

*Journal of the
American Musical
Instrument Society*

VOLUME XXIII • 1997



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.

In discussing "The Background to Bach's Fifth Brandenburg Concerto," Pieter Dirksen explores two sources of the work which predate the dedication autograph of 1721 and suggests that it, as well as other instrumental works, was composed at least in part before Bach's move to Cöthen. In so doing, he reveals a number of instances in which the earlier versions were updated and improved for the autograph score.

Werner Breig's "Zur Werkgeschichte von Johann Sebastian Bachs Cembalokonzert in A-dur BWV 1055" is the only article not translated into English; an editorial note indicates that this "detailed study is so closely linked with his work on the relevant volume of the *Neue Bach Ausgabe* (NBA VII/4) and its accompanying *Kritischer Bericht* that it was considered best to leave it untranslated." This study presents new evidence on the evolution of the A-major concerto, considering the sources and their implications for performance.

Completing the volume is "The Chromatic Fantasia of Johann Sebastian Bach and the Genesis of Musical 'Sturm und Drang' " by Peter Schleuning. After extensive background material on the literary origin and meaning of *Sturm und Drang*, the author points to elements of it in the Chromatic Fantasia, while also advancing the case for this composition (ca. 1720) as a tombeau for Bach's first wife Maria Barbara, who died in July 1720. He also sees Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach's C-minor Fantasia of 1753 as a tombeau for J. S. Bach, based on the model of the Chromatic Fantasia.

The Harpsichord and its Repertoire is an anthology of wide-ranging essays, touching on the instruments, the music, the sources, and performance practice. It should accordingly be of value to all who are interested in the historical harpsichord and its literature.

ARTHUR LAWRENCE

MANHATTAN SCHOOL OF MUSIC

Tula Giannini. *Great Flute Makers of France: The Lot and Godfroy Families, 1650–1900*. London: Tony Bingham, 1993. xxvi, 245 pp.: 8 charts, 2 ports., 64 facsim., 98 black-and-white photographs. ISBN: 0-946113-05-X. £44.00.

In this volume on the history of the most illustrious families of French woodwind makers from 1650 to 1900, Tula Giannini presents previously unavailable documentation that includes some of this century's most

significant archival finds on the subject. The book is illustrated with 98 black-and-white plates, showing not only facsimiles of 36 manuscript documents and 18 printed items, but also clear, page-length photographs of 106 woodwind instruments, most of them never published before.

The central subject of the book is Louis Lot (1807–1896), whose instruments became the official standard at the Paris Conservatoire in 1860. They are still—usually after extensive rebuilding—considered the paragon of the French-style Boehm flute by an influential coterie of modern players, most notably William Bennett and Trevor Wye. The workshop Lot operated in partnership with Vincent Hypolite Godfroy (1806–1868) developed the first conical Boehm 1832-system flute to be made outside Boehm’s own workshop, and bought the exclusive rights to his cylindrical flute of 1847 in August of that year. The prologue to these momentous events makes up the book’s first three chapters, documenting by means of birth records, marriage contracts, and inventories the lives and work of Thomas Lot III (1708–1787), Clair Godfroy *l’aîné* (1774–1841), and a host of more obscure figures related to them by ties of blood or business.

Where did all this new information come from, and how does it change what we knew before? These routine questions are exceptionally difficult to answer. The book contains no index of the source documents (though endnote references are given for quotations), and Giannini avoids referring to previous literature on the grounds that what exists is full of “inaccuracies,” that “fundamental questions have been left unanswered,” and that her book “is based on heretofore unknown primary source material” (p. xxv). However, readers led by these remarks to expect this work to espouse higher-than-average standards of accuracy or to provide its own perspective and context for the documents, unfortunately will not find much satisfaction.

Since some documents are presented in facsimile, Giannini’s version of them may be checked against the originals. On p. 72 a translation of an 1841 Godfroy inventory is given, with a photograph of the original document in plate 36. Part of the text reads as follows (accents are transcribed as in the facsimile):

Instruments

Une flute a huit clefs en argent, patte d’ut (en Boite)

Jurée trente francs

30..

