For four days in May 2016, AMIS members gathered in Vermillion, South Dakota, to attend the forty-fifth annual meeting of the Society. The National Music Museum (NMM) at the University of South Dakota—the location of four previous AMIS conferences in 1976, 1986, 1996, and 2006—hosted a compelling and well-organized program of paper presentations, concerts, and instrument demonstrations.

The conference began on the evening of Wednesday, May 18, with a reception at the National Music Museum. Along with the usual program booklets, name badges, and flyers offered at the registration table, attendees could also find temporary tattoos featuring the NMM’s logo, free to anyone interested in the epidermic expression of their organological enthusiasm.

Also new this year were the nightly “AMIS After Hours” sessions: a series of casual social gatherings held at Carey’s Bar on Vermillion’s Main Street. While after-hours socialization has always been a part of AMIS’s annual meetings, this was the first time such opportunities were built into the formal schedule. The program booklet even included suggested conversation topics for those who needed a little help breaking the ice.

Thursday morning began with an official welcome at the University of South Dakota’s Muenster University Center, affectionately known as “The MUC.” Opened in 2009, the building proved to be a comfortable and convenient location for both paper presentations and meals, the latter of which were held in a light-filled room with towering windows overlooking the university’s well-tended grounds.

The first panel of the conference was titled “Roots, Revival, and Reflection.” It featured papers by Christopher Dempsey, Mimi S. Waitzman, and Neil Wayne, all of which explored the issues surrounding the revival and preservation of different instrumental cultures. This was followed by two panels dedicated to wind instruments. Al Rice presented on the history and use of the basset clarinet, while Will Peebles discussed and demonstrated three very different French bassoons. Bruno Kampman finished the first panel with a presentation on Boehm system saxophones.

After lunch, the presentations resumed with talks on brass instruments given by Francesco Carreras, Sabine K. Klaus, and Robert W. Pyle. The panel concluded with a presentation by Gribbon Award recipient Robert Warren Apple, who talked about the early 19th-century repertoire for the keyed trumpet. After a brief
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Dear Colleagues,

This issue features a full report on the 2016 annual meeting at the National Music Museum, which should bring back fond memories for those who attended. For those who did not make it to Vermillion, I hope reading the report will increase your resolve to attend the next AMIS meeting. The 2017 conference, a joint gathering of the AMIS and the Galpin Society, will take place June 1-4, in Edinburgh, Scotland.

And although plans are just beginning to be made, I can announce that in 2018 we will meet in Bethlehem/Nazareth, Pennsylvania, home of Moravian College, the Moravian Historical Society, Museum and Archives, the Nazareth Guitar Institute, and Martin Guitars. We previously met there in 1991 but much has happened since then, notably cataloguing of the instrument collection at the Moravian Historical Society and identification of the oldest known American clavichord.

Please spread the word to students and colleagues about the William E. Gribbon Award for Student Travel. For this year’s joint meeting, both AMIS and the Galpin Society will contribute to funding for scholarships. Full-time undergraduate and graduate students, aged 35 or under, in accredited academic programs are eligible to receive substantial financial support for travel, lodging, and registration fees. Full information about applying is on the AMIS website [http://amis.org/awards/gibbon/index.html](http://amis.org/awards/gibbon/index.html).

Each year, people join or retire from the AMIS board and committees. I would like to welcome new board members Chris Dempsey, Cynthia Hoover (her third term on the board), and Michael Lynn, as well as to thank retiring board members Aurelia Hartenberger, David Thomas, and Christina Linsenmeyer, who each served six years. Newly added to committees for 2016-17 are Robert Pyle (Nominating), Kathryn Libin (Sachs), Tula Giannini (Bessaraboff), Michael Lynn (Densmore), and Bobby Giglio (Gribbon).

There is also news about the *Journal of the American Musical Instrument Society*: Allison Alcorn will retire from her editorial duties on completion of the 2017 issue. I am sorry to see her go, as she has been highly successful in producing excellent journals and keeping to the schedule, but I am very pleased to announce that James Kopp will become the new editor. With a strong background in both writing and editing, I know that Jim will ably carry on our journal tradition.

As I’ve said before, if you have comments on what AMIS is doing, or should do, please get in touch: cfbryant@jhu.edu.
Dear readers,

An apology is necessary: due to a combination of personal difficulties and professional obligations, I have fallen well behind on my target for publishing this issue of NAMIS. This delay has weighed heavily on me for the last several months and I’m sincerely sorry that it has taken this long to bring it to you. (I particularly apologize to those who had requested announcements that had to be dropped due to being no longer timely.)

Despite its long gestation, I’m very proud of this issue. In these pages you’ll find a number of compelling short articles, along with five thoughtful book reviews. You’ll also find John Koster’s memorable Sachs remarks, an elegant tribute to Friedrich von Huene by Susan Thompson, a report on the 2016 Annual Meeting, and much more. As always, I want to thank all of those who have contributed for their good work.

Finally, I want to introduce the newest member of the NAMIS editorial team: long-time AMIS member Emily Peppers has generously agreed to serve as Assistant Editor. She joins me; our Reviews Editor; Albert Rice; and our dedicated proofreaders, Carolyn Bryant and Thomas MacCracken.

Edmond Johnson
Editor, NAMIS
coffee break, the final panel of the day commenced. Haya-
to Sugimoto, Olivier Fluchaire, and Boaz Berney each pre-
sented on a different instrument-maker.

After an dinner in the MUC—the quality of the food
served was excellent throughout the conference—attend-
ees walked to Farber Hall, an elegant horseshoe-shaped
theater within the University of South Dakota’s historic
Old Main Hall. The night’s concert featured Steve Charpié
and the New Custer Brass Band performing the music of
Felix Vinatieri, an Italian-born cornetist, composer, and
bandleader who is best known for having led General
George Custer’s band from 1873 to 1876. After playing
Vinatieri’s own arrangement of the Star Spangled Banner,
the band was joined on stage by Crystal Nelson, Direc-
tor of the Dakota Territorial Museum in nearby Yankton.
From an unassuming cardboard box, Nelson delicately re-
moved Felix Vinatieri’s original E-flat cornet, now in her
museum’s collection, and placed it on a small table, where
it remained for the remainder of the concert. (While the
cornet was not played during the concert for reasons of
conservation, Charpié was able to use the instrument on
Custer’s Last Band, a compact disc he released in 2001
that features some of the same repertoire heard at the con-
cert.)

Friday morning’s first panel (“Taking Care of Things”)
explored issues related to the conservation and restoration
of instruments. Gribbon student Matthew Zeller presented
his research on the Amati “King” cello, one of the super-
stars of the NMM’s collection. Jonathan Santa Maria Bou-
quett talked about the tensions, both literal and figurative,
involved in the conservation of 19th-century guitars. (This
paper was later awarded the Frederick R. Selch Award
for best student paper presented at the meeting.) Esteban
Mariño Garza presented his research on citterns crafted in
the Italian city of Urbino, while Ana Sofía Silva discussed
the history of the Wagner tuba, with a particular focus on
the conservation treatment she had overseen on an instru-
ment in the NMM’s collection.

The second panel of the morning began with a presen-
tation by Stephen Cotrell on the development of the saxo-
phone octave key, followed by a paper by James Kopp on
bassoons in the NMM collection. The panel concluded
with a presentation by Sarah Davies on the history of the
house organs built in the Toggenburg Valley of Switzer-
land.

Friday’s lunch was followed by the annual AMIS Busi-
ness Meeting (the minutes of which can be found on page
8). Later that afternoon, attendees were invited to “An Af-
fternoon at the Museum” at the NMM, where they could
hear both instrument demonstrations and gallery talks.
Sarah Davies performed on the museum’s Josef Looß organ,
one of the very few Toggenburg Valley house or-
gans to be found outside of Switzerland. Susanne Skyrm
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performed a short recital on the 1767 piano by the Portuguese builder Manuel Antunes, while in the Beede Gallery of non-Western instruments, the Tatag Gamelan Ensemble performed on the Museum’s Kyai Rengga Manis Everist gamelan. In the Rawlins Gallery, Matthew Zeller gave a talk on the instruments of Andrea Amati while standing in front of several of that maker’s masterpieces. During this time visitors were also invited to visit the University Libraries’ Archives and Special Collections, where they could learn more about USD’s Mahoney Music Collection, a collection of print materials focused on the history of the violin and violin family instruments.

Friday night’s dinner was held at the Vermillion Eagles Club, where the Mark Vyhlidal Dance Orchestra provided live music in a wide variety of styles, with a particular focus on polka. While some attendees relaxed at tables or enjoyed the music from the safety of the nearby bar, many AMIS members welcomed the opportunity to put on their dancing shoes and show off their moves.

Saturday morning began with a panel entitled “Strings Attached.” Rick Meyers talked about the American craze for zithers in the last years of the 19th century, while Eleanor Smith presented her research on Beethoven’s 1803 Erard piano. Maria da Gloria Leitao Venceslau, one of the Griibbon Award recipients, gave a paper on German luthiers in Tuscany in the 16th century, and Graham McDonald explored the 20th-century mandolin’s divergent forms and tonal characteristics.

Next came a panel entitled “Adaptations and Cultural Changes,” featuring three presentations on non-Western topics. Stewart Carter discussed the recent development of new bass instruments for use in traditional Chinese orchestras. Jayme Kurland compared Afghan rubabs in collections of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, the Metropolitan Museum, and the NMM, and argued for the importance of cultural preservation during times of war. Wenzhuo Zhang presented on the yangqin, a Chinese instrument related to the hammered dulcimer. Zhang finished her presentation by playing a video of her own performance on the instrument.

The final paper session of the conference featured a presentation by James Westbrook on the luthier David Rubio and a paper by Margaret Downie Bank on the early history of the sousaphone.

Saturday afternoon featured an innovative concert entitled “AMIS Live!” held in the NMM’s Arne B. Larson Concert Hall. While AMIS conferences always feature a good number of musical performances, this was perhaps the most extensive opportunity to date for AMIS members themselves to showcase their musical talents. Over a dozen participants performed on instruments ranging from the clarinet and concertina to the musical saw and cornopean. (A video featuring some of the performances from “An Afternoon at the Museum” and “AMIS Live!” can be viewed online: https://youtu.be/LLq7Ph2CQhY.)

