REVIEWS


Nicholas Lanier was the first Master of the King’s Musick. He was a lutenist/composer and a talented painter. He is of interest to historians of brass instruments because he was a member of one of the two great dynasties of musicians working in England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (the other was of course the Bassanos), thus the book contains references to those members of the Lanier family who were trombonists.

The family arrived in England in the sixteenth century, apparently from France. The first trombone-playing Lanier was John I. He was joined in the Royal Band by his nephew (also John), who filled the place of Guillam van de Borra the sackbut player, who, with the viola player Ambrosio Graso, was mysteriously drowned at Windsor in 1582. A little later, John II’s brothers Clement and Jerome were also taken into the court music establishment. It appears that most of the Laniers also doubled on flute or recorder. Even though the family, as musicians, survived the Commonwealth, it was before the 1640s that the trombone players were most influential, and they appear to have had a wider sphere of activity than just the court.

One of the family, Alphonso, married Aemillia (Emilia) Bassano. Roger Prior has put forward a persuasive argument (see David Lasocki with Roger Prior, The Bassanos..., Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1995, pp.114-142) that she was the dark lady in Shakespeare’s sonnets. The comparison of the two families of immigrant musicians in London is an interesting one, and there is much important detail in this book that is well researched, written, and indexed. Scolar Press, who published this and the Lasocki/Prior book, is also the publisher of Andrew Ashbee’s monumental Records of English Court Music (nine volumes). Much of the source material on the Bassanos and the Laniers is found in Ashbee’s work. In all, Scolar Press is developing an impressive list of material relevant to the study of music-making in the English capital in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Trevor Herbert

* * *


A colleague noticing this formidable tome on my desk (992 pages, and in size resembling a hardback volume of New Grove) and reading its daunting title, remarked wryly that she didn’t envy me my weekend reading. I didn’t relish the prospect either, but I might come
to appreciate the efforts of Morris and Goldstein and their collaborators.

The book is what it says it is—a reference manual of music for the tuba, of discs of tubas being played, of methods and studies for the tuba, of orchestral excerpts for the tuba, tips for the tuba player, and “equipment” for the tuba player. If you have more than a passing interest in the tuba, this is the book for you. The only historically oriented section is the opening chapter by Clifford Bevan entitled “A Brief History of the Tuba,” which is suitably brief but entirely sound. Other chapters—particularly those that deal with repertory—also hold some historical interest.

The book was assembled primarily with the modern rather than the historically inclined player in mind. The editors are to be congratulated on their efforts, but it is hard to avoid asking why the book was written. Like other volumes that have been published in recent years (Flasman’s *Brass Bibliography* and Thompson and Lenke’s *French Low Brass Music*, for example), this is essentially a directory, a catalogue of music and resources the make-up of which changes almost every month. Whereas works like Colver and Dickey’s *A Catalogue of Music for the Cornett* observe an essentially finite repertoire that needs to be defined, the information listed here could be obtained from other sources, or more efficiently confined to an easily refreshed electronic medium. As the book is substantially bigger than my laptop, this method of production would have other charms too.

*Trevor Herbert*


On the face of it, this book should have been unnecessary, for its main purpose is to gather together information about Telemann’s works that include brass instruments, and these works have already been treated in four authoritative thematic catalogs: Werner Menke, *Thematisches Verzeichnis der Vokalwerke von Georg Philipp Telemann*, 2 vols. (Frankfurt: Vittorio Klostermann, 1982-83); Martin Ruhnke, *Georg Philipp Telemann, Thematisch-Systematisches Verzeichnis seiner Werke: Telemann-Werkverzeichnis (TWV)*, Instrumentalwerke, 2 vols. (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1984-92); Siegfried Kross, *Das Instrumentalkonzert bei Georg Philipp Telemann* (Tutzing: Hans Schneider, 1969); and Adolf Hoffmann, *Die Orchestersuiten Georg Philipp Telemanns, TWV 55, mit thematisch-bibliographischem Werkverzeichnis* (Wolfenbüttel: Möseler, 1969). Yet the book provides a great deal more than mere convenience for the English-speaking brass player.

Cron/Smithers is divided into several sections. A short introduction is followed by a useful essay on Telemann’s “continuo group,” pointing out the importance of the harpsichord in the church music, the widespread use of the lute-like *calcedono*, and the existence of...
various Baroque pitches. Next comes “An Annotated Tabulation of the Moveable and Fixed Festivals of the Lutheran Church Year,” a necessary tool for understanding the liturgical position of Telemann’s church music. The introductory material concludes with a short organizational overview of the Telemann thematic catalog (TWV), a list of abbreviations, a list of library sigla cited, and a short bibliography.

The first main section of the book is a calendar of Telemann’s vocal music with brass, in which the dateable works are arranged chronologically and the undateable ones are given in a block at the end. This calendar is valuable not only for bringing out the liturgical position of the works but for singling out the brass forces required (they are listed in a column without the accompanying instrumental and vocal forces).

The second and larger main section of Cron/Smithers is the “Source Catalogue” of the music, arranged by TWV number. For each work the authors list the title, composition date and associated church festival, sources (libraries with call numbers for both manuscripts and prints), performing forces, and key(s). Perhaps the principal advantage of this listing over the four German works cited above is the more accurate information about the brass instrumentation. For example, Ruhnke dubs TWV 40: 110 “Menuett für zwei Hörner ohne Gb.,” whereas Cron/Smithers cite the original title “Menuet à 2 Cornes de Chasse,” adding “in C … (presumably for a pair of horns crooked into whatever suitable key).” Another advantage is the far superior typography to the cramped and messy typewritten entries in Menke. The principal disadvantage—a large one—is the absence of incipits, which TWV, Menke, and Kross do provide (cramped and messy as they may again be in Menke).

