

*Journal of the
American Musical
Instrument Society*

VOLUME III • 1977



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.

fascinating to peruse. There remains the question whether this kind of quasi-encyclopedic survey, a pioneering effort in the hands of Sachs, fulfills expectations of half a century later. This reviewer believes not.

LAURENCE LIBIN

Lenz Meierott. *Die geschichtliche Entwicklung der kleinen Flötentypen und ihre Verwendung in der Musik des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts*. Würzburger Musikhistorische Beiträge (Wolfgang Osthoff, Editor), vol. 4. Tutzing: Hans Schneider, 1974. 279 pp. plus 33 black-and-white plates. DM 80.

Lenz Meierott's study of the development of small flute types (flageolets, recorders starting on c^2 or higher, other little duct flutes with fewer fingerholes, one-hand flutes or galoubets, small fifes, and piccolos) and their use in music of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries draws on a remarkable wealth of sources. Soundly researched and well documented, it fills an important gap in recent instrumental studies for, as the author points out, the development, playing technique, and musical use of the small flute types, which often strongly depart from those of the larger flutes, have been treated heretofore only marginally. The flageolet, perhaps the most overlooked of all these instruments in recent literature, is given the fullest treatment; indeed the author's occupation with it gave the impulse to the rest of the study. But his inclusion of other small flute types is essential, since the problematic interpretation of designations in musical scores and parts referring to high flutes—"petite flûte," "petite dessus de flûte," "flageolet," "flûte de tambourin" or merely "tambourin," "flauto piccolo," "flautino," etc.—cannot be adequately understood without an awareness of the special qualities and historical development of all the instruments.

Early in *Die kleinen Flötentypen* Meierott corrects a widespread error, drawing on a little-known study by Hermann Moeck: the flageolet with four front fingerholes and two rear thumbholes was probably *not* invented by the Sieur de Juvigny around 1581; rather the libretto of the *Ballet de la Roynie* probably meant to say that the

god Pan, whom Juvigny represented, was the inventor of the instrument. Moreover the type of flageolet it refers to is probably the “flageolet à plusieurs tuyaux” (panpipes), not the simple flageolet. (Somewhat earlier Meierott mistakenly cites Machaut’s *Remède de Fortune* as the source of two lines about pairs of “flajos” [p. 21]; the correct source is Machaut’s *La Prise d’Alexandrie*.) Among other surprising facts related to the flageolet that emerge are the appearance in England of four different methods devoted to it before the appearance of the first recorder method (1679) and the publication in Paris alone of thirteen flageolet methods between 1800 and 1813.

Meierott’s treatment of the development of the different types of instruments themselves is generally good, and he has drawn up important tables showing his own detailed measurements of a good many small flutes of various kinds. I am especially grateful for his attempts to distinguish more precisely between the fife, on the one hand, and the transverse flute and piccolo on the other. But he is not altogether consistent: on page 97 he suggests that all eighteenth-century fifes were cylindrically bored, while on pages 99–100 he mentions two “kleine Querpfeifen” dating from ca. 1700 that are weakly conical. He probably also ought to have considered longer fifes (one is illustrated in the *Encyclopédie*, and instruments that go as low as e^1 are extant—see p. 101) at greater length before deciding whether parts designating “fifre” were to be played at written pitch or at the octave above.

One minor correction regarding the first source the author cites that speaks about the existence of the one-keyed piccolo—Michel Corrette’s *Méthode pour la flûte traversière*—is that this treatise was probably not published around 1735 but in 1740, as I demonstrate elsewhere in this *Journal* (Bowers, “New Light,” n. 57). A larger concern is the author’s suggestion that the piccolo probably entered the opera orchestra in France around 1735 and more or less supplanted the recorder in f^2 there by 1740 (pp. 174–175). I find his arguments about range not convincing since many of the post-1735 parts he includes could easily be played on the recorder in f^2 , and their upward expansion probably represents an overall development in instrumental music of this period as much as anything

else. Secondly, I question his arguments based on key since all the high flute parts between 1700 and 1735 he mentions, naturally principally intended for a high recorder because of the later development of the piccolo, are nevertheless in the very keys said to be the "plus favorables" for the piccolo by Francoeur's *Diapason général* (cited on p. 106), whereas only the post-1735 parts include two in keys *not* among Francoeur's most favorable ones, and these (F and B $\flat$) are in keys everyone deems more suitable for the recorder than for the flute. (The nicely documented change in designation from "flûte traversière" to simply "flûte" for the standard instrument around 1735-1740 is based on many more precise markings.) Of course the continued use of the imprecise designation "petite flûte" witnessed the gradual shift over to the predominant use of the piccolo that was complete by 1761 (see p. 105).

