The Impermanence of Obsolescence:
Performance Practice Challenges in Works Written for Revival Harpsichord

BY

KRISTINA CAMPBELL ZUELICKE

A dissertation

submitted to the Victoria University of Wellington
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Musical Arts

Victoria University of Wellington

2017

Abstract

The revival harpsichord leads a double life today—enjoying a small fan base on the edge of obsolescence. Most regard the instrument as a twentieth-century foil to the more historically-oriented harpsichords that replaced them by around the mid-1970s. But they are also valued for the repertoire they inspired during the first seventy or so years of the twentieth century, along with their unique capabilities and signature sound. From mid-century onwards, when historical harpsichords began to gain a wider acceptance, revival harpsichords were derided as representing a false notion of teleological progress. Piano building technologies partially adapted to the construction of revival harpsichords have required compromises that ignore basic laws of the physics of sound—including the differences between plucking a string and striking it with hammer. The ontology of a harpsichord type that is piano-informed has led to a widespread conclusion that revival harpsichords are a mistaken concept and are unsuitable even for many of the compositions written for them. The common practice today is to adapt works written for revival harpsichord to historical harpsichords.

Limited attention has been given to revival harpsichords in recent academic literature. While mention is made of their historical significance, a current evaluation of the instruments and treatment of revival repertoire has been lacking. This dissertation seeks to critically assess instruments and repertoire by examining perspectives of authors, builders, performers, composers and critics, addressing current issues in performance practice such as the impact of changing instrumentation from revival to historical models. A case is made for valuing revival harpsichords on their own merits as well as applying first-hand knowledge of revival harpsichords to performances of revival repertoire on historical models. This methodology is supported by interviews conducted specifically for this dissertation, playing different revival models and in presenting information neither widely available nor understood, such as a picture of the current availability of revival instruments and details of their restoration.

This dissertation contributes to an understanding of revival harpsichords and their repertoire by, firstly, providing up-to-date information on the nature and history of the instrument, as well as highlighting the existence of many revival models, rather than

accepting the notion of one standard type. Secondly, revival harpsichord reception is examined within a context of the changing purposes of harpsichord construction after 1889. Lastly, a selection of relevant repertoire is investigated, including Erik Bergman's 1970 *Energien* for solo harpsichord (a critical edition of which also forms part of the Appendices), Darius Milhaud's 1945 *Sonata for Clavecin (or Piano) and Violin*, op. 257, and Peter Child's *Concerto for Harpsichord and String Quartet* (2005), which was written for an Eric Herz revival harpsichord.

A tradition already exists of compromising over and discussing which historical harpsichords to use for early music repertoire that spans centuries and the building practices of different geographic regions. This dissertation explores the extent to which revival harpsichords are indeed easily replaced by historical models for revival repertoire, or whether it is sometimes best practice to consider performing these works on the instruments for which they were originally conceived. Alternatively, the performer of a revival work may choose to take certain features of revival instruments into account in developing a performance interpretation on a historical model. Factors hindering performance on historical harpsichords can include performance practice challenges and controversies that arise when transferring pieces to these instruments. Some works defy straightforward alteration and require extensive editing, whereas others are more easily accommodated. Through an examination of repertoire in performance, interviews, and changes in the reception and use of revival harpsichords, this dissertation considers the position and relevance of revival harpsichords today.

Table of Contents

Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	ix
List of Abbreviations	xi
List of Illustrations	xii
Note on Terminology	xv
Preface	xvii
Chapter One	
Revival Harpsichords: Inception of an Idea	1
1.1. Introducing Revival Harpsichords	1
Selected Purposes of Revival Harpsichord Design	2
Revival Harpsichords and Automobiles	3
Defining Revival Harpsichords	5
1.2. Revival Harpsichord History	6
Harpsichords in the Nineteenth Century	6
Constructing Revival Harpsichords for the Paris Exposition of 1889	10
Early Revival Instruments by Érard, Pleyel and Tomasini	12
Attitudes at the Time of the 1889 Paris Exposition	16
1.3. The Development of Popular French Factory Harpsichords by Pleyel	20
1.4. German Factory Instruments of J. C. Neupert	23
1.5. Periods of Harpsichord Building in the Twentieth Century	26
1.6. Toward Historical Models: England and the United States	27
Arnold Dolmetsch	27
The United States	28
1.7. Summary and Conclusion	35
Chapter Two	
Revival Harpsichord Reception	37
Part One: Alternative Fates of Revival Harpsichords	38
2.1. Overview of Recent Locations of Revival Harpsichords	38
2.2. Are Revival Harpsichords Obsolete?	39

2.3. Impassioned Speech	40
2.4. A Range of Perspectives	41
2.5. Restoration of Three Revival Harpsichords	43
Part Two: Chronology of Revival Reception	47
2.6. Early Reception: 1892–1912	47
The Evolutionary View of Keyboard Instruments	48
The Arts and Crafts Influence	49
Landowska’s Pleyel <i>Grand modèle de concert</i>	51
2.7. Gaining Acceptance: Revival Harpsichords 1912–1930s	53
2.8. Popular Appeal and Variety in the 1940s	57
2.9. Changing Tastes: 1950s–1980	58
Harpsichord Preferences at the Bruges Harpsichord Festival: 1965–1980	63
Part Three: Stereotypes	65
2.10. Reception of Revival Harpsichord “Gadgets”: the 16’ Register and Pedals	65
Destigmatising the 16’	68
Pedals	69
2.11. Terms Associated with Revival Harpsichords	69
2.12. Factors in the Reception of Volume	70
2.13. Amplification: Wittmayer Elektronik harpsichord	72
2.14. Summary: Valuing Revival Harpsichords	74
Chapter Three	
Performing Works for Revival Harpsichord Today	75
Part One: Overview	76
3.1. Contemporary Repertoire Prior to 1974	76
3.2. Revival Score Availability	79
3.3. Twentieth-Century Historical Authenticity	80
3.4. Instrument Availability	83

3.5. Which Harpsichord?	85
Part Two: Perspectives	86
3.6. Perspectives on Interpreting Contemporary Harpsichord Scores	86
3.7. Instrumentation for Ligeti and Xenakis	88
3.8. Sonic Expectations	91
3.9. Applying Experiences with Revival Harpsichords to Historical Harpsichords	92
3.10. Technique and Articulation	93
3.11. Issues in Revival Harpsichord Technique	97
Part Three: Case Studies	103
3.12. Three Case Studies – Bergman, Milhaud and Child	104
3.13. Erik Bergman’s <i>Energien</i> , op.66 (1970)	104
Process	105
3.14. Darius Milhaud’s <i>Sonata for Clavecin (or Piano) and Violin</i> , op. 257 (1945)	106
Style and Tempo	106
3.15. Score Discrepancies in Milhaud’s <i>Sonata</i> , op. 257	108
3.16. Performance Notes to Milhaud’s <i>Sonata</i> , op. 257	111
3.17. Example of the 16’ in Recent Compositional Practice: <i>Concerto for Harpsichord and String Quartet</i> by Peter Child (2005)	112
3.18. Summary I: Evaluating Differences	115
3.19. Summary II: Selected Suggestions for Altering Revival Works for Historical Harpsichord	117
Registration	118
Dynamics	118
Articulation	119
Conclusion	120
Appendices	
I. Summary of Selected Builders and Harpsichordists	122
II. Registration Combinations on Alastair McAllister’s 1963 Pleyel	125

III.	Revival Harpsichord Works Performed during DMA Candidature	128
IV.	Critical Edition of Erik Bergman's <i>Energien</i> (1970)	129
V.	Manuscript of Darius Milhaud's <i>Sonata for Clavecin (or Piano) and Violin</i> , op. 257 (1945)	141
VI.	Performance Notes to Darius Milhaud's <i>Sonata for Clavecin and Violin</i> , op. 257, for a Double-Manual Historical Harpsichord	153
Bibliography		155

Acknowledgements

This dissertation was made possible by those who have given generously of their time, including Melbourne-based builder Alastair McAllister, who has provided me with multiple opportunities to learn about revival instruments and twentieth-century performance practice, along with access to a 1963 Pleyel he has restored. Professor Emeritus Mark Kroll in Boston, with whom I enjoyed three summers of lessons and interviews, has lent insights into the performance and history of contemporary harpsichord music, not only through his own career, but in connection to his former teacher at Yale University, Ralph Kirkpatrick (1911–1984), who is mentioned throughout this dissertation.

Further interest was shown by others, such as Managing Director and fourth generation of the J. C. Neupert historical keyboard firm, Wolfgang Dieter Neupert, who wrote: “I was pleased to receive your email and that you are writing a doctoral dissertation about revival harpsichords, as they have up to now been rather ignored in the academic literature.”¹

A visit to the Berlin Musikinstrumenten-Museum in 2014 furnished my introduction into playing a variety of revival harpsichords. I am grateful for the assistance of curator Dr. Martin Elste and restorer Sabine Hoffmann, who even fished out an electric cable so I could play the Wittmayer Elektronik harpsichord previously owned by the Berlin Philharmonic. Harpsichordist Donald Nicolson, owner of a 1956 Thomas Goff revival model in Melbourne restored by Auckland builder Paul Downie, helped me learn to play his Goff and shared a range of experiences. Comparing McAllister’s Pleyel to Nicolson’s Goff showed me what can emerge from making changes to revival harpsichords during the restoration process and how different revival instruments can be from one another.

Grateful acknowledgement is also made of those who have given their time and energy in lessons, interviews, assistance with Sibelius music notation software, harpsichord moving, and support in many ways: Douglas Mews (New Zealand School of Music, Victoria University of Wellington), Dr. Erin Helyard (Melbourne Conservatorium of Music, University of Melbourne), Patrick Lindley (University of California at Santa Barbara), Lynne Wenden, Dr.

¹ Email from W. D. Neupert, October 22, 2014: “Mit Freude entnehme ich Ihrer E-Mail, dass Sie eine Doktorarbeit über das, in der Literatur bisher eher vernachlässigte, moderne Cembalo schreiben.” English translation by the author.

Jonathan Berkhan, Mel Matheson and Joe Gorman (NZSM), Professor Peter Child (MIT – Massachusetts Institute of Technology), Elaine Funaro (Durham, NC), Emeritus Professor Zuzana Růžicková and Professor Monika Knoblochová (Prague Academy of Performing Arts), Ales Brezina (Director of the Bohuslav Martinů Institute, Prague), archivist Richard Boursy (Gilmore Music Library at Yale University) and Nicholas Renouf (Musical Instrument Collection at Yale University). I have also received assistance via interviews with composers Robert Hinchliffe (England) and Jukka Tiensuu (Finland), builders Carey Beebe (Sydney), Paul Downie (Auckland) and Martin Spaink (The Netherlands), Professor Corey Jamason (San Francisco Conservatory of Music), Sheridan Germann (Boston) and Andrew Bernard (Melbourne). In New Zealand, I have had the pleasure of interviewing Roy Tankersley and Conny May, with French language assistance from Amina Elmokrifi. I am grateful for the dedication of performers HyeWon Kim, Ingrid Culliford, Konstanze Artmann, Alison Eldridge, Jane Young, Rupa Maitra, Iain Gordon and George Wills.

I am thankful for assistance from Victoria University of Wellington for Research Travel Grants (2013, 2014 and 2016), the Therle Drake Scholarship (2015) and Freemasons awards from the Lankhuyzen-Whetu Kairangi Trust (2015 and 2016). Additional support came from a travel grant provided by the Musicological Society of Australia to present a conference paper entitled “Signs of the Times: Valuing the Revival Harpsichord Today” at their National Conference in Sydney (2015).

Academic support at Victoria University is gratefully acknowledged from Associate Professor Samantha Owens, Dr. Erin Helyard, Emeritus Professor Peter Walls, Dr. Inge van Rij, Associate Professor Greer Garden, Dr. David Cospers and Dr. Sondra Bacharach. Their help is most appreciated, as well as from the entire staff at the New Zealand School of Music, especially Senior Technician Roy Carr and a special thank you to the staff at Vic Books.

List of Abbreviations

AMU	Akademie múzických umění Academy of Performing Arts Prague, Czech Republic
B.B.mim	Musée des instruments de musique, Brussels
D.B.im	Musikinstrumenten-Museum, Berlin
MIT	Massachusetts Institute of Technology
NZSM	New Zealand School of Music, Wellington, New Zealand
NZSO	New Zealand Symphony Orchestra
UCSB	University of California at Santa Barbara
US-NH	Yale University, Irving S. Gilmore Music Library
RKA	Yale University, Ralph Kirkpatrick Archive

List of Illustrations

1.1. Anon., <i>Vocal Magazine</i> , volume II, title page. Edinburgh: C. Stewart & Co., 1798.	7
1.2. Double Manual harpsichord by Abraham and Joseph Kirkman, 1789.	11
1.3. Sébastien Érard harpsichord, 1779. Musée de la musique: E.979.2.5.	12
1.4. Érard harpsichord, 1889. D.B.im: Inv. 5191.	13
1.5. Érard harpsichord, 1896. D.B.im: Inv. 4924.	13
1.6. Business Card of Louis Tomasini, ca. 1889.	14
1.7. Pascal Taskin harpsichord, 1769. Raymond Russell Instrument Collection, University of Edinburgh.	15
1.8. Louis Tomasini harpsichord, 1889. D.B.im: Inv. 5080.	15
1.9. Pleyel harpsichord, 1889. D.B.im: Inv. 4874.	16
1.10. Pleyel harpsichord, 1891. D.B.im: Inv. 1598.	16
1.11. Marguerite Delcourt with the 1889 Pleyel harpsichord, ca. 1905. Musée de la musique: Inv. E.988.9.18.	18
1.12. Postcard, ca. 1911. Bibliothèque nationale de France.	19
1.13. Pleyel-Wolff-Lyon & C ^{ie} harpsichord, 1905. D.B.im: Inv. 8992.	21
1.14. Pleyel harpsichord pedals, 1927. D.B.im: Inv. 4885.	22
1.15. Comparative Pedal Dispositions by Alastair McAllister. <i>Talking Harpsichords</i> (2012).	23
1.16. Neupert Production Figures for Double-Manual Revival Models from 1906–2014.	24
1.17. Neupert harpsichord, 1967. Philharmonie de Paris: E.01297.	25
1.18. Dolmetsch-Gaveau harpsichord, 1923. D.B.im: Inv. 5121.	28
1.19. John Challis harpsichord, 1982. Yale Collection of Musical Instruments: Inv. 4906.2011.	29
1.20. Interior, John Challis harpsichord, 1982. Yale Collection of Musical Instruments: Inv. 4906.	30
1.21. Herz harpsichord, 1970, op. 202.	31

1.22. Interior, Herz harpsichord, 1970, op. 202.	32
1.23. Rutkowki and Robinette harpsichord, 1961. Owned by Igor Kipnis.	33
1.24. Detail of Rutkowski and Robinette harpsichord, 1961.	34
1.25. Interior, Rutkowski and Robinette harpsichord, 1961.	35
2.1. Pleyel harpsichord, 1963. Owned by Alastair McAllister.	44
2.2. “314 Newly-Leathered Jacks” by builder Martin Spaink.	47
2.3. Pianist Ferruccio Busoni in 1909 at the Dolmetsch-Chickering harpsichord No. 60.	51
2.4. Jackrail inscription. Pleyel harpsichord, 1963. Owned by Alastair McAllister.	52
2.5. Jackrail inscription. Pleyel harpsichord, 1963. Owned by Alastair McAllister.	53
2.6. Harpsichordist Lotta van Buren, ca. 1920s.	54
2.7. Harpsichordist Eta Harich-Schneider playing an eighteenth-century Michael Mietke harpsichord at Castle Monbijou, Berlin, 1935.	56
2.8. Harpsichordist Wanda Landowska, 1944.	57
2.9. Illustration of “Leading Harpsichordists,” in “Harpsichord Output Zooming” by Fred Kirby, <i>Billboard Magazine</i> , September 10, 1966.	60
2.10. Neupert “Bach” harpsichord, 1963.	64
2.11. Puyana at his Paris home.	65
2.12. Robert Morley & Co. Advertisement, <i>Musical Times</i> , 1970.	67
2.13. Interior, “Bach” Wittmayer Elektronik harpsichord, 1970. D.B.im: Inv. 5420.	73
2.14. “Bach” Wittmayer Elektronik harpsichord, 1970. D.B.im: Inv. 5420.	73
3.1. Mario Castelnuovo-Tedesco, <i>Sonata inglese</i> , title page. Manuscript. US-NH, RKA: MSS 11, Box 3, Folder 7.	77
3.2. Mario Castelnuovo-Tedesco, <i>Sonata inglese</i> , first page. Manuscript. US-NH, RKA: MSS 11, Box 3, Folder 7.	78
3.3. Poster, Bohuslav Martinů Competition (Czech Republic) for Winds and Harpsichord, November 27, 2016.	84

3.4. Györgyi Ligeti, <i>Continuum</i> (1968), page 9.	90
3.5. Ned Rorem, <i>Spiders</i> (1968), page 8, final bars.	93
3.6. Walter Piston, <i>Sonatina for Violin and Harpsichord (or Piano)</i> (1945), first movement, bars 122–125. Manuscript. US-NH, RKA: MSS 11, Box 6, Folder 17.	95
3.7. Figures 1 and 2. Eta Harich-Schneider, <i>The Harpsichord</i> (1954/2nd edn 1960).	98
3.8. Figures 3 and 4. Eta Harich-Schneider, <i>The Harpsichord</i> (1954/2nd edn 1960).	99
3.9. Figures 17c and d; 18. Denise Restout, <i>Landowska on Music</i> (1964).	100
3.10. Left side: Duration marked at the end of the first movement. Darius Milhaud's <i>Sonata for Clavecin and Violin</i> , op. 257. Manuscript. US-NH, RKA: MSS 11 Box 6, Folder 13.	107
3.11. Right side: Milhaud's op. 257, second movement, bar 30. Manuscript. US-NH, RKA: MSS 11 Box 6, Folder 13.	107
3.12. Note on registration. Milhaud's op. 257. Elkan-Vogel, 1946. US-NH, RKA: MSS 11 Box 1, Folder 19.	109
3.13. Milhaud's op. 257, first movement, bars 19–20, harpsichord. 1946 Elkan-Vogel. US-NH, RKA: MSS Box 1, Folder 19.	109
3.14. Milhaud's op. 257, same bars (19–20). Manuscript. US-NH, RKA: MSS Box 6, Folder 13.	110
3.15. Milhaud's op. 257, second movement, page 10. Manuscript. US-NH, RKA: MSS Box 6, Folder 13.	110
3.16. Milhaud's op. 257, first movement, bar 80. Manuscript. US-NH, RKA: MSS Box 6, Folder 13.	111
3.17. Milhaud's op. 257, first movement, bar 12 (both hands are in treble clef, but are mislabelled as bass clef). Manuscript. US-NH, RKA: MSS Box 6, Folder 13.	111
3.18. Peter Child, <i>Concerto for Harpsichord and String Quartet</i> (2005), "Berceuse," bars 4–8.	113
3.19. Child, <i>Concerto</i> , harpsichord in treble clef, second movement, bar 25 with optional (+16').	114
3.20. Child, <i>Concerto</i> , third movement, bar 25 with optional (+16').	114
3.21. Ibid., harpsichord, bars 94–97, etc. with optional (+16').	115

Note on Terminology

The term “modern harpsichord” has often been used to describe all types of harpsichord constructed from the start of the instrument’s building revival in 1889 to the present, or more narrowly, to refer to instruments built at the time of writing, such as in Wolfgang Zuckermann’s *The Modern Harpsichord*.² This term has also been used to denote harpsichords that have been built with significant influences from piano manufacturing.

“Pedal harpsichord” is another term that has been used by only a few authors to signify the type of harpsichords that are the subject of this dissertation, but is usually a term reserved for instruments that have a pedal board.

To avoid confusion, I use the term “revival harpsichord” to describe instruments from 1889 to the present day that often feature heavy framing, foot pedals to change registration and a 16’ stop (see descriptions below). I first came across this term from UCSB harpsichordist and staff accompanist, Patrick Lindley. He studied at the New England Conservatory in the United States during the 1960s, in Europe with harpsichordist Gustav Leonhardt, practiced on instruments such as Fernando Valenti’s harpsichord and witnessed many changes in instrument building and performance practice during the 1960s and 1970s. Some feel the term revival harpsichord has disadvantages, as revealed in this perspective from harpsichordist, author and Boston University Professor Emeritus Mark Kroll: “[Revival] implies resuscitating something extinct, which is not the case . . . and since there are so many different styles of Baroque harpsichords, just what are we reviving?”³ Perhaps in future, a more widely accepted term for the revival harpsichord will come into common use.

The term “historical harpsichord” is employed in this dissertation to refer to instruments built during the twentieth and twenty-first centuries that adhere very closely to building practices and designs of antique harpsichords from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (or, more rarely, the sixteenth century).

Harpsichords have “stops” that are named after the lengths of organ pipes. These registrations determine which strings are plucked, buffed or when a different plucking point

² Wolfgang Zuckermann, *Modern Harpsichord: Twentieth-Century Instruments and Their Makers* (London: Peter Owen, 1969).

³ Email from Mark Kroll, May 4, 2015.

of the string is used. These options affect tone colour, pitch and, to varying degrees, volume. Registration names include 8'-foot pitch (the notes in this register sound at written pitch), 4' (the notes in this register sound an octave above written pitch), 16' (the notes in this register sound an octave below written pitch), along with a Buff stop (leather or felt pads are moved into position to touch strings, which creates a dampened sound) and a Lute stop (a harp-like sound is achieved by plucking a string at a different point). Registration changes on two-manual concert revival instruments are usually operated by foot pedals, but these instruments may also have hand stops, such as on some models manufactured by the German company, J. C. Neupert.

Preface

This dissertation centres on revival harpsichord repertoire and the instruments for which these works were originally conceived. While debates concerning instrument choices for early music have become mainstream, the selection of a historical versus a revival harpsichord for the performance of revival works has received only infrequent mention in the academic literature, particularly since the mid-1980s. Today, works written for revival harpsichord are usually performed on historical harpsichords, when played at all. Although consideration of twentieth-century performance practice issues has gained in popularity, current knowledge of revival repertoire and revival period instruments is rare and so it is timely to contribute to the discourse on how these instruments are valued and used today. This dissertation questions whether revival harpsichords are obsolete in every sense of the word, and brings together disparate perspectives on their future.

In seeking to address these issues, the first chapter informs the reader about revival models from their inception in 1889 to the present. Although the scope of this dissertation does not allow for exhaustive treatment of all makes and models, both the chapter itself and instruments listed in Appendix I assist the reader in appreciating the comparative capabilities and designs of these instruments. Chapter One also explores how revival harpsichords have come to be defined and argues that it is significant that a diverse range of revival instruments exists rather than a single, iconic example. Too often, evaluations of revival harpsichords are made without considering the variety of revival instruments or the condition to which they have been restored. One thread of this dissertation is that revival instruments, like machines such as automobiles, have been created for specific purposes that change over time. Dating from at least the 1960s a standard of judgment has been the degree to which revival harpsichords are “historically accurate.” Yet what is the result if we categorise them differently and cease to expect them to resemble historical harpsichords? What if we do not require them to be “historically accurate,” except for the works for which they were written?