As a bonus, Cron and Smithers furnish 158 erudite footnotes on points of interest: church history, the designations of the brass instruments involved, Baroque timpani, unusual features of the instrumentation, biographical notes on people connected with the manuscripts, more information on pitches, the symbolism of instruments, errors in modern writings and editions, etc.

Three brief complaints: The prose would have benefitted from a good copy editor. The citations of books lack publishers. The seven suites that Ruhnke considers to be for a chamber ensemble (TWV 44) and Hoffmann considers to be orchestral (TWV 55) are listed by Cron/Smithers under TWV 44 with a cross-reference to TWV 55 but not under TWV 55.

The International Trumpet Guild is to be congratulated on sponsoring such a worthwhile publication — a congenial “companion” (as other publishers call them) to the wealth of brass material by one of the most important composers of the Baroque era. I look forward to seeing more from Matthew Cron. As for Don Smithers, in all truth I would much rather see one volume of his magnum opus on trumpet history appear than all the catalogs in Christendom. How about it, Don?

David Lasocki
Indiana University

Despite a promising opening quotation from no less authoritative a source than Tubby the Tuba (“… people don’t write pretty melodies for tubas. It just isn’t done.”), this book is likely to disappoint historical brassophiles seeking primarily to understand their chosen instruments better. They will learn little new here about the status of horns (paraded in the first Brandenburg concerto) and nothing whatsoever about Bach’s unprecedented use of a trumpet in F (in the second).

Marissen’s aim rather is to explore the “musical, social, and religious implications of Bach’s treatment of eighteenth-century musical hierarchies.” Thus in the first concerto, he argues, a contemporary musical connoisseur would have been aware of a “bridging of the social distance between the horns and the rest of the ensemble” that occurs during its course, while the four solo instruments of No. 2 (trumpet, recorder, oboe, and violin), all “readily … associated with the Stadtpfeifer,” would have made that concerto appear “rather uncourteously in some respects.” According to Princeton’s blurb,

the book argues that the Brandenburg Concertos are better understood … as a carefully compiled and meaningfully organized set … It shows how Bach’s concertos challenge (as opposed to reflect) existing musical and social hierarchies.

… One important message of Lutheranism … is that in the next world, the heavenly one, the hierarchies of the present world will no longer be necessary. Bach’s music more likely instructs its listeners how to think about and spiritually cope with contemporary hierarchies than how to act upon them … Bach’s concertos [thus] share with his … vocal music for the Lutheran liturgy an essentially religious character.

Despite its scholarly presentation and language (and here I confess to being allergic to expressions such as “fortspinnung-type syntax”), and despite much penetrating formal analysis and insight, Marissen’s thesis remains—almost by definition—entirely speculative (in a non-perjorative sense). This raises an interesting question: What if, anything, distinguishes it from, say, Philip Pickett’s more recent (non-scholarly) interpretation of the same concertos—in which he casts horns as representatives of Roman pomp in “The Triumph of Caesar” and trumpet as the allegorical figure of Fame on Mount Parnassus? Certainly Marissen’s book (as opposed to any CD booklet) could have allowed a much more extensive exploration of the historical evidence—not for any one particular interpretation but for a general mode of thinking that validates interpretations such as his own.

One small (brass-related) example will serve to illustrate the problem: in a reference to the cantata Du sollt Gott, deinen Herren, lieben (BWV 77) and its D-minor alto aria with “melancholy, tortured” trumpet obbligato (“Oh, there bides in my loving still nothing but
imperfection”), Marissen comments,

What more effective way was there at the time to help express this imperfection than to have the natural (valveless) trumpet struggling through material that is exceedingly unnatural for the instrument? (p. 4)

And from there—and without any attempt to shore up the hypothesis with examples from elsewhere—the discussion simply moves on. (Nor is any mention made of the designation *tromba da tirarsi* and of that instrument’s ability to correct its natural “imperfection.”)

Nevertheless, a sung text does at least provide a reasonably fixed reference point for such speculation. With practically all purely instrumental music, by contrast, it is dangerously easy to read whatever we like into the purely musical “evidence.” Marissen’s and Pickett’s very different interpretations are not obviously compatible, and both may indeed be wrong; but if either is correct, how are we to choose between them?

In short, the main value of Marissen’s book lies, at least for me, in its exploration of how the Brandenburg concertos expand and explode the Vivaldian concerto model—and not in its main thrust, which, quite simply, may or may not reflect Bach’s own thinking.

Andrew Parrott

* * *


Producing a museum catalogue is not a project to be undertaken lightly, and it is sometimes the case that the best-intentioned start soon turns into an unwieldy task that may never come to a satisfactory conclusion. This is sometimes the case if, from the beginning, the catalogue is projected to occupy one complete and definitive volume. The by now classic example of the success of this approach in the brass instrument world is Herbert Heyde’s definitive volume *Trompeten, Posaunen, Tuben*, which has set a standard of excellence. But this approach incurs a long delay between conception and completion, and the resultant volume must stand alone on its own merits. An alternative approach is to produce the work in installments, allowing for incremental and continuous dissemination of the information, and also rendering the individual sections small enough to update as new artifacts are acquired, or fresh evidence comes to light on those already described. This was the policy adopted over ten years ago when preparing to catalogue the Edinburgh University Col-
lection of Historic Musical Instruments. Proof of the validity of this policy is the second edition of the “Horns and Bugles” fascicle (see following review), which has recently been completed. This new edition includes more than thirty further instruments, a great many more measurements of those catalogued before, and a much refined layout.