The conference concluded with the traditional banquet and award ceremony, though this time there was an added twist. Following the presentation of the Sachs, Bessaraboff, and Selch Awards—the full list of recipients can be found on page 8, with John Koster’s Sachs Award acceptance remarks starting on page 9—comedian Jimmy Helm took to the stage to host the first-ever “AMIS Story Hour.” Attendees who had stories to share could submit their names, which were then drawn at random. Selected participants were then invited to the stage to tell their stories. Some stories evoked laughter, while others were profoundly moving. All reflected richness and diversity of the lives led by Society members.

The meeting concluded with many attendees happily heading to Carey’s Bar for one last “AMIS After Hours.”

Edmond Johnson
Occidental College

Below left: Rebecca Apodaca regales the crowd at the post-banquet “AMIS Story Hour,” as host Jimmy Helm looks on. Below right: Gibbon Award-recipient Robert Apple plays the keyed trumpet, accompanied on piano by Dr. Warren Apple. (Photos by E. Johnson)
Top row (left to right): Will Peebles holds a ca.1875 metal “contrebasoon” (also known as a “reed contrabass”) built by Victor-Charles Mahillon; Sarah Davies poses with the 1786 Swiss house organ by Josef Looßer. Middle row: Conference attendees socialize during the happy hour preceding the banquet; An AMIS member sports a NMM temporary tattoo on her ankle (photo by C. Bryant). Bottom row: Susanne Skyrm plays the 1767 grand piano by Manuel Antunes (photo by C. Bryant); The Society’s Board of Governors meet at RED Steakhouse in downtown Vermillion on the first night of the conference (photo by C. Bryant).
Clockwise from top: AMIS members dance to the sounds of the Mark Vyhlidal Dance Orchestra at the Vermillion Eagles Club; Gregg Miner holds his 2015 Duane Noble harp ukulele; Jayme Kurland (toro) and Jonathan Santa Maria Bouquet (toro) help to take down the registration table at the end of the conference; a photogenic dessert provided by the USD’s catering department. (All photos by E. Johnson.)
Minutes for the 2016 Annual Business Meeting

AMERICAN MUSICAL INSTRUMENT SOCIETY
Annual Business Meeting
May 20, 2016

The Annual Business Meeting of the American Musical Instrument Society was called to order at 1:25 pm on Friday, May 20, 2016, by President Carolyn Bryant in the Ballroom of the Muenster University Center at the University of South Dakota in Vermillion. Bryant welcomed the membership.

The minutes of the June 4, 2015 Annual Business Meeting, having been distributed to the general membership via the Newsletter, were approved with no objections.

Secretary Deborah Check Reeves reported that 119 ballots were cast in the 2016 election. She apologized for having forgotten to include the proxy form in the ballot. Even so, 91 people sent in the proxy form that was circulated via email. Because of this mix-up, it was decided to count all the ballots. Results of the 2016 election were reported as follows: re-elected Treasurer Joanne Kopp and Secretary Reeves for 2016-2018, and all first-term Governors Christopher Dempsey, Cynthia Adams Hoover, and Michael Lynn for 2016-2019. Reeves then announced a change in AMIS By-Laws that was approved at the Board of Governors meeting:

Change from the Current By-laws (Article V, Elections): “The President and Vice-President shall be elected for terms of two years and may be elected for not more than two consecutive terms. They may serve again after an interval of two years.”

Change to: “The President and Vice-President shall each be elected for a single term of three years. They may serve again after an interval of three years.”

Reeves then reported that a special election will be held next year for President and Vice-President for terms of one year that will bring the terms of the current President and Vice-President into line with the newly changed By-Laws. President Bryant thanked out-going governors for their years of service: Aurelia Hartenberger, Christina Linsenmeyer, and David Thomas.

Treasurer Joanne Kopp reported that assets at the end of 2015 reflected the market and were down. By the end of April the market was back up and assets had recovered what was lost. AMIS revenue consists of two primary sources: dues and contributions. Dues have been flat from 2014 and contributions were down substantially from the previous year. The biggest expense that AMIS incurs is the publication of the Journal of the American Musical Instrument Society. Printing costs had increased and mailing costs continue to rise.

The recent passing of several AMIS members was noted: Cecil Adkins, Dale Higbee, and Friedrich von Heune.

JAMIS editor Allison Alcorn reported that the 2016 edition will be arriving soon. There are five articles including the first publication grant article by Jocelyn Howell. June 1 is the date of when the next publication grant applications are due.

Newsletter editor Edmond Johnson announced that the Newsletter just came out. The deadline for the fall Newsletter will be July 15. Johnson is investigating a separate email address for Newsletter correspondence.

Johnson reported that there were nine Gribbon Scholars in attendance this year. Introduced to the general membership were: Robert Apple, Jake Blount, Núria Bonet, Lidia Chang, Hannah Grantham, Kenneth Jimenez, Maria da Gloria Leitao Venceslau, Charles Pardoe, and Matthew Zeller. Johnson urged the membership to strongly encourage students to apply for this grant.

Christopher Dempsey reported that the Membership Committee tried to contact ex-members to find out why they are no longer members. Jayme Kurland reported that AMIS has a strong social media presence with activity on Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter.

An announcement was made about the next annual meeting of AMIS. The 2017 meeting will be held in conjunction with Galpin Society. Arnold Myers and Sarah Deters welcomed the membership to the University of Edinburgh and the provided information about the newly refurbished St. Cecilia’s Hall, location of Musical Instrument Museums Edinburgh. The dates of the conference are June 1-4, 2017. There is no particular theme to the meeting, and proposals for short and long papers will be entertained. More details of the Call for Papers is located in the back of this year’s program book. Proposals are due December 16, 2016.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:50.

Respectfully submitted,
Deborah Check Reeves, Secretary

Addendum: 2016 Awards

William E. Gribbon Award for Student Travel
Robert Apple, University of Memphis
Jake Blount, Hamilton College
Núria Bonet, Plymouth University (England)
Lidia Chang, University of Massachusetts, Amherst
Hannah Grantham, University of North Texas
Kenneth Jimenez, North Dakota State University
Maria da Gloria Leitao Venceslau, Sapienza University (Italy)
Charles Pardoe, University of Cambridge (England)
Matthew Zeller, Duke University

Frederick R. Selch Award
(for best student paper at AMIS annual conference 2016)
Jonathan Santa Maria Bouquet, University of Edinburgh: “Self-Destructive Elements in the Construction of Guitars in the Nineteenth Century”

Nicolas Bessaraboff Prize
(for the best book on musical instruments written in English and published in 2014)
Rollin Smith: Pipe Organs of the Rich and Famous.
(Organ Historical Society Press, 2014)

The Francis Densmore Prize
(for the best article on musical instruments written in English and published in 2014)

Curt Sachs Award
John Koster
The award was presented to John Koster on Saturday, May 21, 2016, “in recognition of his contributions to the study, restoration, and construction of the harpsichord and early piano, his many articles and books, including those for which he was awarded the Society’s Bessaraboff Prize and Densmore Prize, his years of service to the National Musical Instrument Museum, and his dedication to the teaching of organology.” What follows are Koster’s remarks on receiving the award:

This is indeed a high honor, for which I am deeply grateful. To use a word unfortunately worn out by common overuse, it is awesome to be deemed worthy of admittance to the distinguished company of women and men who have received this award in the past. It’s gratifying to know that one’s life work is so appreciated by one’s colleagues, and it’s lovely that this is happening in Vermillion, among my friends and associates of so many years at the National Music Museum.

Thirty years ago the late John Henry van der Meer, my dear old friend, was here to receive the Sachs Award. I wasn’t at that meeting, but for years afterwards people kept telling me about how interminably his remarks went on for the better part of an hour. I try to follow my dear old friend Jack’s example in many ways, but not now. Given this platform, however, there are a few things I’d like to say.

First, I’m enormously grateful to all those who had faith in me, inspired me, or helped me in so many ways over the years. You don’t need to hear me recite a succession of names, but I should mention at least the heads of the great American museum collections who provided me with opportunities at critical junctures: Barbara Lambert and then Sam Quigley at the Boston Museum of Fine Arts; Laury Libin at the Metropolitan Museum of Art; and André Larson of what will probably always be called the Shrine. In addition to employment of various sorts, they all gave me practically the run of these collections: at one point just before I came to work in Vermillion I came within a few days of simultaneously having in my pocket the keys to all three. In any case, I’ve tried to make full use of all the extraordinary opportunities that came my way.

In the context of a typical state university where everyone on the faculty is habitually called “Doctor so-and-so,” it was André P. Larson, PhD, as he signed his name, who hired me, with just a baccalaureate degree, as a professor, among other duties, and assigned me substantial responsibilities in the master’s program. This leads me to say that I’m very proud of our students, who have gone on to so many successes here and abroad. I can’t claim that the wonderful presentations made by several of them yesterday morning were the result of having taken my courses or having me as their thesis advisor or internship supervisor, but it’s good to know that apparently I did no lasting harm. Actually, I believe that, ultimately, we are all self-taught, at least in what each of us has done that distinguishes us from what anyone else has done.

André was not always easy to work with, but we got on well enough. He never balked at all the time I spent doing research, traveling to other collections, and writing articles. Moreover, he indulged me by spending upwards of million and a half dollars on old harpsichords and such. I will always count the development of the NMM’s keyboard collection as one of my principal accomplishments. Even better for me as a penniless would-be collector was that I didn’t have to spend my own money.

Some previous Sachs recipients offered their thoughts on various broader issues related to organology. So now, with your indulgence for a few minutes, I’d like to offer a couple random thoughts of my own. Peter Williams, intellectually vigorous and cantankerous as ever until his too-early death a few weeks ago, accepted the Sachs Award at the meeting held here in 1996. The title of Peter’s remarks, delivered somewhat more formally as a keynote address, posed the question “Do musicologists always pay enough attention to organology?” As anyone could have guessed, the answer was “no.” But I think one could also answer “no” to the reverse, “Do organologists always pay enough attention to musicology?” From a more distant viewpoint, however, both questions may just fade away, for organology is itself a branch of musicology. If you look up Curt Sachs in Grove, you will read that he “was a giant among musicologists.” This became a practical matter for me this (continued on following page)
April in filling out our first tax return after leaving the real job I’d had for twenty-four years: under occupation I put “consulting musicologist.” I hope that doesn’t get us audited.