A nuanced perspective on the value of revival harpsichords is presented, with sources selected not only from academic literature, but also from blogs and interviews conducted for this dissertation. Chapter Two concerns the appreciation of, ambivalence towards and

vilification of revival instruments. Chronological and topical approaches to reception are used to contextualise current treatment of revival harpsichords. Issues in reception are also correlated to the early music movement where relevant. Comments on instruments are sometimes couched in emotional or ethical terms. In critiquing the “ethical tone” communicated by certain proponents of historical performance practice, musicologist and harpsichordist John Butt has queried the usefulness of such emotional views, and that “this presupposes that the works concerned have an identity – a correct form of being – that the performer is morally bound to realise in sound.”⁴ Such philosophical issues are mentioned where they arise, within the confines of the relatively small scope of this dissertation.

The third chapter concentrates on the primary justification for valuing revival harpsichords today: the works written for these instruments. The focal point of the chapter includes three case studies of works written for revival harpsichord: Erik Bergman’s *Energien* (1970) (which is supplemented by a critical edition of the same, see Appendix IV), Darius Milhaud’s 1945 *Sonata for Clavecin and Violin*, op. 257 (together with a reproduction of the autograph manuscript score, see Appendix V; for performance notes, see Appendix VI) and Peter Child’s *Concerto for Harpsichord and String Quartet* (2005). Chapter Three builds on material introduced in previous chapters, focussing on implications for contemporary repertoire, revival instruments and how our view of these instruments can change when we consider them as an individual category of instrument, rather than as a misguided version of historical models.

In addition, taking as evidence the testimony of performers, builders, auditors and composers who appreciate revival harpsichords and work towards their rejuvenation and rehabilitation in the public eye, this dissertation seeks to discover whether there is viable space for the revival harpsichord today and in the future.

⁴ John Butt, *Playing with History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 55.

Chapter One

Revival Harpsichords: Inception of an Idea

Concertmaster to harpsichordist Ralph Kirkpatrick in the 1930s:
“Hey mister, can’t you get any more noise out of that buggy?”⁵

1.1. Introducing Revival Harpsichords

A study of revival harpsichord repertoire logically begins by introducing the instruments for which these works were written. Throughout approximately three-quarters of the twentieth century, revival harpsichords were the most well-known and utilised type of harpsichord for performances of both early and contemporary harpsichord music. These instruments inspired not only new generations of harpsichordists, but were the vehicles of a new tradition of contemporary harpsichord music beginning in the late nineteenth century. From the 1950s, however, revival instruments were increasingly criticised for design flaws and a heavy reliance on piano manufacturing techniques. A desire for “authenticity” that became the watchword in early instrument building and performance practice from the 1960s and 1970s, meant that by around 1980, revival harpsichords lost their popularity and were considered too dissimilar to antique harpsichords to maintain even a mainstream value for the works composed for them.⁶ Revival harpsichords were largely replaced by historical models that more closely resembled antique designs.

On a smaller scale relative to historical harpsichords, but on a larger scale than is frequently acknowledged—revival models are still used in some locations, and indeed, continue to be manufactured by the J. C. Neupert firm in Bamberg, Germany.⁷ Alongside this activity has been a seeming increase in the acceptance or consideration of these machines as viable instruments, particularly as twentieth-century performance practice concerns become more commonplace. Enough time has elapsed from the heyday of authenticity that a younger generation of performers such as Welsh harpsichordist Christopher Lewis and Czech harpsichordist Monika Knoblochová have not only recorded on restored revival instruments

⁵ Kay Jaffee, “Boston Early Music Festival and Exhibition May 26–31, 1981,” *The Journal of Musicology* 1/1 (1982): 128.

⁶ The popularity of revival harpsichords lasted somewhat longer in some areas including Germany, Eastern Europe and South America.

⁷ Founded by Johann Christian Neupert (1842–1921).

but are vocal in their support of the intrinsic value of these harpsichords. It appears that a stigma associated with revival harpsichords has lessened. In 2003, when reviewing the previous decade, musicologist and harpsichord builder Edward Kottick noted “a minor resurgence of interest in revival instruments with 16’ and pedals, particularly since they are needed to play the harpsichord literature of the early twentieth century.”⁸

This dissertation draws on this statement made by Kottick and extends its timeframe to the present day, challenging prevalent notions that revival harpsichords are of little or no use today. That they were integral to the history of contemporary harpsichord music in the twentieth century remains undisputed in academic and popular circles. But whether they have a current value based on aesthetic, financial or musical criteria is still controversial.

The first two sections of Chapter One explore how revival harpsichords are defined and how and why they were developed in the late nineteenth century. Sections 1.3–1.6 include examples of revival harpsichord models produced in the twentieth century by French, German, Austrian, English and American companies or workshops, focussing on unique contributions made by these builders that resulted in a wide spectrum of instruments.

Selected Purposes of Revival Harpsichord Design

In 1970, eminent musicologist and organologist Robert Donington considered instruments to be musical “tools” that were updated over time to suit market demand and changing attitudes toward mechanisation.⁹ By 1974, popular conceptions of what a harpsichord should look, feel and sound like had so dramatically altered from the zeitgeist of the harpsichord building revival late in the nineteenth century, that there was a decisive reversal of modernisation to an emulation of original building methods from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries.

American harpsichordist, teacher and scholar Ralph Kirkpatrick (1911–1984), with a career that spanned over fifty years, witnessed many stages in the development and construction

⁸ Edward Kottick, *A History of the Harpsichord* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2003), 464–465.

⁹ “Tools,” for example, appears in the heading: “Instruments: The Working Tools of Music,” in Robert Donington, *The Instruments of Music* (London: Methuen, 1970), xxv.

of revival and historical harpsichords in the twentieth century.¹⁰ The statement quoted at the beginning of the present chapter was made during a rehearsal of J. S. Bach's Brandenburg Concerto No. 5 with Kirkpatrick during the early 1930s, and equated the revival harpsichord with a buggy—that is, an old, dilapidated automobile.¹¹ One may assume revival harpsichord reception would have been entirely favourable in the 1930s, as few were familiar with other types of harpsichords. However, although revival models were designed for an increase in volume and other advantages over antique models, in practice they were often quieter. In the 1930s, as now, harpsichords of all types did not produce enough volume to fill a large, modern hall. It was mistakenly thought that the use of piano wire, an open bottom and bracing as for modern pianos, along with an iron frame on many models, would solve the problem of a quiet harpsichord in a large hall.

Another factor in the design of revival models was a desire for increased tuning stability and structural integrity than seemed possible for antique harpsichords. Some revival models, such as those by builder John Challis (1907–1974), had the reputation for being exceedingly stable, as illustrated in a story about an instrument owned by American harpsichordist Fernando Valenti (1926–1990), which, after being accidentally dropped in the Colorado River during transport, was dried and concert-ready that same evening.¹² Indeed, Managing Director of the J. C. Neupert keyboard firm, Wolfgang Dieter Neupert, has recently stated that sales of new revival instruments have in part relied on their long-held reputation for stability.¹³

Revival Harpsichords and Automobiles

In some respects, revival harpsichords can be seen to share analogous space with another machine—the automobile. Early automobile development overlapped with the beginning of the revival harpsichord period, and each invention originated as a hybrid composite of other machines. In 1886, Carl Benz patented his “vehicle powered by a gas engine,” only three

¹⁰ Ralph Kirkpatrick, “Fifty Years of Harpsichord Playing,” *Early Music* 11/1 (1983): 31–41.

¹¹ “Buggy,” www.dictionary.com, Random House, accessed September 26, 2016.

¹² Larry Palmer, *Harpsichord in America: A Twentieth-Century Revival* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989), 89.

¹³ Email from W. D. Neupert, October 30, 2014.

years prior to the construction of the first revival harpsichords.¹⁴ The Ford Company sold their initial ground-breaking Model T in 1908 and the Cadillac Model 30 was introduced the following year. In 1912, Cadillac launched their first production car to feature a modern electric starting and ignition system, which was, strikingly, the same year in which the French instrument factory, Pleyel, introduced their most successful model, the *Grand modèle de concert*. Factory-made revival harpsichords and automobiles had in common an assembly line type of production, and offered options and custom-built models. Cast iron (or aluminium) frames for harpsichords have at times been produced in foundries used also by car manufacturing plants.¹⁵ As expressed by English builder John Paul: "The harpsichord with a 16' and a row of seven or eight pedals had the absurd appeal of a motor car with power steering and little buttons to raise and lower the windows."¹⁶

Other keyboard instruments have attracted analogies with automobiles in a variety of sources, such as in the work of New Zealand philosopher Steven Davies. When commenting on the "danger of assuming an 'improved,'" newer version is necessarily better (as opposed to different) than an older one, Davies compared Steinways and fortepianos with a Rolls Royce and a Model T.¹⁷ Highlighting links between automobiles and harpsichords contributes to the understanding that revival instruments are a different type of harpsichord with their own unique development and attributes, rather than the typical practice of regarding revival harpsichords merely as substandard or an inauthentic version of historical harpsichords.

Claiming analogies between revival harpsichords and automobiles (or other types of machines) can result, however, in both positive and negative connotations. As expressed by

¹⁴ <https://www.daimler.com/company/tradition/company-history/1885-1886.html>; patent number 37435, accessed September 24, 2015.

¹⁵ Harold Haney, "Portrait of a Builder: John Challis," *The Harpsichord* 2/3 (1969): 17.

¹⁶ John Paul, *Modern Harpsichord Makers: Portraits of Nineteen British Craftsmen & Their Work* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1981), 54.

¹⁷ Steven Davies, *Musical Works & Performances: A Philosophical Exploration* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001), 219. Other examples include Bösendorfer, "the Rolls-Royce of pianos," in Michael Wise, "Music; Piano versus Piano," *New York Times*, May 9, 2004.

http://www.nytimes.com/2004/05/09/arts/music-piano-versus-piano.html?_r=0, and Stephen Schafer's statement, "We've come a long way from Wanda Landowska's six-cylinder hyper-harpsichords," in "Elizabeth Farr: My Passion Is My Profession," interview, March 9, 2009, <http://www.naxos.com/news/default.asp?op=580&displayMenu=Interviews&type=2>.

English harpsichordist George Malcolm (1917–1997) in an interview in the *English Harpsichord Magazine* in 1973:

some of the modern [revival] harpsichords are just machines—there’s no question about that—they are just gigantic things made for moving about in concert halls, with frames so thick that nothing will vibrate, and they have no sound in them at all. I find some of the German factory-made instruments are just absolutely useless—vast armed machines; but you can’t hear them in the next room. I like to strike a balance between ‘mod. cons’ and a good sound.¹⁸

Malcolm contrasted German factory revival harpsichords with those of his preferred revival harpsichord builder, Englishman Robert Goble (1903–1991). Historical harpsichords were more widely accepted at the time of this interview, but Malcolm defended his choice of revival harpsichords by Goble on the grounds that he liked their gadgets and sound:

The sound, to my ears, is entirely acceptable . . . You know I am not an authenticist at all, and I use the geared pedals that the Goble harpsichord (and for example the Goff harpsichords also) have for things like fading off an appoggiatura. . . . Most of my colleagues won’t have anything to do with what they consider to be a modernized version of the harpsichord. They don’t like the sound; they need something more resonant, and they don’t like the gadgets. They refuse to use the gadgets in fact because Bach did not have gadgets.”¹⁹

Defining Revival Harpsichords

In the latter quotation, Malcolm referenced the authenticity debate that by that time had won the battle for the supremacy of historical models. Revival models were usually fitted with metal or other material to create heavily weighted jacks to pluck large-diameter strings, produced a different sound than historical harpsichords and were criticised for having “gadgets” that “Bach did not have.” One such gadget was the foot pedal lyre used to change registration instead of the more traditional hand stops or use of a smaller number of

¹⁸ Edgar Hunt, “George Malcolm, C. B. E.: An Interview,” *The English Harpsichord Magazine* 1/1 (1973): second page.

¹⁹ Ibid. The term “gadgets” was used in a similar manner by Kirkpatrick, see “Fifty Years,” 36; see also Howard Klein, “Harpsichords and Harpsichordists,” *New York Times*, February 16, 1964.

knee levers or pedals. Another gadget was a set of 16' strings that sounded an octave below written pitch, which, along with foot pedals also had precursors in the eighteenth century. It should be pointed out, that although not all revival harpsichords were built with pedals, nor a 16' set of strings, they may nonetheless be considered revival models.

Revival harpsichords can be differentiated from historical harpsichords in that they possess many of the following features:

- Foot pedals that change registration (some models may also have hand stops)
- Metal soundboards and/or other metal components (besides small parts such as screws)
- Open bottom, thickly-walled cases and piano-style bracing that impede resonance
- Leather, rather than bird quill or substitute plectra material
- A heavier touch, in part due to heavily-weighted jacks and possibility to load up to five registers at once on one key
- A damping system informed by piano manufacturing (i.e. a damper bar) and/or thicker felt dampers
- A longer-lasting tonal decay envelope to the sound
- Even scaling like a piano—rather than having a greater tonal distinction between bass, middle and treble regions as is the case for most historical harpsichords
- More registration choices (see Appendix II for a listing of forty-eight on Alastair McAllister's 1963 Pleyel)

On his website, Sydney-based historical keyboard builder Carey Beebe lists thirty-five parameters of comparison between the Neupert revival-model "Cristofori" model owned by the Cairo Opera House and a Ruckers historical harpsichord Double built by Beebe in 2003. According to Beebe, "Generally, if an instrument has at least half a dozen characteristics of the revival harpsichord [then] that is the type it is most likely to be."²⁰

1.2. Revival Harpsichord History

Harpsichords in the Nineteenth Century

²⁰ Carey Beebe, "Resources I: What Sort of Harpsichord Is That?" (2011), Carey Beebe Harpsichords, website, <http://www.hpschd.nu>, accessed March 3, 2016.

The last known harpsichord built in the nineteenth century as a continuation of eighteenth-century building traditions was in 1809, made by the son and grandson of builder Abraham Kirkman (1737–1794), who, together with his brother Jacob Kirkman (1710–1792) had established the English Kirkman brand.²¹ No other extant harpsichords were constructed until the appearance of revival models in 1889,²² although as noted in Howard Schott's chronicle of the harpsichord revival, "an occasional instrument might even be produced once in a decade by an enthusiastic restorer."²³

Towards the end of the eighteenth century, harpsichord use decreased as pianos grew in popularity, with harpsichords disappearing from opera orchestras by around 1820. The title page of the second volume of *The Vocal Magazine*, a collection of popular songs published in Edinburgh in 1798 (see Fig. 1.1), demonstrates that harpsichords enjoyed some use late in the eighteenth century, but were no longer included, for example, on the title pages of Beethoven's published keyboard works in 1802–1803.²⁴

Fig. 1.1. Anon., *Vocal Magazine*, volume II, title page. Edinburgh: C. Stewart & Co., 1798.²⁵

²¹ Donald Boalch, *Makers of the Harpsichord and Clavichord, 1440 to 1840* (London: Ronald, 1956), 106.

²² See Palmer, *Harpsichord in America*, 1.

²³ Howard Schott, "The Harpsichord Revival," *Early Music* 2/2 (1974): 85.

²⁴ Anon., "Beethoven and the Harpsichord," The Beethoven Center at San José State University, website, http://www.sjsu.edu/beethoven/research/beethoven_and_harpsichord/, accessed May 20, 2016.

²⁵ National Library of Scotland, Permanent URL: <http://digital.nls.uk/94604312>.

After the turn of the nineteenth century, although restoration techniques were sometimes included in the training of piano builders, harpsichord building and preservation traditions largely died out. Antiquarian interest in the harpsichord as a work of art or furniture helped maintain its value as a collector's item, but they were seldom kept as working instruments in museums and collections. Private collectors such as Morris Steinert (1831–1912), universities and conservatories helped develop what would later become important instrument collections in centres such as Paris, Edinburgh, Berlin, Leipzig, and in New Haven, Connecticut at Yale University. Despite this seemingly mute activity, antique harpsichords maintained a small presence in the concert hall from the 1830s, including as part of François-Joseph Fétis's (1784–1871) Paris-based *concert historique* performances that took place most notably during the 1832–1833 concert seasons.²⁶

Mark Kroll's biography of Ignaz Moscheles (1794–1870) detailed this pianist's early music soirées in England beginning in 1837 on a 1771 Schudi-Broadwood harpsichord, drawing attention to the fact that Moscheles was the first to perform in public on the harpsichord in England in the nineteenth century.²⁷ An anonymous review of one such concert was published in *The Atlas* in 1837. It assured readers that the concert of early music given by Moscheles on the harpsichord was not the "resurrection of dry bones" as expected, but was both educational and musically pleasing.²⁸ It is likely Sir Thomas Beecham's oft-quoted metaphor that related the sound of a harpsichord to "skeletons copulating on a tin roof," owed much to nineteenth-century recurring narratives of associating bones and ghosts with harpsichords.²⁹ Musicologist Edmond Johnson has examined the ghostly imagery of harpsichords through the lens of nineteenth-century poetry, as in these lines from a poem, "On an Old Harpsichord," published as part of James Payn's novel *The Heir of Ages* in 1886:

The lights go out;
the voices die;
Among the strings strange tremors fly,

²⁶ Anon., "Les concerts historique," *La Revue Musicale*, 2/1 (January 1902): 53.

²⁷ Mark Kroll, *Ignaz Moscheles and the Changing World of Musical Europe* (Rochester, NY: Boydell and Brewer, 2014), 287; 263.

²⁸ Anon., *The Atlas* 4/48 (February 26, 1837): 128, quoted in Kroll, *Moscheles*, 286–289.

²⁹ Tilman Skowronek, "History of the Tin Roof," blog entry, <https://skowronek.wordpress.com/2008/02/10/history-of-the-tin-roof/>, cited in Jessica Wood, "Keys to the Past: Building Harpsichords and Feeling History in the Postwar United States" (PhD diss., Duke University, 2010), 111.

That slowly sink to slumber;
The harpsichord remains alone,
A monument of glories done,
An ancient piece of lumber.³⁰

In light of such literary evidence, Johnson summarised the overall museumisation of the harpsichord at the time:

In many ways the real story of the harpsichord in the nineteenth century is not one of dormancy, death, or even abandonment, but instead of a transformation from musical tool into visual and historical artefact—a century the instrument largely spent as ‘a monument to glories done, an ancient piece of lumber.’³¹

Although harpsichords were heard in concert, particularly in the larger European cultural centres of London, Paris and Berlin from the 1830s, associations with such terms as “frail,” “anachronistic,” “quaint,” “death” and “obsolescence” persisted alongside an interest in the instrument that increased during the latter nineteenth century.³² The mixture of fascination and mystery connected with the harpsichord grew into efforts to recreate them in 1889 for a new age. A quarter-century later, in 1914, the harpsichord reflected the latest in futuristic trends, as outlined in an anonymous article entitled “‘Pastism’ and Futurism” in London’s *Tatler* magazine:

To be considered really smart nowadays you must never be up to date. Your aim must be either to live seventeenth century or scream A.D. 2000. If you play the piano with the desire of being listened to you must either play Bach on a harpsichord or sit down here and there on the keyboard and call it the “music of the Future.” Back and Forward. In the same way, if you paint, you must either copy the earliest Italians or cut a chocolate box into a hundred pieces, throw them into the air, paste them on a canvas as they fall, and call it a Futurist portrait of the Queen-Mother of the Netherlands. Even your clothes must either be tres-Poiret or else as near the Garden

³⁰ James Payn, *The Heir of Ages* (London: Smith, Elder, & Co., 1888); quoted in Edmond Thomas Johnson, “Revival and Antiquation: Modernism’s Musical Pasts” (PhD diss., University of California at Santa Barbara, 2011), 45.

³¹ Johnson, “Revival and Antiquation,” 47.

³² *Ibid.*, 47–49; for “obsolescence,” see 29.

of Eden as a yard of tulle and a blue bow will permit you. Never must you be fin-de-siecle that is, of To-day. You must either hark back to the year nothing or soar into the Future on the wings of your individual fancy.³³

Constructing Revival Harpsichords for the Paris Exposition of 1889

The innovation and exoticism on display from around the world at the Paris Exposition of 1889 was the perfect staging ground for the newly created revival harpsichords after an approximately eighty-year hiatus in construction. It was a significant development to build instruments with an essentially lost building tradition, and unsurprising that piano technologies were used. An unattributed review of an early model revival harpsichord made by French piano maker Pleyel appeared in the *Saturday Review* of 1894: “In the construction of their new harpsichord they had little to guide them but their own experience as pianoforte makers, and so their instrument in many ways suggested the piano.”³⁴ This review was somewhat ambivalent about the artistic value of any type of harpsichord: “During the last few years the harpsichord has occasionally figured in the concert-rooms, here and at Paris, as an instrument which, although obsolete and, for the ordinary purposes of music, rightly consigned to the taciturn seclusion of the museum, has yet some distinctive charm and quality of its own.”³⁵

The three revival harpsichords constructed for the 1889 Paris Exposition reflected exhibition themes of French cultural excellence in engineering and music. Competing piano firms Pleyel and Érard, along with Italian-born builder and restorer Louis Tomasini—all based in Paris—infused modern interpretations into harpsichords that were nevertheless based on antique models. Decorative influences came from the Rococo Revival, with fluted legs inspired by the Grecian Revival. Changes made to the internal design included foot pedals built by Pleyel to change registration rather than relying on Baroque hand stops. Having pedals on a harpsichord was not new: the Kirkman family had built harpsichords in the latter

³³ Anon., “‘Pastism’ and Futurism,” *The Tatler* 678/52 (June 24, 1914): 386, www.illustratedfirstworldwar.com/item/pastism-and-futurism-bpc000007_1914, accessed December 3, 2015.

³⁴ Anon., “Bach and the Harpsichord,” *The Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art* (December 15, 1894): 654.

³⁵ Ibid.

eighteenth century, some having foot pedals (see Fig. 1.2). (Other examples of late-eighteenth-century harpsichords with foot pedals include harpsichords by Portuguese maker Antunes and English builder Shudi-Broadwood.)³⁶

Fig. 1.2. Double Manual Harpsichord by Abraham and Joseph Kirkman, 1789 (Pelham Galleries, Paris).³⁷

However, the idea to expand to an array of six, seven (or even eight pedals for a Maendler-Schramm Model 246-8) on an elaborate pedal lyre, came with Pleyel's first revival instrument in 1889 and was likely influenced by Pleyel's experience in harp and piano manufacturing.³⁸ The internal designs of these first revival harpsichords were altered in additional ways from antique models, a practice of divergence that continued into the twentieth century as revival harpsichord models became more heavily influenced by piano manufacturing technologies. It took another eighty years after the Paris Exposition of 1889

³⁶ See Sheridan Germann, "Harpsichord Decoration," in *Historical Harpsichord* (IV), ed. Howard Schott (Hillsdale, NY: Pendragon Press, 2002), 106 and 187.

³⁷ Photo <http://www.pelhamgalleries.com/Double-Manual-Harpsichord-Abraham-and-Joseph-Kirkman-London-1789.DesktopDefault.aspx?tabid=6&tabindex=5&objectid=671660&categoryid=16256>, accessed June 19, 2016.