Volume 1, the volume of illustrations, begins with a “Concise History of the Collection from 1860 to 1990,” tracing the fascinating and quite sinuous history of an accumulation that was to become one of the preeminent collections of the world. The next section, “Methods of Cataloguing,” lays down the museological principles upon which the catalogue is based. The systems of measurement used are described and a complete explanation of field names and contents is provided. Fields fall into four basic categories: those used in identifying the instrument, those used in describing it, those providing performance characteristics, and the last providing the instrument’s history and use. Additional special fields that might be used for describing features found on only a few instruments in the collection are omitted in favor of a general field labeled “Technical Description.” Two examples of the extraordinary thoroughness of approach are provided in the following review.

The body of the volume is taken up with the illustrations. This volume contains all the printed illustrations projected to be produced for the entire collection. There are 397 black-and-white photographs in fourteen categories, corresponding to all classes of musical instruments. Photographs in the category of brass instruments include twenty of conical brasswinds, eighteen of intermediate brasswinds, twenty of cylindrical brasswinds, and nineteen of brasswind mouthpieces. Radiographs of a cornett and several mouthpieces are also included. The editor remarks in the preface that the illustrations are a “representative cross section of the Collection as a whole, while actually having an emphasis on the items of greatest interest” (p. 5). To enhance the usefulness of what must necessarily be a small sampling of the entire collection, the instruments chosen for illustration are mostly items not illustrated elsewhere in the literature. The photography is of a uniform and very high quality, and the volume is beautifully printed in black on high-quality gloss white paper, with a sewn binding and blue cloth-covered boards with gold tooling. It is an essential acquisition for the student of brass instruments.


Each fascicle of the Catalogue supersedes the Museum’s Checklists, which are allowed to go out of date as the corresponding fascicle is published. With Part H the section on brass instruments is complete. While the illustrated volume (reviewed above) is organized according to the categories of conical brasswinds, intermediate brasswinds, cylindrical brasswinds, and brasswind mouthpieces, the fascicles use the more common terminology
of horns and bugles, cornets and tubas, and trumpets and trombones. The mouthpieces are divided into two fascicles, one for small and the second for large. (Small mouthpieces are those up to 20 mm cup diameter and include tenor horn, alphorn, and quinticlave; large mouthpieces have a cup diameter of over 20 mm, including trombone and baritone.) Each fascicle begins with a section on cataloguing methods and terminology specific to brass instruments. The thorough, methodical approach provides a wealth of information on every instrument. The best way to illustrate the level of information presented is to excerpt examples from the text. The following are entries for a trumpet from Fascicle ii and a mouthpiece from Fascicle iv:

(996)
Natural trumpet.
Nominal pitch: f.

Maker: Johann Wilhelm Haas.
Nuremberg.
1676-1723.

Overall size: 630-640.
Bore: mouthpipe minimum 10.2; bell 108-113.5.
Dia of mouthpiece receiver: m.r.t. 11.8-11.0.

Technical description: Single coil; small simple central ball without groove; wooden spacing block; rings on insides of both bows. Blue and white cord binding. External diameter of main tubing: 11.7. Weight excluding mouthpiece but including wood block and cord: 485 g.
Bell wall thicknesses:

Axial location -
Distance from bell 25          160           260

Circumferential location relative to seam -

Inscribed on bell garland “JOHANN WILHELM / HAAS / NÜRNBERG” and “IWH” / leaping hare facing left, looking forward. Inscribed on one side of block in ink: “Jakob Pretori” (?) / “I . . . 29 Juni 1819.” Decorative features: Three winged cherub heads on bell garland; five ferrules with turned decoration.

Bell somewhat crumpled: original length probably 5-10 mm longer than at present; several dents; all three yards somewhat bent inwards.
The fourth ferrule different from and simpler than the others: possibly a replacement; patch on inside of distal bow; soldered repairs in middle of first yard and on the bell yard between the block and the ball. There is a hole in the bell where the distal bow has in the past been wired to the bell.
Usable pitch: With mouthpiece (997) plays in F at about 100 cents below $A_4 = 440$ HX. With mouthpiece (649) plays in F at about 100 cents below $A_4 - 440$ Hz.

Performance characteristics: The 11th mode serves better as written $F#$ than $F$$\flat$.

(3285)
Mouthpiece for bugle.

Maker: Potter.
London.
Late 19th or early 20th century.

Overall size: length 54.5; external diameter 26.5.
Sounding length: cup depth 11.
Bore: cup diameter 17.3; minimum diameter 4.4.
Depth of taper: shank depth 27.3.
Diameter of taper: maximum 13.0; minimum 10.9.

Technical description: German silver; semi-flat rim contour; maximum bite radius of curvature 1.0; intermediate cup shape; maximum throat radius of curvature 8.

Stamped at top of shank taper “POTTER / LONDON”

Lent with natural trumpet in $E_\flat$ (3284).

(Shaw-Hellier Collection).