Une autre flute a six clefs & garnitures d'argent jurée vingt cinq francs	25..
Trois flutes a cinq clefs & garnitures d'argent jurées soixante francs	60..

The translation reads:

Instruments

An eight-keyed flute mounted in silver, C-foot, with case	30 francs
A six-keyed flute mounted in silver	25 francs
3 five-keyed flutes mounted in silver	60 francs

A correct translation would be:

Instruments

A flute with eight silver keys, C-foot (in case) Estimate thirty francs	30
Another flute with six keys & mounts of silver estimate twenty-five francs	25
Three flutes with five keys & mounts of silver estimate sixty francs	60

To take the most obvious example, an eight-keyed flute mounted in silver is not the same thing as a flute with eight silver keys. If such details are not so very important, one wonders why this and so many other inventories are included.

Translations of legal documents and letters ought to make more interesting reading than long lists of objects, but owing to poor translation their meaning is often obscure, and can sometimes only be deduced by consulting or guessing the French and re-translating. Faulty tenses, number, and technical language are frequent. For example, the company charter of an 1833 partnership lays down that the company “aura pour raison sociale . . .”—which means, “shall have as its trade name”—Godfroy fils et Lot. But the translation reads that the company “will be for social reasons” Godfroy fils et Lot (p. 101)—the verb *to be* forced to do duty for the verb *to have*. In Giannini’s translation the charter’s language, legal jargon notwithstanding, makes little sense—or none at all if the punctuation is interpreted strictly: “The signature will be collective and be carried by each of us who cannot employ it particularly without the concurrence of both of us, at the penalty of nullifying all that will be made, contrary to the present clause.” Such

awkward and incorrect English continually vexes the reader: throughout the book “actuellement” is translated “actually” instead of “now”; “améliorer” is “ameliorate” rather than “improve”; “soit . . . soit,” meaning “either . . . or,” is rendered as “be it . . . be it.” Difficult or unusual expressions are simply left in French, like the “indemnité à titre de gratification proportionné” (compensation by right of parity) on p. 80, or the lathes “en l’air” (lathes for faceplate or steady-rest turning) and “à pointes” (center lathes) on p. 157, or the “grand justesse” possessed by the instruments of Godfroy *l’ainé* on p. 214 (which means they were “very well in tune”). A famous passage in François Devienne’s *Nouvelle méthode théorique et pratique pour la flûte* (Paris, 1794), variously dated in the book 1795 (p. 52) and 1794 (p. 78), becomes “the simplest manner being according to me, the best, I cannot recommend too much students to put them into practice as much as they would be able to.”

Other inaccuracies include citations of printed sources with wrong dates, misnumbered plate references, and typographical errors so abundant that no date, spelling, or citation seems quite trustworthy. The two-page bibliography contains a high proportion of incomplete, inconsistent, or misspelled items, while the list of archives on p. 233 is printed without indented subheadings, making it useless as a key to the location of the documents cited.

The book leaves the scholar with many frustrations, but the general reader will have no easy time of it either. A good index fortunately makes finding particular pieces of information possible, but because the text focuses narrowly on Giannini’s documents and hers alone, the selection and sequence of the material in the text are fatiguing and often confusing to follow, while numerous highly discursive annotations (note 77, p. 52; or note 13, pp. 144–47, for instance), distract the reader who is trying to piece together a sense of continuity.

The volume contains two appendices. The first lists serial numbers of Louis Lot flutes from 1855 to 1951, with the exception of wood flutes after 1891. This information may be useful for antique flute owners and dealers. But they will be unable, as perhaps they might wish, to check its accuracy since no source is cited. (Some of it may come from Lot’s *Journal* for 1855–1864, which according to a caption in the list of plates on p. xix is in the author’s private collection.) Appendix 2 contains reports on French woodwinds at the international exhibitions, 1823 to 1900. The 1862 exhibition report (pp. 222–23) is presented as providing

“a valuable perspective” on European instrument making, whereas on the contrary the rich chauvinism of its French authors, particularly their anti-German sentiment, passes without comment.