³⁸ For information on the Maendler-Schramm model, see Alastair McAllister, *Talking Harpsichords: Rambling Revelations* (Melbourne: The Rhykane Press, 2012), 14–15; McAllister suggested the probable connection with harp construction, interview with the author, Melbourne, October 2015.

to re-establish building traditions inspired by closely emulating antique instruments built from the sixteenth through eighteenth centuries.

Early Revival Instruments by Érard, Pleyel and Tomasini

Érard's credentials in innovation began with the company's founding in 1777 by Sébastien Érard (1752–1831), who registered patents such as the double-escapement mechanism for the piano in 1821. He was the first to incorporate pedals onto early Parisian pianos, including the bassoon pedal that emits a buzzing sound, due to material being placed against the strings and a knee-lever with an *una corda* function. Jean-Claude Battault documented the influence of a 1779 harpsichord built by Sébastien Érard (see Fig. 1.3) on the Érard company's 1889 Exposition revival model.³⁹

Fig. 1.3. Sébastien Érard harpsichord, 1779. Musée de la musique: Inv. E.979.2.5.⁴⁰

³⁹ Jean-Claude Battault, "Les clavecins Pleyel, Érard et Gaveau, 1889–1970," in *Music of the Past – Instruments and Imagination*, ed. Michael Latham (Bern: Peter Lang, 2006), 194. See Martin Elste, "Nostalgische Musikmaschinen: Cembali im 20. Jahrhundert," in *Kielklaviere: Cembali, Spinette, Virginale*, ed. by Dagmar Droysen-Reber (Berlin: Staatliches Institut für Musikforschung Preußischer Kulturbesitz, 1991), 246, that only the external decoration of the 1779 Érard was used for the 1889 model. A letter dated April 28, 1982 by Sheridan Germann to the D.B. in which Elste is curator, questioned whether the 1779 decorations were original, as Germann suggested the artist who painted the 1889 Érard repainted the 1779 model during restoration.

⁴⁰ Photo by Jean-Marc Anglès, http://www.mimo-international.com/MIMO/detailstatic.aspx?RSC_BASE=IFD&RSC_DOCID=OAI_CIMU_ALOES_0130094.

In 1902, Érard's catalogue indicated that their harpsichords were priced at 4,000 FR—higher than the 1,980 FR cost of a Pleyel that year, in part due to elaborate decoration.⁴¹ This less competitive price was conceivably a contributing factor as to why the firm discontinued harpsichord production in 1914. It is interesting to note that Érard's original 1889 version featured hand stops (Fig. 1.4),⁴² while their 1896 model (Fig. 1.5) had pedals and was decorated with inlaid wood. The keyboards on the 1896 model also had more in common with the look of a modern piano.⁴³

Fig. 1.4. Érard harpsichord, 1889. D.B.im: Inv. 5191.⁴⁴

Fig. 1.5. Érard harpsichord, 1896. D.B.im: Inv. 4924.⁴⁵

Érard and Pleyel based their 1889 Exposition models primarily on a 1769 Pascal Taskin harpsichord restored by Tomasini in 1882.⁴⁶ According to Jean-Claude Battault, this was not

⁴¹ Battault, "Les clavecins Pleyel, Érard et Gaveau," 199–200. Another reason manufacturing ceased in 1914 was likely the First World War.

⁴² Érard's catalogue, "Exposition Rétrospective 1889," 87, as described in Elste, "Nostalgische Musikmaschinen," 245.

⁴³ Some antique harpsichords shared the same colouring of piano keyboards, i.e. naturals covered in light-coloured boxwood and sharps of stained walnut. See the Italian harpsichord by Stefano Bolcioni, 1731, held in the Yale Collection of Musical Instruments, Accession No. 4889.

⁴⁴ Photo by Annie Dalbera.

⁴⁵ Photo by Gérard Janot.

⁴⁶ Elste, "Nostalgische Musikmaschinen," 245.

Tomasini's first restoration and he had completed several prior to 1880.⁴⁷ Also worth noting is that Tomasini's business card displayed his awards, including two silver medals for his 1889 *clavecin* (harpsichord) Exposition entry (Fig. 1.6).

Fig. 1.6. Business Card of Louis Tomasini, ca. 1889.⁴⁸

Tomasini's Exposition instrument (Fig. 1.8 on the right) had Louis XV cabriole legs, as did the 1769 Taskin (Fig. 1.7) and featured case paintings after Jean-Antoine Watteau (1684–1721). The disposition of the upper manual on this instrument is an 8' x Lute x Moderator, with the lower manual 8' x 4'.⁴⁹ Tomasini's instrument was modelled not only after the 1769 Taskin, but also a harpsichord built by Henri Hemsch (1755/1756).⁵⁰

⁴⁷ Battault, "Les clavecins," 194; Elste earlier surmised that the 1882 restoration was Tomasini's first, in "Nostalgische Musikmaschinen," 245.

⁴⁸ Reproduced in Elste, "Nostalgische Musikmaschinen," 245.

⁴⁹ Ibid., see 251 for the disposition of all revival harpsichords exhibited at the 1889 Exposition. The moderator has the effect of dampening the sound.

⁵⁰ Elste, "Nostalgische Musikmaschinen," 246.

that may have developed into the “plucking piano” moniker used derogatively by authors during the twentieth century, such as Wolfgang Zuckermann.⁵⁵

Fig. 1.9. Pleyel harpsichord, 1889.
D.B.im: Inv. 4874.⁵⁶

Fig. 1.10. Pleyel harpsichord, 1891.
D.B.im: E1: Inv. 1598.⁵⁷

Attitudes at the Time of the 1889 Paris Exposition

Expositions such as the one in Paris in 1889 were a popular form of entertainment and education; they also promoted national pride. A statement made by American President William McKinley (1843–1901) famously summarised their value: “Expositions are timekeepers of progress . . . They record the world’s advancement; they stimulate the energy, enterprise and intellect of the people and quicken human genius.”⁵⁸ The first Paris Exposition was held in 1855, but the 1889 Exposition was the first to feature music on such a

⁵⁵ Zuckermann, *Modern Harpsichord*, 164.

⁵⁶ Photo at Pinterest.com.

⁵⁷ Photo at <http://www.mim.be/pleyel-harpsichord>.

⁵⁸ Quoted in Elaine Brody, *Paris: The Musical Kaleidoscope 1870–1925* (New York: George Braziller, 1987), 77. This quotation was made during a speech at the Pan-American Exposition, Buffalo, New York on September 5, 1901.

grand scale and with international contributions.⁵⁹ Annegret Fauser has associated national pride with instrument manufacturing in France at the 1889 Exposition, particularly as France had previously been considered preeminent instrument builders worldwide, but had fallen behind Great Britain, Germany and the United States towards the end of the nineteenth century.⁶⁰

The 1889 Exposition displayed antique and new revival French harpsichords in what was an “event of superlatives”⁶¹ that showed off the best of France in celebration of the centenary of the French Revolution. Two historical concerts were performed by Paris Conservatoire piano professor Louis Diémer (1843–1919) on the 1889 Pleyel, with music already known to local audiences including works by Jean-Philippe Rameau and François Couperin.⁶² Fauser detailed the deep familiarity of early French music among Parisian concert-goers in the late nineteenth century that had been established over fifty years of historical concerts. In addition to Diémer, it is less-well known that two female harpsichordists, Marguerite Delcourt (Fig. 1.11) and Régina Patorni-Casadesus (Fig. 1.12) also performed at the Exposition.

⁵⁹ Other international expositions included: London, 1851 and 1862; Paris 1867, 1878, and 1889; Vienna, 1873; Philadelphia, 1876; Melbourne, 1880; and Barcelona, 1888.

⁶⁰ Annegret Fauser, *Musical Encounters at the 1889 Paris World's Fair* (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2005), 25.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 1.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 318–19. Diémer concertised with the 1769 Taskin and 1889 Pleyel after the Exposition, especially with the Société des instruments anciens, which he co-founded in 1901.

Fig. 1.11. Marguerite Delcourt with the 1889 Pleyel harpsichord, ca. 1905. Musée de la musique, Paris: Inv. E. 988.9.18.⁶³

⁶³ Reproduced from Battault, "Les clavecins," 197.

Fig. 1.12. Postcard, ca. 1911. Bibliothèque nationale de France.⁶⁴

Harpsichords at the 1889 Exposition exemplified French refinement from a nineteenth-century perspective. Associated with the French aristocratic past, harpsichords were thought to contrast eloquently with instruments and music from non-Western cultures at the Exposition. Jann Pasler has explored the implications of racial overtones and ideas of cultural superiority during the late nineteenth century, at a time when musical instruments signified “hierarchy in notions of beauty, taste and aesthetic judgement within race and ethnicity.”⁶⁵ Fauser also considered that this brand of nationalism during France’s Third Republic encompassed a comprehensive representation of French history that included, rather than excluded, the aristocratic culture previously rejected in the French Revolution. Érard produced fourteen harpsichords before abandoning production, but Pleyel continued beyond the scope of what began as an intriguing project for the Exposition of 1889,

⁶⁴ Photo at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:OCasadesus_Soc_Instruments_Anciens.jpg.

⁶⁵ Jann Pasler, “The Utility of Musical Instruments in the Racial and Colonial Agendas of Late Nineteenth-Century France,” *Journal of the Royal Musical Association* 129/1 (2004): 24–76.

producing approximately 180 instruments up until 1970.⁶⁶ The goal of these companies was to improve upon designs of antique harpsichords that were considered frail predecessors of the modern piano. As one anonymous reviewer of a 1905 concert in London remarked: “Sitting quietly in Queen’s Hall, and waiting for Miss Landowska to make her appearance, one reflected that there was a tremendous advance in mechanism from the long, thin somewhat anaemic-looking harpsichord to the substantial, modern piano.”⁶⁷ Later, in 1944, builder John Challis was still encountering the “lay notion that the harpsichord is a sort of Pleistocene piano.”⁶⁸

1.3. The Development of Popular French Factory Harpsichords by Pleyel

After Gustave Lyon became managing director of Pleyel in 1887, he took a rare step of working with Polish harpsichordist and pianist Wanda Landowska (1879–1959) at a time when coordinating design aspects with a performer was unusual.⁶⁹ Together with his chief engineer, M. Lamy and after years of planning and production, Pleyel premiered the *Grand modèle de concert* with Landowska at the 1912 Breslau Festival.⁷⁰ Pleyel’s pre-1912 factory models were similar to the 1905 version shown below (Fig. 1.13), having three rows of strings, six pedals, and a disposition of 1’ x 4,’ 2 x 8’ plus a nasal stop. The tailpiece was metal, but most of the instrument was made of wood.⁷¹ The 16’ stop was not included until the 1912 model and a full metal frame not until 1923.

⁶⁶ http://www.mim.be/pleyel-harpsichord?from_i_m=1#, accessed October 2, 2014. Others suggest a total number of ca. 100; see Bjarne Dahl and Richard Wyton, “Pleyel,” in *Harpsichord and Clavichord: An Encyclopedia*, ed. Igor Kipnis (New York: Routledge, 2007), 378.

⁶⁷ Johnson, “Revival and Antiquation,” 50, citing anon., “Matters Musical,” *The Bystander* 6/73 (April 26, 1905): 194.

⁶⁸ Anon., “Man from Ypsilanti,” *Time Magazine*, January 24, 1944, 92–93, quoted in Palmer, *Harpsichord in America*, 87.

⁶⁹ *Uncommon Visionary: A Documentary on the Life and Art of Wanda Landowska* (1997), by Barbara Attie, Janet Goldwater and Diane Pontius (Video Artists International DVD 4246).

⁷⁰ For further information see Michael Latcham, “Don Quixote and Wanda Landowska: Bells and Pleyels,” *Early Music* 34/1 (2005): 95–109. M. Lamy’s first name is unknown.

⁷¹ Battault, “Les clavecins,” 198.

Fig. 1.13. Pleyel-Wolff-Lyon & C^{ie} harpsichord, 1905. D.B.im: Inv. 8992.⁷²

Revivals of Neo-Greek architecture and Neo-classical designs were popular in France from the second half of the nineteenth and into the first decades of the twentieth century. The decorated pedal lyre, fluted columns and use of colour in design details shown on a 1927 Pleyel (Fig. 1.14) would have had more in common with the latest fashions than with the design aesthetics of the Baroque era. The photo below (Fig. 1.14) shows colourful rubber buttons that kept one's foot from slipping, before rubber-soled shoes became the norm after the Second World War.⁷³

⁷² Photo by Gérard Janot.

⁷³ McAllister, *Talking Harpsichords*, 99.

Fig. 1.14. Pleyel harpsichord pedals, 1927. D.B.im: Inv. 4885.⁷⁴

Two tables of pedal operation created by builder Alastair McAllister appear in Fig. 1.15. The first relates to Pleyel harpsichords made between 1912 and 1956, which McAllister refers to as “Landowska models.”⁷⁵ Four of the pedals on these instruments operate in the “negative” direction, meaning they are on when up. (The Lute, Coupler and Buff operate when pressed downward in the “positive” direction.) Harpsichords made after 1956 were altered in ways that included a reversal of pedal direction for certain pedals, a change made at the behest of Columbian harpsichordist, Rafael Puyana (1931–2013). Instead of having pedals that operated negatively, all pedals on the “Puyana models” operate when pressed downward in the “positive” direction, as in the manner of foot pedals on a piano.

McAllister has pointed out several advantages of Landowska’s negative pedal design. When “negative” pedals are voiced in the rest position (meaning on and up), plectra cannot be “overplucked” as can pedals that can be depressed past their voicing point. A harpsichord performance technique known as “overplucking” creates an increase in sound as the pedal is depressed and is used for crescendo effects, but this practice damages the leather

⁷⁴ Photo by the author.

⁷⁵ McAllister, *Talking Harpsichords*, 91.

pectra's elastic memory.⁷⁶ The voicing, therefore, of a Landowska model tends to remain more stable than for a Puyana model. A further advantage of negatively-operated pedals is less wear on the felt lining of pedals and thus easier maintenance.⁷⁷ McAllister's explanations are significant, as Howard Schott has recorded, for example, that negative-action pedals were so designed "for reasons which have never been explained."⁷⁸

<i>Landowska Model</i>						
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16	4	L8	Buff	Cplr	Lute	U8
Buff, Lute and Coupler pedals work in the positive. Depressing the remaining pedals disengages the registers.						

<i>Puyana Model</i>						
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16	L8	4	Buff	Cplr	Lute	U8
All registers are engaged by depressing the pedals. Additional pedal pressure intended to produce greater volume.						

Fig. 1.15. Tables of Comparative Pedal Dispositions. Reproduced with permission.⁷⁹

1.4. German Factory Instruments of J. C. Neupert

Germany was the foremost producer and exporter of revival harpsichords in the twentieth century and included the J. C. Neupert firm, the only company still manufacturing revival models today. Twentieth-century German output in the tens of thousands came from builders including Kurt Wittmayer, Kurt Sperrhake, Konrad Sassmann and Karl Maendler, many of whom had apprenticed with Neupert.⁸⁰ Ammer, a company founded by Alois and Michael Ammer, catered especially to Eastern Europe. In 1968, Sperrhake was the largest worldwide producer of revival harpsichords and had sold approximately 8,000 instruments

⁷⁶ McAllister, *Talking Harpsichords*, 95. (Note: Battault, "Les clavecins," 208 gives 1959 as the date of change to positive pedal direction.)

⁷⁷ McAllister, interview with the author, Melbourne, October 2015.

⁷⁸ Schott, "Harpsichord Revival," 91.

⁷⁹ McAllister, *Talking Harpsichords*, 99. U = upper manual and L = lower manual.

⁸⁰ Maendler-Schramm halted production after the Second World War. Most firms suspended production during the war, except Challis in the United States (see Appendix I for a table of builders).

from 1948–1968.⁸¹ Neupert’s third generation managing director, Hans Neupert, presented an annual turnover figure of DM 5,000,000 for the four largest German harpsichord factories at the Berlin 1965 Europiano Congress, a sum he used to defend the continuation of revival harpsichord building practices in the face of criticism that such instruments were “inauthentic.”⁸²

Neupert began building historical harpsichords in 1973, after fourth generation Wolfgang Dieter Neupert became Managing Director, with a likely period of transition as builders learned new methods and approaches.⁸³ In 2014, the Neupert firm’s revival models comprised 20% of their total harpsichord output.⁸⁴ W. D. Neupert has generously provided the figures below for his company’s production of double-manual revival concert models from 1906 until 2014 (Fig. 1.16). Neupert revival models were built in their greatest numbers between 1930 and 1970, during which time leading musicians (among them Ralph Kirkpatrick and Karl Richter) played and recorded on such models. Approximately 10,000 Neupert revival instruments were built from 1906 to 1970, which included single-manual revival harpsichords. From 1973 until 2014, the company constructed approximately 7,000 harpsichords, including historical and revival types.⁸⁵

<u>Model</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Number</u>
Cembalo “K”	1906–1937	30 instruments
Cembalo “D4”	1929–1939	65 instruments
“Bach”	1930–end of 2014	638 instruments
“Couperin” (with pedal or hand stops)	1935–end of 2014	730 instruments
“Cristofori”	1938–end of 2014	621 instruments
“Vivaldi”	1949–1984	383 instruments
“Händel”	1955–1980	169 instruments

Fig. 1.16. Neupert Production Figures for Double-Manual Revival Models from 1906–2014.⁸⁶

⁸¹ Zuckermann, *Modern Harpsichord*, 186; he found it difficult to obtain precise production figures for other German companies.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 154.

⁸³ Carey Beebe, interview with the author, Sydney, September 30, 2015.

⁸⁴ Email from W. D. Neupert, October 30, 2014.

⁸⁵ *Loc. cit.*

⁸⁶ *Loc. cit.*

Rather than the overhead damping system used by Pleyel that resembled a piano's system, the Neupert firm designed metallic "OK" jacks with thick pads of felt attached as dampers.⁸⁷ Compared to the thin pieces of felt called "flags" used for historical harpsichord dampers, "OK" dampers shown below (Fig. 1.17) strongly silence the large-diameter strings of a Neupert instrument. This accounts in part for the abrupt cut off sound achieved on such revival instruments.⁸⁸

Fig. 1.17. Neupert harpsichord, 1967. Philharmonie de Paris: E.01297.⁸⁹

⁸⁷ According to Hal Haney, Mrs. Hans Neupert designed the "OK" jacks, see HCSCH-L Listserv 16.0, April 6, 1998 (10:34:02), <https://list.uiowa.edu/scripts/wa.exe?A2=ind9804&L=HPSCHD-L&D=0&P=36877> accessed January 11, 2017.

⁸⁸ For a description of Pleyel's overhead damping system, see McAllister, *Talking Harpsichords*, 101.

⁸⁹ Photo by Claude Germain.

1.5. Periods of Harpsichord Building in the Twentieth Century

W. D. Neupert has delineated two “epochs” in German revival harpsichord making. The first from 1889 until the 1930s, was marked by metal framing and heavy influences from piano manufacturing.⁹⁰ The second, which overlapped slightly, ranged from the 1930s–1960s and featured a “mixed construction” of modern and historical elements with an emphasis on the disposition of the mistakenly-called “Bach” harpsichord. The so-called “Bach” harpsichord (No. 316 at the D.B.im) was acquired by Paul de Wit, a dealer in early musical instruments, late in the nineteenth century, but the instrument was never owned by J. S. Bach as de Wit claimed. However, the myth persisted and this harpsichord was used as a model for thousands of harpsichords, particularly in the inclusion of a 16’ stop, a 4’ stop on the top manual and rather heavy build.⁹¹ Only later did it become clear that the “Bach” harpsichord was an atypical design from the eighteenth century and that the presence of the 4’ on the top manual was the result of a subsequent alteration.⁹² The French Pleyel firm was not influenced by the “Bach” harpsichord and never placed their 4’ stop on the top manual.

Nearly all manufacturers worldwide used leather as a plectrum material for their revival models.⁹³ New revival harpsichords currently built by Neupert can be quilled with either Delrin or leather. The discovery of Delrin as a plectrum material in 1956 helped to enable the lightening of cases and around the framing, keys and registers for historical harpsichord models.⁹⁴ A confluence of technologies and preferences created a potentially “final” phase in harpsichord building in the late twentieth century, using more traditional methods and materials from the sixteenth through the eighteenth centuries. Influencing events included X-rays for the examination of internal specifications of antique harpsichords, a post-war return of interest in natural materials over metal, affordable kit-sets from 1960, a

⁹⁰ W. D. Neupert, “Cembalobau im 20. Jahrhundert.” Paper presented at the Annual Meeting for the Bund Deutscher Klavierbauer (Banz Castle, Germany, May 9, 2013): 6.

⁹¹ See Sabine Hoffmann, “Das Berliner ‘Bach Cembalo’ aus der Perspektive seiner Restaurierungen und Nachbauten,” in *Music of the Past – Instruments and Imagination*, ed. Michael Latham (Bern: Peter Lang, 2006), 151–168.

⁹² See Schott, “Harpsichord Revival,” 88.

⁹³ The Dolmetsch-Chickering, No. 60 used crow quill, for example.

⁹⁴ This concept was attributed to R. K. Lee, Hubbard and Dowd’s first apprentice, in Edward Kottick, *The Harpsichord Owner’s Guide: A Manual for Buyers and Owners* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1987), 52. For Delrin, see <http://www.dupont.com/products-and-services/plastics-polymers-resins/articles/innovation-of-plastics.html>.

commitment to understanding the merits of antique harpsichord technology, and builders who apprenticed in the Dolmetsch workshop at Haslemere or with Hugh Gough. This historically-oriented direction was also seen in revival harpsichord models that might be called semi-historical, as they share features of revival and historical harpsichords. Restorations of revival harpsichords today often replace leather plectra with Delrin or similar materials.

1.6. Toward Historical Models

Arnold Dolmetsch

French-born musician-scholar and builder Arnold Dolmetsch (1858–1940) worked in England, the United States and France. Although eschewing much piano-informed technology, he nonetheless built with hallmarks of modern design such as foot pedals and a 16' register.⁹⁵ The instrument below (Fig. 1.18) was built during Dolmetsch's employment with the Gaveau piano manufacturing company in Paris from 1911–1914. Its ornate "classical" French exterior has cabriole legs and a wooden frame, but the six pedals and 16' register mark it as modern. The young harpsichordist Ralph Kirkpatrick compared Gaveau harpsichords to the Pleyels he had been playing, in a diary entry of 1931: "Saturday morning I really saw the Gabriel Gaveau harpsichords, which are quite good, at least real harpsichords and most delightful after the Pleyels."⁹⁶

⁹⁵ Dolmetsch's first harpsichord, built in 1894, featured half-hitching and pedals, but no 16'. In 1908, he began building a 16' onto American Chickering models.

⁹⁶ *Ralph Kirkpatrick: Letters of the American Harpsichordist and Scholar*, ed. Meredith Kirkpatrick, journal entry of December 7, 1931 (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2014), 16.