This level of completeness and detail is carried through every entry of the entire Catalogue—in all 919 times in the brass instrument category. Some entries may not be as extensive as those shown above; to save space and lend neatness, where no information is forthcoming on a certain aspect the field pertaining to it is omitted. A brief list of references bearing largely on nomenclature and cataloguing is included, followed by a list of makers’ and other names and serial numbers. The reader new to museum catalogues might initially be perplexed by the apparent randomness of the numbers in bold which head each entry. These are the numbers that are applied by museums at the time of acquisition and, of course, bear no relation to the category or class of instrument represented. A list of these acquisition numbers cross-referenced against page numbers completes each volume.
Although the editors deprecate their work in the Introduction to Volume 1, stating that it cannot compare with the publications of Mahillon, Bessaraboff, or Heyde, the achievement is nevertheless comparable. In attention to detail and standards of cataloguing this work can stand alongside the best. The fascicles are printed black on white on plain paper, and are saddle-stitched into blue soft covers. This lower-cost approach renders updating much less of a task, and makes acquisition of newly released fascicles an economically attractive option.

The text of all fascicles can also be supplied as DOS files on standard 3 1/2" diskettes, either in ASCII or formatted in WordPerfect 5.1. The appearance once printed is identical to the published version. The default setting is for a Hewlett Packard LaserJet printer, so some resetting of tabs and margins will be necessary with other printers if the pagination and layout are to be maintained. North American uses will also need to change the paper size from A4 to 8 1/2" x 11". Text can also be transmitted to any Internet address as an ASCII file. The prices for either diskettes or e-mailed files are the same as for the printed version.

Volume 3, “The Electronic Picture Gallery.” Images and text on the musical instrument collection of Edinburgh University are freely available through the World Wide Web at the following site:

http://www.music.ed.ac.uk/euchmi/

The user can acquire a wealth of information, including news of the collection, aims and plans for the future, biographies of staff, lists of instruments in the collection, available drawings, and prices of publications. The images are the most attractive feature of this site, but be warned that the faster the computer one uses, the lower will be the frustration level in waiting to download. Sites with a heavy graphic component still appeal to only a few privileged users, although this situation will probably right itself in years to come. The illustrations on the EUCHMI web site do not duplicate those in the Catalogue of the collection; all are new since publication of the printed work. Illustrations can be viewed on screen and even downloaded to a high-resolution printer.

Links can be made from this site to the International Musical Instrument Committee (CIMCIM) of the International Council of Museums, the Russell Collection of Early Keyboard Instruments, and the home pages of the Galpin Society and the Faculty of Music of Edinburgh University.

Although the initial thrill of sitting at one’s desk and browsing through a collection thousands of kilometers away is powerful, in this reviewer’s estimation the lack of depth in the information compared to that available through the printed words makes the experience rather hollow. If good-quality illustrations are needed, or in-depth information on particular instruments, the web site is not yet the place to go. It is still an advertisement for something, and not the thing itself. This too will doubtless change for the better all too soon, and in the meantime one must congratulate the Curator of the Edinburgh University
Collection for his enormous energy and commitment to the musical instruments under his care and the information that they embody.

—Robert Barclay


Without question this book covers an important and difficult subject. The authors address critical questions pertaining to Bach’s brass instruments, particularly as regards form, terminology (tromba, corno da caccia, corne du chasse, corno da tirarsi, lituus, etc.), and function. Their conclusions are terse and dogmatic: they assert that Bach’s tromba is the ordinary folded trumpet with a bell diameter of 100-110 mm, his clarino, a trumpet with a smaller bore (bell 96-105 mm). The corno da caccia is identical to the jägertrompete—a horn furnished with a cylindrical leadpipe, with a bell diameter ranging between 120 and 180 mm. By way of contrast, the corne du chasse or corne par force in C has a bell diameter between 200 and 240 mm, while the corno or Naturwaldhorns is equipped with a large bell featuring a diameter of 240-300 mm.

The book’s problems begin with these glib, simplistic answers and they continue to its end. For example, if we compare the Csibas’ bell diameter for trumpets with those of surviving instruments, we arrive at a different estimate. Without intending to give an average value, we shall examine the diameters used by Nuremberg trumpet-maker J. W. Haas the Elder as well as those by Leipzig craftsmen. Haas, who was already working a generation before Bach (between 1676 and 1723), furnished his trumpets with bells 108-113 mm in diameter. Diameters in the lower end of this range tend to be employed in the earlier years of his career, and for military trumpets. Unfortunately, only a few trumpets from Leipzig workshops have survived. A lost 1697 circular trumpet built by Heinrich Pfeifer for the church in Carlsfeld had a diameter of 115 mm (not 110 as one reads in some publications); a 1744 trumpet bell by A. Crone has a diameter of 130 mm, and a 1753 trumpet by J. F. Schwabe has a bell with a diameter of 127 mm. Diameters of 110 mm and larger are also prevalent in other German centers of trumpet making after about 1700. J. C. Kodisch in Nuremberg built bells of 119 mm as late as about 1700, while M. Leichamschneider in Vienna constructed bells of 115 and 117 mm respectively in ca. 1725 and in 1733. Although this survey is sketchy, it is comprehensive enough for us to conclude that the Csibas’ dogmatic statement cannot be upheld: trumpets with bells of 96-110 mm belong more to an earlier period, prior to the time of J.S. Bach.

In fact, most of the measurements the Csibas claim to be typical for instruments from Bach’s time may be challenged. As another example, one might ask where we can find horns
with a bell diameter of 300 mm? The largest horn bells from Bach’s time that I was able to.locate are those by J. H. Eichentopf of Leipzig (1735), measuring 270 mm (Prague, National.Museum). They are clearly exceptional. Most horn bells of the time range between 220 and.250 mm; horns with bells as large as 300 mm in diameter hardly appear before 1790.