Turning from the documents to Giannini’s description of the instruments that her subjects manufactured, precisely the opposite problem arises: the reader is presented the results of an analysis with nothing, save for the photographs, to support them. The biographical information in the book makes a significant contribution to the study of these instruments, for example by providing for the first time a framework for attributing and dating flutes with stamps from the Naust-Pelletier-Delerablée-Naust-Lot workshop. However, with a single exception in the third paragraph of p. 110, the assertions in the book about flutes themselves are insufficiently substantiated. Each maker’s or workshop’s output is classified with mechanical regularity into “early,” “middle,” and “late” periods, using only the appearance of the instruments as a guide. Apparently none of the physical evidence crucial to such determinations is considered: bore; materials and manufacturing technique of tubes and mechanisms; the size, location, and undercutting of embouchure and toneholes. Here too there are errors: a flute shown in Michel Corrette’s *Méthode pour apprendre aisément à jouer de la flûte traversière* (Paris, most reliably dated ca. 1740 rather than ca. 1735) is stated on p. 43 to resemble in appearance an instrument of Lot’s “early” pattern. Rather, it resembles a Bizey flute (Bate Collection, University of Oxford, no. 106)—one of several rare types, including some by Naust (e.g., Museum Vleeshuis, Antwerp, no. 3741; Suga [private collection], Tokyo, ex Sotheby’s 11-22-89, lot 16, illus.) and Lot (Guy Oldham [private collection], London), left out of Giannini’s implausibly tidy analysis.

Assertions about how the instruments were used likewise are made without due regard for source material and its character. If there is new evidence that “[Johann Baptist] Wendling played the one-keyed flute throughout his career” (p. 32), we certainly ought to expect it to be cited. Instead it seems likely that this bold statement is spun out from the old yarn of Andrew Ashe’s 1774 flute lessons with Wendling, who professed dislike of Ashe’s keyed flute by Richard Potter (see Richard Shephard Roskstro, *A Treatise on the Construction, the History and the Practice of the Flute* [London: Rudall, Carte & Co., 1890], paragraph 890). In the nearly quarter-century remaining before his death Wendling had plenty of time to try other keyed flutes than Potter’s and to

change his mind, as many other professional players seem to have done.

Because this volume's new documents shed so much light on their subject, its careless preparation is all the more regrettable. The papers reproduced in facsimile, together with the photographs of instruments, justify the book's price, but the material set in type falls far below acceptable standards. It deserved better.

ARDAL POWELL

FOLKERS & POWELL, MAKERS OF HISTORICAL FLUTES
HUDSON, NEW YORK

David Lasocki, with Roger Prior. *The Bassanos: Venetian Musicians and Instrument Makers in England, 1531–1665*. Aldershot, Hants., England: Scholar Press; Brookfield, Vt.: Ashgate, 1995. xxxvi, 288 pp.: 2 black-and-white photos, 7 black-and-white drawings, 8 tables, 5 musical examples. ISBN: 0-85967-943-8. \$67.95.

Among the many musical dynasties of the Renaissance and Baroque, the Bassano family stands out for the sheer number and importance of its members, and for its influence on the musical life of England and Italy. The researcher interested in writing the history of such a numerous family faces some very daunting obstacles: simply tracing family relationships sometimes can be nearly impossible, as names recur from generation to generation, and court or church scribes fail to distinguish between individuals with similar names. The tendency to use only the first names of individuals in official records also clouds the picture: when one finds a reference to a "Zuane musico" in a sixteenth-century Italian document, for instance, that name could usually refer to anyone of a half-dozen similarly named musicians in town.

In the case of the Bassanos, researchers have despaired at times of ever being able to disentangle the complex family tree, and thus to gain a clearer picture of the family's activities. Progress in that direction has been slow, incremental, and often due to pure serendipity. This is true for my own research: I have found a couple of documents about the Bassano family in Venetian archives while looking in notary records for something quite different. David Lasocki, however, has taken giant strides towards a complete reconstruction of the activities of the English Bassanos through his own skillful, methodical, and detailed research.