Fig. 1.18. Gaveau harpsichord built in Haslemere, Surrey by Arnold Dolmetsch, 1923.
D.B.im: Inv. 5121.⁹⁷

The United States

American builder John Challis was apprenticed to Dolmetsch, whose influence helped steer the attitudes of American builders toward historical building practices.⁹⁸ Frank Hubbard, who was a founding member of the “Boston School” of historically-oriented harpsichord building from 1949, was apprenticed to Hugh Gough as well as at the Haslemere workshop under the direction of Arnold Dolmetsch’s son, Carl Dolmetsch. Hubbard’s workshop co-founder, William Dowd, learned from Challis in the United States. Challis relied on unique construction methods, particularly after his development of an aluminium soundboard. When asked why he switched from wood to steel, which was the first stage in creating a metal soundboard, he responded:

Because harpsichords had always been made of wood and I believed there could be something better. The old ones were not designed this way and I wanted to see if

⁹⁷ Photo by Annie Dalbera.

⁹⁸ Keith Andrew Thorp, “The Twentieth-Century Harpsichord: Approaches to Composition and Performance Practice as Evidenced by the Contemporary Repertoire” (DMA diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1981), 12.

they could be improved upon. The old ones could not be easily tuned, and when they were in tune, they didn't stay that way.⁹⁹

Eventually Challis lit on the idea of using aluminium. Positive reviews of these harpsichords included: "It sings much longer than wood and has a beautiful tone."¹⁰⁰ But some orders were cancelled after he introduced aluminium, and it was an effort to overcome customer resistance to this material.

Challis's models (for example, see Fig. 1.19 and 1.20), along with those of German-born builder, Eric Herz (1919–2002) can be considered semi-historical, in part because they were not as heavily built as the European factory instruments such as by Neupert. A member of the "Boston School," Herz as well as Challis continued to build with a 16' register after it had become "one of the seven deadly sins" of harpsichord construction.¹⁰¹

Fig. 1.19. John Challis harpsichord, 1982.
Yale Collection of Musical Instruments: Inv. 4906.2011.¹⁰²

⁹⁹ Harold Haney, "Portrait of a Builder," *The Harpsichord* 4/1 (1971): 17.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 16–17.

¹⁰¹ Interview with Kroll, July 2014.

¹⁰² <http://musical-instruments.squarespace.com/music-at-hand/>, accessed August 12, 2016.

Fig. 1.20. Interior, John Challis harpsichord, 1982.
Yale Collection of Musical Instruments: Inv. 4906.2011.¹⁰³

Fig. 1.20 above shows the aluminium hitch pin rail of the 1982 Challis harpsichord pictured in Fig. 1.19 and the 4', 8' and 16' bridges, which were made of brass. Challis drilled holes into his brass bridges to lighten their weight.¹⁰⁴ Figs. 1.21 and 1.22 below show a Herz harpsichord built in 1970, with its bridges made of wood.

¹⁰³ Photo by the author.

¹⁰⁴ Email from McAllister, March 3, 2017.

Fig. 1.21. Eric Herz harpsichord, 1970, op. 202.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁵ Sold on harpsichordclearinghouse.com, accessed January 2, 2017.

Fig. 1.22. Interior, Eric Herz harpsichord, 1970, op. 202.¹⁰⁶

Another semi-historical instrument (see Figs. 1.23–1.25 below) was made by Frank Rutkowski and Robert Robinette, builders who were entrusted with care of the Yale Instrument Collection for many years.¹⁰⁷ The instrument was closely-modelled on eighteenth-century French harpsichords, but was also influenced by Challis designs.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁶ Loc. cit.

¹⁰⁷ They were appointed as museum instrument conservators at Yale University in 1982, <http://music.yale.edu/2015/01/09/memorial-richard-rephann-82/>.

¹⁰⁸ Jessica Wood, "Rutkowski and Robinette," *Grove Dictionary of Musical Instruments* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014).

Fig. 1.23. Rutkowski and Robinette harpsichord, 1961.¹⁰⁹

American harpsichordist Igor Kipnis (1930–2002) previously owned the instrument pictured in Fig. 1.23, and noted that it did not need much attention to regulation or tuning, even while on tour.¹¹⁰ This semi-historical harpsichord provided its owner with the comparable advantage of robust stability over other types of harpsichord available at the time, echoing the reported experiences of customers of Challis harpsichords. The “modern” influences on this 1961 Rutkowski and Robinette included the use of metal, which was thought to positively affect the harpsichord's ability to stay in tune. Rutkowski made revival harpsichords from 1957, with Robinette joining him in 1961. They built harpsichords at a rate of about three per year and switched to historical construction around the late 1960s

¹⁰⁹ Item No. 853502 auctioned at I-Gavel auctions from Igor Kipnis's estate in 2007, http://bid.igavelauctions.com/Bidding.taf?_function=detail&Auction_uid1=853502, accessed March 28, 2016.

¹¹⁰ Tom Moore, “An interview with Igor Kipnis,” *Fanfare* 25/3 (2002): 76.

and early 1970s, in keeping with the times.¹¹¹ The registration of the 1961 harpsichord shown above is 8' x 8' x 4' with six pedals. Fig. 1.23 shows its front 8', 4', back 8' quilled in Delrin, with the back 8' quilled in leather. The rearmost set of jacks carries a piano-informed damping system, but which is much lighter than the metal damper bar on a Pleyel. Note also the metallic 4' hitch pin rail and plastic jacks below, possibly made from phenolic resin.¹¹² A final picture (Fig. 1.25) shows the instrument's fuller interior.

Fig. 1.24. Detail of Rutkowski and Robinette harpsichord, 1961.¹¹³

¹¹¹ See Zuckermann, *Modern Harpsichord*, 170; Grinnell College, see <http://omeka1.grinnell.edu/MusicalInstruments/items/show/305> for a description of their “hybrid” single-manual Rutkowski and Robinette (1962).

¹¹² Email from McAllister, October 9, 2016.

¹¹³ Photo at http://bid.igavelauctions.com/Bidding.taf?_function=detail&Auction_uid1=853502, accessed March 28, 2016.

Fig. 1.25. Rutkowski and Robinette harpsichord, 1961. Kipnis estate.¹¹⁴

1.7 Summary and Conclusion

This chapter has looked at a range of revival instruments, including those that bear a close similarity to historical models, revealing a spectrum of revival harpsichords rather than one standard, representative model. To ascertain the potential value of revival harpsichords for today's audiences and performers, understanding the zeitgeist in which they were built and recognising that form, appearance and function differ according to make and model, helps us appreciate that they were built for aesthetic purposes that continue to change over time.

Semi-historical harpsichords by Dolmetsch and other builders reflected tastes akin to the Arts and Crafts movement, including the use of natural materials such as wood instead of metal. One way to view the competing and overlapping styles of revival harpsichords is to consider the sometimes different and intersecting philosophies of Beauty that have underpinned them. Organic materials and designs also used in architecture around the beginning of the twentieth century were distinct from an ethos of designing with materials

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

from the factory and mass production, such as cast iron. Both aesthetic strands, however, were in evidence and were reflected, for example, in the Eiffel Tower built for the Paris Exposition of 1889.¹¹⁵

While it has often been considered that revival harpsichords were the products of a grand narrative favouring manufactured instruments, there were other conceptions such as the semi-historical revival harpsichords of Dolmetsch, Gough, Herz and Challis that represented a variety of aesthetic aims. We also need not assume that the more heavily-built factory revival instruments, with their own distinct sound and capabilities, are without an aesthetic purpose that is applicable today, particularly for the performance of works composed for these instruments.

The differing capabilities, touch, sound and external decoration of revival harpsichords distinguish them from historical models. The next chapter explores divergent perspectives on revival harpsichords, in ways that help contextualise and question the widely-held view that historical harpsichords are in every way superior to revival models.

¹¹⁵ On the use of glass and iron, see Girolamo De Michele, “The New Object (Iron and Glass: The New Beauty),” in *Beauty*, ed. Umberto Eco, trans. Alastair McEwen (London: Maclehose Press, 2004), 364–367.

Chapter Two

Revival Harpsichord Reception

“The Pleyel harpsichord sounds as much like a typewriter in Berlin as in Paris.”¹
—Ralph Kirkpatrick, 1932

This chapter examines issues arising in the reception of revival harpsichords to better understand their current use and value. Parameters considered include financial, historical, restoration and aesthetic aspects, along with personal attachments to these instruments. Although a wide range of topics relating to reception is covered, a truly comprehensive study of revival harpsichord reception is beyond the scope of this chapter.

The first section provides an overview of selected recent locations of revival harpsichords, along with a consideration of the significance of quality restoration. A second section presents a chronological view of revival harpsichord reception from the late nineteenth century to 1980. This tells the story of a harpsichord type at first ambivalently welcomed, then widely accepted, later vilified for being inauthentic, and as seen in Chapter Three, finally preserved out of historical performance practice concerns and enjoyment of the instrument. Following the lead of authors such as Leon Botstein in his article, “Music in History: The Perils of Method in Reception History,”² the goal is to situate the perspectives of builders, critics, musicologists, composers and performers within a historical context. Where relevant, connections are made between current and historical evaluation of revival harpsichords. The hope is that in the future, revival harpsichords may be freed from their traditional, constant comparison with historical models and evaluated not on the basis of an assumed inferiority, but on their “own merits.”³ A final section looks at stereotypes and a recent softening of the reception of “gadgets” associated with revival models, particularly the 16’ stop and pedals.

¹ Ralph Kirkpatrick, *Early Years*, journal entry for November 7, 1932 (New York: Peter Lang, 1985), 100.

² Leon Botstein, “Music in History: The Perils of Method in Reception History,” *Musical Quarterly* 89/1 (2006): 1–16.

³ “Own merits” is from a remark on the subject by Dutch builder Martin Spaink, posting on Facebook group: HARPSICHORD - CEMBALO – CLAVECIN – KLAVECYMBEL, April 17, 2015. (On April 19, 2015, a post announced the total member list for the group had reached 4900.)

Part One: Alternative Fates of Revival Harpsichords

2.1. Overview of Recent Locations of Revival Harpsichords

In 1983, harpsichord builder John Paul proposed three fates of harpsichords that were constructed in England in the 1970s and early 1980s: “No doubt posterity will decide that it likes some of our instruments better than others and direct some to museums, some to bonfires and some to continued use.”⁴ These same categories can be aptly used to describe alternative fates of revival harpsichords today. While widely considered obsolete and housed in museums, revival harpsichords also play a minor role in professional and amateur music making. They are traded secondhand in stores and on websites such as the German music-anzeigen.com, British Online Galleries and the American Harpsichord Clearing House located near Boston, Massachusetts.⁵ One example from the last-named company website showed thirteen double-manual revival models listed on October 16, 2015 at a median price of \$US 13,000, while fifty-eight double-manual historical secondhand instruments were available at a median cost of \$US 18,000. Although more historical instruments were for sale at a higher price, the number of revival models was not negligible and were offered at a higher price overall than might be expected of a completely undesirable instrument.⁶

Secondhand prices for revival harpsichords are significantly lower than their newly manufactured price: for example, a new Neupert “Bach” double-manual revival harpsichord currently sells for US\$48,628.⁷ While the market for revival harpsichords is much smaller relative to historical harpsichords, it is arguably beyond a mere category of collectibles.

As it is beyond the scope of this dissertation to create a comprehensive survey of international venues, a few examples are provided of revival harpsichords that I have come across during the course of my research. They include a 1975 revival Herz used at the University of Southern California at Santa Barbara;⁸ a restored Pleyel for Christopher Lewis’s

⁴ John Paul, *Modern Harpsichord Makers* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1981), 55.

⁵ <http://www.onlinegalleries.com/art-and-antiques/antique-musical-instruments/antique-harpsichords> and <http://www.harpsichord.com>.

⁶ Searches on the HCH website throughout 2016 yielded similar results. Results do not take into account the length of time that instruments were listed but not sold.

⁷ <http://www.jc-neupert.de>, accessed October 18, 2016.

⁸ Patrick Lindley, interview with the author, UCSB, December 2014. The Herz is mostly used for contemporary music.

Master's work in contemporary harpsichord performance at the San Francisco Conservatory of Music; a 1969 John Feldberg revival harpsichord utilised by the University of Southampton (UK) Trust for a research and performance project, "Making of the Modern Harpsichord" and a restored "Eaton Pleyel" (ca. 1930) employed for a recent revival harpsichord recording by Lewis, *20th Century Harpsichord Music*.⁹ Revival harpsichords are available for contemporary music performances at the Czech Academy of Performing Arts (AMU), where harpsichord lecturer Monika Knoblochová is considering offering a course on how to play revival harpsichords.¹⁰ There is a Sperrhake at the University of Toledo, and in New Zealand are two William de Blaise harpsichords in Christchurch at St Mary's Catholic Church (Pro Cathedral) used for annual performances of Bach's *St. John Passion* and Handel's *Messiah*. Two additional examples in New Zealand are a 1975 de Blaise single-manual "Model A" purchased in 2015 by local music teacher Heather de Ridder in Palmerston North and a Wittmayer owned by and used on rare occasions by the New Zealand Symphony Orchestra.¹¹

2.2. Are Revival Harpsichords Obsolete?

When I asked Melbourne builder Alastair McAllister whether he believed revival harpsichords were obsolete, he replied in the negative.¹² Yet, revival and historical harpsichords are often considered competing technologies, with obsolescence the foregone conclusion for revival harpsichords. Taking into account the ongoing interest in revival repertoire, that revival harpsichords are still used for both contemporary and early music and are newly manufactured and traded second hand, we might profit from examining this obsolete status. Dictionaries define obsolescence as that which is "no longer in use or no longer useful" and as "having been replaced by something newer and better or more fashionable."¹³ There exists a continuum along which revival repertoire can be successfully

⁹ Christopher D. Lewis, <http://blog.soton.ac.uk/music/tag/the-making-of-the-modern-harpsichord/>, accessed December 12, 2015; Lewis, *20th Century Harpsichord Music*, Naxos, 8.573364, 2015.

¹⁰ Email from Knoblochová, April 21, 2016.

¹¹ The Sperrhake at the University of Toledo needed maintenance as of July 2015 and is sometimes used according to Assistant Professor of Music Pamela Stover (interviewed onsite, July 12, 2015). Information on the NZSO Wittmayer was obtained from harpsichordist Douglas Mews, November 3, 2016.

¹² McAllister, interview with the author, Melbourne 2015.

¹³ "Obsolete," Merriam-webster.com, Cambridge University Press, accessed September 15, 2016.

transferred from revival harpsichords to historical models, and some believe revival instruments should be more highly valued for historically-informed performances of these works. Repertoire will be a focus of Chapter Three, including the notion that learning about revival instruments can illuminate performance aspects of revival works on revival as well as historical harpsichords.

2.3. Impassioned Speech

The increasingly negative stance taken against revival instruments that was prevalent particularly during the 1950s until around 1980 developed in part out of the efforts required to supplant revival models. Revival harpsichords were economically successful prior to the early 1970s. Those who favoured historical harpsichords felt they needed to re-educate the public and argued that modern designs had strayed from the original intent of what a harpsichord was. Such critics wanted instruments that supported the musical aesthetics of the Renaissance and Baroque periods, which meant lightweight designs that better enabled strings of a small diameter to vibrate freely, without the encumbrance of influences from piano manufacturing. The first publication to contribute significantly toward an appreciation of historical harpsichords was Raymond Russell's 1959 *The Harpsichord and Clavichord, an Introductory Study*, followed in 1965 by Frank Hubbard's landmark *Three Centuries of Harpsichord Making*.¹⁴ Numerous authors subsequently contributed to the general conclusion that progress was best represented by, in the words of author and harpsichordist Larry Palmer: "building harpsichords in the style of eighteenth-century instruments rather than as modern deviations from the piano."¹⁵

Critics of revival instruments tended to be vehement, as was Wolfgang Zuckermann in his *Modern Harpsichord* in 1969, writing "The German factory harpsichords (and the instruments of Ammer, Neupert, Sperrhake, Wittmayer and others are so alike that they can be lumped together) can be faulted for the way they look, sound, and work."¹⁶ A tendency

¹⁴ Raymond Russell, *Harpsichord and Clavichord, an Introductory Study* (London: Faber and Faber, 1959); Frank Hubbard, *Three Centuries of Harpsichord Making* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1965).

¹⁵ Larry Palmer, foreword to *Harpsichord and Clavichord Music of the Twentieth Century* by Frances Bedford (Berkeley, CA: Fallen Leaf Press, 1993): xvii.

¹⁶ Zuckermann, *Modern Harpsichord*, 73.

toward impassioned language was reflected by many in the early music community at that time, who averred that certain techniques, performers and instruments were better than others in an absolute sense. Hardened opinions on historical authenticity have been recorded in such sources as *Reprise: The Extraordinary Revival of Early Music*, which reflected on the 1976 French “war of the airwaves,” a “‘legal’ pitch for performing Bach” and debates described as “flying . . . brickbats.”¹⁷ An ensuing correction against applying rigid rules to the performance of early music resulted in such rebuffs as “Earlier than Thou.”¹⁸ Patrick Lindley, a staff member at the UCSB Department of Theatre and Dance, described an overall situation of unpleasant behavior in the 1960s and 1970s, with strong allegiances formed among builders, players and their students. He believed financial pressures helped motivate poor behavior that included examples known to him, in which one licensed harpsichord dealer received a threatening phone call by another dealer.¹⁹

Zuckerman stated in 1969 that historical harpsichords alone adequately represent the form and function of the harpsichord: “such an instrument [by Ammer] can be damaging in its capacity as a representative of the genus ‘harpsichord.’”²⁰ There is a significance therefore in the wording chosen by Kottick in 2003 when he termed historical harpsichords as not necessarily “better,” but “different” than revival models.²¹ As Mark Kroll has also said of Pleyels: “I have played Bach, Couperin and Scarlatti on Pleyels, and they sound wonderful. Different, but wonderful.”²²

2.4. A Range of Perspectives

Whether one accepts revival harpsichords as valid instruments may depend on factors that include the choice of repertoire, restoration, availability, transportation, functionality, tonal

¹⁷ Joel Cohen and Herb Snitzer, *Reprise: The Extraordinary Revival of Early Music* (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1985), 3–4.

¹⁸ This phrase parodies “Holier than Thou,” described by Kroll in interviews with the author in Boston, 2014. For further details, see Laurence Dreyfus, “Early Music Defended against its Devotees: A Theory of Historical Performance in the Twentieth Century,” *Musical Quarterly* 69 (Summer 1983): 297–322.

¹⁹ Lindley, interview, Santa Barbara. 2014.

²⁰ Zuckermann, *Modern Harpsichord*, 76.

²¹ Kottick, *History of the Harpsichord*, 467.

²² Email from Kroll, April 5, 2015.

expectations and personal preferences.²³ Reactions to revival instruments range from highly negative, as in William Dowd's famous words to Harold Haney in 1971, "We felt that the whole German school [of revival harpsichord making], Neupert, Wittmayer, and Pleyel, who is sort of the chief anti-Christ of them all, must have plugs in their ears. They were not making anything remotely like an antique harpsichord," to positive, as for amateur musician Conny May, whom I visited in Palmerston North, New Zealand in 2014.²⁴ Her love of her revival, late 1960s-model Sperrhake previously owned by her Lutheran minister father, included the familial connection that drew her to the instrument as well as an intrinsic enjoyment: "I like the sound; it is a new creation." I played this instrument myself and found it was quiet, had leather quilling, wooden bracing and a small compass that only fit works from the Baroque and none of the contemporary pieces I had brought with me.

Nevertheless, I enjoyed the touch and the intimate sound produced by this instrument.

Melbourne-based harpsichordist Donald Nicolson, who owns the 1956 Thomas Goff No. 6, commented on its transportability: "It cost AU\$700 all up last time to get the Goff for the ABC [Australian Broadcasting Corporation] concert recording."²⁵ He also noted that issues can arise in moving such instruments between venues, particularly in the adjustment of the threaded capstans that determine the lengths of each pedal push rod. When the pedals are engaged, the length and alignment of these rods affect the pre-determined order in which the strings are plucked, called the "stagger." A difference of even half a millimeter in the length of each push rod affects registration and the accuracy of the stagger.²⁶ Nicholson's restored Goff has a current stagger order of upper 4', lower 8', upper 8' and 16'.

The back story of Nicolson's instrument was recently shared in a documentary made by Radio New Zealand.²⁷ Nicolson, like May, felt a personal connection to the instrument via his father, who had purchased it from Radio New Zealand. Auckland-based harpsichord maker

²³ A Neupert "Bach" harpsichord model weighs 170 kg, far more than a historical harpsichord, see <http://jc-neupert.de/en/node/48>, accessed January 12, 2017).

²⁴ Harold Haney, "Portrait of a Builder," *The Harpsichord* 4/1 (1971): 13, quoted in Kottick *History of the Harpsichord*, 440; Conny May, interview with the author, Palmerston North, August 3, 2014. (The instrument was originally a revival pedal harpsichord, with the pedals removed.)

²⁵ Donald Nicolson, interview with the author, Melbourne, May 2014.

²⁶ Paul Downie, interview with the author, Wellington, August 28, 2017.

²⁷ James Gardner, "Rise and Fall of Harpsichord 6," radio broadcast, May 18, 2016, <http://www.radionz.co.nz/concert/programmes/sundayfeature/audio/201797637/the-fall-and-rise-of-harpsichord-6>.

Paul Downie restored the instrument and in the process made discoveries that resulted in improvements to the tone, such as restringing the 16' with uncovered brass (a material used to string historical harpsichords).²⁸ In Melbourne in 2014, I had the opportunity to play both Nicolson's 1956 Goff and McAllister's 1963 Pleyel. Both instruments have a very responsive action, in part because of the change from leather to Delrin (or Celcon) plectra. I enjoyed the registration contrasts that are available on the Goff, including half-hitching. The Pleyel projects a very rich and deep sound, particularly in the lowest region of the 16', which reverberates longer than the Goff. McAllister found ways to prevent the tones of his Pleyel from being abruptly cut off when the keys are released, which is a frequent critique of Pleyels. This was in part accomplished by replacing the overhead damper bar with aluminum instead of the original brass, so that the bar does not release downward as heavily. Even taking such changes into account, I do not hold the view that either instrument has been re-engineered, but rather has been updated to take advantage of modern stringing options and other materials that are available. Such alterations have the potential to increase the appeal of revival instruments for today's harpsichordists and listeners.

2.5. Restoration of Three Revival Harpsichords

Best practice for museum instruments is to leave them in as original a condition as possible. McAllister, however, "felt freer" to experiment, knowing that his Pleyel was a late-model in private hands, and so was not faced with ethical decisions around "cutting down the oldest tree in the forest."²⁹ Conservation was not his primary aim, but rather maximising sound quality and a responsive touch. He believes Pleyels are expertly built and approves of the Pleyel fine tuning system first engineered by J. P. Alibert, which has been criticised by others such as Zuckermann.³⁰

²⁸ Downie subsequently found that the instrument's tone improved when all strings were changed to brass. Strings sound best when near their breaking point. A soft wire such as brass has a lower breaking point than the steel wire originally used for revival harpsichords. Interview with the author, Wellington, August 28, 2017.

²⁹ McAllister, interview with the author, Melbourne, May 2014.

³⁰ In *Modern Harpsichord*, 165, Zuckermann claimed it took him twice longer to tune a Pleyel than "normal harpsichords." McAllister disagrees and has noted a related advantage of a lack of string metal fatigue, *Talking Harpsichords*, 96.