Except for a few relatively clear-cut cases—such as the trombone, cornetto, and parforce horn—there are problems with virtually every instrument type described by the Csibas. As.for the slide trumpet, the authors reached some startling conclusions after examining the.inner leadpipes of extant natural trumpets by means of an endoscope. They searched for.invasive marks that might have been caused by the motion of a slide that was subsequently. lost. Indeed, they discovered scratch marks in some of these instruments and were quick to.interpret them as the result of the motion of a “short slide.” This is possible, but it remains.to be proven; the scratches may be the result of cleaning procedures. Abrasion patterns.of extend slide trumpets should be examined for comparison. Whether or not some of.the extant trumpets in museums were once equipped with a slide has actually no bearing.on the subject of this book. There is ample evidence that the slide trumpet was common.in Leipzig. A document of 1748, according to which Gottfried Reiche himself owned a.Zug-Trompete and a Waldhorn, is described in an article the Csibas overlooked (Herbert Heyde, “Instrumentenkundliches ueber Horn and Trompete bei Johann Sebastian Bach,” in Bachstudien 10 [Wiesbaden/Leipzig, 1991]: 251-265). The churches of St. Thomas and.St. Nicholas in Leipzig ordered three Zugtrompeten as late as 1801 and 1802, one for the.tower watchman and two for church music.

The Csibas interpret the corni da caccia in Bach’s scores as a horn with a cylindrical.leadpipe, played with a trumpet mouthpiece. They state summarily that “The corni da caccia.is a trumpet” (p. 35) and offer a photo of a horn by G. Fr. Steinmetz (early 18th century).as supporting evidence. As for other types of horn, they go so far as to claim that “by the.mid-1700s all horn instruments were played with a trumpet mouthpiece by trumpeters”.(p.36). As evidence for this conclusion they refer to two sources: first, a contemporary.image that shows an orchestra in which the trumpeters have horns close at hand for the.purpose of switching; and second, a Leipzig document of 1730 that makes it clear that the.brass section for the church music at St. Thomas comprised three trumpeters only. The.authors reason as follows: Since trumpeters cannot handle both trumpets and French horns.with narrow conical leadpipes and conical mouthpieces, they played horns with trumpet.mouthpieces.

I can understand this interpretation as seen from the vantage point of a 20th-century.professional trumpeter, but from a historical standpoint it cannot be sustained. First, the two.documents give no indication as to the form of the leadpipes or mouthpieces; certainly no.detailed information on this point relating to Leipzig intruments is available. Second, every.Stadtpfeifer went through a course of training on several different instruments—training.that inevitably involved switching to different sizes of mouthpieces. Third, extant horns.with cylindrical leadpipes seem to have been constructed for the hunt; they are usually.equipped with rings for a carrying strap and with a bell that is blackened inside (originally.for the purpose of magically assuring the success of the hunt). These horns, which are
easier to play than horns with narrow conical leadpipes, continued to be built in Germany throughout the 19th and 20th centuries for the same reason. We cannot accept these horns as regular and typical hunting horns, neither today nor in the 18th or 19th century. From this perspective we have to be extremely hesitant to connect those horns with Bach’s church music. Fourth, the artistic-aesthetic situation in Leipzig was anything but provincial, as Bach’s music demonstrates. In Bach’s early years, the large French-style horns began to be introduced in the orchestras of opera and church. These horns had a touch of aristocratic flair and a strong association with the hunt. Their “pompous” and mellow sound exercised a great appeal to the middle and upper classes.

In Bach’s time the horn was in a period of dramatic change, involving many different hybrid models and considerable confusion in terminology. The larger horns gradually superseded the smaller types, which previously had been used in the hunt. Bach’s youth saw the adoption of terminal crooks (ca. 1700), the introduction of hand-stopping (by the 1720s in Dresden), and the invention of the corona da tirarsi (1724). In order to understand these virtually revolutionary changes, we need to examine the horn’s evolution in conjunction with that of the trumpet, both in terms of the physical changes in the instruments themselves and in their respective roles in the orchestra.

Looking at the 18th century as a whole, we see a rise and expansion of a bright-dull polarity of the “brass” sound in the orchestra. The horn sound tends to become duller and mellower. The bell, an easily measurable indicator, increases in large French-style horns from approximately 22 cm to approximately 30 cm between ca. 1700 and ca. 1790/1800. In the context of this trend we can hardly reconcile the performances in the Thomaskirche with horns of the Steinmetz type.

