

*Journal of the  
American Musical  
Instrument Society*

VOLUME I • 1975



Copyright by the [American Musical Instrument Society](#).  
Content may be used in accordance with the principles of fair  
use under [Section 107 of the United States Copyright Act](#).  
Content may not be reproduced for commercial purposes.

lini's trial for fraud in 1910 and a curious announcement of a selling trip to England by one of Franciolini's sons in 1911.

This book is prepared by a leading scholar for specialists engaged in the identification of poorly understood or "peculiar" musical instruments whose authenticity might be suspect. In his studies Ripin has already made more order out of Franciolini's chaos than anyone, and his book has this kind of authority behind it. Those not directly concerned with problems of instrument forgery will be fascinated by this wealth of previously-undocumented musical instrument history.

R. M. ROSENBAUM

Don L. Smithers. *The Music and History of the Baroque Trumpet before 1721*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1973. 323 pp. \$18.00.

After defining the Baroque trumpet and discussing its precursors, Mr. Smithers proceeds to consideration of Baroque-period trumpet-playing in Italy, Germany, the Austro-Bohemian Empire, England, and France. There are also chapters on the trumpet guilds and on the trumpet music of Henry Purcell. Each of these sections is based on considerable research and contains extremely well documented information on the use of trumpets, music written for them, composers, players, techniques of playing, and instruments used. Sixty pages of "An Inventory of Musical Sources for Baroque Trumpet," a bibliography, and an index complete the work.

The author has put together a most authoritative work, the bulk of which rests securely on written records and music of the period. Most of the material supports views established by earlier writers, but the role of Italy in the development of Baroque trumpet playing is considerably strengthened.

Mr. Smithers' style is straightforward and concise, and it is with surprise that one reads a rather petty attack on a statement of Anthony Baines.

Pitch designations throughout the book give c as middle C instead of c' as is more commonly encountered. A table on page 20

notes that this will be done without explaining the necessity for creating this minor bit of confusion.

The book is an important gathering of sources which speak for themselves. We are in debt to Mr. Smithers for a great deal of excellent spadework.

ROBERT ELIASON

*Mr. Smithers replies:*

I should like the following communication to be drawn to your readers' notice in response to a review of my book, *The Music and History of the Baroque Trumpet before 1721*.

There are two statements in your reviewer's critique which I feel to be incorrect and require some comment. In the third paragraph of the review there is the following comment: "... it is with surprise that one reads a rather petty attack on a statement of Anthony Baines." The only nonbibliographic reference in my book to Anthony Baines is found on page 52 and refers to the dating of the earliest surviving (dated) trumpet, the Montini trumpet from Siena inscribed "1523." I mention that Curt Sachs was "probably correct in stating that the Siena trumpet is the oldest known dated instrument." I then add the following, "Anthony Baines in his article on the trumpet in *Grove's Dictionary of Music and Musicians* states that 'The oldest surviving specimens are rare sixteenth-century work by the famous Nuremberg maker Anton Schnitzer. ...'" As I then point out, none of the Schnitzer family is likely to have made any trumpets before the Montini instrument. It therefore comes as a surprise to see in what way my remarks could possibly be construed as an attack on Baines. If Baines has published an incorrect statement or one that leaves an erroneous impression about something as important as the earliest surviving European trumpet that can be dated with certainty, then it behooves a scholar to correct such information when more precise data are known. This is known as *science*. I do not think there is anything about my remarks that can be taken as petty faultfinding.

The second statement in your reviewer's critique ought not to be left uncorrected. In the penultimate paragraph he nit-picks over