Alterations made by McAllister included the removal of felt bushings that constricted resonance along the soundboard and a reduction in the lead weighting of jacks by about one-fifth. This resulted in an improved key-to-finger leverage ratio, so that the keyboards became lighter to the touch. My experience when playing his Pleyel was that the keyboards had a fleet response.

Fig. 2.1. Pleyel 1963. Owned by Alastair McAllister.³¹

McAllister's 1963 Pleyel's 16' strings were also changed from over-wound copper to uncovered brass. Over-wound strings can create "dead areas" when windings become compromised and flattened over time. Some sections of the 1963 Pleyel were restrung from steel to plated iron and McAllister changed the stagger order of the registers. He believes the stagger sequence has traditionally been incorrectly positioned in instruments with a 16' and has led to a lack of tonal clarity.³²

Contributing to a well-defined sound for this 1963 Pleyel was also the removal of graphite on the top surfaces of the bridges and nuts. Graphite is appropriate in piano manufacture

³¹ Photo by Andrew Bernard, 2015.

³² McAllister changed his Pleyel's speaking order to: 4', 16', lower 8', upper 8', Lute, *Talking Harpsichords*, 112. He could not determine the exact original speaking order of the instrument.

where it does not interfere with the sound due to the extremely high string tensions involved. For revival harpsichords, however, graphite is detrimental to the transmission of sound from the bridge to the soundboard and is unnecessary. Removal of this material by McAllister resulted in improved tonal clarity and could be replicated on other revival harpsichords. McAllister published a book on his findings entitled *Talking Harpsichords* that includes a discussion of details such as the replacement of noisy jack springs with Nylon covered multi-cored stainless steel, which he believes to be the cause of Kirkpatrick's famous "typewriter criticisms" noted at the beginning of the chapter.³³ Although McAllister makes and restores historical harpsichords today, it does not preclude him from enjoying revival instruments and their unique attributes. One reason for his appreciation is that the revival sound was what he grew up with and first attracted him to the instrument.³⁴ (See Appendix II for a listing of forty-eight registration combinations on McAllister's 1963 Pleyel.)

Downie's restoration of the 1956 Goff No. 6 also involved changing from leather to Delrin plectra, resulting in a full, rich tone that it did not previously possess. (Most revival models were originally outfitted with leather plectra, which was used in the French Baroque as a special effect.) As explained by owner Donald Nicolson:

the most interesting thing is finding out after twelve years of persistence, that there was actually a hell of a personality concealed within it. 'Cause I can tell you it didn't sound like that five years ago. It just had this weak, uninteresting, single-dimensional sound. And then as soon as we restrung the 16', something just kind of transformed it . . . I have become like Alastair, very, very passionate about an instrument—then you become convinced there is nothing else like it. Baroque is my field of pursuit. And it is quite amazing to have an instrument that isn't actually a Baroque harpsichord, but I think that opens completely different possibilities on it as well . . . I've got such a personal story with the beast [his term of endearment for the Goff]; it's what got me playing harpsichord in the first place. I've always been attached to it, first out of principle, then out of a realisation that my original instincts were right

³³ Ibid. For a discussion of graphite, see 107.

³⁴ McAllister, interview with the author, Melbourne, October 2015.

that there was something quite special embedded within it. We just had to find some way to pull that voice out.³⁵

Downie found that other revival models he restored did not respond as well as the Goff when changing to Delrin.³⁶ At times, builders prefer to re-leather a revival instrument. Fig. 2.2 below shows Dutch builder Martin Spaink's re-leathering of a revival William de Blaise harpsichord.³⁷ Echoing the opinion of Australian builder Carey Beebe, revival harpsichords are not his preference, but Spaink has respect for and has restored a number of them:³⁸

However one looks at it, Pleyels are a part of musical history. From my own standpoint as regards preferred aesthetics it is not my chosen cup of tea. Still, they are musical instruments with a history and their musical possibilities inspired many composers to write original works for these instruments.³⁹

Restoration can mean restoring an instrument to its initial condition to the fullest extent possible or including notions such as "improving upon the concept of the Pleyel."⁴⁰ Use of Delrin rather than leather has its supporters and detractors. Sometimes it is a matter of personal taste as for Czech harpsichordist Zuzana Růžicková (1927–2017), who preferred the sound of leather.⁴¹ It stands to reason that consideration of restoration details should be included when judging revival harpsichords today.

³⁵ Nicolson, interview with the author, Melbourne, May 2014.

³⁶ Ibid. Other anecdotal information is obtainable from builders and sellers, as in the advertisement for an "Ammer-Cembalo "Ruckers" model, <https://www.ebay-kleinanzeigen.de/s-anzeige/ammer-cembalo-modell-ruckers-/427068636-74-18894>, accessed May 16, 2016, which stated that changing from leather to Delrin improved the fullness of sound.

³⁷ <https://imageshack.com/i/p38tTTO6j>, created by Martin Spaink, October 18, 2015.

³⁸ Carey Beebe, interview with the author, Sydney, September 30, 2015. Spaink has restored a 1934 *Grand modèle de concert* and is currently working on a 1952 Pleyel restoration; email November 1, 2016.

³⁹ Spaink, posting on Facebook group, HARPSICHORD - CEMBALO – CLAVECIN – KLAVECYMBEL, April 17, 2015.

⁴⁰ McAllister, interview with the author, Melbourne, October 2015.

⁴¹ Skype Interview with Růžicková, November 5, 2014.

Fig. 2.2. "314 Newly-Leathered Jacks" by builder Martin Spaink.

Part Two: Chronology of Revival Reception

2.6. Early Reception: 1892–1912

Positive and negative reception of revival harpsichords can be traced from their initial construction in the late nineteenth century, particularly in London and Paris where they were most known. Early reception tended to focus on the perceived main advantages of revival instruments: stability and reliability. An early French review published in the 1892 edition of *L'Écho musical* considered the 1891 Pleyel to be of "matchless elegance, a marvel of refinement worthy of the famous firm whose name it bears . . . combining the delicacy and variety of timbre of instrument building of old with the precision and reliability of the modern."⁴² By way of contrast, a year later Irish critic George Bernard Shaw reviewed a concert presented by Alfred James Hipkins (1826–1903), an influential figure in the early music movement at the time:

Is there the smallest reason to suppose that if we took to making harpsichords we would make good ones? Alas! the question is already answered. Mr. Hipkins played . . . on a new harpsichord manufactured by a very eminent Parisian firm of pianoforte makers; and not only did it prove itself a snarling abomination, with vices

⁴² Anon., *L'Écho musical*, 22/15 (July 17, 1892): 177, quoted in http://www.mim.be/pleyel-harpsichord?from_i_m=1#, accessed October 2, 2014.

of tone that even a harmonium would have been ashamed of, but it had evidently been deliberately made so in order to meet the ordinary customer's notion of a powerful and brilliant instrument.⁴³

In 1894 an anonymous review in London's *Saturday Review* contrasted the successful reconditioning of antique harpsichords by Dolmetsch with the frail state of harpsichords most commonly restored to the "chattering ghosts of their former selves."⁴⁴ The reviewer preferred a Dolmetsch-restored antique Ruckers harpsichord to Pleyel's new revival harpsichord. Confessing that Pleyel had "failed" to create a harpsichord comparable to a well-restored antique, the reviewer found that with the introduction of the Pleyel, "at least, was an instrument which was in tune, and upon which it is possible to play with a certain speed and semblance of execution." That new harpsichords were influenced by modern piano designs was blamed on the fallacious belief that the piano had both evolved from the harpsichord and "surpassed" it.⁴⁵

The Evolutionary View of Keyboard Instruments

That the modern piano had evolved from the inferior harpsichord was a commonly-held belief at the turn of the twentieth century. Evolutionary and Darwinian ideas were applied to keyboard instrument development, which encouraged a hybridisation of piano and harpsichord technologies to "improve" the harpsichord. These views were reflected in this 1903 advertisement for Érard pianos in the *Tatler*:

Probably no instrument connected with the great science of harmony enjoys a more romantic and varied career than the piano. The little band of workers living in the centuries past on Italian soil evolving from the harpsichord the great instrument of to-day never in their wildest imaginings conceived the possibilities or probabilities of the new [piano] instrument.⁴⁶

⁴³ George Bernard Shaw, January 11, 1893, quoted in Michael Steinberg, "Review of Some Observations of the Harpsichord in Twentieth Century Music in London 1890–94 by Bernard Shaw," *Perspectives of New Music* 1/2 (1963): 189–194.

⁴⁴ Anon., "Bach and the Harpsichord," 654.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 655.

⁴⁶ Anon., "Some Artistic and Historical Pianos," *The Tatler* 94 (April 15, 1903): 112.

The hybrid nature of revival harpsichords was discussed by organologist Laurence Libin in 1997 regarding Pleyel's *Grand modèle de concert*:

The Pleyel harpsichord was really a hybrid of harpsichord and piano technology. It was not authentic in the terms of the early music movement in replicating the kinds of sound that Bach would have known, or any of the French composers. But that almost doesn't matter; it was a kind of instrument that had integrity on its own.⁴⁷

Libin theorised that "concepts of biological and technological evolution implicit in typical late nineteenth-century classification systems and museum displays" contributed to notions of superior and inferior instruments in music.⁴⁸ While early music enthusiasts were engaged in performing works from earlier centuries, creating editions and recreating instruments such as the recorder and viola da gamba in the latter nineteenth century, others considered musical efforts prior to the Classical era (particularly before J. S. Bach) to be primitive. Such reasoning led musicologist Philipp Spitta in the 1870s to speculate that J. S. Bach had composed for an imaginary instrument that combined the qualities of the organ and clavichord, declaring: "Every one [*sic*] sees at once that the modern pianoforte is in fact just such an instrument."⁴⁹ As argued by Libin above, it can be useful to evaluate a type of instrument apart from notions of superiority or inferiority and focus instead on the specific and unique characteristics of that category of instrument.

The Arts and Crafts Influence

A review by John Findlay Runciman (1866–1916) in London's *Saturday Review* in 1910 was arguably influenced by the Arts and Crafts movement of the nineteenth and early twentieth century.⁵⁰ Runciman had worked as a music critic for the *Review* since 1894 and was acquainted with Arnold Dolmetsch who, for example, had built the "green harpsichord" for an Arts and Crafts show in 1896 and the "Harris" clavichord owned by Runciman.⁵¹ While

⁴⁷ Interview in *Uncommon Visionary: A Documentary on the Life and Art of Wanda Landowska*.

⁴⁸ Laurence Libin, "Progress, Adaptation, and the Evolution of Musical Instruments," *Journal of the American Musical Instrument Society* 26 (2000): 189–213.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 189.

⁵⁰ John Runciman, "Harpsichord and Piano" *The Saturday Review*, October 22, 1910, 514–515.

⁵¹ Peter Bavington, "Arnold Dolmetsch's Clavichord Making in the Years Before 1914," <http://www.peter-bavington.com/Bavington-Dolmetsch.pdf>, appearing in *De Clavicordio VIII* from the Proceedings of the Magnano Clavichord Symposium, 2007.

the usual narrative at the time favoured a teleological approach to instrument making, Runciman's review extolled the virtues of antique craftsmanship that gave a harpsichord its original, "characteristic timbre." In reviewing Dolmetsch-Chickering revival harpsichords: "The addition of strings of sixteen-foot pitch adds strength to the bass and richness to the general mass of tone; but for purity and combined power and sweetness the old instruments are still far ahead of these new specimens."⁵²

Runciman believed early pianos exhibited more "personality" than modern, iron-framed pianos and related this to his appreciation of the use of wood instead of metal in harpsichord making. As reviewer Christopher Nobbs later observed in 1983 of British-made harpsichords such as by the Dolmetsch family at Halsmere: "it was far easier to reject the products of Pleyel and the German factories than these amiable products of the Arts and Crafts movement."⁵³

In the United States, an unattributed review also dating from 1910, praised Dolmetsch-Chickering harpsichords and cited the concert success of Ferruccio Busoni (1866–1924) on Chickering pianos and harpsichords. Believing the "feelings" and "love" the "old masters" had for their "quaint harpsichords" to be in excess of emotions that could be expressed in the "sophisticated age" of the twentieth century, the reviewer nonetheless hoped to convince readers of the value of playing early music on harpsichords. The reviewer was not a purist, however, and did not find the combination of old and new technologies to be contradictory:

The instrument illustrated [Fig. 2.3 below] is a doublebank harpsichord [two-manual], with the octave, lute, swell and combination pedals . . . Many of the old harpsichords had drawstops, which were inconvenient. The adoption of pedals marks a great improvement.⁵⁴

Establishing audiences and respect for *any type of harpsichord* was still novel in the early twentieth century. Contemporary compositions were rare and tended to be written in a

⁵² Runciman, "Harpsichord and Piano," 514.

⁵³ Christopher Nobbs, "Review of *Modern Harpsichord Makers: Portraits of Nineteen British Craftsmen & Their Work*," by John Paul," *Early Music* 10/4 (1982): 533.

⁵⁴ Anon., "Busoni at the Harpsichord." *Music Trade Review* 51/10 (September 3, 1910): 18. Busoni toured the United States in 1901–1911.

pianistic style rather than specifically for the harpsichord, including Busoni's *Sonatina ad usum infantis Madeline M. Americanae, pro Clavicimbalo composite* (1915).⁵⁵

Fig. 2.3. Pianist Ferruccio Busoni, 1909 at the Dolmetsch-Chickering harpsichord No. 60.⁵⁶

Landowska's Pleyel Grand modèle de concert

Wanda Landowska, recollecting turn of the twentieth-century efforts to revive the harpsichord, believed Louis Diémer's "deficient instrument and insignificance of the pieces he chose to play" were why he failed to ensure a solid harpsichord revival at the start.⁵⁷ The instrument models she considered deficient were likely the 1889 Pleyel model Diémer played as well as the Érard and Pleyel models circa 1900, which were "not the ones she dreamed of."⁵⁸ Some of Landowska's friends involved in the Schola Cantorum, the Parisian society established for the study and performance of early and sacred music co-founded in

⁵⁵ See Martin Elste, "Kompositionen für nostalgische Musikmaschinen: Das Cembalo in der Musik des 20. Jahrhunderts," *Jahrbuch des Staatlichen Instituts für Musikforschung Preußischer Kulturbesitz* (1994): 215, for remarks such as that passages in early contemporary works seem to require a sostenuto pedal and are overall more idiomatic to the piano.

⁵⁶ Anon., "Busoni at the Harpsichord," 18.

⁵⁷ Denise Restout and Robert Hawkins, ed., *Landowska on Music* (New York: Stein and Day, 1964), 8.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*: 9.

1896 by Charles Bordes (1863-1909) Alexandre Guilmant (1837–1911) and Vincent d'Indy (1851–1931), believed the antique harpsichord was a “tin-pan” instrument. As Bordes’ famous letter of 1903 read: “enough of this ‘cage for flies’ which reduces superb and often large-scale works to the size of its tiny, spindly legs.”⁵⁹

Bordes encouraged Landowska to play early music, but on the piano rather than the harpsichord. However, Landowska sought to rediscover the “voice of these harpsichords which people then knew only as a museum piece. Adorned with rich carvings, decorated with faded colors and dim gold, they appeared like phantoms, formerly magnificent, now forever mute.”⁶⁰ To her, the epitome of a successful harpsichord was Pleyel’s *Grand modèle de concert* introduced in 1912, which she helped design and featured her name on the jackrail (Figs. 2.4–2.5). She believed this instrument had the stability required for touring and the bonus registration of the 16’ stop featured on Hieronymus Albrecht Hass German harpsichords, known to her from museum visits in Berlin.⁶¹

Fig. 2.4. Left side. Jackrail inscription. 1963 Pleyel harpsichord. Owned by Alastair McAllister.

⁵⁹ Landowska on Music, letter dated July 31, 1903, 10.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 11.

⁶¹ Landowska was familiar, for example, with the 1740 Hass owned by Puyana. See Michael Latham, “Don Quixote and Wanda Landowska: Bells and Pleyels,” *Early Music* 34/1 (2006): 95–109.

Fig. 2.5. Right side. Jackrail inscription. 1963 Pleyel harpsichord.
Owned by McAllister.⁶²

2.7. Gaining Acceptance: Revival Harpsichords 1912–1930s

W. D. Neupert remarked that during at least the first third of the twentieth century, pianists were the company's main harpsichord customers.⁶³ In addition to constructing harpsichords that resembled pianos, audience appeal for early music was enhanced through the use of quasi-historical costumes, staging and candles. Fig. 2.6 shows Lotta van Buren (1877–1960) dressed in an Elizabethan-style dress in the 1920s, seated next to a Dolmetsch harpsichord. From an early keyboard recital review from earlier in 1912 we read: "Lotta van Buren gave a clavichord costume recital with candle light and appropriate features."⁶⁴

⁶² Photos by the author.

⁶³ Neupert, "Cembalobau im 20. Jahrhundert," 39.

⁶⁴ Palmer, *Harpsichord in America*, 40–41.

Fig. 2.6. Harpsichordist Lotta van Buren, ca. 1920s.⁶⁵

By 1925, when Wanda Landowska was awarded the French Legion of Honour for services to music, significant inroads had already been made toward public acceptance of the harpsichord. The *New York Times* described Landowska as that “celebrated pianist, who revived the obsolete art of the clavecin [despite having] to battle against misunderstanding and hostility.”⁶⁶ In the United States, however, her pioneering work of acquainting audiences with the harpsichord had all but disappeared by 1930, as was the case in Boston, for example.⁶⁷ In 1932, Spanish harpsichordist José Iturbi remarked: “Too often, however, others who cannot play the piano go to the harpsichord in order to give the public a novelty . . . Consequently, the public hears only an amusing tinkle, instead of the beauties and subtleties of the instrument.”⁶⁸

In another photograph from the time, German harpsichordist Eta Harich-Schneider (1897–1986) is pictured in Fig. 2.7 in a ball gown surrounded by candles in 1935. She later criticised

⁶⁵ Photo reproduced in Palmer, *Harpsichord in America*, 41.

⁶⁶ “Landowska Decorated for Service to French Art,” *New York Times*, October 4, 1925, 193.

⁶⁷ Kirkpatrick, “Fifty Years,” 31.

⁶⁸ “Activities of Musicians Here and Afield,” *New York Times*, April 17, 1932, 162.

such visual displays and voiced opposition to the fashion for “historical ‘coquetterie’” that existed at the beginning of her career and the practice that “the instrument should make the artist”:

What a wonderful opportunity for easy success and publicity was the harpsichord! Many a wealthy girl, for whom the career of concert pianist seemed out of reach, but for whom the purchase of a harpsichord was no problem, started boldly on the harpsichord, trusting in the efficacy of candle light and stylish eighteenth-century attire! . . . ‘If only they had performed in the costume of the period . . .’ oh yes: there it is! This is no genuine recognition of an honest musical necessity. It is, rather, a romantic yearning for “days gone by” and it sees the harpsichord only as an effective device to grace an artistic fancydress ball.”⁶⁹

⁶⁹ Eta Harich-Schneider, *The Harpsichord: An Introduction to Technique, Style and the Historical Sources*, 2nd edn (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1960 [1954]), 7.

Fig. 2.7. Harpsichordist Eta Harich-Schneider playing an eighteenth-century Michael Mietke harpsichord. Castle Monbijou, Berlin, 1935.⁷⁰

The struggle for acceptance of the harpsichord as a viable instrument was not particularly connected to the type of harpsichord at this time. During the first few decades of the twentieth century, attempts were frequently made to assist the popularity of the instrument through historical costuming and staging. Simultaneously, there was a focus on the performance of large-scale works for harpsichord that were more demanding and required greater technique, such as the *Goldberg Variations* by J. S. Bach. The creation of new contemporary works for harpsichord would also help to establish the harpsichord as a mainstream instrument rather than a mere historical curiosity.

⁷⁰ Photo Max Ehlert/Ullstein Bild/Getty Images used with permission.

2.8. Popular Appeal and Variety in the 1940s

While the harpsichord had become more well-known by 1940, harpsichords were still frequently viewed as an inferior type of piano. One radio programme featuring Landowska was reviewed by Joseph Carlton in 1942. He employed phrases such as “the faded glory of a 16th to 18th century piano,” the “pluck tones sound distant and unreal when heard in the year 1942” and that the “introduction of harpsichordery to radio’s few-enough classical moments . . . seems academic.” While praising Landowska’s abilities, Carlton concluded that “when the tools are primitive, the handiwork is at best curiosa Felicitas.”⁷¹

Redacted image. For the original, please see the library hard copy.

Fig. 2.8. Photograph of Landowska by Philippe Halsman, 1944.

During the first half of the twentieth century, the increase in the acceptance and popularity of the revival harpsichord was the result of a number of factors that included the use of “historical” costumes and other showmanship effects, developments in revival harpsichord construction, new contemporary compositions for harpsichord, improved multi-media access and “star” personalities such as Landowska.

The Second World War threatened the lives and livelihoods of many musicians, including those of Landowska, Harich-Schneider and Czech harpsichordist Zuzana Růžicková. During the war, the revival harpsichord first appeared in films, including Samuel Goldwyn’s 1939

⁷¹ Joseph Carlton, “Wanda Landowska,” *Billboard Magazine*, November 14, 1942: 7, <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1032290423?accountid=14782>, accessed August 25, 2016.

Wuthering Heights and Warner Bros' 1944 *Arsenic and Old Lace*. In the realm of radio, American harpsichordist Sylvia Marlowe (1908–1981) introduced listeners to the harpsichord via this medium, playing a wide range of repertoire including jazz and contemporary works. Note the mingling of “historical” attire and popular music in this 1940 review of a performance by Sylvia Marlowe:

Looking quite prim but attractive in ‘18th Century Drawing Room’ Attire, she introes to and with that Raymond Scott composition. But since her novelty appeal is swing on the yesteryear pianoforte, which is what the harpsichord is, having both a tinkling and a heavy keyboard, she segues from Mozart into ‘Boogie Woogie Rhapsody.’⁷²

2.9. Changing Tastes: 1950s–1980

During the 1950s, more revival models were in circulation than either antique or newly-constructed historical harpsichords, but there was a growing sense that revival instruments did not represent an improvement on antique building styles. As Raymond Russell observed in 1956: “I have never seen a modern [revival] harpsichord as resonant as a good old one, and the prosthesis of electrical amplification is no solution to basic problems of construction.”⁷³ He equated the sound of a harpsichord when “very heavily constructed” to the sound of a “toasting fork drawn over the parrot’s cage,” but believed leather plectra were more reliable, less noisy, and longer lasting than quill.⁷⁴ Russell thought the heavier touch of a revival instrument compromised the development of correct harpsichord technique and was against the fashion of frequent changes of registration: “I personally do not care to see the harpsichord treated like a small cinema organ.”⁷⁵ Comparisons between revival harpsichords and organs have since been made, as in Howard Schott’s more generous comment in 1997: “To term the imposing but misguided Pleyel a ‘jazzy, incipient

⁷² Abel, “House Review: New Acts – Sylvia Marlowe,” *Variety* 138/7 (Apr 24, 1940): 20.

<http://search.proquest.com/docview/1505795099?accountid=14782>, accessed September 12, 2014.