In order to support this view of a refined and subtle sound aesthetic in Bach’s music, I wish to return once more to the trumpet—specifically to Reiche’s instrument in the portrait by E.G. Hausmann. This crucial instrument does not play a significant role the Csibas’ discussion. To them it is a coron da caccia, thereby confirming the opinions of Sachs and Karstädt (1955) but clashing with the perceptions of Schering (“Zu Gottfried Reiche’s Leben und Kunst,” Bach Jahrbuch 19 [1918]), Kirchmeyer (1961), and others. If we want to judge Reiche’s instrument, we have to know its bore and historic environment. As misleading opinions and information about this instrument (Dahlquist in HBSJ 5 [1993]: 175, and G. Nicholson in “Correspondence,” HBSJ 7 [1995]: 216-20) have recently come to light, I wish to refer to an article that seemingly remained unknown or almost unknown to these authors and to the Csibas. This article (Herbert Heyde, “Das Instrument von Gottfried Reiche,” in: Beiträge zur Bachforschung 6 [Leipzig, 1988]: 96-109), reports on an investigation into the original painting by Hausmann in Old City Hall in Leipzig. Painstaking measurements were taken, the slanted position of the horn was taken into consideration, the measurements were compared with the subject’s skull proportions, and a mock instrument of cardboard was made. As a further step, an individual was posed with the mock trumpet by the side of the painting, while a jury of several people compared the painting to the replica. Suggestions and corrections were made until everyone agreed on the dimensions. With the assistance of artists and art historians, other portraits by Haussmann were examined and questions of
scale addressed. We then came to the conclusion that the minimum diameter of the bore was about 9.1 mm, the bell approximately 126 mm, and the leadpipe conical. Needless to say, a completely faithful rendering cannot possibly be obtained under such circumstances; a reasonable approximation is the most we can expect. A painting is a painting.

Trying to place Reiche’s instrument in its proper historical context, we must first remember that 17th-century-style small hunting horns with conical leadpipes were on the decline in Bach’s time. Understanding Reiche’s horn as a *corno da caccia* would place music at the Thomaskirche of the 1720/30s behind the times. If we reject this line of reasoning, we have little choice but to adopt the contrary point of view: that the instrument is a coiled trumpet. Its conical leadpipe and its slightly larger bell are probably “modern” adaptations to make the sound slightly mellower.

The basis of this “modern” trend must apparently be sought in aesthetic and intellectual currents of Bach’s period. In this connection it is worth mentioning that Leipzig and Halle were strongholds of Pietism, a current that emphasized an emotional perception of Christian faith. Bach himself was strongly influenced by Pietism. In the traditional sense, the trumpet was a symbol of the ruler, of the worldly monarch as a warrior. In the Pietistic slant of the time, however, the heavenly ruler embodied qualities such as love, goodness, and comfort rather than martial might and shining splendor. It seems appropriate that a trumpet that often represents the heavenly ruler in church music should then sound softer and mellower than a trumpet that serves a martial ruler. Given the tradition of the coiled trumpet in Leipzig, Reiche’s instrument appears, in my opinion, as a mellower-sounding version of the traditional coiled trumpet. Incidentally, the concept of a mellower-sounding trumpet did not have a future in the Classical orchestra, which stressed increasingly the polarity between the bright/shiny trumpet and dull/mellow French horn. The Classical orchestra was first and foremost the court orchestra, in which the trumpet lived on in its martial aspect.

It is logical that in the Csibas’ sweeping equation of *corno da caccia* = trumpet-type instrument, the *corno da tirarsi* gets a cylindrical leadpipe with a slide. According to the authors, the entire instrument had to be pulled and pushed. This has been suggested previously by Karstädt (1955), who posited a straight 20 cm-long slide in the leadpipe. But the slide envisioned by Karstädt and the Csibas is inconsistent with the conical bore of the instrument’s leadpipe. As explained above, apparently all the horns used in the Thomaskirche had narrow, conical leadpipes. In the aforementioned article of 1991 I suggested a resolution to this problem: a U-slide with a primitive spring mechanism. I submitted a sketch of the gadget, which is basically equivalent to that of Dikhut’s *Zughorn* of 1812.

Another unusual term that appears in Bach’s scores is *lituus*. The Csibas follow Curt Sachs (1921) and H. O. Koch (1982) in their interpretation of *lituus* as horn. Indeed, there are some sources that understand the *lituus* as a horn in its narrower sense. The question is whether this meaning was a common one and whether it was so understood in Leipzig. If the *lituus* was really a horn, why did not Bach call it *corno*, or *corno da caccia*, as he was customarily did? Why did he change the terminology only for this funeral motet *O Jesu Christ, meines Lebens Licht*? Returning to a line of reasoning that I presented earlier, I wonder whether the *litui* were *Stocktrompeten* (*Trompetenstücke* or staff trumpets). These
instruments appear in sources from Arnstadt and Zeitz in the 1690s. Weigel (*Abbildung der gemein-nützlichen Haupt-Stände*, 1698) and Friese (*Ceremoniel und Privilegia derer Trompeter und Paucker*, 1709) mention them as well. The *Stöcktrompete* had a bent bell similar to the Thuringian shepherd’s horn (*tuba pastorita*) and Roman *lituus*. J. S. Bach, who was familiar with Latin, certainly knew that *lituus* was also the name of the bishop’s pastoral staff or *crosier*, a name originally drawn from the staff of the augurs. In the light of the pastoral staff, the theological message of this funeral motet makes sense. “O Jesus Christ, Thou Light of My Life” would refer to Christ as the “good shepherd” who guides his sheep with his sounding *crosier*. In the sense of this interpretation the use of the *Stöcktrompete* as a sounding shepherd’s staff would be a symbol of Pietistic and pastoral sentiment. Further research, particularly about the decedent himself, Reichsgraf von Flemming, is needed before this hypothesis can be accepted or rejected.

