

*Journal of the
American Musical
Instrument Society*

VOLUME V–VI • 1979–80



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.

Anvers au 16^e siècle," by Nicolas Meeùs, the assistant editor of the *Bulletin* (pp. 55–64); this paper is, in fact, the only contribution from the Brussels Museum per se, an indication of just how broadly based a forum the editors hope to make of their publication. Meeùs discusses the position of the Brussels Museum's polygonal virginal by Joes Karest near the beginning of a hypothetical line of development from the *épinette* to the *muselar*. He not only describes the nature of these two types of instruments more precisely than had previously been done but also suggests some experiments which might show why the *muselar* eventually became the most prevalent form of virginal in Flanders. Meeùs's contribution is original and shows what sort of results can be obtained from creative investigation of a set of organological classifications.

All in all, *The Brussels Museum of Musical Instruments Bulletin* shows promise of providing a most valuable contribution to the budding discipline of organology. It is well printed in a generous (8½"×11") format on good-quality paper (one does wish, however, that it were bound in signatures rather than glued), and there seems to be an unlimited budget for illustration (O'Brien's article alone contains seventeen quarter-page photographs, and there is a stunning color photograph of the Hans Ruckers (I) mother-and-child virginals loaned by the Metropolitan Museum of Art for the 1974 exhibition in Antwerp). Let us wish the *Bulletin* a long life which continues to fulfill its early promise.

R. PETER WOLF

Smithsonian Institution, Division of Musical Instruments Staff. *A Checklist of Keyboard Instruments at the Smithsonian Institution*. Second Edition. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1975. 82 pp.; 7 figures. \$2.00 (plus \$.45 mailing; available from the Smithsonian Bookstore, National Museum of History and Technology, Washington, D.C. 20560).

When in 1959 the directors and curators of a number of large instrument museums and divisions and some private collectors con-

vened at the Gemeentemuseum in The Hague, a list of tasks to be fulfilled on an international basis by these museums and collections was drawn up. One of the tasks, agreed upon by all present, was to be the drawing up of mimeographed checklists of the items in the museums and collections involved, which were then to be circulated so that researchers, instrument makers, and musicians would be able to ascertain with a few quick glances where there were instruments that might interest them. Very few of those present, I am afraid, indeed drew up such checklists. The reason for the nonappearance of checklists of many museums and collections was, I think, not so much laziness or lack of organization, but in most cases lack of enough qualified staff.

In 1959 the Smithsonian Institution was not represented at these meetings, as no instrument specialist had been appointed at that time. When, however, in 1961 Cynthia Adams, now Cynthia Hoover, was charged with the Division of Musical Instruments of the Institution, she saw clearly that one of the many impending tasks was to be the recataloguing of the entire collection of musical instruments (4,000 items). The recording of the keyboard collection was given priority for two reasons: for its numeric (224 items) and qualitative importance, and for its absence from the *Handbook of the Collection of Musical Instruments in the United States National Museum*, as the Smithsonian Institution was then called, published by Frances Densmore in 1927. Since a scientific catalogue of such a comparatively large number of technologically complicated objects—as keyboard instruments are—cannot be conjured into being at short notice, a checklist of the keyboards was not published until 1967.

Well-functioning museums (and the Smithsonian undoubtedly belongs to this category) are never static. New acquisitions are made; research on certain items makes former attributions and dates questionable; new publications appear; instruments are restored; more phonograph records, more technical drawings, more photographs, more radiographs are produced. Therefore, a checklist, such as the one published in 1967 of the Smithsonian keyboards, rapidly becomes obsolete.

Now a second edition of the keyboard checklist with twenty additional instruments has been published. Like the 1967 edition, it

is subdivided into pianos, "harpsichords," clavichords, organs (including free reed instruments), and miscellaneous (comprising mainly automatic instruments with keyboard and electronic organs). Precise indications are given of photographic negatives, from which prints can be acquired, technical drawings, publications concerning and recordings of the instruments in question. The only suggestion I would like to make is not to use "harpsichord" both as a generic term and as a specific one (in contrast to virginals, spinets, and clavictheria). As a generic term, "plucked (stringed) keyboard instruments" is, if more prolix, clearer.

For each instrument the maker, the catalogue number, the place of origin, the date, the type, the compass, and the negative number are listed. For harpsichords and organs the disposition is added, and for pianos data concerning the "pedals," which include hand stops and knee levers. As it does not seem etymologically correct to speak about "hand pedals" and "knee pedals," might I suggest "stops" as a generic term, to be subdivided into those actioned by hand, knee, or foot? Also it might be useful to specify the stops of each piano. In many cases their effects can be easily ascertained.

There are a few places where greater accuracy might be attained. Some examples follow here: The Jean-Louis Dulcken grand (formerly listed alphabetically under Stein, but now correctly attributed) is listed as "Munich? 1790–1800." No question mark is needed behind Munich, and the *FF–g'''* compass does not occur in Germany, as far as I know, before 1795. For the same reason the dating "between 1780 and 1800" of the Gottlob Emanuel Rűfner, Nuremberg, square piano with the same compass is slightly on the optimistic side. The Meincke and Pieter Meyer, Amsterdam, square piano with the compass *FF–f'''* is dated "between 1789 and 1806." The *terminus ante quem* is probably correct, as an instrument of these makers with the compass *FF–c''''* can be dated ca. 1808. The *terminus post quem* is, however, slightly pessimistic, as a *FF–f'''* square from their workshop dated 1786 is preserved. It is helpful that initials and incomplete Christian names of makers in signatures are completed between square brackets. For ignorant researchers—of which there is a surprising number, at least in Europe—it might be useful to complete "Stein, André" to "Stein, Mathäus Andreas." The extremely inter-

esting *spinettone* (as Cristofori terms the type in his 1700 Medici inventory), correctly termed "transverse harpsichord" in the checklist, is listed as being made by an unknown maker. It is practically identical with an instrument in private possession at Pistoia, which bears the signature of Giovanni Ferrini, a pupil of Cristofori. Therefore, it might be better to label it "probably Ferrini" rather than "possibly Cristofori."

These are a few suggestions that might be useful for the next edition. On the whole, however, this checklist is drawn up with admirable scholarship and will be extremely useful to all those interested in the field of keyboard instruments.

JOHN HENRY VAN DER MEER

Alfred J. Hipkins. *A Description and History of the Pianoforte and of the Older Keyboard Stringed Instruments*. Introduction by Edwin M. Ripin. Reprint of 3d ed., 1929. Detroit: Information Coordinators, 1975. xv, 130 pp.; 11 black-and-white plates.

Helen Rice Hollis. *The Piano: A Pictorial Account of Its Ancestry and Development*. New York: Hippocrene Books, Inc., 1975. 120 pp.; 102 plates. \$12.50.

For readers seriously interested in exploring the fundamentals of piano design and construction, no better, more concise survey can be found than Alfred James Hipkins's (1826–1903) venerable *Description and History of the Pianoforte*. In Edwin Ripin's introduction to the reprinted third edition (1929), in which he discusses the broad scope of Hipkins's pioneering studies, Ripin quite rightly calls this "one of the most extraordinary books about musical instruments ever written and a model for the lucid exposition of a complex and technical subject." It is not too much to say, humbly, that during the eighty years since this little book first appeared (1896) no individual has explained the piano's workings with greater clarity and precision. While more detail is known now of the piano's history and ancestors,