Musicology, of course, has changed enormously since my college days. Subjects and approaches that didn’t exist or were considered marginal have become central concerns. The same is true, now, in organology, sometimes to our bafflement inside the traditional circles of the AMIS and the Galpin Society. A few weeks ago my most recent article, a survey of historical harpsichord registration, appeared in the journal Keyboard Perspectives published by the Westfield Center. In the introduction summarizing the contents in of issue, the Editor, coming to my article, wrote, “Gently guiding us away from sociology, John Koster …” etc. I imagine him thinking, well, “now back to the old-fashioned hardware-oriented Positivist stuff.” Fair enough. There is ample room even in the organological corner of the broad tent of musicology for all sorts of approaches. If I don’t write them myself, I look forward to reading future organological studies with keywords like “empowerment” and “gender” (not the Indonesian instrument!). Nevertheless, there’s still a hell of a lot of work to be done just with tape measures.

A popular slogan in the 1960s was “Question Authority.” I’ve been at it long enough to question even some things I’ve said myself. I won’t do that here, but now wearing, in some sense, the mantle of Curt Sachs, I’ll question a little something he wrote in 1913. This was in one of his first organological publications, an article about the musical instruments listed in Eberhard Cersne’s Minne Regel, a long poem written in 1404. Sachs’ article is entitled “Die Musikinstrumente der Minneregel,” and published in Sammelbände der Internationalen Musik-Gesellschaft 14/4 (July–September 1913), pp. 484–486.

Among organologists, the poem is perhaps best known for including the earliest instances of the words clavicordium and clavicymbolum, that is, harpsichord, although the actual earliest known uses of these words are now known to have been in Vienna about seven or eight years earlier. By the way, it’s an interesting sociological phenomenon how fast these newly coined words and the instruments themselves spread from place to place. Two of the other instruments in Eberhard’s list are stegeryff and begil. The first of these, stegeryff, is an obsolete German word for stirrup. Here is an actual stirrup from that period (see accompanying photos)—so one can plainly see that the instrument was a triangle. It’s a little degraded, so doesn’t clink very well. But this other one, a little later or perhaps a modern imitation, gives a better idea. As for begil, Sachs concluded that it meant “horn,” more or less our English “bugle.” But, to the contrary, I’m sure that Cersne’s begil was one of a group of Germanic words meaning something bent, especially bent all the way around, such as what’s called in Yiddish a bagel.

In fact, a Late Middle High German word for stirrup was essentially the same word, bügele, which eventually became the modern German word both for coat hanger and for stirrup. So, Eberhard was just using begil as another word for triangle alongside stegeryff. As a poet and scholar, he, like other medieval poets, used every word in his vast vocabulary wherever he could fit them into the scansion. So despite the authority of such as Curt Sachs, we always need to check and, if necessary, reinterpret our original sources, be they documents or instruments. Here we follow Sachs’s own example, since in concluding that a bagel was a bugle he was himself disputing an earlier authority, August Wilhelm Ambros, who—in his musicological commentary in an early edition of the Minne Regel (Vienna, 1861)—had actually gotten it right, or so it now appears.

Enough of this, and it’s about time for the rest of tonight’s program. Let me finally just say that, coming here this week, having been honored in years past with the Bessaraboff and Densmore Prizes, I thought that I would have a complete set of Roland Hoover’s beautiful certificates. But Cynthia happened to mention the other day that Roland also does them for the Organ Historical Society. Oh well—in any case it’s the AMIS where my work has found an audience and where so many of my best friends and colleagues have been centered.

Again, thank you.
I would like to inform the members of AMIS that I have recently started a new post-doc research project titled “A Creative Triangle of Mechanics, Acoustics and Aesthetics: The Early Pedal Harp (1780-1830) as a Symbol of Innovative Transformation.” The project, which will be funded by the Funding Initiative “Research in Museums” of the Volkswagen Foundation for three and a half years (March 2016-August 2019), will be based at the Research Institute for the History of Science and Technology at the Deutsches Museum in Munich.

The project will investigate an important transitional phase in the history of the harp at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries, when the instrument became as popular as the piano among amateur and professional performers in Europe. This was largely the result of the harp’s visual and technical upgrading, particularly the introduction of new pedal mechanisms for shortening the strings, which coincided with significant advances in the manufacture and marketing of the harp. As evidenced by the many patents granted for the instrument between 1780 and 1830, a large number of instrument makers, musicians, and inventors in Paris and London worked intensively to improve the pedal harp’s design and function. This competitive race for a superior harp, mainly intended to overcome the deficiencies of the single-action harp (figure 1), culminated in the 1810s with the introduction and establishment of the double-action harp by Sébastien Erard (figure 2), an instrument which has remained in use with only minor changes until today. Through these experiments the pedal harp was gradually transformed into a prestigious, “state-of-the-art” instrument as well as a luxurious, fashionable object which played a significant role in the music, art, literature, and lifestyle of the late Classical and early Romantic eras.

The aim of this project is to explore the development of the early pedal harp from a historical, technical, and sociocultural perspective by documenting the multiple changes of the instrument during this time. The project will concentrate on the musical instrument collection of the Deutsches Museum, but will also examine objects and archives in other public and private collections in Germany and abroad. The research will have a broad interdisciplinary approach connecting the concepts and methods of several fields, such as organology, musicology, history of technology, social history, history of fine and applied arts, industrial archaeology, material science, and conservation. The results of the project will be presented in a monograph and will also be integrated in the new permanent exhibition of musical instruments at the Deutsches Museum. Additional information on the project can be found here:


Those wishing to share information related to this project are welcome to contact me.

Dr. Panagiotis Poulopoulos
Musikinstrumentenabteilung/Forschungsinstitut für Wissenschafts- und Technikgeschichte
Deutsches Museum
Museumsinsel 1
80538 München
Tel: +49(0)89/2179-455
Fax: +49(0)89/2179-239
E-Mail: p.poulopoulos@deutsches-museum.de

---

Left: Figure 1, Single-action harp, unsigned, France, c.1780/1790, in the Deutsches Museum, Munich (Inv. No.: 6724). (Photo: Konrad Rainer, © Deutsches Museum)

Right: Figure 2, Double-action harp by Sébastien Erard, London, 1818, with serial number 2631, in the Deutsches Museum, Munich (Inv. No.: 16147) (Photo: Hans-Joachim Becker, © Deutsches Museum)
Among unique documents in the collection of Liana Marie Sive of Ansonia, Connecticut, is a manuscript receipt for the sale on 10 November 1821 of a Robert Wornum cabinet piano to a Mrs. Ashurst of Philadelphia. The seller was the prominent cellist, composer, music publisher, and music merchant George Schetky. John George Schetky (1776-1831) came from a large family of professional musicians in Edinburgh, where his German-born father was also a successful cellist and composer. No doubt seeking less competitive opportunities, the boy emigrated in 1787 to Philadelphia, where his uncle, the composer and concert manager Alexander Reinagle, had arrived from Edinburgh the previous year. By 1803 Schetky was working with the second-generation music publisher Benjamin Carr; about 1806 the men formed a partnership that lasted through 1811, and Schetky also published music under his name alone. With the outbreak of the War of 1812 Schetky returned to Scotland, but in 1817 he resumed his career in Philadelphia, where in 1809 he had been a performing member of the Amateurs of Music society. In 1820, following several years as cellist in a small informal ensemble, he became a founder, along with the piano maker Thomas Loud and others, of the Musical Fund Society, organized to provide relief to impoverished musicians and their families and to cultivate music performance and appreciation.

According to J. Thomas Scharf and Thompson Westcott’s History of Philadelphia, 1609-1884 (Philadelphia: L. H. Everts & Co., 1884), vol. 3, p. 2291, about 1819 Schetky, then residing at 71 Locust Street, began importing pianos in a variety of models, manufactured in London by Robert Wornum. Whether Schetky had an exclusive deal with Wornum is unknown, but by this time piano manufacture was well established in Philadelphia, and presumably Schetky aimed to provide instruments of superior quality and status to those produced locally by Charles Albrecht, Thomas and John Loud, and others. As described in an unsigned article, “Wornum’s Patent Piano Forte” in John E. Hall, ed., The Port Folio, vol. 11/1 (Philadelphia, March 1821), pp. 129-30, Wornum’s chief innovation in the design of cabinet pianos was to stabilize tuning especially in the upper octaves by equalizing string gauge and tension. Reportedly he began addressing the problem of treble tuning instability, particularly disturbing in duet performance, in 1819; but whether Schetky knew of his efforts and decided at that time to promote Wornum’s instruments is unknown. This contemporary account of Wornum’s work on string scaling is significant because he is now remembered principally for improvements to piano actions and for introducing new, short upright models. However, in 1820 he patented his scaling method (British patent no. 4460, 13 May 1820); Schetky’s receipt refers to this “Royal Patent, equal Tension.”

Schetky’s customer, Mrs. Ashurst, was probably the wife of one Richard Ashurst who arrived in Philadelphia from England in 1805. The Ashurst (or Ashhurst) family were prosperous merchants; their papers, preserved in the Winterthur Library’s Joseph Downs Collection of Manuscripts and Printed Ephemera, call number Col. 290, include many receipts dated from 1805 onward for a wide range of luxury items, but no piano. Evidently Schetky’s receipt became separated from the others before the Downs Collection came to Winterthur. At any rate, the six-hundred-dollar price of Mrs. Ashurst’s cabinet piano, serial number 735, is remarkably high even considering the cost of shipping from London and the inclusion of a complete extra set of strings and a tuning hammer and tuning fork. The notation “O:g: Front” probably refers to the ogee form of the keyboard enclosure (fallboard), specified for example in the New-York Book of Prices for Manufacturing Piano-fortes issued in 1835 by the Society of Journeymen Piano-forte Makers, pp. 33-35. Clearly Mrs. Ashurst’s was a stylish, state-of-the-art instrument suitable for an affluent household.

I thank Ms. Sive for her kind permission to publish the autograph receipt in her possession.

Laurence Libin
The tenora is most often made from jujube wood; some French makers have also used ebony wood in mass production. However, during my research I repeatedly came across the suggestion that metal tenoras existed and that one in particular had been played by a famous virtuoso—a different one depending on the account. However, over a year into my research, I was running out of museum exhibits to chase up and still had not found the metal tenora.