The turbulent character of the horn’s evolution in Bach’s time has its counterpart in a terminological bewilderment and confusion. Nomenclature was not standardized. As is often the case, existing terminology is insufficient for the identification of new models. We may find that traditional meanings were expanded and new ones drawn from the words’ vernacular usage. Thus the word “horn” appears in its most general meaning, i.e., indicating something curved, like an animal’s horn. From this basis the new terms “basset horn” and “English horn” were created. In the application of the word “horn” to circular horns and trumpets we encounter an ambiguous and unstable terminology. We even find terms suggesting compromise in a number of scores, such as *tromba à vero corno da caccia*. Only a few cases need be mentioned. The Penzel copy of the Brandenburg Concerto no. 2 reads on its title page *Concerto a … Tromba Corno Con.[certato].…*, while the trumpet part reads *Tromba à vero Corno da Caccia*. When Bach arranged the cantata *Ich will meinen Geist euch geben* by his Meiningen cousin Johann Ludwig Bach for a performance in Leipzig, he called for *Clarini piccoli à corni di Selva* in F, suggesting some sort of a *Jaegertrompete*. Another example is the autograph of the cantata BWV 48, which calls for a *Corno* (title page) or *Tromba* (upper system of the score). The term *corno* signifies in the latter example not a bore shape in the sense of the technical classification, but an overall shape. In a general sense all circular or half-moon shaped instruments are horns. It is crucial to consider these subtle differences between the technical, functional, and nominal classifications of instruments. The simplistic concept of equation between term and model, which abounds in the literature about brass instruments, does not work; the problem is treacherous and convoluted. Moreover, we do not know if Bach was consistent in his use of these terms. Did he always understand by *corno, corno da caccia*, etc., the same instrument over the entire period of his productivity? Given the revolutionary situation in the evolution of the horn, I tend to doubt it.

History means constant change and variance in the local dimension. The same type of instrument is commonly made slightly differently from place to place, and particular local features may continue to exist over time. In my opinion, it is in Leipzig that the large-bore concept for brass instruments first surfaced. Bells of trumpets and horns made in Leipzig are large—if not the largest of all that are known. The cylindrical bore of Eichentopf’s
bass trombone is likewise very large. It seems to foreshadow the large-bore German-style trombone of the 19th century (designed in Leipzig by F. C. Sattler in 1839). It seems that Bach’s powerful music was a challenge to the instrument makers in Leipzig.

As I close this review I wish to say that it is a mark of scholarship to offer evidence for one’s hypotheses or statements. The Csibas rarely do this; they merely present assertions. As sources they use scores, a few historic instruments, and some scholarly literature. This is not enough. Every investigation into a special field will necessarily fail if it is restricted in terms of source material. A glance at the Csibas’ bibliography reveals that they neglected to pick the rich harvest of the Bach anniversary of 1985, which stimulated research also in the field of brass instruments. Nor did they undertake special historical research on site. They remained alien to Bach’s environment, as one can see in their error in locating the city of Cöthen, where Bach worked before going to Leipzig, near Derby in Bohemia (p. 39). A further mark of scholarly methodology is to read the literature critically and give credit to the ideas that form the foundation on which one builds his/her ideas. Here too the book under review leaves much to be desired.

One very useful feature of this book is the chart of pitches required for each instrument in each piece, clearly illustrating the respective ranges and notes outside the harmonic series. Similarly worthwhile are the photos of instruments and original manuscripts. Many of the instruments are reproductions made by Mr. Csiba himself, in collaboration with Max and Heinrich Thein of Bremen, Germany, who trained him in instrument-making techniques.

This review has been largely confined to organological matters discussed in the book. I intentionally avoided addressing the musical aspects, nor did I delve deeply into Bach’s usage of terms. Reading this book leaves me with the impression that a comprehensive study of the brass instruments in the music of J. S. Bach remains to be written.

Herbert Heyde
Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York


The long-awaited revised version of Bruce Dickey and Michael Collver’s catalog of music for cornett has arrived. In 1981 Bruce and Michael published the first version of this work, as “Musik für Zink - Ein Quellenkatalog” [Music for Cornett—A Catalog of Sources], in the Basler Jahrbuch für historische Musikpraxis, volume 5. This first attempt at a comprehensive overview of the cornett’s repertoire was a fifty-page article, of which forty pages were dedicated to lists of instrumental and—despite the statement to the contrary on page 3 of the present volume—vocal music with parts designating cornett. Even before the “Quellenkatalog” (hereafter QK) came off the press, those of us involved in its compilation were aware that it was in no way complete, that it was in fact just a beginning.
In the ensuing fifteen years, Collver and Dickey continued work on the catalog, visiting libraries, combing through secondary literature, and collecting information. The result of their efforts is a book of over 200 pages encompassing some 247 printed collections and more than 1000 manuscript works.

The catalog is divided into two main sections, “Instrumental Music Specifying Cornett” and “Vocal Music Specifying Cornett,” with an “Appendix of Works with Unknown Location or Source.” Each of these lists is arranged alphabetically by composer. A useful improvement over QK is the inclusion, where known, of each composer’s place and date of birth and death. For printed sources, relevant information from the title pages, including publisher, place and year of issue are cited, followed by a listing of pieces specifying cornett. For collective manuscripts, the piece or list of pieces is preceded by the volume’s title, if present. In each case the individual pieces are followed by library and bibliographical information. Modern editions are sometimes noted.

The list of instrumental music fills thirty-four pages, just four more than the corresponding section in QK. Yet, if the figures in Table II (p. 20) are accurate, the revised catalog contains almost 100 additional pieces in the genres canzon, sonata and sinfonia alone: 428 as compared to 333 in QK. (It must be noted that Table II contains a few errors. The number of ricercare for solo instrument, for instance, is given as eight. There are, however, ten such pieces in Virgilio’s Del dolcimelo (p. 73). The totals for the genres “Fuge/Fantasia” and “Capriccio” are incorrect, and a couple of categories have surprisingly decreased in size since QK: sonatas for sbBc (soprano, bass, basso continuo) from 25 to 21 and sinfonias for ssBc (soprano, soprano, basso continuo) from 26 to 13. This shrinkage is not explained in the accompanying text.)

