Strad}, March 2011, pp. 32-33.
\end{flushright}
The button is a semicircle, with two pins under the purfling, one in the lower part and the other above [in the upper part]; neck and ribs match the back [plate], the scroll does not have a black outline; the front is made of most beautiful wood, rippled, with a small patch [inserted from the] outside within it, under the f-hole on the bass side, the f-holes are not hollowed, label stamped 1730, red varnish, this is of Francesco, the son.\textsuperscript{32}

It will be noted that description 1A does not mention a maker’s name; it is the close repetition of the information from 1A in 1B – and description 1B concluding with \textit{questo è del Francesco figlio} – which enables Francesco’s name to be applied to the first description (1A) of this 1730 violin. It is unclear on what basis Count Cozio identified the violin as having been made by Francesco Stradivari; again, perhaps Paolo Stradivari was the source of the information. Count Cozio does not describe the text-content of the violin’s internal label.

These two near-identical descriptions are evidently of the same violin, label-dated 1730, and this violin exhibits strong physical similarities to that which today is known, slightly confusingly, as Francesco Stradivari’s Salabue violin (which contains an internal label dated 1742). Photographs of today’s Salabue violin reveal the following positive correspondences with the 1A and 1B descriptions of the 1730 violin:\textsuperscript{33}

- one-piece slab-cut back plate; the wood matches that of the ribs and the neck
- semi-circular neck button
- the scroll not outlined in black\textsuperscript{34}
- longitudinal ripples in the wood of the front plate\textsuperscript{35}
- an infill on the front plate underneath the bass-side \textit{f}-hole (see Plate 33, below)\textsuperscript{36}
- two locating pins – top and bottom of the back plate
- the \textit{f}-hole wings are not hollowed\textsuperscript{37}

\textsuperscript{31} BSCr, LC, ms. Cozio 41; see also Cozio/Bacchetta, p. 218. Count Cozio has drawn a box around the final phrase of the description (present author’s underscore).

\textsuperscript{32} The near-identical text suggests that the first description may have been a rough draft, with the second description the fair copy.

\textsuperscript{33} High-resolution photographs of the Francesco Stradivari Salabue violin – front plate, back plate, centre bout, and head – are published in Accornero, G., Epicoco, I., Guerci, E., \textit{Il Conte Cozio di Salabue, Liuteria e Collezionismo in Piemonte} (2005), pp. 50-51.

\textsuperscript{34} The disintegration of the black outlining seems to have occurred very rapidly; only a few flecks of black are still visible on the bass side of the scroll. See Chapter 12 for a discussion of the rate at which the body varnish on Cremonese instruments disintegrated and disappeared.

\textsuperscript{35} The ripples are visible in the treble-side lower bout and to the right of the treble \textit{f}-hole. Count Cozio also noted (BSCr, LC, ms. Cozio 46) a rippled appearance in the top plate of a Nicolò Amati violin with a label-date of 1658: \textit{Coperchio vena larga disugale in fondo e dalla parte del canino con diversi ondeggiamenti} (‘The top has wide uneven veins [growth-rings] at the lower end, and on the treble side, with various ripples’).

\textsuperscript{36} The infill (see Plate 33) is elliptical, orientated longitudinally, and is approximately 20mm long by 3mm wide.