During my first tenora-related research trip in April 2014, the Institut d’Estudis Catalans (Institute for Catalan Studies) in Barcelona fortuitously held a conference to present a new instrument 20 years in the making: the barítona. The barítona is a bass shawm developed by Joaquim Agulló i Batlle and a team of doctoral students and serves as the bass instrument in the Catalan shawm family with tible (treble) and tenora (tenor).1

Introducing myself to the researchers after the talk, an older lady told me that her father had heard a metal tenora in Barcelona many years previously. I heard a similar anecdote in Girona too. She claimed that a famous musician played his new metal tenora in Barcelona around the turn of the century; the audience’s reaction was one of dismay and anger. The sound of the instrument is said to have been terrible. This caused the musician to paint his tenora to look like wood in order to fool the audience before his next performance. This time around, they appeared to find much pleasure in the sound of the instrument, further confirming to them that the metal tenora had been a dreadful idea. The lady also claimed that the musician was Pep Ventura i Vaque (1817-1875), the first “superstar” of the tenora. Finally, she also thought the instrument in question might be kept in a glass cabinet at the IEC. This curious anecdote intrigued me and I began looking for the mysterious metal tenora.

In December 2015, I traveled a third time to Catalonia to inspect tenora collections; seven collections and fifteen historical instruments later I had not found the metal tenora yet. The Girona History Museum was likely to be the last major collection I was to visit for this project. The visit was already a success after inspecting the first instrument, as I discovered that a tenora had been labelled Catroi when it was in fact an original Toron instrument! However, a particularly thin, black and quirky tenora caught my attention (Fig. 3). It was in fact a metal tenora coated unevenly in black paint. The metal bell has a beautiful engraving of Josep Coll i Lligora’s (1893-1965) emblem; the museum’s catalog states that the metal tenora was built in 1931. The cobla interest group Associació Músic per la Cobla confirms that Coll built this in 1931. The cobla interest group

Figure 1: Two tenoras by Puigdellívol belonging to Jordi Molina i Membrives. The instrument on the left is a good example of a contemporary tenora, the instrument on the right is a metal tenora. (Image copyright Jordi Molina; used with permission)

(continued on page 17)
Amateur Orchestra vs. Professional Singer: A Footnote in the History of Musical Pitch

The adoption of French diapason normal (and subsequently A440) by professional orchestras in England—with Henry Wood’s Queen’s Hall Orchestra leading the way—is a story that has already been told.¹ The lingering of high pitch for decades among amateur ensembles is less well documented. In the course of our research for a new edition of Charles Villiers Stanford’s orchestral song cycles Songs of the Sea and Songs of the Fleet, my co-editor Edison Kang and I came across an incident in which an exchange of vituperative letters in the musical press made the public very much aware of this professional/amateur divide.

At the turn of the twentieth century, the Stock Exchange Orchestral and Choral Society had a high profile among London’s amateur musical organizations. Dating back to the 1880s, the orchestra and male chorus sported a list of patrons at the very top of the musical establishment, and they gave their periodic concerts in the Queen’s Hall. For the winter concert on February 5, 1907, the organization had engaged the celebrated baritone Harry Plunket Greene to sing Stanford’s popular Songs of the Sea. This work (premiered at the Leeds Festival in 1904, and extremely popular at the time) was ideally suited for the Stock Exchange Society—featuring male choir and orchestra—and it had been composed for Greene; moreover, the composer was secured to conduct the work. All of this amounted to a very significant event in the Society’s season, so one can understand the consternation and anger of the Society’s members when after the rehearsal the composer and soloist decided to remove Songs of the Sea from the program and to replace it with some of Stanford’s earlier songs. The reason for this change was the high pitch of the Stock Exchange Orchestra. It had been about a decade since the London professional orchestras had moved down to “low pitch” (around A439, but not standardized); as documented by Alexander J. Ellis in 1880, London pitch had varied considerably, but was generally very high.² In the 1870s and 80s there were notable instances of singers refusing to perform at such a high pitch, including Sims Reeves, Christine Nilsson, and Adelina Patti.³ Thus when “Z. (A Member of the Orchestra)” wrote to The Musical News shortly after the Stock Exchange Society concert, he compared Plunket Greene (although without naming him) with the temperamental artists of a bygone age:

“Sir,—in my youthful days I used occasionally to read heartrending stories of the vagaries and caprices of the fashionable ‘prima donna,’ but now we are to enjoy the fun of seeing ‘mere man’ take up the same undignified method of procedure. I am moved to address you thus after our experience at the Queen’s Hall on February 5th, when a well-known baritone, who had successfully rehearsed his songs with the orchestra, did not hesitate to disappoint a crowded house because the orchestra was playing at the old high pitch instead of the diapason normal! He rehearsed at the higher one without any difficulty, and quite as well as he usually sings.

“The Secretary had to announce that the parts were a semitone too high, and the Times the next day announced that, as ‘the band parts were in an impossible key,’ he could not sing. The band parts were those printed and issued by the publishers, so it was not the fault of the Society giving the concert that they were not to the singer’s liking.

“The incident may be a very small one, but it is not every singer who can, or should, take five numbers out of a programme because the pitch is one-third of a tone higher than he prefers. Courtesy towards one’s audience should surely be observed, even at the appalling expense of one-third of a tone up.”⁴

This, together with a letter signed merely “AUDITOR,” touched off a heated correspondence in the next several issues—invited, indeed, by the editorial note following the first salvo: “Our columns are open to Mr. Plunket Greene.” In fact, Stanford beat Greene to it, with a letter in the following issue stating, “it was a physical impossibility for them to be sung at high pitch, as I wrote them for low pitch up to the limit of Mr. Plunket Greene’s range.”⁵ After the rehearsal (from which Stanford was absent) Boosey & Hawkes had supplied a set of manuscript parts transposed down a half-step for just such a situation; as the works had not been rehearsed in the more awkward new keys, Stanford reported that “both I and the officers of the Society had no hesitation in declining the great risk of playing them at sight, and preferred to postpone the performance to a later date.”⁶

Greene did in fact perform the songs, with the altered parts facilitating his preferred pitch, at the Society’s “smoking concert” on March 20 (on a program that also featured the young Josef Szigeti as violin soloist), but in the meantime he had increased the communal tension with his lengthy rejoinder in The Musical News. In it he denied that the February rehearsal had gone well, claiming that he had sung “part with half-voice, part an octave lower, singing out only when it was necessary to give leads, and when the chorus sang, except when it was essential, not singing at all. If this variegated performance really commends itself to ‘Z.’ as fit to be repeated in public, I do not envy him his (continued on next page)
complacent musicianship.” 7  Greene did not hold back on his ad hominem attacks: “If he has no better knowledge of his own musical instrument than of mine, I am sorry for those members of the orchestra who sit in his immediate vicinity.” 8 The Secretary of the Society, S. J. Spurling, wrote in the same issue, regretting that a member of the orchestra should have aired his grievances publicly: “It would have been better had ‘Z.’ taken the trouble to acquaint himself with the true facts of the case before rushing into print to make a laughing-stock of himself and to insult a great artist.” 9 (Given the masthead of patrons of the Society, Spurling may well have felt compelled to side with the professionals over his players.)

Z. was not ready to acquiesce: indeed, despite the reference to the “true facts,” it was undeniable that Greene had not sung the work that the society had clearly anticipated with enthusiasm—the most popular new work that would fit precisely their male choir and orchestra. Z. responded, denying Greene the apology he had demanded. He remarks that Greene “makes a mistake in saying that ‘low pitch is practically universal in England.’ That is not the fact, as every orchestral player knows.” If Greene thought otherwise, it betrayed his lack of experience with amateur ensembles. Indeed, the debate centers on the noblesse oblige expected of the professional and the performing conditions that were inevitably the lot of amateur ensembles: the wind players were not able to invest in new instruments to bring the pitch down to the new standard. Indeed, even with professional orchestras, this changeover had sometimes been financed by an outside benefactor.10

Z. writes that Spurling’s letter “is couched in such ‘slogging’ terms, to the effect that I am not entitled to an opinion or any knowledge, that I feel the force of the common saying that ‘two blacks do not make a white,’ and so prefer to resign my seat in the orchestra; this I have promptly done, rather than retort in kind.” Further, he invites Greene to seek him out at home if he wants further satisfaction, noting, “Mr. Spurling can give him my address.”

The anonymous Z. was the loser as the musical professionals circled the wagons. Both Spurling and Greene wrote to respond, deploring “a lack of loyalty to his society, his conductor, and his committee” (Spurling) and his unwillingness to do the gentlemanly thing and withdraw his charges (Greene).11 There was but one last communication—the final communication of parting shots. In a letter published just after Greene did finally perform the songs with the society, Z. insisted that true professionals ought to be able to accommodate any reasonable situation that confronts them: “[Greene] gives particulars to show how extremely difficult it would have been for the orchestra of one hundred and ten performers to play from the transposed MS. at sight… but we hear nothing of his being willing to sing them from the printed parts; in fact, one hundred and ten may be inconvenienced so that he may not.”12 He holds up the incident as a dangerous precedent: “if we are to admit the possibility of a repetition of such an incident as that of February 5th, then we must always be willing to make our announcements with the proviso that So-and-so will sing ‘if he thinks fit to do so.’” Then comes a significant revelation: “I have been credibly informed that Mr. Plunket Greene has sung those same five songs at the high pitch elsewhere!... If he had been as loyal to his professional engagement to the Society as I have been to my colleagues this matter would never have arisen.”13 Greene performed Songs of the Sea14 far and wide after he premiered it at the Leeds Festival in 1904; although the pitch at the premiere was the low “New Philharmonic Pitch” (as the players were all imported from London), it is extremely likely that some of those other provincial performances were at high pitch—and although the editors of the Musical News invited Greene’s response, none was forthcoming.

Z.’s implication is that Greene was more willing to break an engagement with an amateur society than with a professional one. There may be a simpler explanation, as there is evidence elsewhere that Greene’s voice was somewhat unpredictable. When Stanford followed up the successful Songs of the Sea with Songs of the Fleet in 1910, he scrupulously avoids any pitches higher than Greene’s top E-flat (Songs of the Sea occasionally ascends to E); just with this slightly lower tessitura, Stanford has circumvented the high/low pitch issue.14 Beyond that, however, he included ossia alterations to the vocal line in order to avoid sustained higher passages, particularly in the slow central movement, “The Middle Watch.” In fact, Greene’s biography of Stanford reveals that at the premiere of Songs of the Fleet, this movement had to be taken down a whole tone, even though it had worked in its original key when reading through it at Stanford’s piano.15 It was published only in its original key, and Greene’s account is the only documentation of this alteration.