It is in the list of vocal music that the catalog has grown the most. QK’s ten-page appendix containing a selection of small-scale vocal music has expanded here to 119 pages. The amount of music listed in this section is overwhelming. Overwhelming too are the forces required for some of the works, such as the unnamed motet in eight choirs by Virgilio Mazzocchi (p. 138). This piece, with thirty-six vocal and eighteen instrumental parts, including a solitary cornett, as well as the many 18th-century sacred compositions by composers at the Viennese court (J.J. Fux, Reutter, Sances, Ziani) that include colla parte cornett parts also make obvious a cataloger’s dilemma: Where does one draw the line? Should dozens of works in which the cornett merely doubles the soprano voice be included? Does one cornett part justify inclusion of a fifty-four-voice motet?

In QK, the authors decided to list works with up to three vocal parts. In the present catalog, they do away with this limit. This was an ambitious decision, for even as the authors themselves remark: “No catalog of an instrumental repertoire can ever be complete, even within its defined limits.” A catalog without defined limits, however, runs the risk of being unmanageable, one with too narrowly defined limits, of being unrepresentative. I think the authors have made the right decision here. Although the catalog has by no means become unmanageable, the average cornettist looking for works to perform with his/her modestly sized ensemble will have to wade through lots of large-scale works to find suitable pieces. But on the other hand (and more importantly), we have here for the first
time a truly representative overview of the cornett repertoire in its many facets.

Something that I miss in this book, however, is a list of theoretical works dealing with the cornett. I mention this for two reasons. First, such a list would have been a valuable supplement to the catalog’s listings of musical sources. Secondly, such a list is indeed mentioned on page 2 of the introduction as being available in the Appendix, but it isn’t there. If something had to be sacrificed because of space limitations, as I assume happened here, would it not have made more sense to retain this quite relevant information and cut something less important? The composer index, for instance, which simply mirrors the alphabetical organization of the catalog and contains neither references made to composers in the introduction nor to those mentioned in entries other than their own (Palestrina in Bach’s entry, for example), could have been discarded without impairing the catalog’s usefulness.

The introduction is informative and well written, although as we have seen, it does contain a few errors. In it, the authors relate their considerations concerning the contents of the catalog as well as the various problems they had to confront in compiling it. I find it a bit strange, though, that they consider the changing political situation following the fall of the “Iron Curtain” to have been a “major problem” (p. 7). After all, just this upheaval has made access to several major collections possible for the first time since the end of World War II—something that the authors themselves used to good advantage.

The excursus on “The Prints” offers interesting information on the state of music publishing in Europe before 1700. Publishing trends in Italy and the countries north of the Alps (principally Germany), and reasons for the dearth of musical prints in others (England, France) are lucidly presented and considered in the context of the rise and fall of the cornett and its repertoire. (A few quibbles: The dotted curves of Graphs II and V strangely change their “spots” with every change of direction, and the labeling of the horizontal axis of Graph III is anything but user-friendly. The reference to Graph IV at the bottom of page 15 should surely read “Graph V.”)

The section on manuscripts provides short descriptions of the seven collections in which the majority of the manuscripts listed in the catalog are preserved: the Bokemeyer and Erfurt collections (both in D-B), the Grimma collection (D-Dl; contrary to the information in the text, the town of Grimma is near Leipzig), The Düben collection (S-Uu), the Bohn collection (D-B formerly in PL-WRu), the Liechtenstein collection (CS-KRa), and the Music Collection of the Austrian State Library (A-Wn).

In rereading this review, I realized, to my dismay, that it had taken on a more critical tone than I intended. The book does indeed have a few editing problems, yet I think that Michael Collver and Bruce Dickey deserve admiration for the dedication and hard work that they have put into this project over the years. Their Catalog of Music for the Cornett is a major contribution to cornett research and belongs in the library of every cornettist. Trombonists and others whose repertoires overlap with that of the cornett will also find in it a wealth of useful material.

Howard Weiner
PS Those who wish to give their personal copy of the catalog a “work-in-progress” look might want to pencil in the following information: The two sonatas by Francesco Magini (p. 59) in Ms L 155 (D-B) are the same as the sonatas La Teodola and La Bolognetti, respectively, in the Magini manuscript Sant. Hs. 2436 (D-MÜs). The Anonymous Canzon super An wasserflüssen Babylons (p. 81) rightly belongs in the instrumental not the vocal list; its basso continuo part is missing however. Bonum est confiteri by Samuel Capricornus (p. 186) can be found in the printed collection Scelta musicale (Frankfurt, 1669; RISM C 939). The Sonata à 5 by Giovanni Valentini (p. 71) is currently located in D-B (Ms. mus. 204e); the correct call number for his Sonata à 4 in D-Kl is Ms. mus 60r. The manuscript parts to Johann Störl’s 6 Sonatas (p. 70) are bound at the back of the partbooks of Gottfried Reiche’s Vier und zwanzig Neue Quatricinia now in PL-Kj. Hans Hake (p. 52) was born in Hamburg, probably in 1628, and died there after 1668. Recent research has revealed that Andrea Gabrieli (p. 52) was born ca 1533 and died in 1585.

Howard Weiner