Several other alternative interpretations that I see in the material Meierott presents about the use of small flute types are: (1) The second "flautino" part in No. VI of Schütz's *Symphoniae sacrae I* has too many c $\sharp$'s for it to be playable on a recorder in c 2 ; a recorder in g 1 would work much better for that part. (2) The "zuf-folo" parts in Keiser's *Croesus* are certainly playable on the fife as well as on the recorder in d 2 . (3) Since in Mozart's "Kanarienvogel" trio (KV 600, no. 5) the "flauto piccolo" part exactly repeats what the "flauto" (transverse flute) plays before it, though it sounds an octave higher, the closer relationship of the piccolo to the flute than of the flageolet to the flute suggests to me that the former instrument is a more reasonable choice for this part. The eighteenth-century piccolo was considerably less shrill than most modern ones, too, and should not have been too loud for a trio calling for reduced forces, as Meierott suggests it would. (4) Since Meierott calls attention to a (albeit later) Tuerlinckx piccolo marked G with a lowest note of g 2 (p. 112), I would not rule out the possibility that such an instrument existed earlier and that Mozart could have had it in mind for the *Entführung aus dem Serail* part marked "flauto piccolo in G" (Meierott would assign it to the flageolet).

Nevertheless, the information drawn together about the use of little flute types forms an extremely important contribution to our knowledge of performance practice. The author makes crucial dis-

tinctions between the “fiffaro” and “piffaro” and demonstrates convincingly that Monteverdi’s “flautino alla vigesima seconda” was a recorder with the lowest note of c^2 , not c^3 . He discusses the kinds of pieces in which a designation of only “petite flûte” or “tambourin” probably signified the galoubet. He wrestles with the problem of when a part was played at pitch and when above. He quite fascinatingly considers the kinds of dramatic and musical situations in which not only high flutes but also lower ones normally took part, and he also traces the development of orchestral writing for the higher instruments.

From a technical point of view, I find his method of describing nontransposing instruments with, for example, a lowest note (and basic scale) of D as being in C, and of describing a smaller instrument of the same type with a lowest note (and basic scale) of F as being in E $\flat$, confusing. Merely giving the lowest pitch of the instrument or stating the relationship between its lowest note and that of the standard instrument of its type is not only clearer but also reflects the manner in which seventeenth- and eighteenth-century sources spoke of these instruments. I also object to the author’s description of a part being notated, for example, in G when on the page it clearly appears to be in the key of A (p. 34); what he means is that the instrument itself could be considered to be in G since it transposes up a twelfth. Other difficulties arise for the reader from the organization of the plate material; in one instance I found myself having to flip back and forth between more than four different pages to follow the author’s argument—the page on which he described several instruments, the end of the paragraph on the following page that gave the numbers of the plates illustrating these instruments (pp. 59–60), the plates themselves at the back of the book, and the list of plates that told which of the instruments was represented in a given plate. Some of the plates themselves are too small to be clear in what they illustrate (as in the case of the *Wellenprofil*), and some of the fingering charts do not clearly show the difference between open, closed, and half-closed holes (the fourth hole of Mersenne’s fingering for $f^{\#1}$ on page 50 should be open, for example). Clearly these are problems that vex the reader needlessly.

Nevertheless *Die kleinen Flötentypen* is a successful book. It is not surprising that a work that brings together so many diverse kinds of material about matters that call for a good deal of speculation should have some weaknesses and suggest interpretations that differ from the author's. On balance I find it much more often sound and revealing than open to question, and the marvelous detail it contains provides its readers with about all the sources they need to come to their own conclusions, a situation that speaks well for the excellence of research and objectivity of the author. Not only because it stands unique in its field, but also because it is comprehensive and thoughtful, it will be indispensable for anyone interested in the small flute types, whether they be instrument specialists, instrument makers, musicologists dealing with the repertoire that calls for these instruments, or performers seeking to perform the same.

JANE BOWERS

Orpha Ochse. *The History of the Organ in the United States*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1975. 494 pp. \$22.50.

This book is invaluable to all students of the history of organ design. Not only is it comprehensive in scope, it is also overwhelmingly well documented. Written from a broadly informed historical perspective, it is organized in a manner that elucidated the cultural and economic contexts within which the construction and use of organs took place, from the beginnings of this country to the present.

It appropriately begins with a survey of what is known about the earliest instruments that appeared in what is now the United States: those built for the Spanish missions of the West. The almost total disappearance of numbers of small Spanish and Mexican organs which came to the Western missions before 1700 is properly lamented; this loss is also a comment on the "American" disregard for the past, an attitude only beginning to dissipate in the second half of the present century.

Documentation of organ history, especially of the recent past, is