Eventually, of course, newly manufactured instruments were constructed for the new “standardized” pitch and the high-pitch instruments on the second-hand market declined. Ideally such situations pitting the vocalists against the in-
Michael Lynn (professor of Baroque flute and recorder at Oberlin Conservatory) has been taking part in an interdepartmental performance and history project at Oberlin, which he has described in “The Development of the Flute in 19th-Century France” in The Flutist Quarterly (Summer 2016, pp.20–25). The project’s goal is to help flutists and pianists, both modern and historical, gain an appreciation for the virtually unknown repertoire for the flute in mid-19th-century France and to acquaint them with the wonderful instruments in use at that time. Lynn worked with colleagues Alexa Still (flutist), David Breitman (fortepiano), guest lecturer Tom Moore (Florida International University), and members of the music history department, using rare early editions of music, many from the Selch Collection.

The University of Tennessee Press has published a Second Edition of Ralph Lee Smith’s book, The Story of the Dulcimer. The original edition was published in 1986 and has long been out of print. The book covers the mountain or Appalachian dulcimer rather than the hammered dulcimer. It is regarded as a leading authority in its field.

The Frederick Piano Collection in Ashburnham, Massachusetts, has acquired two more Erard pianos since March 2016. The earlier piano is reputed to have belonged to one family since it was purchased new, in 1859. After undergoing considerable tuning, voicing, and regulating, the piano was chosen for the opening concert of the Historical Piano Concerts series’ thirty-second fall season. The more recent Erard, vintage 1895, was also in one family until the Fredericks purchased it. Delivered to the Collection in late July, it has joined a continuum of six other Paris Erards in the building.

Of potential interest is an 1846 Breitkopf & Härtel concerto grand, in need of a fair amount of tender loving care, delivered to the Fredericks’ home in July. Pianos of this make and model are known to have been purchased by Franz Liszt and by Robert Schumann, for Clara, at a time when such important musicians (especially Liszt) were often given pianos by the manufacturers. It remains to be heard what this instrument will sound like when restored.

Meanwhile, the Piano Collection was busy, as during most summers, with visits by individual musicians and groups of students and music lovers, and a pair of recitals in August by Central Conservatory of Beijing pianist Yuan Sheng, uncharacteristically playing Bach on Mike Frederick’s personal harpsichord by Joel Katzman, Amsterdam, after a double-manual harpsichord by Ruckers, Antwerp (1638), au petit ravalement, in the Russell Collection, Edinburgh University.

The first concert, consisting of Bach’s flute sonatas, featured Baroque flutist Mary Oleskiewicz. For the second, of Bach’s French Suites, Dr. Sheng alternated between the harpsichord and the 1840 Erard from the Frederick Collection, to suggest what such Bach proponents as Chopin and Mendelssohn may have heard when playing Bach on pianos of their time, since both are known to have owned Erard pianos.

For more details about the Frederick Piano Collection and its concert series, please visit the website at http://www.frederickcollection.org.

Notes

6. Ibid.
8. Ibid.
9. Ibid.
13. Ibid., p. 296.
14. The one E that appears (“The Little Admiral,” m. 107) is marked as an ossia—the only instance in which the ossia is higher than the main text—and is doubled in the orchestra.
instrument and played it until his retirement 26 years later. He won a national cobla competition in 1932 with Cobla Barcelonã, and the juror Pau Casals lauded the metal tenora!

Coll himself describes his motivation for building the instrument in his seminal tenora and tible method book: “to achieve a more homogeneous sound, more brilliant and less nasal, as those in their deficient and rudimentary construction, have the sound of their three registers unbalanced….” Coll also worked on a second metal tenora prototype and a metal tible prototype, although the locations of these, if extant, are currently unknown.

The metal tenora has a number of original features that demonstrate Coll’s will to modernize the tenora, his solutions indeed address issues such as the intonation difficulties, the differences between registers and the weight of the instrument. In fact, it is extraordinarily light in comparison to its wooden counterparts, which are rather awkward and heavy, while retaining the tenora’s usual bore shape and length. Unfortunately, the instrument is in a fragile state and therefore unplayable; the tenons are missing string or cork, so the tenora cannot be lifted when assembled. As I could not hear the instrument being played, I will have to take the word of Pau Casals i Defilló with regards to the improved tone and intonation until further investigation. I was however interested to discover that Coll introduced a small but important further improvement: a rectangular case to hold the long keys in place on the side of the instrument. The long keys are in fact a weakness on most historical tenoras; this is because the keys are dislocated or broken as players lay the instrument over their crossed legs or simply knock them off.

The metal tenora is a fantastic proof of Coll’s vision for the tenora, and it appears that fellow musicians much appreciated his prototype. However, it seems that audiences did not feel the same enthusiasm for the metal instrument. The uneven black paint on the instrument seems to confirm that Coll was indeed forced to hastily modify his tenora in order to please the crowds. I am therefore confident that this is the metal tenora that I heard about on my first research trip; however, it could not have been played by Pep Ventura who died over 60 years before its construction.

Josep Coll’s prototypes show the difficulties he faced trying to improve an instrument which has become a national symbol for Catalan music in its short 166-year history. While everything indicates that he improved on the traditional model, the public reaction was less than favorable; presumably the use of metal for the body was not considered “traditional.” Further research on the metal tenora and the unfinished prototypes is likely to uncover some more of Coll’s visionary ideas. It must be mentioned that Catalonia’s foremost contemporary tenora soloist, Jordi Molina i Membrives, currently plays a metal tenora by Puigdellívol which is built on the maker’s standard tenora model (Fig. 1). It is used as a lighter and maybe visually more striking counterpart to the wooden original. Coll might not have convinced the crowds during his lifetime, but his legacy lives on.

Núria Bonet
Plymouth University

Notes

In Memoriam: Friedrich von Huene (1929-2016)

Friedrich von Huene, musician, teacher, and maker of woodwind instruments inspired by Renaissance and Baroque originals, died peacefully on Sunday, May 8, 2016, at the Hillhouse Assisted Living facility in Bath, Maine, where he had been residing since the fall of 2015. According to his wife, Ingeborg, he died from complications of Parkinson’s disease.

Friedrich devoted his career to music, serving initially as a flutist in the US Air Force Band, thereafter becoming a designer and builder of woodwind instruments. He was one of the first individuals (if not the first) in 20th-century America to commercially produce wooden recorders, flutes, and oboes after centuries-old designs.

The art of instrument building provided lifelong challenges for von Huene. Fascinated with the music of Renaissance and Baroque composers, he made repeated trips to Europe to examine, measure, and produce plan drawings of 17th and 18th century instruments in private collections and museums. Using these measurements, he was able to build exact copies of a number of originals to determine how they might have sounded in their day.

These exact copies did not embody late 20th-century standards of pitch and temperament, however. In essence, they had been built in non-equal temperaments at various base pitches (e.g., sixth-comma meantone at a'=409 hz). Although they provided clues to how instruments were pitched and tuned in the past, they could not be played with present-day wind instruments and pianos. Von Huene therefore rationalized that if he were going to meet his entrepreneurial goals, he would need to adapt old designs to modern purposes. Consequently, the majority of his instruments are not exact copies of antique originals; rather they are likenesses of such, scaled to play in equal temperament at a'=415 Hz or 440 Hz—practical measures that ensure their suitability for use in most of today’s musical ensembles.

By adhering to these practical measures, von Huene became a major figure in the world of early wind instrument production. From the outset, he was driven to produce high quality, handmade instruments for discerning players, an ideal that his successors retain to this day. Later, when his reputation had become established, he received commissions to design recorders for the larger instrument-making firms of Moeck, Zen-On, and Mollenhauer.

Since 1960, The Von Huene Workshop has produced over 12,000 instruments. The fact that many are owned by professional musicians around the globe is, in itself, a testament to Friedrich’s foresight, ingenuity, and fine craftsmanship.

Friedrich Alexander von Hoyningen-Huene was born on February 20, 1929, in Breslau, Germany, to Freiherr (Baron) Heinrich A. N. von Hoyningen-Huene and Aimée Freeland Corson Ellis, an American from Hartford, Connecticut. Raised in Germany before and during World War II, he emigrated to the United States in 1948. After completing his high school education in Brunswick, Maine (where his mother had purchased a farm), he entered Bowdoin College in 1949. Within a year, his studies were interrupted by the outbreak of the Korean War.

In 1950, he joined the United States Air Force, serving in the capacity of military musician. When discharged from duty three years later, he was granted U.S. citizenship. Shortly thereafter, while on a trip to Europe to visit extended family and friends, he toured the galleries of a number of museums, where his enthusiasm for historical instruments, their sound, and construction was sparked.

Returning to Maine, he re-entered Bowdoin in the fall of 1954 to finish his degree. In the autumn of 1956, he embarked upon a four-year apprenticeship with Verne Q. Powell, Inc., a leading maker of modern flutes and piccolos in Boston. It was during this period that Friedrich found time after hours to experiment with making recorders. His early instruments were of a composite design, incorporating elements from modern altos by Robert Goble, Wilhelm Herwig, Rudolf Otto, and Ernst Stieber. One of his first flutes was a version of a traverso by the French builder Chevalier, ca. 1700, which is housed in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts.

(continued on next page)
In 1960, Friedrich and Ingeborg established their own instrument making business in Waltham, Massachusetts. From the outset, the V on Huene Workshop engaged in the manufacture of historically based woodwinds. In 1964, the firm was moved to Boylston Street, Brookline, where it has remained in operation until the present, providing finely crafted instruments and high quality service to professional and amateur players alike.

A second business, established in 1981, operates under the name of the Early Music Shop of New England. Situated in premises adjacent to the Workshop, it offers music, instruction books, music literature, woodwind supplies, and new and used instruments to a broad base of consumers. (More about the business can be found at www.vonhuene.com)

The success of the von Huenes’ business ventures has been enhanced by the participation of their five children in the firm. Son Patrick apprenticed with Friedrich in the early 1980s. Over the past 35 years, he has gradually assumed responsibility for instrument design and production, custom hand-finishing, and repairs. An instrument maker in his own right, he is now president of the corporation.

Andreas, an engineer by training and sculptor by choice, designs and maintains specialized tooling and machinery for the shop; while Thomas, a private school administrator and educator, oversees facilities management and grounds maintenance.

Although Nikolaus no longer works full-time for the firm, he deserves credit for having devoted many years of his early career to company sales. He also participated in the organization and initial success of The Early Music Shop. Today, he is an educator. Daughter Elisabeth is an artist and performer, who has worked in instrument production from time to time and has contributed artwork and photography to publicity endeavors.