\textsuperscript{37} This not-hollowed condition appears to be confirmed by the photographic evidence (see Plate 33).
Mr James Warren, in correspondence with the present author, has supplied the following dimensions of the present-day Salabue violin (with its 1742 label) – ‘over the arching’ – i.e. measured with a tailor’s tape:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Bout</td>
<td>6½ inches [165.1mm]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre Bout</td>
<td>4³/₈ inches [111.1mm]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Bout</td>
<td>8 inches [203.2mm]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Length</td>
<td>13¹⁵/₁₆ inches [354mm]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calliper equivalents of these measurements (thus comparable to the measurements made by Count Cozio) would likely be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Calliper Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Bout</td>
<td>163.9mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre Bout</td>
<td>108.1mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Bout</td>
<td>202mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Length</td>
<td>352.5mm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Allocating 352.5mm to the length of the back-plate of the Salabue violin as photographed in Accornero et al., pp. 50-51 and extrapolating the bout widths (as photographed) by using a multiplication of 2.049 produces the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Measurements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Bout</td>
<td>164.9mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre Bout</td>
<td>107.7mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Bout</td>
<td>203.2mm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results closely correspond with the proposed calliper-derived equivalent measurements (above) and thus establish the physical reality of the present-day Salabue violin. Supportive evidence is provided by the Francesco Stradivari violin known as Le Besque which is stated by Ernest Doring to have an Antonio Stradivari label of 1734 and the following dimensions:

UB 6²⁷/₁₆ inches, CB 4³/₈ inches, LB 8 inches, Length 13¹⁵/₁₆ inches.

These measurements are almost identical with Mr James Warren’s over-the-arching measurements of the Salabue violin; the Salabue violin thus has a twin – the Le Besque violin.

---

38 American violin dealer, based in Chicago.
39 Doring p. 357.
The *Salabue* violin (352.5mm length) and the *Le Besque* violin both fit around Antonio Stradivari’s *S* mould of 20th September 1703:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UB</th>
<th>CB</th>
<th>LB</th>
<th>Body Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>S</em> mould</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>345 (with blocks fitted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mould + 7.3mm extensions</em></td>
<td>164.3</td>
<td>109.3</td>
<td>203.3</td>
<td>352.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The <em>Salabue</em> measurements</td>
<td>164.4</td>
<td>107.9</td>
<td>202.6</td>
<td>352.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, these certain measurements of today’s Francesco Stradivari *Salabue* violin do not agree with the measurements obtained by Count Cozio, on 3rd June 1816, from the Francesco violin of Description 2 (see overleaf).

*****

Descriptions 1A and 1B both indicate that the described violin was label-dated 1730; the present-day *Salabue* violin has a 1742 Francesco Stradivari label glued inside:

Franciſcus Stradivarius Cremonenſis  
Filius Antonii faciebat Anno 1742

These details of the label-text and the date-digits – ‘The last three digits in ink by hand’ – were supplied to the present author by Mr James Warren, who also offered the following comments:

You should also be aware that this label was put in the violin by Alfred Hill, who considered it likely to be its original label, possibly removed by Count Cozio who owned this particular instrument and was known to sometimes do some alterations, including label switching […]. The Dalla Valle Collection included this label and Mr Hill approached Signor [Giuseppe] Fiorini of Rome, who [subsequently] had all the Stradivari relics [between 1920 and 1930]. He [Alfred Hill] purchased this label from him and reinserted it in the violin. He was quite sure, because of this trail, that it was the violin’s original label.

If the Hills’ violin was that which was described by Count Cozio in 1A and 1B, and, post the Hills, was that which became Francesco’s *Salabue* violin (after Alfred Hill ‘reinserted’[?] a 1742 label), then someone had removed the 1730 label before the violin arrived at the Hills’ workshop in London. Alfred Hill’s insertion of a 1742 label into his anonymous violin (rather than a 1730 label) would seem to indicate that he was unaware of the manuscripts which contained Count Cozio’s 1A and 1B descriptions.

In their 1902 monograph the Hills provide a ‘facsimile’ of a 1742 Francesco Stradivari label:

Franciſcus Stradivarius Cremonenſis  
Filius Antonii faciebat Anno 1742

In this case only the last two date-numerals are handwritten with pen and ink, which raises doubts over the provenance and reliability of the label. There is no monogram in the Hills’ facsimile of the label.44 The Hills write:

---

40 See the end of Chapter 2 for an explanation of the author’s ‘extensions’.
41 Averaged from the proposed ‘calliper equivalents’ and the ‘extrapolated’ measurements.
42 Note the Count’s comment – ‘not so large a type’ – in Description 1A.
43 Hill (1902) between pp. 216 and 217.
44 Another Francesco Stradivari 1742 label (without a monogram) is illustrated by Antoine Vidal (Vidal (1876-78) Volume I, Plate XXII, opp. p. 106), and yet another (also without a monogram) in Vidal (1889) Plate XVIII, opp. p. 198. The latter label is very similar, but not identical, to that illustrated by the Hills in 1902.
The Francesco Stradivari label comes to us\textsuperscript{45} from the Marquis [Rolando Alessandro?] Dalla Valle. It was most probably taken from one of the two violins purchased by Count Cozio in 1775 from Paolo Stradivari. We may add that not a single authentic example of Francesco’s work has been hitherto identified by us.\textsuperscript{46}

In the 1909 second edition of the Hills’ monograph (p. 233) the final quoted sentence is excised, which would suggest that between 1902 and 1909 the Hills saw an instrument – perhaps the cello mentioned by Wurlitzer (see later in this Appendix) – which contained a Francesco Stradivari label, but it is unclear how a solitary label could be adjudged as genuine and entirely reliable.\textsuperscript{47} Ernest Doring quotes from a 1928 letter sent by Alfred Hill to Monsieur Vatelot-Hekking: ‘Since the publication of our [1902] Life of Stradivari, I have been fortunate enough to come across an authentic instrument of Francesco’s bearing his original label’, but Doring does not indicate whether this instrument was a violin, viola, or cello.\textsuperscript{48}

A conundrum centres on why, if the Hills had obtained a 1742 (42 handwritten) Francesco Stradivari label from the Marchese Dalla Valle (and reproduced this label in their 1902 monograph), Alfred Hill then purchased a 1742 label (742 handwritten) from Giuseppe Fiorini on a date between 1920 and 1930? What had happened to the label used in the 1902 monograph?

*****

**Description 2**

On 3\textsuperscript{rd} June 1816 Count Cozio wrote a descriptive entry (see Plate 34) which, mostly, comprises measurements of a Francesco Stradivari violin. This entry appears to describe the same 1730 violin as in descriptions 1A and 1B but the instrument is now clearly identified as containing an Antonio label despite Francesco being the author of the instrument:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Misure mio violino del Francesco Stradivari con biglietto suo padre del 1730 compresi li profilis sul coperchio}\textsuperscript{49}
\end{quote}

Measurements [of] my violin of Francesco Stradivari with his father’s label of 1730, including the profiles [purfling] on the front plate.\textsuperscript{50}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{45} ‘comes to us’ evidently indicates a date prior to 1902, and thus this is not the 1742 label bought by Alfred Hill from Giuseppe Fiorini. Whether ‘comes to us’ indicates that the 1742 label was a gift to the Hills from the Marchese Dalla Valle, or just loaned for the purposes of the Hills’ 1902 monograph (and returned thereafter), or bought outright by the Hills, is unclear.
\item \textsuperscript{46} Hill (1902) p. 220.
\item \textsuperscript{47} The Francesco Stradivari label illustrated on page 227 of the Hills’ 1909 second edition is the same as that which appeared in the earlier 1902 edition.
\item \textsuperscript{48} Doring p. 357.
\item \textsuperscript{49} BSCr, LC, ms. Cozio 47, folio 29v; see also Cozio/Bacchetta p. 255. The underscore is as in the original manuscript.
\item \textsuperscript{50} Sacconi (Sacconi (1972) p. 101) comments: ‘Of this period we know of instruments totally constructed by the sons [Omobono and Francesco] with the father’s original label but without any annotation of age.’ Sacconi gives no details of these instruments. Count Cozio writes (22\textsuperscript{nd} December 1820) of a colleague’s violin which has an Antonio Stradivari label dated 1725: ‘I believe that this violin could be made by Francesco […] who, as in my two [violins], used his father’s label’ (che fece come ne’ miei due uso del biglietto di suo padre).
\end{itemize}
Towards the end of his listing of the measurements Count Cozio writes:

*Curve larghe e longhe ben spianate; coperchio ondeggiato e traversato con un tasello sotto l’FF della q[uar]t[o]n* bislongo per riempire un groppo che vi era; il fondo e fascie prese per asse senza vena. Il manico bella vena fina. Nel fondi […] le due ponte per fermare nelle toppe cioè la superiore nel profilo e altra fuori d’esso. […] La voce è buona eguale ma non così forte come li retrodescritti altri tre Stradivari. Il lavoro in totale ben e atto e polito.*

---

51 BSCr, LC, ms. Cozio 47, folio 30v; see also Cozio/Bacchetta p. 256. The sheet of paper on which Count Cozio has written this description is badly damaged and, in places, his text is now impossible to read.
The arching is well-smoothed across both width and length; the front plate is rippled, and crossed with a patch under the f-hole of the fourth [string]—an oblong—to repair a knot which is there [in the wood]; the back and the ribs are slab-cut without flames. The neck [has] beautiful narrow flames. In the back plate […] the two pins to fix [the back] to the blocks, namely the pin in the upper part [i.e. at the neck] within the [width of the] purfling and the other pin [at the tail-piece end] outside [the width of the purfling]. […] The voice is good, and even, but not so strong [sonorous] as the previously described three [violins] of [Antonio] Stradivari. Overall, the workmanship is good and appropriate and neat.

At first sight it seems that Count Cozio might once again be describing the violin of Descriptions 1A and 1B. However, in 1A and 1B the ‘neck and ribs match the back’ (alternatively, ‘neck and ribs are of the same wood as the back’) but now, in Description 2, whilst the back and ribs are slab cut without flames ‘the neck has beautiful narrow flames’. In Description 2, the knot (groppo) under the bass-side f-hole is not the same as the small resin-pocket infill of Descriptions 1A and 1B, notwithstanding the similar location on the front plate; the Count’s usage of al di fuori in both Description 1A and 1B is conspicuous by its absence in Description 2. Count Cozio’s text – e traversato con un tasello sotto l’FF della quarta bislongo per riempire un groppo che vi era – makes clear that while the front-plate knot could be seen, its supportive patch was glued to the underside of the front plate, beneath the knot. Evidently Count Cozio, or one of the Mantegazzas family, or G B Guadagnini, removed the front plate from this violin, and, on the underside, below the bass-side f-hole, saw an oblong reinforcing patch, orientated across the bout width, repairing (or supporting) the knot.

In addition, the 3rd June 1816 measurements made by Count Cozio (see Plate 34) clearly demonstrate that this violin (Description 2) has no dimensional connection with the 1A/1B/Salabue/S-mould violin:

Misura mio violino del Francesco Stradivari con bigl’ suo padre del 1730
compresi li profili sul coperchio

Maggior Larg[hezz]a superiore – polici cinque, ponti undeci e mezzo: 5. 11 3/6
Minor Larg[hezz]a nel petto fra li CC – polici tre, ponti nove e due terzi: 3. 9 4/6
Maggior Larg[hezz]a inferioremente – sette, ponti tre e mezzo: 7. 4 4/6

Larg[hezz]a dal ponticello al Bordo superiore – polici sette: 7. ------
Larg[hezz]a dal ponticello al Bord del covino – polici cinque, ponti nove: 5. 9 –

Grosezza del ponticello – poli due: 2 –
Grosezza dei due orli54 ossia bordi – ponti tre e mezzo: 3 3/6

Totale polici tredici, ponti due e mezzo ponti: 13. 2. 3/6

Measurements [of] my violin of Francesco Stradivari, with his father’s label of 1730, including the profiles [purfling] on the front plate:

Maximum upper width [upper bout]: 5 pollici and 11½ ponti
Minimum width in the chest between the CC [C-bout]: 3 pollici and 9 2/3 ponti
Maximum lower width [lower bout]: 7 pollici and 4 2/3 ponti