⁷³ Raymond Russell, “The Harpsichord since 1800,” *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association* 82/1 (Taylor & Francis Ltd., 1956): 70, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/765868>.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 66. Zuckermann maintained that leather softened over time and negatively impacted tone quality in *Modern Harpsichord*, 60.

⁷⁵ Russell, “The Harpsichord since 1800,” 68.

cinema-organ' instrument, as does [Richard] Lockett, seems gratuitously nasty.”⁷⁶ Alastair McAllister recently commented on the sound produced by his 1963 Pleyel while several registers are engaged: “the sustain of the sound is so great that one is reminded of French Cathedral organs.”⁷⁷ And, in his 2014 article “From Stringed Organ to Mechanical Lute,” Martin Elste claimed that revival models resemble stringed organs, whereas historical harpsichords are more like mechanical lutes.⁷⁸

In 1950, American harpsichordist Igor Kipnis (mentioned in Chapter One) played his first harpsichord, which was the same 1907 revival Dolmetsch-Chickering harpsichord (No. 59) that Kirkpatrick first played at Harvard.⁷⁹ For those of Kipnis’s generation, it was often the recordings by Landowska and other artists on revival models that sparked their initial interest in the harpsichord. But looking back from the perspective of 2002, Kipnis acknowledged Landowska’s “artistry,” but noted that “the [revival] instrument is no longer considered a proper harpsichord.”⁸⁰

This view resonated with Kirkpatrick in 1983, who disapproved of the “gadgets” and registration fashions of the 1920s, 1930s and beyond, such as an instance of fourteen pedal changes he reported witnessing once during a performance by Landowska of the first prelude of the *Well-Tempered Clavier*. Kirkpatrick had revised his performance practices by the late 1950s, and considered his new approach with fewer registration changes to be a “relative purity,” informed by changing attitudes in harpsichord construction and techniques required to play historical harpsichords.⁸¹ Post-revival contemporary compositions around the mid-1970s reflected such performance practice changes that were initially applied to early music.

In 1966, an article published in 1966 by *Billboard Magazine* entitled “Harpsichord Output Zooming,” depicted several kinds of harpsichords available at the time. We also learn that

⁷⁶ Howard Schott, review of “Pioneer Harpsichordists on CD: Great Virtuosi of the Harpsichord,” *Early Music* 23/3 (1997): 514, quoting Richard Lockett’s jacket notes of *Violet Gordon Woodhouse: Complete Recordings*, Pearl GEMM CD 9242.

⁷⁷ McAllister, *Talking Harpsichords*, 105.

⁷⁸ Martin Elste, “From Landowska to Leonhardt, from Pleyel to Skowronek: Historicizing the Harpsichord, From Stringed Organ to Mechanical Lute,” *Early Music* 42/1 (2014): 13–22.

⁷⁹ Moore, “Igor Kipnis,” 72.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*: 73.

⁸¹ Kirkpatrick, “Fifty Years,” 36; 33; 36.

although Landowska passed away in 1959, her recording *Ancient Dances of Poland*, was reissued by RCA and she was a top selling artist for both RCA and Angel. Fig. 2.9 shows press release photographs of five famous harpsichordists seated at a variety of harpsichord types. Puyana's instrument (pictured top, left) is likely a Pleyel and looks most like a piano, with a black lacquer finish and cut away side cheeks. Marlowe's instrument (below, left) is likely a Dowd historical harpsichord, with seven rods showing for pedals (Dowd made instruments with pedals for customers who desired them until 1970). Valenti's instrument to the right of Marlowe is a Challis with straight, slanted cheek edges (NB: the photos of Valenti and Kipnis are incorrectly matched to their descriptions in the upper right corner). Kipnis's instrument (bottom left) is possibly his 1961 Rutkowski and Robinette, while Kirkpatrick's instrument (bottom right) is most likely a historical harpsichord by Dowd.

Fig. 2.9. Illustration of "Leading Harpsichordists," in "Harpsichord Output Zooming" by Fred Kirby, *Billboard Magazine*, September 10, 1966.⁸²

⁸² Page 50.

Prior to 1968, when Neupert's antique instrument collection was donated to the Nuremberg Germanisches Nationalmuseum, visitors to the company showroom enjoyed playing the antique harpsichords, but exclaimed how fortunate they were to have revival instruments that were more "reliable" and "better constructed." According to W. D. Neupert, they did not appreciate the differences in resonance and touch between historical and revival harpsichords, but were guided more by what was popular.⁸³ He stressed that revival harpsichord building practices were the result of the spirit of the times: to "allow the old instruments to rest; we have better ones."⁸⁴ In 1973, Australian historical harpsichord builder Mars McMillan said she was pleased that Hubbard's book (*Three Centuries of Harpsichord Making*) had caused more historical harpsichords to be built, as "too many people in Australia had only heard 'the whispering heavies.'"⁸⁵

Four years later, in 1979, English harpsichordist J. A. Richard's perspective was that Pleyels were an "evolution in the harpsichord-maker's craft." Contradicting what others had said, such as Zuckermann concerning factory instruments, Richard maintained that Pleyels were loud and enjoyed a twenty-five-second long resonance with all registers employed.⁸⁶ He believed other brands compared unfavourably to Pleyels; however, as their string tension was not as high, which resulted in "edgy partials" and a weak, "irritating" tone. Richard made a point that few have, namely that having a variety of harpsichord makes and styles was commonplace throughout earlier periods, and that modern attempts to reduce variety were perhaps unnecessary. He concluded by asking whether Pleyels, or something similar to them, could eventually come back into favour: "Perhaps at some time in the future, tastes will change once more and these magnificent instruments [Pleyels] will again find the appreciation they deserve."⁸⁷ More recently, McAllister commented in a similar vein: "It may be said that the musical disposition of the Pleyel concert grand harpsichord is based largely on historical precedent and so it is to be hoped that future generations of music historians will treat its creation with a little more deference, even appreciation."⁸⁸

⁸³ Neupert, "Cembalobau im 20. Jahrhundert," 7.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 1; 3.

⁸⁵ Christopher Monk, "Where the Wind Blows," *Early Music* 1/2 (April 1973): 103.

⁸⁶ J. A. Richard, "The Pleyel Harpsichord," *English Harpsichord Magazine* 2/5 (1979): 110–113, <http://www.harpsichord.org.uk/EH/Vol2/No5/pleyel.pdf>, accessed November 13, 2013.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 113.

⁸⁸ McAllister, *Talking Harpsichords*, 101.

The transition to favouring historical harpsichords over revival models was made at different times depending on geographic location. For the East Coast of the United States a date of 1980 might be assigned for completion of this transition, as exemplified in comments made that year by builder David Way (1919–1994), who purchased his harpsichord company from Zuckermann in 1970. Way reported that he and others in the 1970s “became ruthless” about selling historical harpsichords and that prior to that time, “harpsichords had to be as like pianos as possible to sell them.”⁸⁹

A further perspective on changing reception comes from harpsichordist Patrick Lindley, who in 2014 looked back on his studies at the New England Conservatory of Music during the late 1960s:

It was already becoming unfashionable to play revival instruments in the late 1960s. In 1968 the New England Conservatory had a Chickering with a 16’ and a Hubbard and Dowd [historical instrument] with a 16’. Nobody wanted to play an instrument with a 16’ except for me . . . It was considered by the musicological police that you couldn’t make really wonderful music on these instruments, which I never bought, but that was just the attitude.⁹⁰

Separating widely-held attitudes regarding visual and aural aesthetics, enjoyment of playing, performance practice and observations concerning resonance, from those that relate to personal preference can be a thorny issue. This dissertation, instead of supporting an either/or approach to harpsichord types, suggests revival instruments be valued for the myriad ways in which they *differ* from historical models, rather than be discounted due to such characteristics. Similar to both antique and historical harpsichords, revival models exist along a spectrum of quality and restored condition—factors that are often overlooked.⁹¹

Many of the current notions of revival harpsichords have their background in past reception, which has been distilled over time into a received view. An apparent contradiction that

⁸⁹ Terri Byrne-Dodge, “A Harpsichord Revival in Stonington,” *New York Times*, January 6, 1980, 63.

⁹⁰ Skype interview with Lindley, April 4, 2014.

⁹¹ Donald Nicolson pointed out the analogous position of poorly-restored antique harpsichords at the turn of the twentieth century to the decrepit condition of many revival models today—and their ensuing negative reception. Interview with the author, Melbourne, May 2014.

results from valuing revival harpsichord repertoire, but not the instruments for which the works were written, is rarely considered.

Harpsichord Preferences at the Bruges Harpsichord Festival: 1965–1980

The Bruges Harpsichord Festival has been held every three years since 1965. Between 1965 and 1968, historical instrument builder Derek Adlam observed that one could see a change in preference towards historical models, noting that “a revolution took place.” Builders encouraged customers to purchase historical harpsichords instead of revival models, in effect “depriving the players of their pedals and forcing them to discover authenticity.”⁹²

Howard Schott described changes that occurred between 1971 and 1974 at the Festival. While harpsichord choice was in part dictated by repertoire, most performers adapted revival scores to historical models rather than play the available revival model:

Returning to Bruges after a lapse of three years, one was immediately struck by the fundamental change in the type and quality of the instruments exhibited. Gone was the ‘modern’ harpsichord, the heavy-cased, leather-plucked instrument with registration pedals and a 16’ foot stop which dominated the concert scene for decades. To be sure one such was on stage along with traditional instruments by Dowd and Schütze, which were invariably preferred for the interpretation of early music, for the possible use of competitors who might feel obligated to perform the compulsory modern work on such a ‘Bach’ model. In fact, hardly any of them did so, preferring to sacrifice the 16-foot register asked for in the score in favour of the fuller tone and richer basses of the classic harpsichord, and to rely on page turners to add and subtract stops as required.⁹³

Schott’s report from the following Festival in 1977 mentioned that works could be performed on one of two Dowd historical instruments or a Neupert ‘Bach’ revival harpsichord (see Fig. 2.10 for an example). Schott added that “Dowd harpsichords had been

⁹² Derek Adlam, “Magnano Clavichord Symposium,” *Early Music* 22/3 (1994): 533.

⁹³ Howard Schott, “Bruges Harpsichord Week 1974,” *Early Music* 3/1 (1975): 52.

chosen by a majority of contestants polled, but a modern instrument was also provided out of consideration for those unfamiliar with any other type of harpsichord.”⁹⁴

Fig. 2.10. Neupert “Bach” Double harpsichord, 1963.⁹⁵

Concerning the 1980 festival, Schott made much of historical “reproductions” on display: “Many long-established builders were on view, including Dowd, Feldberg-Whale, Klop, Morley, Neupert, Sassmann, Wittmayer and Wooley, showing instruments of familiar and entirely professional standard.” With all German instrument factories making historical harpsichords by this date, the mention of a “monster” harpsichord in his report did not refer to a revival type, but to a Canadian instrument by Wolfgang Kater and Harvey Fink modelled after an eighteenth-century Hass with three manuals and a 16’. In 1980 Schott thought readers might have forgotten about the 16’ stop: “the 16’ strings—remember the 16’ stop?”⁹⁶

⁹⁴ Schott, “Harpsichord week in Bruges 1977,” *Early Music* 5/4 (1977): 545.

⁹⁵ <http://www.harpsichord.com>, accessed October 4, 2014.

⁹⁶ Schott, “Harpsichord Week in Bruges 1980,” *Early Music* 8/4 (1980): 522.

Part Three: Stereotypes

2.10. Reception of Revival Harpsichord “Gadgets”: the 16’ Register and Pedals

Revival “gadgets” such as a 16’ set of strings and pedals have been vilified in association with revival instruments from the 1950s and even more so during the 1960s and 1970s. Kottick observed in 2003 that, due to increased scholarship concerning the 16’ stop on Baroque harpsichords, the stop had been more frequently included on historical instruments since 1993.⁹⁷

During the eighteenth century, Hass harpsichords were sometimes built with a 16’ stop and were the favourites of revival harpsichordists Rafael Puyana and Zuzana Růžicková.⁹⁸ When it was becoming unfashionable to play revival harpsichords in the 1960s, Puyana was dissatisfied according to former student Clive Unger-Hamilton, by what he felt were “the limitations of such ‘authentic instruments.’” He found a compromise in the purchase of a 1740 Hass that had a 16’ stop and three manuals (Fig. 2.11).⁹⁹

Fig. 2.11. Puyana at his Paris home.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁷ Kottick, *History of the Harpsichord*, 464.

⁹⁸ Skype interview with Růžicková, May 5, 2014. She named Hass instruments as her favourite, followed by those of Ammer.

⁹⁹ Clive Unger-Hamilton, “Rafael Puyana Obituary: Colombian Harpsichordist at the Heart of the Instrument's Revival,” *The Guardian*, March 16, 2013.

¹⁰⁰ Photo by Sanctus.

An advertisement from 1970 for Hass replica instruments (Fig. 2.12) proclaimed Hass harpsichords as “the only surviving 16’ harpsichords to be accepted by the leading authorities as genuine.”¹⁰¹ Mention was also made of the 4’ register built on the lower manual, referencing the earlier misconception that the 4’ register should be on the top manual, as was the case for the so-called “Bach” harpsichord discussed in Chapter One.

¹⁰¹ Robert Morley & Co., *Musical Times*, 111/1541 (September 1970): 870. Recent scholarship includes Dutch and Flemish Baroque makers of 16’ harpsichords.

BACH HARPSICHORD

by John Morley

Based on the superb large harpsichords made by the Hass family of Hamburg in the early 18th century.

These instruments were noted for painstaking craftsmanship, outstanding tonal quality and are

the only surviving 16' harpsichords to be accepted by the leading authorities as genuine. Generous dimensions, 8' 6" long by 3' 3" wide

F—G compass, allows adequate space for a separate 16' soundboard which provides correct 16' string lengths

and tone quality without detracting

from the 8' registers. This concert

instrument provides a classical dis-

position for accurate interpretation

of the great masters of the harpsi-

chord. The 4' is on the lower man-

ual which slides forward to couple

the upper manual 8' and which is

the traditional method of ensuring

a light and responsive touch.

Available in mahogany or walnut casework, other finishes by arrangement from £1,525 and suitable for use in any climate.

We specialize in direct, speedy,
safe, door-to-door Delivery
and Export

ROBERT MORLEY & CO LTD
4 BELMONT HILL, SE13 01-852 6151

Fig. 2.12. Robert Morley & Co. Advertisement, *Musical Times* (1970).

Destigmatising the 16'

In 2002, Angel Records re-released Igor Kipnis's recordings from the 1970s and were reviewed by Tom Moore:

The tone of Kipnis's [revival] Rutkowski and Robinette, patterned after the large Hass harpsichords from Hamburg, is grand, and even after three decades the recorded sound is impressive, thunderous in the tuttis of the *Italian Concerto*, and lyric in the solos. Warmly recommended to all lovers of Bach and the harpsichord.¹⁰²

In 2005, Andreas Staier recorded a selection of Baroque works and one recent composition on a Hass replica instrument having two manuals and a 16' register.¹⁰³ Staier cited the organ as having inspired Hass's instruments and noted that they had "became a victim of guilt by association [with revival models]: his [Hass's] creations were seen as 'the grotesque result of the barbarous imposition of tonal concepts appropriate to the organ.'"¹⁰⁴

Elizabeth Farr has also recorded on historical instruments with a 16' stop: her CD *My Ladye Nevells Booke* (2007) used a Flemish harpsichord and in 2009 she employed a Hass-style harpsichord for a release of J. S. Bach's solo concerti.¹⁰⁵ Both instruments were made by Michigan-based builder Keith Hill (b. 1948). Writing for *Allmusic*, James Mannheim focused his review of Farr's 2009 recording on Hill's 16' stop, which gave her Bach a "truly mighty sound."¹⁰⁶ Although aware that such harpsichords were a "luxury item" at Bach's time, Mannheim believed a large harpsichord with a 16' register was invaluable for such works:

one possible audience for this release would be fans of the monster harpsichords that accompanied the revival of the instrument on LP in the 1960s who'd like to hear a big harpsichord sound done right."¹⁰⁷

¹⁰² Moore, "An interview with Igor Kipnis," 76. This harpsichord was built in 1970.

¹⁰³ Andreas Staier, *Hamburg 1734*, Harmonia Mundi, 2005.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., booklet notes, 12; the second half is quoted by Staier from Hubbard, *Three Centuries*, 191.

¹⁰⁵ Keith Hill's Opus 341 (1999) was used for Farr's 2007 Naxos recording (8.570139-41, [http://www.naxos.com/mainsite/blurbs_reviews.asp?item_code=8.570139-41&catNum=570139&filetype=About this Recording&language=English#](http://www.naxos.com/mainsite/blurbs_reviews.asp?item_code=8.570139-41&catNum=570139&filetype=About%20this%20Recording&language=English#)); Farr's 2009 recording used Hill's Opus 361 (2002).

¹⁰⁶ James Mannheim, review of *J. S. Bach Concertos for Solo Harpsichord* with Elisabeth Farr, *Allmusic*, 2009, Naxos, 8572006-07, (2009), <http://www.allmusic.com/album/js-bach-concertos-for-solo-harpsichord-mw0001416694>.

¹⁰⁷ Loc. cit.

In 2009, Stephen Schafer interviewed Farr for *Naxos News*. Expressing her appreciation of Hill's instruments with a 16', she stated "the feeling of playing them coupled to the sound I hear is magical."¹⁰⁸ Thus, the stigmatisation of the 16' register or a negative association with revival harpsichords seems to be no longer in the foreground. Perhaps in the future, historical harpsichords with a 16' will be used to record and perform not only early music, but also to present revival repertoire.¹⁰⁹

Pedals

Now that it is more recognised that pedals were used in the construction of harpsichords in earlier centuries, there is perhaps no need to continue to stigmatise their use. As Mark Kroll recently remarked: "I wouldn't mind having pedals; I would love them. French levers don't work as fast as a good modern pedal. [But] no one is going to build one of those now; there is no market."¹¹⁰ While stigmatisation of the 16' register has diminished, pedals are still negatively associated with revival harpsichords and an "outmoded" approach to performance practice.

2.11. Terms Associated with Revival Harpsichords

The large size, weight and metallic content of revival harpsichords have contributed not only to nicknames mentioned earlier, such as "plucking piano;" but also "monster,"¹¹¹ "a mighty beast,"¹¹² and "tinny, nasal, a 'bucket of bolts.'"¹¹³ Concerning touch, Frank Hubbard commented in 1975 that, in building, the "endeavor now is to duplicate the light touch [of historical harpsichords], and the silvery vibrant tone, light yet expressive."¹¹⁴ Historical

¹⁰⁸ Stephen Schafer, "Elisabeth Farr: My Passion is my Profession," *Naxos News* March 9, 2009. <http://www.naxos.com/news/default.asp?op=580&displayMenu=Interviews&type=2>.

¹⁰⁹ I could not locate a recording of a revival work on a historical instrument with a 16'.

¹¹⁰ Kroll, interview with the author, Boston, June 2015.

¹¹¹ Cohen and Schnitzer, *Reprise*, 25.

¹¹² James Mannheim, Review of *Fernando Valenti Bach: Harpsichord Toccatas*, Lyrichord #8062, *Allmusic*, 2008, <http://www.allmusic.com/album/release/bach-harpsichord-toccatas-mr0002852271>.

¹¹³ Bruce Haynes, *The End of Early Music: A Period Performer's History for the Twenty-First Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 35.

¹¹⁴ Tom McGeary, "Frank Hubbard," *The English Harpsichord Magazine* 1/4 (April 1975): last page.

harpsichords are often seen to possess a “brilliant” tone as compared with the “metallic” sound of a revival harpsichord.

American Record Guide reviewer Robert Haskins, for example, referenced Sir Thomas Beecham’s famous “skeletons copulating on a tin roof:” “Beecham had in mind, I think, the early ‘tank’ harpsichords—their ultra-metallic sound.”¹¹⁵ Robert Donington’s 1970 organology, *The Instruments of Music*, observed of revival harpsichords that “some have been given an excessively harsh, metallic tone . . . the tone of a good harpsichord should be brilliant.”¹¹⁶ Former Director of the Yale Collection of Musical Instruments, Richard Rephann, found that leather (*peau de buffle*) “tends to minimize high harmonics,” which part accounts for the lack of brilliance on revival models.¹¹⁷ As discussed previously with regards to McAllister’s and Downie’s re-quilling of revival harpsichords with plastic Delrin or Celcon, restoration can impact tone quality and should be investigated further.

Looking at tonal attributes from the perspective of the electric guitar, Rebecca McSwain has pointed out that the feedback noise emitted by these instruments eventually became integral to electric guitar music. This exemplifies a technological reverse salient, or engineering fault of an instrument taking on a positive value.¹¹⁸ In an analogous way, the characteristically lengthy tonal decay of revival harpsichords and metallic sound could be acknowledged to have a positive value for works that prioritise tonal density, such as Erik Bergman’s 1970 *Energien*, written for a revival harpsichord and discussed in Chapter Three.

2.12. Factors in the Reception of Volume

The parameters involved in measuring volume include the maximum achievable volume, the dynamic range available due to registration and voicing and the time span and graphic shape of tonal decay. Effects of being recorded or amplified must also be considered, as well as how an instrument projects in a particular hall. A thorough discussion of these

¹¹⁵ Robert Haskins, “Review of *Frivolous Harpsichord* by Jukka Tiensuu,” *American Record Guide* 62/5 (1999): 280.

¹¹⁶ Donington, *Instruments of Music*, 100–103.

¹¹⁷ Richard Rephann, “A Fable Deconstructed,” in *Historical Harpsichord IV*, ed. Howard Schott (Hillsdale, New York: Pendragon Press, 1995), 235.

¹¹⁸ Rebecca McSwain, “The Social Reconstruction of a Reverse Salient in Electrical Guitar Technology: Noise, the Solid Body, and Jimi Hendrix,” in *Music and Technology in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Hans Joachim Braun (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000), 186–198.

dimensions lies outside the scope of this dissertation, but it should be noted that they play a role in the perception of volume in both relative and absolute terms. Brief detail is given below of three factors: the reputation of the harpsichord as a quiet instrument, the effect of hall size, and electric amplification. Volume is an important subject, as historical harpsichords are generally considered to emit a louder, more projected sound than revival models, which is one reason that revival models fell out of favour.

Antique harpsichords have long been considered a relatively quiet instrument, as suggested by French essayist Mathon de la Cour in 1777:

the harpsichord is the only creature in this world that has been able to claim sufficient respect from other instruments to keep them in their place and cause itself to be accompanied in the full sense of the term . . . as soon as it is a question of accompanying a harpsichord, you see submissive and timid instrumentalists softening their sounds like courtiers in the presence of their master, before whom they dare not utter a word without having read permission in his eyes.¹¹⁹

A review by Rosalind Halton of Kottick's *History of the Harpsichord* addressed the difficulty of harpsichord performance in modern halls, highlighting revival models: "It is interesting to read that more than one critic of the time—though struck by her [Landowska's] playing—referred openly to the problem of the harpsichord in large concert halls: its 'weak and non-carrying quality.'" ¹²⁰ Halton queried, "Was this perception—the discrepancy between the grandeur of the artist and the 'almost inaudible' instrument she played—the factor that led to the engineering of those massive, unreal sonorities heard in the recordings through which Landowska's playing is now heard?" ¹²¹ Although it is widely acknowledged that revival harpsichords sound fuller recorded than in a live performance, should we indeed consider these sounds to be "unreal" or is the instrument instead heard in its most advantageous venue, the recording studio? Although infrequently mentioned, the

¹¹⁹ Mathon de la Cour in *Almanach Musical* 1777 (for 1776), quoted in Mark Kroll, "French Masters," in *Eighteenth-Century Keyboard Music*, ed. Robert Marshall (New York: Routledge, 2003), 145.