Throughout his long career, Friedrich sought ways to promote the field of early music. In addition to building high-caliber instruments, he played in early music ensembles, taught recorder students, trained potential instrument builders, championed the formation of instrument-based societies like the American Musical Instrument Society and the American Recorder Society, and urged the establishment of the now popular Boston Early Music Festival (BEMF), of which he and Inge were co-founders.

Over time, von Huene’s peers came to recognize his many contributions. Since the mid-1960s, he has been the recipient of numerous honors and awards, among them a fellowship from the Guggenheim Foundation (1966), a Honorary Doctorate in Music from Bowdoin College (1984), Honorary Vice President of The Galpin Society (1984), Living Treasure of New England recognition (1985), a Distinguished Achievement Award from the American Recorder Society (1987), the Curt Sachs Award from the American Musical Instrument Society (2003), a Lifetime Achievement Award from the National Flute Association (2004), Howard Mayer Brown Award for Lifetime Achievement in Early Music from Early Music America (2005), and a Resolution of Congratulations on the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Von Huene Workshop from the Town of Brookline, Massachusetts (2010).


Friedrich von Huene will be remembered as a man of great ingenuity. He was a consummate craftsman whose instruments embody his ideals of structural integrity, artistic detail, and tonal perfection. A soft-spoken and humane man with a passion for the music of Johann Sebastian Bach, he leaves behind Inge, his wife of 61 years, their five children, and eight grandchildren.

Susan E. Thompson
Yale University
Collection of Musical Instruments
BOOK REVIEWS


There has long been a need for a monograph about the biblical instrument which “can fairly claim to be the oldest musical instrument in written history that is still in use … almost unaltered since its first appearance in human hands,” and Jeremy Montagu’s new book is a magnificent achievement that fills the lacuna. As former curator of the Bate Collection of Musical Instruments at Oxford University and President of the Galpin Society, he has contributed vastly to the enrichment of our appreciation of instrument development, notably instruments of the Bible. His scholarly and accessible style here illuminates the shofar’s unique significance within religious-historical and musical-organological contexts, enhanced by his experience and expertise as practitioner.

Throughout the book are extensive explanations of Jewish liturgy, especially about the New Year festival when the shofar is blown, and the diversity of rituals across Ashkenazi and Sephardi (Spanish and Portuguese, and Oriental) traditions, in particular varying performance styles. Diversity permeates the very definition of “shofar”: most familiar as a “ram’s horn” (which connects to the biblical Sacrifice of Isaac), a shofar may also be fashioned from goat, antelope, gazelle, kudu, ibex, gemsbok, and oryx horn. The striking exception is any bovine animal, symbolically related to the narrative of the Golden Calf. Indeed, it is symbolism which distinguishes the shofar as a religious-musical rather than merely functional, ceremonial instrument. Montagu discusses the rich etymology and highlights the reasoning for preferring curved to straight shapes, citing S. Y. Agnon’s reminder that the purpose of the shofar is to be listened to “with hearts bent in repentance” (p.7).

The early chapters deal well with the history and literature about the shofar, and the use of the shofar within the New Year rite, drawing on Talmudic and later sources. One senses the wisdom of a practitioner, as in his approach to divergent interpretations of duration amongst the three calls: *t’qi’ah* (single sustained sound), *sh’varim* (three shorter sounds) and *t’ru’ah* (rapid series of short notes). As Montagu observes, “I do not think anyone does this precisely if only because there are more important things to think about when one is blowing—such as the spiritual meaning of the calls, known as ‘kavana’ in Hebrew, than worrying about stopwatch timing” (p.21). Whilst he refers to the Sephardi practice of blowing shofar for “Hoshana Rabba,” the conclusion of the festival of Sukkot, strikingly no mention is made of the spectacular Water-Libration ceremony during Sukkot in Temple times, featuring massed shofars: the emphasis is clearly on current, rather than historical practice.

An extensive discussion about shofar notation relates the two earliest sources, 12th-13th century prayer books in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, and at the Jewish Theological Seminary, New York, to the wider context of tropes and cantillation notations. Montagu’s own modern transcriptions demonstrate the results of empirical research amongst a group of informants about modern performance styles, showing “no clear separation between Ashkenazi and Sephardi styles” (p.21), but “minor differences in articulation, especially *t’qi’ah* and *sh’varim*” (p.22). Such work lays the ground for future research with a larger sample spread over a wider range of traditions, drawing on digitized oral history archives. Yet Montagu highlights one striking variation between traditions for the final long note: whereas the Ashkenazi custom is to blow a *t’qi’ah g’dolah*, a long sustained tone, Sephardi custom prefers a *t’ru’ah g’dolah*, a rapid series of staccato or fluctuating notes. Similarly Ashkenazi custom calls for a *maqri* (caller) to call each note, whilst Sephardi communities do without.

The chapters on construction and performance add useful insights. Straightening, cutting the tip, shaping the embouchure, cleaning the core, and even inscribing and decorating, are all given detailed description. Wide variation amongst shofars is highlighted in the chapter on “How to Choose and How to Blow a Shofar,” full of “tips” about buying, maintenance and technique benefiting from years of experience. I agree that it is easier to blow from the side of the mouth, but mention might be made of the possibility of blowing from the center; the advice on relaxation, lip pressure, breathing, and holding is useful for all including novices. It is also salutary to read about how staccato tonguing, or the Yemenite use of an “l” technique benefiting from years of experience. I agree that it is easier to blow from the side of the mouth, but mention might be made of the possibility of blowing from the center; the advice on relaxation, lip pressure, breathing, and holding is useful for all including novices. It is also salutary to read about how staccato tonguing, or the Yemenite use of an “l” for the *t’ru’ah* (rapid succession of short notes) anticipates techniques discussed in treatises for European Renaissance cornett and recorder players.

Most original and pioneering in scope is the chapter “Shofar typology, old and new,” an engaging organological taxonomy covering the author’s substantial shofar collection and photographic sources garnered from an array of Jewish communities.

(Reviews continued on following page)
museums around the world. Montagu’s inventive typology reflects the shofar’s connection to wind and brass instruments by referring to bell shape, carving styles, and different animal horns, profusely illustrated through over fifty photos, albeit black and white. Bell shapes range from scooped, scalloped, wavy, and flat-topped, to obtuse and slightly upturned. The categories enable one to detect patterns in provenance: Western European Ashkenazi bells have deep cut-out hooks, some adorned with carved blocks; Eastern European bells are hooked; Mediterranean bells are slightly upturned with sawtooth carvings. Salonikan shofars have thicker mouthpiece blocks for easier embouchure; Yemenite ram’s horns are short and curved, whilst Yemenite kudu (also found in India’s Ko- chin community) produce the popular large spiral shape. Others include polished ibex, rough Syrian ibex, South African gemsbok and East African oryx.

Each type receives thorough catalog-style description, though generalization from single examples would appear to need a larger sample. In the sequence of sixteen types, the commonest (modern shofars from Israel and China) is oddly listed fifteenth.

Allied to the typology is a survey of shofar inscriptions, popular since engraved texts do not affect the prohibition to alter the instrument’s structure. The most common inscription is Psalm 81:4-5 (“Blow the horn at the new moon…”), closely followed by Psalm 89:16 (“Happy are the people who know the sound”). Also quoted are Exodus 19:19, Isaiah 27:13, Psalm 47:6; Psalm 98:6, and a startling instance of “Herem,” a term indicating excommunication. The survey is an appendix, yet expanded with a larger sample would furnish a fascinating new chapter. By contrast the final chapter, a useful yet already available listing of biblical, Talmudic and post-Talmudic sources, would well suit an Appendix. Whilst there are copious references in footnotes, the bibliography is noticeably underpowered, its main core pre-2000, avoiding some of the more cutting-edge research to have emerged in recent years, for instance books by Amnon Shiloah and Joachim Braun which have illuminated mystical and archaeological contexts.

The chapter on “The Shofar’s Meaning” offers an excellent religious and philosophical discussion highlighting core values such as improving the world (tikun olam). At the heart is one’s inner attitude, one which the author himself exemplifies in his role as practitioner, eschewing “performance” for its own sake: “I was trying to move their hearts; trying to divert their souls from mundane issues such as my sound quality to the meaning of the day, to repentance, trying to inspire them towards the infinite and unity with God.”

In this sense the shofar functions as a moral catalyst, and the discussion concludes with a contemporary moral dilemma to puzzle over, whether to make use of horns of the endangered species of east African kudu, whose more polished tone and appearance has become popular both with collectors and composers of shofar art music. If the topic of how shofars have been used by composers from Elgar to the present day is not touched upon here, the way is well prepared by highlighting the shofar’s musical and spiritual role within a living tradition. Moreover the comparative research on performance styles and traditions, innovative shofar typology, and survey of inscription-types offer valuable models for future studies. Overall, this inspiring monograph promises to be studied and enjoyed for many years by scholars and aspiring shofar blowers, organologists, social and religious historians and anyone interested in the power of music to move and uplift.

Malcolm Miller
Honorary Associate in Arts
and Associate Lecturer,
The Open University, London


Most everybody knows what a synthesizer “is,” and yet synthesizers as a group include so many variations, exceptions, and outliers that they are almost impossible to definitively define. While often thought of as keyboard instruments, a keyboard is merely the most commonly used interface; broadly stated, what makes a synthesizer a synthesizer is its use of variable electronic circuitry to produce sound. The word “synthesis” comes from the ancient Greek σύνθεσις (σύν “with” and θέσις “placing” or alternatively “putting together”), and means a combination of two or more things that form something new. Although synthesizers are often perceived as something new, the roots of synthesizers stretch back over 200 years to the earliest electronic instruments; modern synthesizer electronics can trace their ancestry to the heterodyne circuits found on early twentieth-century instruments, such as the theremin. Although synthesizers are some of the most widely played and widely heard musical instruments in the world, relatively little scholarship—historical, organological, musicological, or pedagogical—has been done on them compared to other instruments. Additionally, the world of synthesizers has changed so much over the last 50 years, and continues to change ever more and faster, that it is difficult for a non-synthesizer specialist to easily acquire an understanding of the instrument. To this end, Mark Vail’s The Synthesizer: A Comprehensive Guide is an exploration of all things synthesizer and aims to present to the reader an in-depth overview of the instrument, its history, and capabilities.