Length from the bridge to upper border [purfling]: 7 pollici
Length from the bridge to button border55 [purfling]: 5 pollici and 9 ponti

---

52 The G-string.
53 It is entirely possible that the internal oblong patch was fitted by the Mantegazzas, or by Guadagnini, or even by Count Cozio.
54 ‘brim’, ‘hem’ (Giuseppe Baretti 1831 dictionary).
Bridge thickness: 2 ponti
The width of the two brims, or edges [combined]: 3½ ponti
Total length of the violin body: 13 pollici and 2½ ponti

Converting the Count’s measurements with 27.07mm for 1 pollici, and 2.26mm for 1 ponti: 56

UB: 5 pollici and 11.5 ponti + 3.5 ponti for the edges = 6 pollici and 3 ponti = 169.20mm
CB: 3 pollici and 9.67 ponti + 3.5 ponti for the edges = 4 pollici and 1.17 ponti = 110.92mm
LB: 7 pollici and 4.67 ponti + 3.5 ponti for the edges = 7 pollici and 8.17 ponti = 207.95mm

The Body Length measurement of 13 pollici and 2.5 ponti = 357.56mm.

Count Cozio’s 357.5mm violin fits very convincingly around Antonio Stradivari’s G mould:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UB</th>
<th>CB</th>
<th>LB</th>
<th>Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G mould (Sacconi 1972 measurements)</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>350mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mould + 7.3mm extensions 58</td>
<td>168.3</td>
<td>110.3</td>
<td>208.3</td>
<td>357.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count Cozio measurements (3rd June 1816)</td>
<td>169.2</td>
<td>110.9</td>
<td>207.9</td>
<td>357.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*****

Count Cozio’s documents contain an inventory dated 28th February 1823:

*Inventario degli instrumenti di me Conte Cozio oltre quelli lasciati a Milano ne tre inventari presso il Sig[ore] Caval[iere] Carlo Carli* 59

Inventory of instruments [owned] by me Count Cozio in addition to those left in Milan, in the three inventories, in the care of Signor Carlo Carli. 60

Underneath this title Count Cozio writes *Violini a Parigi* [Paris] and lists three violins, one of which is by Antonio Stradivari. This is followed by *A Torino* [Turin], listing another Antonio Stradivari violin and a violin by Guadagnini. Next is *A Bologna*, followed by *A Casale Monferrato*. 61 Under this last heading are listed five violins: one by Guadagnini, three by Gioffredo Cappa, and one by Francesco Stradivari.

*Un violino form[ato] G di Francesco Stradivari con biglietto del padre del anno fendo per asse intiero, e coperchio ondato*

A violin, mould G, of Francesco Stradivari with label of his father of the year
The back plate is slab-cut, one piece, and the front plate wavy.

Count Cozio leaves blank the space on the paper where the label-date could have been entered (after del anno). Nonetheless, his descriptive detail – slab-cut back plate, rippled front plate – points

---

55 The Count has here confused matters since covino normally indicates the neck-button. The Count’s measurements, however, clarify that this length is from the bridge down to the tailpiece end of the violin. The Count possibly used covino to indicate the tail-pin button around which the tailpiece cord is looped.

56 See Chapter 5 for a detailed explanation of the Count’s system of measuring, using the ‘Foot of Paris’.

57 Sacconi (1972) p. 198, states that the body length of the G mould (with top and bottom blocks fitted) is 354mm but this is clearly a typographical error and the correct figure is 350mm.

58 See the end of Chapter 2 for an explanation of the author’s ‘extensions’.

59 BScr, LC, ms. Cozio 70; not transcribed by Renzo Bacchetta.

60 This inventory was drawn up on the day after Count Cozio had written out his *la Collezione (Primo Inventaro)* inventory, together with his second and third inventories (see Chapter 6, footnote 59). Evidently Count Cozio owned still more instruments (but instruments which, at least in 1823, were not for sale).