¹²⁰ Rosalind Halton, Review of *History of the Harpsichord*, "Musicology Australia" 27/1 (2004): 142.

¹²¹ Loc. cit. See also Christopher Brooks for comments on the unsuitability of modern halls for early music, "What Early Music Needs Is the Sound of Silence," *Early Music America* 9/3 (2003): 34.

evaluation of revival harpsichords could include differences between live and recorded sound as well as the effects of hall size.

2.13. Amplification: Wittmayer Elektronik

Rolf Drescher, a representative of the Berlin Steinway branch where Wittmayer harpsichords were sold, developed a built-in magnetic amplification system in the mid-1960s called the Wittmayer Elektronik harpsichord. One exemplar owned previously by the Berlin Philharmonic is now housed at the D.B.im (Figs. 2.13 and 2.14). According to Zuckermann (1969), an unamplified Wittmayer harpsichord “is no better and no worse than that of the typical *Serien* instrument. The big Bach model has the usual disappointing lack of volume and heavy tone, and cannot be heard above an ensemble in a large hall.”¹²² The Wittmayer Elektronik was meant to overcome such criticism but received limited favourable press. A review of Valenti’s performance on a Wittmayer Elektronik Concert Model in 1968 claimed a blind-folded auditor could not have heard the difference between a Wittmayer Elektronik played at Carnegie Hall versus an unamplified Wittmayer, except that it would have seemed to have been heard in a hall a third of the size.¹²³ *New York Times* reviewer Donal Henahan wrote that he enjoyed the sound: “The Wittmayer is a most musical instrument in every sense,” but criticised that the Lute stop differed from that of a usual harpsichord and that the treble tones did not fade away quickly enough. Generally, however, the experiment of an in-built amplification system was considered a failure.

¹²² Zuckermann, *Modern Harpsichord*, 196.

¹²³ Donal Henahan, “Valenti Is a Plugged In, Turned on Harpsichordist,” *New York Times*, February 5, 1968, 29.

Fig. 2.13. Interior, “Bach” Wittmayer Elektronik, 1970. D.B.im: Inv. 5420.

Fig. 2.14. “Bach” Wittmayer Elektronik harpsichord, 1970. D.B.im: Inv. 5420.¹²⁴

¹²⁴ Photos by the author. The knobs shown are not hand stops, but electronic and volume controls.

2.14. Summary: Valuing Revival Harpsichords

The quotation from Kirkpatrick cited at the beginning of this chapter compared revival harpsichords to typewriters. This indicates the degree of ridicule that has been directed toward revival harpsichords, particularly as historical models gained in popularity from the 1950s to the mid-1970s. Rather than argue conclusively on the side of positive or negative reception of revival instruments, this chapter has surveyed their reception from the late nineteenth century into the present, aiming for a deeper awareness of the historical and current motivations for valuing or rejecting this type of harpsichord. Whichever position one holds in the debate on the relevance of revival harpsichords today, these instruments have a historical, aesthetic, personal and market value—at least to a segment of auditors, builders and players. The declining stigmatisation of the 16' stop as evidenced by recent early music recordings using historical harpsichords with this feature may help inspire an increased acceptance of revival instruments or encourage the use of a historical harpsichord with a 16' stop for revival works.

A thorough basis for developing criteria upon which to value revival harpsichords could include contributions from philosophy, including considerations of work identity and work versions that arise with changes of instrumentation and performance interpretation.¹²⁵ Evaluation of an instrument's worth beyond its financial value could be explored in the distinctions between fact and value judgments as discussed by philosopher Hilary Putnam—where not only are “beauty” or “good versus bad” considered subjective, but seemingly factual statements are questioned.¹²⁶ One such “factual” statement from Chapter One: “thickly-walled cases impede resonance,” depends to a degree on whether a revival harpsichord is played live or in a recording studio. Such questions and evaluative methods are beyond the scope of this dissertation to discuss in depth, but indicate a wealth of resources that suggest reception need not always involve assessing the revival harpsichord in relation to early music aesthetics or contexts.

¹²⁵ See Julian Dodd, “Sounds, Instruments, and Works of Music,” Michael Morris, “Doing Justice to Musical Works” and Stephen Davies, “Versions of Musical Works and Literary Translations,” in *Philosophers on Music: Experience, Meaning, and Work*, ed. Kathleen Stock (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 23–51, 51–78 and 79–92.

¹²⁶ For examples of thick ethical concepts and preferences, see Hilary Putnam, *Collapse of the Fact/Value Dichotomy and Other Essays* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2002), 35–37.

Chapter Three

Performing Works for Revival Harpsichord Today

“The demands of many of the compositions would seem to bring the harpsichord itself under scrutiny and cumulatively to raise the question: What constitutes the ‘modern’ harpsichord on which this repertoire is to be performed?”¹
—Frances Bedford, 1993

While audiences are familiar with harpsichords through early music performances such as Georg Frideric Handel’s *Messiah*, few auditors are well-versed in the many genres and styles of contemporary harpsichord music. Music for harpsichord dating from the turn of the twentieth century to the mid-1970s was usually conceived for revival models. Although these works are occasionally performed on revival instruments today, they are most commonly transferred to historical harpsichords. The resulting performances differ with regards to parameters that include (but are not limited to) registration, the palette of sound, articulation, dynamics, as well as listener and performer experience.

Some works for revival harpsichord are relatively well-known, such as György Ligeti’s *Continuum* (1968) and belong to a loosely-defined canon. Others are propelled now and then back into the spotlight through recordings such as Jory Vinikour’s 2013 release of Ned Rorem’s *Spiders* (1968), performed on a historical model.² While this recording considers Vinikour’s release to have been a world-premiere, *Spiders* was, in fact, recorded earlier by Carole Terry on a historical harpsichord in 1986. Her LP version was notable for the use of a tape-splicing technique that allowed original revival harpsichord registrations to be followed.³

Other approaches in recording and performing revival works on historical models have included the use of a stop-pulling assistant for complex registrations and a likely fade-out for the *pianissimo* end of Vinikour’s brilliant 2013 rendition of *Spiders*. Adapting harpsichord works to suit the model on hand is commonplace for performances of early and contemporary harpsichord repertoire. But in contrast to early music, little has been written

¹ Bedford, *Harpsichord and Clavichord Music*, xxix-xxx.

² Jory Vinikour, *Toccatas: Modern American Music for Harpsichord*, Sono Luminus, 2013, DSL-92174.

³ David Calhoun, liner notes from original CRI LP jacket for Carole Terry, “*Something Else to Do*”: 20th Century Harpsichord Works, 1986, <http://www.newworldrecords.org/uploads/fileeD1d0.pdf>.

about altering revival scores. Approaches have tended to be as individual as the preferences of the performer. Few revival works are well-known today, and, as Elaine Funaro, Artistic Director of the Aliénor Harpsichord Competition has pointed out for contemporary harpsichord music as a whole, each performer tends to develop his or her own “personal canon.”⁴ The works discussed in this chapter form part of my own “canon” that I explored over the course of my degree (see Appendix III).

This chapter provides perspectives on the treatment of revival repertoire since the apparent obsolescence of revival harpsichords, focusing on *Energien*, op. 66 (1970) by Erik Bergman, Darius Milhaud’s *Sonata for Clavecin (or Piano) and Violin*, op. 257 (1945) and Peter Child’s *Concerto for Harpsichord and String Quartet* (2005).⁵ While not written during the heyday of the revival harpsichord, Child’s *Concerto* was informed by and scored for a Herz revival harpsichord. The chapter begins with an overview of revival repertoire and highlights intersections with twentieth-century historical authenticity. This is followed by perspectives on contemporary score interpretation and three case studies that help illuminate why revival harpsichords are important to a current study of revival repertoire.

Part One: Overview

3.1. Contemporary Repertoire Prior to 1974

Four hundred and sixteen contemporary solo works were catalogued in Frances Bedford’s and Robert Conant’s 1974 *Twentieth-Century Harpsichord Music: A Classified Catalogue*, along with additional works for ensemble.⁶ A majority of these works were written for revival harpsichord. The first piece composed for harpsichord in the nineteenth century was Francis Thomé’s *Rigodon*, op. 97 (1893), dedicated to Louis Diémer. Among the small number of other works produced during this early period were Jules Massenet’s offstage minuet for his opera *Thérèse* (1905–1906) and Mario Castelnuovo-Tedesco’s *Sonata inglese* (1909), considered to be the first solo work for harpsichord written in the twentieth

⁴ Interview with the author, April 3, 2014.

⁵ These works were presented at my final lecture recital (see Appendix III).

⁶ Frances Bedford and Robert Conant, *Twentieth-Century Harpsichord Music: A Classified Catalogue* (Hackensack, N.J.: J. Boonin, 1974). Some revival works were left out, such as Paul Ben-Haim’s *Sonata a Tré* (1968). See the 1993 publication by Bedford, *Harpsichord and Clavichord Music* for a more complete listing of 4,800 works for harpsichord.

century.⁷ As it is rare to find a print or digital copy of this work, the title and first page of Castelnuovo-Tedesco's manuscript are reproduced in Figs. 3.1 and 3.2. Published by Mills in 1962 under the title *English Suite*, Castelnuovo-Tedesco's original instrumentation was reversed from listing harpsichord first, to read instead: "for piano (or harpsichord)," presumably for wider appeal. Manuel de Falla's *El retablo de Maese Pedro* (1923) was composed for Landowska and was an invaluable preparation for his more famous *Concerto for Harpsichord, Flute, Oboe, Clarinet, Violin, and Cello* (1923–1926). Francis Poulenc's *Concerto champêtre* (1929) was also composed for Landowska and benefited from her editing and advice. The appearance of concerti such as these from the 1920s signalled an increase in the status and serious regard of the harpsichord. As noted by Dana Ragsdale, they were the "vanguard works in the breaking of new ground for the instrument."⁸

Fig. 3.1. Mario Castelnuovo-Tedesco, *Sonata inglese* (1909), title page. Manuscript. US-NH, RKA: MSS 11, Box 3, Folder 7.

⁷ Igor Kipnis, "Review of Frances Bedford's *Harpsichord and Clavichord Music*," *Early Keyboard Studies Newsletter* 7/3 (July 1994), quoted in Larry Palmer, "Mario Castelnuovo-Tedesco's *English Suite* for harpsichord at 100," *Diapason* (December 2009): 36–37.

⁸ Dana Ragsdale, "The Revival of the Harpsichord in the Twentieth Century with Particular Attention to the Harpsichord Concerti of Manuel De Falla and Francis Poulenc" (PhD Diss., University of Cincinnati, 1989), 208.

Fig. 3.2. Castelnuovo-Tedesco, *Sonata inglese* (1909), first page. Manuscript.
US-NH, RKA: MSS 11, Box 3, Folder 7.

Composers who wrote for revival harpsichord included Lou Harrison, Walter Piston, Henry Cowell, Francis Poulenc, Frank Martin, Ned Rorem, George Rochberg, Iannis Xenakis, Elliot Carter, Luciano Berio and John Cage. Styles ranged from Neoclassical to Avant-garde, with composers not stereotyping merely along Baroque or Neoclassical compositional avenues. A majority of titles, however, were selected for their association with Baroque or Classical forms, especially Partita, Toccata, Pavane, Suite, Bagatelle, Invention and Sonata. The reader is referred to Larry Palmer's *A Harpsichord in America* for more information on revival harpsichord repertoire history, including a reproduction of Thomé's *Rigodon*.⁹

After the mid-1970s, only a small number of composers continued to write for revival harpsichord, including György Ligeti, who wrote *Hungarian Rock* for Elisabeth Chojnacka in 1978.¹⁰ British composer Brian Ferneyhough imagined "a resonant modern [revival] instrument" for his 1993 *Études transcendentales for Flute, Oboe, Cello, Harpsichord, and Voice*, but commented that it was never its "fate" to be performed on a revival model.¹¹

3.2. Revival Score Availability

Several dissertations touch upon the topic of interpreting contemporary scores just after "the swing" to historical harpsichords, most prominently those by Keith Thorp (1981), Joyce Lindorff (1982) and Linda Khadavi (1983).¹² Of the one hundred and seven works discussed by Thorp (1981), only two were not readily available at the time: Graciane Finzi's *Profil Sonore* for prepared harpsichord was out of print and François-Bernard Mâche's *Korwar* for harpsichord and tape was only available from the composer. Many of the works studied by Thorp were intended for revival harpsichord. While Thorp's primary purpose was a stylistic

⁹ Palmer, *Harpsichord in America*, 6.

¹⁰ Nordwall claimed that although Ligeti once tried *Continuum* on a French double manual historical harpsichord owned by harpsichordist Eva Nordwall, it was advantageous to perform the work on a revival instrument, see Ove Nordwall, "Ligeti's Harpsichord," *Contemporary Music Review* 20/1 (2001): 73.

¹¹ Jane Chapman, "An Interview with Brian Ferneyhough: Thoughts on the Harpsichord in *Études Transcendentales*," *Contemporary Music Review* 20/1 (2001): 103.

¹² Keith Thorp, "The Twentieth-Century Harpsichord: Approaches to Composition and Performance Practice as Evidenced by the Contemporary Repertoire" (DMA diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1981); Joyce Lindorff, "Contemporary Harpsichord Music: Issues for Composers and Performers" (DMA diss., Julliard School of Music, 1982); Linda Sue Khadavi, "Twentieth-Century Harpsichord Music: Selected Playing Techniques" (DMA Diss., University of Missouri- Kansas City, 1983).

description and geographic categorisation of repertoire, he also shared first-hand accounts of performing on a Challis harpsichord. He found its tone to be comparable to historical harpsichords built at the time, but with a far greater tuning stability. Thorp criticised the fact that metal soundboards were “summarily dismissed by the public” as inauthentic to be evidence of the kind of prejudice that can “stifle real creativity and progress in the technology of harpsichord making.”¹³

A decrease in the availability of revival scores was noted by Khadavi in 1983, as only half of the scores she requested from publishers were available for purchase.¹⁴ Even fewer revival works can be bought now than in the early 1980s, but a significant number are still in print, particularly those that are scored alternatively for piano or other instruments such as harp (see, for example, Jacques Ibert’s 1946 *Deux Interludes*).

3.3. Twentieth-Century Historical Authenticity

Jukka Tiensuu’s 1987 *Fantastic Harpsichord* CD utilised a Wittmayer revival model for two works: Iannis Xenakis’s *Khoai* (1976) and Salvatore Sciarrino’s *De o de do* (1970).¹⁵ Matti Tuomisto’s booklet notes ascribed the use of both a revival and historical harpsichord to a “determination to present every piece in his repertoire according to the original version and intention of the composer, regardless of whether the work dates from the 18th century or the 1980’s [sic].”¹⁶

Tiensuu’s *Exuberant Harpsichord* released two years later, however, opted for a historical harpsichord for György Ligeti’s *Continuum*, citing the benefits of a “glorious sonority,” while other revival works on the same disc were recorded on a revival instrument.¹⁷ Historical authenticity may be a tool in the performer’s toolbox, but not one that necessarily overrides all considerations.¹⁸ Canadian harpsichordist Kenneth Gilbert (b. 1931) once remarked:

¹³ Thorp, “Twentieth-Century Harpsichord,” 13.

¹⁴ Khadavi, “Twentieth-Century Harpsichord Music,” xiv.

¹⁵ Matti Tuomisto, booklet notes to Jukka Tiensuu, *Fantastic Harpsichord*, Finlandia Music, 1987, FACD 357.

¹⁶ *Ibid*, 7.

¹⁷ Jukka Tiensuu, *Exuberant Harpsichord*, Finlandia Records, 1989, FACD 367: 4.

¹⁸ For such issues in relation to early music, see Peter Walls, *History, Imagination and the Performance of Music* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003).

“most of the modern repertoire through de Falla of the 1920s to the 1970s would be playable on historical instruments, sometimes much to their gain,”¹⁹ reflecting a widely-held view. The opposing standpoint is represented by Polish harpsichordist, Elisabeth Chojnacka (1939–2017), to whom many works such as by Xenakis and Ligeti were dedicated. In 2001, she asked:

Why is there so little respect for new works? Is it the fact that they are still unknown by the public that allows:

- the composer’s indications concerning articulation, registration, tempo and rhythm to be ignored,
- the distortion of the musical meaning of the work by failing to respect the choice of instrument for which it was conceived,
- the distortion of the performance of the work since it has real meaning only on the modern [revival] instrument that inspired it and not on an ancient harpsichord (far be it from me to imply the superiority of one instrument over another. I am concerned merely with the music),
- the distortion of the musical meaning as a result of an incorrect understanding of the score.²⁰

Chojnacka also expressed concern that we are in danger of forgetting our history, noting, for example, that it has been incorrectly believed that Ligeti’s *Hungarian Rock* was written for a historical harpsichord.²¹

Approaches to “authenticity” with regards to early music have resulted in lively debates about instrumentation, which have only sporadically been explored for contemporary harpsichord music. The concept of authenticity, critiqued for problems of definition, has earned a substantial entry in Grove Music Online, in which John Butt notes that it “has expanded in all historical directions, even producing period performance of twentieth-century music.”²² In a review of contemporary harpsichord recordings, Mark Kroll has

¹⁹ Nordwall, “Ligeti’s Harpsichord,” 72.

²⁰ Elisabeth Chojnacka, “L’Interprete – la memoire du compositeur (the performer – the essence of the composer),” *Contemporary Music Review* 20/1 (2001): 32.

²¹ Loc. cit.

²² John Butt, “Authenticity,” *Grove Music Online, Oxford Music Online*, Oxford University Press, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/46587>, accessed November 3, 2016.

observed: “It is indeed somewhat ironic that the principles of the historical performance movement applied to the music of the distant past are also relevant when performing certain contemporary works for harpsichord.”²³

In 2004, Czech harpsichordist Monika Knoblochová recorded Bohuslav Martinů’s *Concert pour clavecin et petit orchestra*, H. 246 (1935) on a Pleyel revival instrument. Aleš Březina’s accompanying booklet notes stated: “A high degree of authenticity has also been achieved by using one of the few preserved Pleyel harpsichords from the time, corresponding to the composer’s timbral expectations.”²⁴ Printing errors were corrected through an examination of autographs and Martinů’s original scoring for nonet was followed, departing from the usual doubling of parts. Blair Sanderson, in reviewing the release for *Allmusic*, supported the aims of this recording: “Historically informed performance practice is no longer just an issue for Baroque or Classical music, but now a relevant matter in twentieth century music, as well.”²⁵

Revival-era works were recorded on Japanese harpsichordist Michiyo Honma’s *Contemporary Harpsichord* CD in 2008 on a Neupert “Bach” revival model.²⁶ Geoff Thomason’s booklet notes discussed the application of historical performance practice to revival harpsichord music of the twentieth century, suggesting that such instruments be “revived for the music originally intended for them.”²⁷ When I spoke to Czech harpsichordist Zuzana Růžicková, who has taught many students, including Knoblochová, she shared her belief that playing revival works on historical instruments “is a question of attitude: I think that first of all twentieth-century music should definitely be played on a revival instrument, because it is historical.”²⁸

²³ Mark Kroll, “Keyboard Music,” review in *Music Library Association Notes* 59/4 (June 2003): 991.

²⁴ Aleš Březina, booklet notes to *Martinů Harpsichord Works*, Supraphon, 2005, Su 3805-2, 7.

²⁵ Blair Sanderson, “Review of Monika Knoblochová: *Martinů Harpsichord Works*,” *Allmusic*, 2005.

²⁶ Michiyo Honma, *Contemporary Harpsichord*, SteepleChase Productions/ KON 32340, 2008.

²⁷ *Ibid*, 2.

²⁸ Skype interview with Růžicková, November 5, 2014.

3.4. Instrument Availability

A revival harpsichord is sometimes desired for the presentation of certain repertoire, but is unavailable. For his 2013 *Harpsichord Concertos* CD on Naxos,²⁹ for example, Christopher Lewis intended to use a revival model but could not locate one in time. He has since recorded on a 1939 Pleyel in 2015,³⁰ with two further recordings planned that use a revival harpsichord.³¹ Bruce Reader reviewed Lewis' 2015 *20th Century Harpsichord Music* release and noted: "Some may find the impressive sound of the 1930's Pleyel harpsichord a little strident and powerful, but wow is it impressive."³²

Monika Knoblochová had hoped to record on an instrument similar to that which was used for the premiere of Martinů's 1935 *Concert pour clavecin et petit orchestra*, H. 246. But as she wrote to me from the Czech Republic:³³

Intriguingly, there is a little Gaveau here, but in poor condition. As I write this, I wonder myself what has happened to it. When I recorded the Martinů Concerto, I was interested in this Gaveau as a possible instrument to use, as the premiere of this work was on just such a Gaveau! Unfortunately, the instrument was not in a playable condition.³⁴

Knoblochová has observed that most Czech harpsichord students choose to focus on Baroque repertoire and that most modern works are chosen from the revival harpsichord period. She recently became a harpsichord lecturer at Czech Academy of Performing Arts (AMU), where students are given the choice of either a historical or revival instrument for contemporary repertoire. At AMU, she is considering offering a course on how to play the revival harpsichord. For the Martinů Competition for Winds and Harpsichord held in Prague on November 25–27, 2016 (Fig. 3.3), there were two required pieces, one by Martinů and

²⁹ Christopher Lewis, *Harpsichord Concertos*, 2013, 8.573146.

³⁰ Lewis, *20th Century Harpsichord Music*, Naxos, 2015, 8.573364.

³¹ <http://blog.soton.ac.uk/music/2014/06/01/reviving-modern-harpsichord/#comment-26>, accessed May 16, 2016.

³² <http://theclassicalreviewer.blogspot.co.nz/2015/11/harpsichordist-christopher-d-lewis.html>, November 2, 2015.

³³ The official country name is Czechia.

³⁴ Email from Knoblochová, April 21, 2016. Original German translated by the author.

another by a different Czech composer chosen by contestants, and these works were playable on either a revival or a historical harpsichord.³⁵

Fig. 3.3. Poster, Martinů Competition for Winds and Harpsichord, November 25–27, 2016.³⁶

Concerning revival instrument availability, well-known advocate of contemporary harpsichord music, Annelie de Man (1943–2010) wrote in 2000:

The pieces written before the late sixties clearly employed the pedal [revival] instrument and were as such not acceptable to the by now totally authentic-minded performers and public alike. To this day it is almost impossible to find a good pedal instrument in the Netherlands, and for this reason the music centre 'De Ysbreker' recently acquired a brand new Neupert, and in doing so is able to make its vast repertoire accessible."³⁷

³⁵ Loc. cit.

³⁶ <http://www.martinu.cz/en/institutions/bohuslav-martinu-foundation/competition/>.

³⁷ Annelie de Man, "Contemporary Harpsichord Music in the Netherlands, *Contemporary Music Review*, 19/4 (2000): 51.