The book is organised into five sections. The first section...
is a historical overview of synthesizers. Somewhat unusually, Vail’s history of the synthesizer is not organised chronologically but rather around five facets of synthesizers: control, sound, performance, interface, and composition, with each of these subsections discussed in historical sequence. While this structure does have some advantages, for example when talking about the use of synthesizers in live performance, it makes the larger narrative of the development of the synthesizer somewhat disjointed and hard to follow. Another difficulty with the chapter on synthesizer history is that there are some factual errors, for example, citing Jean-Baptiste Thillais Delaborde’s clavecin électrique of 1759 as the first instrument to use electricity rather than Václav Prokop Divíš’s Denis d’or (“golden Dionysus”) created about ten years earlier. When discussing electric instruments made before World War II, the author appears to have made particular use of Thomas Rhea’s 1972 PhD thesis, “The Evolution of Electronic Musical Instruments in the United States” (George Peabody College for Teachers [now part of Vanderbilt University]) which, while groundbreaking at the time, does not reflect the current state of electric musical instrument research. These discrepancies, while admittedly minor within the greater context of the book, distract from the authority of the work.

The second section covers acoustics and the basics of synthesis. This is the strongest section and contains much useful information and definitions of common terms. However, it would have been very helpful to have all of these definitions assembled as a glossary to make referencing them easier. The principles of analogue synthesis are explained clearly and the section gives a good overview of the types of components available to synthesizer players and how they function. In particular Vail gives a good account of the ins and outs of modular/rackmounted synthesizer components and how these work in combination to produce sounds. FM synthesis (so beloved and ubiquitous in the 1980s and 90s) is also discussed, but not nearly to the same degree. Likewise, digital sampling—one of the most popular forms of modern synthesis—is touched upon but is not examined in any depth.

Section three, entitled “Choosing Your Synthesizer(s),” examines different styles and configurations of synthesizers a player is likely to encounter and the pros and cons of each. Particularly good is a side-by-side comparison of the different types and sizes of modular/rackmounted synthesizers. One of the most interesting and useful aspects of this section is a discussion of the many non-keyboard types of synthesizer interfaces and controllers, including percussion interfaces (including trigger pads), touchscreens, wind instrument controllers and controllers for microtonal tunings.

The last two sections concern themselves with programming and performance techniques and recording synthesizers. This material is not presented as a straightforward “how-to guide,” but rather as a series of vignettes with a number of professional synthesizer players, many of them working in the television and film industry, giving their insights to the use of synthesizers in their creative process. In addition to the material printed in the book, there is also an associated website which is accessible by means of a username and password given in the text. Featured on the website is a 185-page discography of synthesizer recordings of the last forty or so years. While this discography is large, it suffers from a lack of context and commentary. A shorter annotated discography telling us details of the synthesizers used on the recording and why the recording is important or significant would have been much more effective.

From the ubiquity of synthesizers in modern music it is clear that a book like this is sorely needed; unfortunately, it doesn’t really answer this need. The book suffers from a number of problems that keep it from being as successful as it could be. While there are sections that are informative, there are elements, especially in the last two chapters, that appear to be almost randomly thrown in, such as a large picture of a musician in his living room standing proudly next to a combination coffee table and drum made from a tree trunk.

As a whole, The Synthesizer: A Comprehensive Guide is a frustrating book. It is clear that the author has a practical knowledge and overarching understanding of synthesizers, both from their artistic and technical standpoints, matched by few. Vail is at his strongest when writing about the nuts and bolts of analogue synthesizers and less so when he ventures into historical and analytical territory. This book would have been better with a stronger focus on the practical aspects of musical gear and less on the history and players. One gets the feeling that a real-life conversation with the author would be a masterclass in synthesis, and it’s frustrating to not have that experience when reading this book. While Vail writes with obvious expertise and knowledge about synthesizers, his approach is more from the perspective of the technician or fan, rather than the scholar; there is much use of superlatives in describing the instruments and people, and judgments that seem less than empirical. Strangely, all this gives this book on the most modern of instruments an almost nineteenth-century feel in its outlook.

This is a book that tried to be too many things—a history, a tutorial, a catalog and a purchaser’s guide—and ended up not really being any of these. It should be emphasized that, for the most part, the deficiencies of this work are not from a lack of knowledge or expertise on the part of the author, but due to ineffective execution in shaping this material into a book. A great deal of the blame for this should be laid at the door of Oxford University Press for a lack of editorial oversight on their part. With a tighter focus and better editing, this book really could have been a comprehensive and definitive guide to the synthesizer.

☞ Matthew Hill
The University of Edinburgh


Volume three of a series all published with the same bilingual title, *Flower World – Mundo Florido*, contains eight chapters by well-known archaeologists and ethnomusicolo-
The etchings of turtle shapes in cups found in mortuary sites. Instruments of the Spiro Mound site in Oklahoma, specifically iconography and mythology to examine the sound-making in connections and common historical experiences. The value of a historical model in emphasizing inter-cultural not rejecting “culture area theories,” his purpose is to show Post-Contact, Late Post-Contact and Contemporary. While five musico-historical periods: Archaic, Pre-Contact, Early productive, and exciting approaches to diverse methodologies the chapters ends to the collection. Within these diverse methodologies the chapters in Flower World present new, innovative, and exciting approaches to the study of organology.

Richard Keeling chooses to re-examine classification of song and accompanying sound producers in North American Indian cultures based on the works of the anthropological students of Franz Boaz (especially George Herzog and Bruno Nettl). He uses an archeological model of “layering” strains of musical style, function and symbolic content to account for various different “music styles” within a culture, in essence attempting to define a historical rather than evolutionary development within the music of a culture. He accomplishes this by representing his previous study of Yurok ritual music looking for prototype elements (similar to Stith Thompson’s folkloric studies) to develop historic layers and then he applies the theory to an overview framework of Native American musics. While admitting that musico-archeological constructs depend heavily on inference, he continues to outline five musico-historical periods: Archaic, Pre-Contact, Early Post-Contact, Late Post-Contact and Contemporary. While not rejecting “culture area theories,” his purpose is to show the value of a historical model in emphasizing inter-cultural connections and common historical experiences.

James A. Rees, Jr. uses iconography combined with ethnography and mythology to examine the sound-making instruments of the Spiro Mound site in Oklahoma, specifically the etchings of turtle shapes in cups found in mortuary sites. These intricate engravings on first examination appear not as music instruments but rather as complex human or animal faces. Through a process of reduction of internal elements and comparison with historical and ethnological data he clearly shows a projection of turtle shell rattles within the etching. While there is some confusion as to Caddoan vs. Siouan elements within the study, he demonstrates the images’ importance to the “spirit world.” I might suggest that he expand his study to include iconographic rattle relations with both Northwest Coast and Algonquian Indian cultures.

In “Music of the Center Place,” Emily J. Brown examines the instruments of Chaco Canyon in New Mexico in relation to “Flower World” (a widespread Southwest American concept with music as an integral part). Investigating remains of conch shell horns, foot drums, copper bells, flutes, and rattles, she constructs a layered history of evolving “worlds” linked to a “center place” connected to the pre-emergence world, showing the importance of foot drums as a means of communicating between worlds. Other instruments are used to show historical and directional relations; using present-day ethnological studies, she hypothesizes the connection between the historic use of flutes and current Pueblo cosmology.

Four-tubed flutes from Teotihuacan comprise the object of the study by Dorothee Judith Arndt as she presents a general morphological description followed by the archaeological background and formal assessment of each individual artifact, including mouthpiece fragments and miniatures. A lack of good geographical placement information for many excavations prevents her from speculating on context and use of the flutes. The miniature quadruple flutes are unique to Teotihuacan and were most likely used as votive offerings. She concludes with comparisons to similar instruments from Monte Alban and other sites.

The bone rasp of the Mixtecan Baja in Oaxaca, often made from human femurs, is another iconic Mexican archaeologival sound instrument. Sánchez Santiago and Higelin Ponce de León prefer the Zapotecan term quegro xilla for these instruments. They also utilize the terminology idiófonos de lu-
dimiento (“scrapped idiophone”) rather than that of raspador (scrapper or rasp) or even the Nahuatl omichichuahtli (actually from the Central Mexican region). Examining some seventeen specimens from various Oaxacan sites and exemplifying a long historical record, the authors were able to determine differences between specimens of the Late Classic (AD 400–800) and Postclassic (ca. AD 950–1539) eras and discuss the significance to burials.

Kong F. Cheong, Roger Blench, Paul F. Healy, and Terry G. Powis examine the ceramic flutes and whistles of forty Mayan sites in Pacbitun, Belize and nearby locales. These sophisticated instruments of fired clay (alongside bone, shell, copper, gourd and wooden artifacts) reflect the rich ceremonial life ways of Classic Period Mayans. Instruments are first described in relation to specific burial sites and then cosmological relations are discussed. Many are effigy vessel flutes and others are anthropomorphic examples of male and female animals, specifically monkeys in human postures. The latter are considered the patron deities of musicians.

In “Arqueomusicologia de las trompetas de caracol...,” Alexander Herrera, Juan Pablo Espitia Hurtado, Jorge Gregorio García Moncada, and Alejandro Morris present a detailed scientific analysis of Andean shell and ceramic trumpets (actually horns). Some 200 specimens are examined for production methods, performance techniques (a subjective topic at best), and acoustical characteristics. The latter, using the Mel Frequency Cepstral Coefficients when related to the fundamental tones of eighty-one specimens from museums in Germany, Peru, Colombia and numerous archaeological sites, illustrates that the sound of the instrument differs between six different gastropod species of both Caribbean and Pacific origin. Their further analysis as to the relations between multiple instruments in ensemble is, however, speculative at best. Additionally they conjecture that ceramic trumpets were designed for specific sounds rather than to replicate that of the conches. They also present a detailed study of the mouthpieces of the artifacts.

Panpipes and flutes (occasionally rattles and drums) are the focus of Christiane Clados’ chapter, “Beyond Music,” where iconographical methodology is used to illustrate the non-performance uses of musical instruments within the South-coast Peruvian Paracas and Nasca cultures. She cites four types of non-musical uses: 1) as items of “dress” either as part of clothing or decorative accessories such as hair pieces, nose or ear pieces; 2) as items of sacrificial offerings (some examples actually are non-playable replicas); 3) non-playable imitations placed in illustrations as if they were to be played; and 4) the use of panpipes as “pectorals” on textiles. These usages challenge academic studies to examine a holistic role of sound instruments within all cultures.