61 Count Cozio’s family home, the Castello di Salabue, lies south-west of the town of Casale-Monferrato.

62 The three Gioffredo Cappa violins reappear in Count Cozio’s ms. 81 inventory of 11th October 1834; see Chapter 6.
towards the Francesco violin measured on 3rd June 1816 being that which, with a 1730 Antonio label (overriding Francesco’s authorship of the violin), and with its $G$-mould-derived measurements of 169.2, 110.9, 207.9, and 357.5mm, was sent to the Cozio family’s residence. The subsequent history of this violin is unknown.

*****

The layers of confusion which surround the Francesco Stradivari *Salabue* violin, and its label, are replicated across dozens of Italian violins, violas, and cellos made between 1650 and 1750 (and the situation does not improve much even after 1750). In the world of genuinely old and rare instruments – the supply of which is strictly finite – the persistent uncertainty as to whether written information can be trusted is the major reason why a string-instrument expert will always hope to identify a maker by the style of his visible workmanship rather than by the information which is on the internal label. Philip Kass, in a January 2001 letter to *The Strad* magazine, bluntly wrote:

> The quality and depth of research in older reference books, upon which many decisions by dealers and collectors have been based, are for the most part abysmal. When these books give false dates for violin makers’ working periods, it is hardly surprising that we have altered labels giving the wrong dates: a custom practised generations ago, even by such collectors as Cozio di Salabue, who altered and removed labels from instruments by Francesco Stradivari, Girolamo Amati and others in his collection, solely for motives of greed. Ironically, standards of integrity are higher now than they have been for years, or perhaps ever.

During the panel discussion about the authenticity (or otherwise) of the *Messiah* violin (the discussion hosted by the Violin Society of America in November 2000) Charles Beare commented on the issue of labels:

> They are the basis of almost all our knowledge. Indeed, without the information from labels, we would mostly have no idea who made what or where or when. It is vitally important for anyone aspiring to learn about the violin family of instruments to study not only paper, print, ink, and handwriting, but also and especially the appearance of a piece of paper that has been glued in the same place for hundreds of years, as compared to a label which, although apparently original, has been moved from its original spot.

Francesco Stradivari’s *Salabue* violin was the subject of a letter (June 1959) from the American dealer Rembert Wurlitzer (1904-1963) to the collector Mr Henry Hottinger (1885-1979) who owned this violin between 1959 and 1965. Wurlitzer identifies the *Salabue* violin’s label as ‘original’:

> It is interesting to note Mr. Hill’s comments concerning the greater appreciation of the work of Francesco Stradivari, since his great book on the life of Stradivari was written. At that time not a single instrument was known to Mr. Hill bearing an original label of Francesco and although it must have been clear to him that many of the instruments bearing the label of Antonio Stradivari had the collaboration of other hands in the shop, it was of course not possible to specifically identify those hands without finding such an instrument. When that was done, first in the case of Omobono Stradivari and then later after Mr. Hill found an original example of one of Francesco’s cellos, it became easy to identify the hands of each of these makers and clearly trace their work, as Mr. Hill states, in some of the later works of

---

63 American violin dealer.

64 JoVSA (XVII, 3) p. 183. The condition of the label inside the *Messiah* violin is discussed in Chapter 11.

65 It is unclear why Wurlitzer indicates a single author for the Hills’ monograph on the life and work of Antonio Stradivari.

66 The location of Mr. Hill’s statement is not indicated.
Antonio. Only recently we\textsuperscript{67} had the good fortune to see in Paris another violin by Francesco with its original label, and this, along with the example [the \textit{Salabue}] now in your possession, are the only ones with original labels known to us.\textsuperscript{68}

It is here proposed that Francesco Stradivari’s \textit{Salabue} violin should be acknowledged as originating from the year 1730 rather than from 1742.

\textsuperscript{67} ‘we’ probably refers to Wurlitzer himself together with Simone Sacconi who, by 1954, was working at the House of Wurlitzer in New York.

\textsuperscript{68} Quoted in \textit{World of Strings}, Fall 1975, William Moennig & Son, Philadelphia, USA.