Finally, I might suggest two editorial proposals for future volumes. The bibliographies are very widely spaced, consuming multiple pages and the contraction of these would provide room for additional studies. In addition, the placement of figures does not always coincide with their discussion in the text. Such matters aside, this series should be required reading for all organologists if for no other reason than the diversity of methodologies presented and their unique application to the study of music and musical instruments both historically (archaeologically) and in relation to contemporary cultural specimens.

J. Richard Haefer
Paradise Valley, California


It is always a delight when a new book cataloging early pianos arrives on the scene, and even more so when the subject material is from a less well-covered part of the world and is relatively fresh and new to the reader who is not necessarily immersed in that particular region. This is certainly the case with the arrival of The Andrzej Szwalbe Collection of Historical Pianos in Ostromecko, edited by Benjamin Vogel. This book and the accompanying website—http://www.piano.instruments.edu.pl/en/collections/collection/6—are presented as an update to earlier catalogs of the Szwalbe Collection and celebrate its new and improved home located in the Mostowski Palace in Ostromecko, Poland, with better access to researchers and the public. The collection was started in 1970 when the Pomeranian Philharmonic acquired a Carl Julius Gebauhr grand piano produced in Königsberg from the Technical School of Chemistry and Electronics in Gruudziedz. In 1978, Director Andrzej Szwalbe and Dr. Benjamin Vogel amassed a unique collection of over fifty pianos. Among the Polish piano makers whose instruments are part of the collection, the most numerous group are Warsaw-based manufacturers: Kasper Zdrodowski, Józef Budynowicz, Antoni Zakrzewski, and Krall & Seidler. Most of the instruments date to the nineteenth century.

The role of piano manufacturing in Poland during the nineteenth century is not one that is related very often; the country’s most famous musical son, Chopin, had a famous
preference for French instruments by Pleyel and Erard, and, near the end, an interest in instruments by the English maker Broadwood. Therefore the typical early piano enthusiast has usually learned the history of the instrument in terms of the output of Vienna, London, and Paris. As this catalog clearly makes evident, there was an active industry of highly competent piano makers in Poland operating at a level of production far lower than their Austrian and French counterparts, but at no less a level of excellence. Given this lower volume of production (from perhaps several hundred per year in 1830 to about two thousand instruments per year in 1914, for the entire country) and the severe economic and political upheavals, twentieth-century wars, and disruption, and other difficulties that Poland has faced, surviving pianos from the nineteenth century are scarce and their capabilities largely unknown. Hence this catalog, along with a comprehensive website www.piano.instruments.edu.pl that assembles the major Polish collections under one banner, will serve to enlighten people interested in early pianos regarding the contribution of Poland to this instrument’s history.

Along with good-quality photographs in the printed catalog and enhanced photographic content online, both formats feature an English translation. This is extremely welcome as there is much information captured here, and familiarity with the Polish language is usually slight outside of the country. As a benighted American myself, I have spent more than a little time with my German or Italian dictionary wading through untranslated catalogs. That said, the English text must be read with the understanding that it does not always perfectly capture the author’s intent. Aside from the obvious small grammar errors we might find a few shorthand translations. Take, for example, the first sentence of the chapter on “Polish pianinos in the 19th century,” where Vogel’s translation reads:

The first piano was born at the Bartolomeo Cristofori’s workshop by the Medici court in Florence c. 1700, and it was still called a “hammer harpsichord.”

When this is replaced by a more careful translation by Vogel himself we read:

We assume that the piano was born around 1700, when in his workshop at the Medici’s court, Bartolomeo Cristofori made the first “hammered harpsichord”—where the jacks with plectrum plucking strings had been replaced by the hammers striking strings.

These sorts of small translation problems should not be thought of as a real burden, it just means the English reader may want to withhold judgment about a claim until they have spent time with the original Polish. The rest of the history is straightforward and much appreciated.

The book as reviewed is a handsome soft cover edition with a foldout front and back cover, color pictures throughout, and carefully organized texts. The biographies of builders are particularly well done, and many unfamiliar builders can be traced better now with these assembled sketches of their career. The instruments themselves are grouped first by type (Grand, Square, Vertical, Upright, and Hybrid) and within each group are arranged alphabetically by builder’s last name. If the goal is to find pianos by a particular builder, this is handy, but for tracing the progression of the instrument against approximate date of manufacturer (as is common among most catalogs of this type), it is less comfortable. Given the excellent builders list and biography appendices, I would have suggested arranging the pianos by date as far as possible, but again this is a small observation.

The arguably “gold standard” museum catalog remains John Koster’s superb Keyboard Musical Instruments in the Museum of Fine Arts (Boston, 1994) featuring a highly structured discussion of each instrument in the collection, drawings and photographs of actions and dimensions, and condition of the instruments. This level of information is not captured in the Andrzej Szwalbe Collection catalog, which was photographed in only six days, and features few details for any one piano. We can only hope that time and money will allow a more detailed inspection in the future, similar to the more extensive documentation found in the Fryderyk Chopin Institute Collection online.

In the printed catalog each piano is given two pages, with a choice of an eggshell finish rather than a glossy finish for the paper, which takes the vibrancy of the photographs down a little. The online photographs are of similar resolution but are clearer.

A few words should be written about the curatorial selection of the instruments themselves. While almost all the fifty-nine pianos are of Polish origin, the odd German, Viennese, French, and even American pianos are included as well. The pianos themselves are in various states of repair from restored and playing specimens, to victims of historical and contemporary vandalism. We are presented with a grand having nearly three feet of the length sawed off and some coarse work done to make it fit a small space and continue to play, as well as other pianos missing important material such as legs, lids, pedal lyres, key top covers, and similar. Given the rarity of some of these makers it is understandable that pianos such as these would be included, but this begs even more for the documentation of small details and innovations that will place the importance of holding and conserving such artifacts into the future. If we take the Director of the Municipal Cultural Centre Marzena Matowska at her word, the theme of the collection is “Enjoy Me,” and a hands-on approach to the instruments is encouraged. Given that kind of thinking, it is not hard to imagine that additional time will be devoted in the future to teasing out the details, either by the current custodians or those to come!

Tom Strange
Easley, South Carolina


In More London Piano Makers, the promised sequel to Five London Piano Makers, Alastair Laurence continues to document the piano manufacturing industry in London. Laurence, curator at the former Finchcocks Musical Museum and...
The chairman of John Broadwood & Sons, has been involved in
the industry since his early twenties. He was thus well po-
sitioned to witness the decline and collapse of the industry
during the last decades of the twentieth century. Much of his
information comes from interviews with employees, from
family and company archives, and from his own recollec-
tions: information Laurence rightly feared might otherwise
be lost forever.

Laurence begins with the
Chappell publishing company
and the pianos it built, which
Laurence argues were the finest
ever made in the United King-
dom. Until the end of the nine-
teenth century, Chappell viewed
its piano factory as a sideline.
Laurence describes the transfor-
mation of this mere sideline into
the Chappell Piano Company
Ltd., purveyors of fine concert
and recital hall instruments.

Having begun with Chappell,
Laurence goes on to describe four
other firms. J. J. Hopkinson, like
Chappell, began as a music pub-
lisher in the early nineteenth cen-
tury. George Rogers (later Rog-
ers & Hopkinson) produced high
quality instruments from the late
nineteenth century until 2003. H.
F. & R. A. Brasted specialized in
producing large quantities of af-
ordable pianos, including the
minipiano. W. G. Eavestaff &
Sons was an established and re-
spected firm whose name added
 cachet to the Brasted line when Brasted acquired Eavestaff
in 1920.

In the chapter on H. F. & R. A. Brasted, the minipiano and
its evolution are described in detail. The minipiano was first
designed about 1924 by a Dutchman, Ludwig Maas, working
as factory manager for J. Erbe in Eisenach. It featured a range
of only six octaves and stood a mere thirty-three inches high,
yet produced a surprisingly clear, sweet tone. When Brasted
began producing these pianos in 1934, the minipiano became
a commercial success—witness the young couple admiring
their new minipiano in the front cover illustration. Although
it was appealing to the public, it was not popular with piano
tuners. The strings were located at the rear of the piano behind
the soundboard while the tuning pins extended through the
soundboard toward the front of the piano beneath the keybed.
Tuning the piano involved alternately kneeling in front of the
piano to place the tuning hammer on the pins, and leaning
over the piano to place the mutes between the strings. Happ-
ily, Brasted spent the next twenty years refining the design
to address this and other issues, ultimately producing a very
credible instrument.

Laurence devotes an entire chapter to the Squire family.
The surname, Squire, appears frequently in the records of
the piano industry from the late 1820s to the 1970s. Squires
were involved in the design, manufacture, and sale of pianos
bearing a bewildering variety of names including B. Squire &
Son, Henry Squire, William Squire, and Squire & Longson.
Laurence sorts out the confusion surrounding this enterpris-
ing family by providing biographies of no fewer than twenty-
two of its members.

Laurence finishes with a look
at the life of the remarkable Al-
fred Knight and the eponymous
company he formed in 1936.
Knight possessed all the quali-
ties necessary for success in the
business. He had a gift for piano
design, a management style that
inspired loyalty and dedication,
and an astute understanding of
the piano market. In addition, he
was an accomplished pianist who
never hesitated to use his talent
to promote his instruments. Most
important of all, Knight was
imaginative and innovative, cre-
ating pianos that stood apart from
those of the other makers. During
World War II, for example, he
built pianos for the troops with
a sloped lid that would not ac-
commodate beer glasses, a heavy
brass plate behind the pedals to
prevent the bottom panel from
being kicked to pieces by ineb-
riated feet, ashtrays attached to
the exterior at critical points, and
fire-resistant key covers to stop a
cigarette burn from igniting the
entire keyboard. In 1966, in honor of his services to the music
industry, Alfred Knight was awarded an OBE.

The eleven appendices include price lists, family trees,
lists of models offered, the last will of William Brinsmead
Squire from 1862, and the personal reminiscences of George
Veness, who worked in the Rogers and Hopkinson factory in
the early 1970s.

This book is written with clarity, wit, and humor by a man
who clearly loves his subject. It is a joy to read, although it
leaves one sad to realize that none of these firms remain in
business today. Readers will agree with Laurence that Eng-
land has lost a national treasure with the loss of its piano in-
dustry.

Thomas Winter
San Francisco, CA