She urged, however, that performers not be “lured into yet another ‘authenticity movement’ of one ‘correct’ interpretation of 20th century music.”³⁸

3.5. Which Harpsichord?

Frances Bedford, author of the key reference work on contemporary harpsichord music (referred to by Elaine Funaro as “the Bible” on the subject) suggested that each performer “follow one’s bliss” in matching a harpsichord to a contemporary work.³⁹ Bedford outlined four types of harpsichord: (1) historical harpsichords with hand stops, (2) historical harpsichords having an updated external appearance, (3) revival harpsichords with a 16’ stop and pedals and (4) a harpsichord with integrated (MIDI) electronics. She encouraged respect for a performer’s priorities and allegiances: “Each school of the modern harpsichord [meaning all harpsichords] has its devout followers; nevertheless it is clear that each is valid for the literature written for it.”⁴⁰

On this point Zuckermann has admitted (albeit in parentheses): “Modern harpsichord makers have been able to evolve a new instrument (quite suitable, incidentally, for modern music).”⁴¹ Each type of harpsichord has its own sound, range of capabilities, visual impact and associated repertoire. Evaluating harpsichords and repertoire within the category to which they belong may encourage respect for differing opinions. Currently, however, revival harpsichords are frequently assessed against criteria relevant only to historical harpsichords, and are rarely considered a different type of harpsichord.

³⁸ Ibid., 60.

³⁹ Elaine Funaro, interview with the author, April 3, 2014; Bedford, *Harpsichord and Clavichord Music of the Twentieth Century*, xxx. To “follow one’s bliss” is a catchphrase coined by mythologist and author, Joseph Campbell (1904–1987).

⁴⁰ Ibid, xxix- xxx. According to Bedford, a modern-looking harpsichord presents an “updated listening atmosphere [that] can create an exciting psychological effect.”

⁴¹ Zuckermann, *Modern Harpsichord*, 185.

Part Two: Perspectives

3.6. Perspectives on Interpreting Contemporary Harpsichord Scores

English harpsichordist Jane Chapman has proposed the application of practices associated with current Baroque performance practice norms to contemporary harpsichord music, including such effects as overlegato, arpeggiation and *notes inégales*:

The performer who brings to it [Mike Vaughan's *Tiento* (1993)] a knowledge of contemporary style, supported and informed by previous writings [of earlier centuries], gives the work a kind of spontaneity that it might otherwise lack if played 'cold' by someone who is unaware of earlier performance practices.⁴²

For my performances of revival works in 2015 and 2016, including Paul Ben-Haim's *Sonata a Tre* (1968) and Jacques Ibert's *Deux Interludes* (1946), I judiciously added arpeggiation and overlegato in the slow movements. Like Chapman, Susan Summerfield referred to Baroque practice in her 1990 edition of Lou Harrison's *Six Sonatas for Cembalo or Pianoforte* (1934–1943) in providing suggested ornamentation on the reprises. Harrison contributed historical temperament options for Summerfield's edition and authorised the adaptation of this work for historical models.⁴³ Applying techniques and approaches that are frequently used in historical harpsichord practice to works written for a revival harpsichord is most appropriate for pieces that have a stylistic connection to early music. Such works may have a high melodic content or contain pitches that need to be sustained for a longer duration than can be achieved on a historical harpsichord without arpeggiation, for example. New editions of revival works that have been specifically adapted to historical harpsichords have unfortunately been the exception, however, rather than the rule.

Robert Hinchliffe's (b. 1945) *The Elements for Flute and Harpsichord (or Piano)* (1978) is on the repertoire list for flute exams administered by the Associated Board of the Royal Schools of Music (ABRSM). It is unfortunately rarely performed on harpsichord. A performance on historical harpsichord given by myself and flutist Ingrid Culliford in 2016 (see Appendix III),

⁴² Jane Chapman, "Notes Inégales in Contemporary Music?" *Contemporary Music Review* 20/1 (2001): 63.

⁴³ Lou Harrison, *Six Sonatas for Cembalo or Pianoforte*, ed. Susan Summerfield (New York: Peer International Corporation, 1990).

was well-received and exemplifies harpsichord repertoire from the cross-over period that is easily adaptable to a variety of keyboard types. The only available edition, by Oxford University Press, requires some adaptation when played on a historical harpsichord. In addition to a wide dynamic range, there are many graduated dynamics that must be interpreted by the performer and there is no registration given. The dynamics can often be managed by playing each hand on a different manual or alternating both hands on the quieter upper manual with the lower and louder, coupled manual. Not being a keyboard player, Hinchliffe did not actually have a particular type of harpsichord in mind when he wrote *The Elements*, and does not recall which was used for its premiere at the Merton Festival on May 24, 1978.⁴⁴

Contemporary composers commonly lack a first-hand familiarity with harpsichords, which can lead to mistakes that include composing beyond a harpsichord's range. Bars 81–92 of the final movement of *The Elements*, for example, were written outside the range of any harpsichord, but the right hand can be easily brought down an octave. The performer might regard articulation, registration and range in such cases to be thin, rather than thick descriptions.⁴⁵

For many revival-era scores, as well as those written during the cross-over period to historical harpsichords such as *The Elements*, new editions would be beneficial, particularly those that include suggestions for performance on a historical harpsichord. Additional information could be provided that included previously unpublished background context and the correction of other mistakes and omissions. Hinchliffe personally supplied information for this dissertation concerning *The Elements*. The work was written for the Collage Chamber Ensemble, of which he was a performing member, as an anniversary present for fellow members Jay and Nigel Wilkinson. The autograph manuscript is not publicly available that quotes lines from philosopher Gaston Bachelard, revealing a background to the four movements not available from the edition published by Oxford University Press (1980):

Earthly joy is riches and impediment;

⁴⁴ Email from Hinchliffe, July 28, 2016. The title of the work was inspired by the Festival's theme of "the elements."

⁴⁵ As set forth in Davies, *Musical Works & Performances*, 20.

Aquatic joy is softness and repose;
Fiery pleasure is desire and love;
Airy delight is liberty and movement.⁴⁶

3.7. Instrumentation for Ligeti and Xenakis

Some works present difficulties when transferring them from a revival to a historical harpsichord, particularly those scored with complex registrations. In answering a question posed to English harpsichordist Ruth Dyson in 1975, “Do you find that you need modern harpsichords for this modern music, or can you play it on a traditional instrument?” she responded:

I don’t find it so satisfactory. I must say that even the despised sixteen-foot stop has its place in the twentieth-century repertoire. In the Ligeti piece [*Continuum*], if you don’t get that sudden roar from the sixteen foot you are losing half the dramatic impact from the piece.⁴⁷

Ligeti and Xenakis relied heavily on the capabilities of revival harpsichords for their musical effects. Ligeti’s *Continuum* is a popular work, but not everyone agrees whether it suits a historical harpsichord. Written in 1968 for a revival Neupert “Bach” model, it is scored for a 4’ stop on the upper manual. This creates issues when transferring the work even to another revival harpsichord such as a Pleyel, where the 4’ is on the lower manual.⁴⁸

McAllister has suggested the Lute stop on the upper manual of a Pleyel may be used to replace the 4’ solo at the end of the work, as it more closely mimics a Neupert’s 4’ sound!⁴⁹

Some registration changes in *Continuum* are sudden, giving the performer little time to change manuals or hand stops on a historical instrument. Fig. 3.4 shows the indication “*subito* 16’, 2 x 8’ and 4’” that appears on page 9 of the published edition of this work (see the upper box marked on Fig. 3.4). The lower box indicates an immediate reduction to “4’” for the right hand, while the left hand sustains pitches at a different registration. Mark Kroll

⁴⁶ Email from Hinchliffe, July 28, 2016.

⁴⁷ Edgar Hunt, “Ruth Dyson: An Interview,” *The English Harpsichord Magazine* 1/5 (1975): second page.

⁴⁸ McAllister, interview with the author, Melbourne, October 2015.

⁴⁹ Ibid. He acknowledges, however, that the sounding pitch would not be the same.

has concluded that this composition is ineffective on a historical instrument, primarily due to potential interruptions while managing registration changes without a pedal.⁵⁰

Chapman's perspective has been that the work provides a good exercise for her students on a historical model.⁵¹ *Continuum* has been recorded and performed on a variety of revival and historical instruments, barrel organ and on percussion by Sydney-based percussionist, Claire Edwards, who plays directly from the harpsichord score.⁵²

I preferred the experience and sound of playing *Continuum* on McAllister's Pleyel more than on a French double historical harpsichord. My reasons included the experience of operating the pedals and the corresponding ease of being able to follow the notated registration. To me, there is a more satisfying "continuous" sound that can be created for this work when using a revival harpsichord, as the decay envelope for individual pitches does not diminish as rapidly as on a historical harpsichord. This can create a more dramatic sound that envelopes the listener and performer, as in the case of McAllister's restored Pleyel. However, a historical harpsichord tends to generate more resonance than a revival model, has a more brilliant sound and a greater capacity for the sympathetic vibration of strings. Furthermore, finger techniques such as overlegato can help mitigate against the interruptions of sound produced by the typically more prominent ictus of attack on a historical harpsichord. This helps account for why personal preference plays a role in the choice of harpsichord for this work.

⁵⁰ Mark Kroll, *Playing the Harpsichord Expressively: A Practical and Historical Guide* (Lanham: Scarecrow Press, 2004), 100.

⁵¹ Chau-Yee Lo, "Endangered Species: The Harpsichord and its New Repertoire since 1960" (PhD diss., University of Leeds, 2004), 69.

⁵² Conversation with Claire Edwards, Wellington, August 1, 2013 after her performance with Wellington-based group, Stroma. For a video of *Continuum* on historical harpsichord, see Annelie de Man, 1996, http://www.admf.nl/NL/english_audio.html, accessed February 14, 2017.

16+8+4

(klingt Oktave höher) *

r.H. nur 4' bis zum Ende **

r.H. bleibt zunächst 16'+8'+4' ***

l.H.: liegen lassen bis zum * ****

Fig. 3.4. Györgyi Ligeti, *Continuum* (1968), page 9.⁵³

⁵³ Györgyi Ligeti, *Continuum für Cembalo* (London: Schott, 1970).

In 2004, doctoral candidate Chau-Yee Lo concluded that Iannis Xenakis's *Khoai* (1976) could "only be played on a modern [revival] harpsichord with pedals," as differences in registration help create the character and structure of the piece.⁵⁴ Munich-based harpsichordist Andreas Skouras is one of the few harpsichordists who have performed *Khoai* on a historical harpsichord. While acknowledging the many registration markings that must be ignored, Skouras believes the piece still retains its essential "shape."⁵⁵ Xenakis, however, considered the physicality of this piece to be intrinsic to its performance, including the operation of pedals: "The abrupt changes in texture demand from the player acrobatic qualities involving the entire body."⁵⁶

3.8. Sonic Expectations

In the revival harpsichord era, composers were primarily familiar with the distinctive sound of the revival harpsichord and held this image of sound in imagination. When Ligeti was interviewed in 1978 about *Continuum*, he related the genesis of this work to a commission for horn trio that he received around the same time: "as soon as [the person commissioning the work] pronounced the word horn, somewhere inside my head I heard the sound of a horn as if coming from a distant forest in a fairy tale . . . Much the same happened with *Continuum*."⁵⁷

While Ligeti sanctioned performances of the work on historical harpsichord (without registration changes),⁵⁸ Nordwall claimed it was far from Ligeti's preference that *Continuum* be played on such an instrument, particularly without the solo 4' that extends from the bottom of page 9 to the end of the piece.⁵⁹ When *Continuum* is performed on a historical harpsichord, an alternative version of the work arguably arises as a result of the change in instrumentation. Such versions are often discernibly *different* for both listener and

⁵⁴ Lo, "Endangered Species," 89 and 91.

⁵⁵ Andreas Skouras, <http://www.procembalo.org/works/view/khoa/53d9b26c-0d08-48ff-b2c6-7b2e3ec551f5> and www.concert-dr-graap.de, accessed August 12, 2016.

⁵⁶ Xenakis, quoted in Tiensuu, *Fantastic Harpsichord*, booklet notes, 4.

⁵⁷ *György Ligeti in Conversation with Péter Várnai*, trans. by Gabor J. Schabert (London: Eulenburg Books, 1978), 22.

⁵⁸ Elste, "Nostalgische Musikmaschinen," 233.

⁵⁹ Nordwall, "Ligeti's Harpsichord," 73.

performer, extending to differences of registration, sound, touch, visual and experiential effects.⁶⁰

3.9. Applying Experiences with Revival Harpsichords to Historical Harpsichords

A knowledge of pedal mechanisms and of the feel and sound of playing revival instruments can be used to inform the performance of a revival work not only a revival instrument, but on a more classically-styled historical harpsichord. The following excerpt of dialogue reproduced below is taken from a session I had with Alastair McAllister on October 16, 2015 on how to use the pedals of his 1963 Pleyel. His name is abbreviated as AM, while my initials, KZ, are used to represent myself. Two observers were in attendance, Ian McLaughlan and his wife, Viki, abbreviated as VM. The discussion concerned the limits of pedal movement and the overplucking of positive-oriented pedals (McAllister's instrument has a mixture of positive and negative pedals). This exemplifies, albeit briefly, the experiential nature of learning about revival instruments that comes from hands-on experience:

KZ: But I mean, while pushing down [the pedal], it just feels as though . . .

AM: You can go *too* far. You should only go as far as the notch.

KZ: I'm just saying that tennis shoes are *not* ideal [laughs]; 'cause you can't really tell what you are doing.

AM: You need felt slippers [referring to those that Landowska wore].

KZ: [I play] That sounds better.

AM: That's the upper 8'.

KZ: But not pressing it all the way. I think that sounds cool.

VM: Yes, it does. It's got so many different moods.

AM: It's got so many, you have to work out the registration.

⁶⁰ I refer to the philosophical model of work versions as outlined by Stephen Davies in *Musical Works & Performances*, 2001.

The effort required to coordinate pedals when playing often challenging revival scores has taught me much about the awareness of sound combinations and how articulation and registration affect phrasing, lessons I later applied when performing these works on historical models.

One revival piece I played on McAllister's Pleyel during a week with him in October 2015 in Melbourne, was Ned Rorem's *Spiders* (1968). During the final section, marked "Slower," I later used more overlegato in my performance on a historical harpsichord because of the experience of having played it on the 1963 Pleyel, consciously mimicking the accumulation of sound achieved on the Pleyel when registering for a *fortississimo* marking (see Fig 3.5). Other changes made after returning from visiting McAllister in Melbourne, when once again playing revival repertoire on a historical harpsichord, were more automatic adjustments and a re-enactment of the frame of mind I had when playing the 1963 Pleyel, rather than a thought-out process. In short, I was informed by the *experience* of having played a revival instrument.

Fig. 3.5. Ned Rorem, *Spiders* (1968), final bars, page 8.⁶¹

3.10. Technique and Articulation

As observed by American harpsichordist Albert Fuller, "Some music will survive the transition [to historical harpsichords], depending on its flexibility," but different techniques

⁶¹ Ned Rorem, *Spiders for Harpsichord* (Milwaukee, WI: Boosey & Hawkes, 1969).

are required for the lighter action of historical models.⁶² According to Ralph Kirkpatrick, playing a Pleyel required “pile-driver strength,”⁶³ which was similar to my experience of playing selected pitches on the Berlin Musikinstrumenten-Museum’s 1927 Pleyel (Inv. 4885) in 2014. The stiffness of some notes was due in part to not having been regularly played, and the fact that two years had passed since a major restoration had been completed by Neupert technicians.⁶⁴ In addition, the more registers that are employed, the more weight is required to push a key down, particularly with the lead weights that were inserted into Pleyel jacks. The plucking order, or stagger also greatly affects the action—if registers pluck simultaneously, the key is harder to depress than when they are operated in an optimally staggered position. The stagger is one of the first requirements of regulation on such instruments.⁶⁵ In comparing historical to revival models, regardless of their condition of restoration or maintenance, a two-manual concert revival harpsichord will have a heavier feel on both keyboards.

This heavier touch can invite comparisons with techniques needed to play a modern piano. In order to play McAllister’s Pleyel and create a full-bodied sound, I combined my piano technique with what would be appropriate for a historical harpsichord—in Patrick Lindley’s words, creating “a modified piano technique,” his description of the technique he developed to play revival harpsichords in the 1960s.⁶⁶

For McAllister’s Pleyel, I did not know at first that I needed to play more deeply into the key bed than on a historical model, and played tones in an overly clipped manner. Over time, I learned to lengthen tenuto marks and to potentially add my own, as well as to clearly demarcate rests. The visceral experience and heavier feel of a Pleyel helped me form a concept of Piston’s *Sonatina for Violin and Harpsichord (or Piano)* (1945) not only when playing it on McAllister’s Pleyel (which I did in 2014 and 2015), but also when playing it on a historical harpsichord. Below is a page from Piston’s manuscript of this work, now held at

⁶² Lindorff, “Contemporary Harpsichord Music,” 63.

⁶³ Kirkpatrick, “Fifty Years,” 33.

⁶⁴ Information concerning restoration history provided by Hoffmann, interviewed in Berlin, 2014.

⁶⁵ Downie, interview, 2017.

⁶⁶ Lindley, interview with the author, UCSB, December 10, 2013. He continues to perform on revival harpsichords, particularly the Herz mentioned in Chapter Two. Email September 3, 2017.

the Yale University Library in the Ralph Kirkpatrick Archive, showing Kirkpatrick's pencilled-in articulation.

Fig. 3.6. Walter Piston, *Sonatina for Violin and Harpsichord (or Piano)* (1945), first movement, bars 122–125. Manuscript. US-NH, RKA, MSS 11, Box 6, Folder 17.⁶⁷

Piston dedicated his *Sonatina* to Kirkpatrick and his duo partner, violinist Alexander Schneider. Kirkpatrick's autograph manuscript copy above shows articulation marks that he added for performance, including tenuto markings beneath two slurs shown in Fig. 3.6 in the right hand. Piston's runs such as these are difficult to perform at the required Allegro speed (and even more so where marked *piano* and played on the upper manual in the third movement). On a historical harpsichord, one plays more lightly than on a revival model. On McAllister's Pleyel, I could sink some arm weight onto the keys, which made Piston's rapid passages with leaps easier to perform, particularly on the upper manual and where successive octaves are written for the lower. The manuals on a Pleyel are also closer together than on historical models, which facilitates movement between manuals as well as the simultaneous playing of notes on two manuals with one hand.

⁶⁷ Photo by the author.

Articulation on a historical harpsichord includes techniques such as non-simultaneous release and other means of producing gradations in dynamic shading.⁶⁸ Something to consider for revival works is the fact that the relatively long tonal decay on revival instruments may mean that the composer was thinking of articulation differently than for historical instruments. A historical harpsichord, in contrast to revival models, has a larger initial bloom with greater brilliance and a quicker decay. A revival model responds more like a piano in that once a key is depressed, the tone continues for longer until released. As McAllister explained when guiding me through Landowska's recordings, this helps account for how Landowska could make very slow tempi work, as, for example, in J. S. Bach's *Goldberg Variations*.⁶⁹

Just as added tenuto markings shown in Fig. 3.6 might sound best when exaggerated on a revival model as compared to how they might sound on a historical model, staccato markings added by Kirkpatrick in the same figure above would also likely be performed with a somewhat longer duration on a revival model. I find that Kirkpatrick's 1953 recording of Piston's *Sonatina* supports the notion that Kirkpatrick consciously chose a somewhat longer articulation for certain passages on the revival harpsichord, particularly in sections he marked with additional tenuto articulations, such as in Fig. 3.6 above.⁷⁰ Lengthening melodic pitches in such passages while creating a clear delineation of individual tones is how I interpret Kirkpatrick's tenuto additions. Additionally, this approach to articulation corresponds to what I found to be optimal for the quick, broken chords and scalar runs for this work on McAllister's Pleyel.

In McAllister's considered opinion, very short staccatos that are effective on a historical harpsichord are the "wrong sound" on a Pleyel.⁷¹ Such observations have implications for the performance of articulation not only on a revival harpsichord, but on a historical harpsichord, where the decision has been made to mimic how a passage might sound on a revival harpsichord.

⁶⁸ See Kroll, *Playing the Harpsichord Expressively*, 29–30.

⁶⁹ McAllister, interview with the author, Melbourne, October 2015.

⁷⁰ Ralph Kirkpatrick and Alexander Schneider, *Walter Piston/John Cage Modern American Music Series*, Columbia, ca. 1953, ML 4495.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*

The following example summarises several points concerning performance on revival harpsichords. To demonstrate that a Pleyel revival harpsichord responds differently than a historical harpsichord, McAllister asked me to repeat Middle C in various registrations on his 1963 Pleyel. While repeating “C”, I successively struck the key more quickly and firmly than I would on a historical model, to deemphasise the effect and delay of each staggered register entry. (A smaller, but similar effect is produced on a historical instrument.) Quick repetition of a single key on McAllister’s Pleyel produced a stronger and louder tone, the effect multiplying as more registers were employed. Such differences arising from instrumentation affected my interpretation of works played on his Pleyel, regardless of whether they were written by Ligeti or Bach.

Overall, I found the experience of playing Piston’s work on McAllister’s Pleyel grander, in part because of the longer decay envelope than on a historical harpsichord, but also the “swell-pedal”- like effects that can be achieved through overplucking. When I returned to New Zealand and no longer had access to a Pleyel, I found that I missed playing the instrument—both its sound and feel. The information gleaned about the feel and sound of playing revival works on this and other revival harpsichords also informed my performance decisions on a French historical model and are reflected in the case studies found in Part Three.

3.11. Issues in Revival Harpsichord Technique

While a thorough discussion of revival harpsichord technique is beyond the scope of this dissertation, several points are raised in this section that may encourage the reader to re-evaluate previously-held assumptions. Writings by revival era harpsichordists Harich-Schneider and Landowksa, with whom Harich-Schneider studied from 1929–1935, show that both were aware of early treatises such as those by François Couperin (1668–1733) and Johann Nikolaus Forkel (1749–1818) and believed that they were incorporating such advice into their playing. Indeed, perhaps they were – in ways that were adapted to revival models.

The series of photographs below in Fig. 3.7 and 3.8 are taken from Harich-Schneider’s *The Harpsichord: An Introduction to Technique, Style and the Historical Sources* (1954/2nd edn 1960). Fig. 3.9 is from Denise Restout’s *Landowska on Music* (1964). One can observe a

strong finger technique and reliance on muscles of the back of the hand, which tend to be more relaxed for historical harpsichord technique in comparison.

Fig. 3.7. Figures 1 and 2. Eta Harich-Schneider, *The Harpsichord* (1954/2nd edn 1960).

3. Third movement of Bach's Italian Concerto (page 12)

4. Bach's finger position on the keyboard, according to Forkel (page 17)

Fig. 3.8. Figures 3 and 4. Eta Harich-Schneider, *The Harpsichord* (1954/2nd edn 1960).

Landowska and other revival-era harpsichords have been described as playing with a “claw” hand formation, cited in the aforementioned 2014 article by Elste, “From Landowska to Leonhardt, from Pleyel to Skowronek.”⁷² Whether this description reflects earlier performers’ own understanding of their technique, or rather that the idea of a “claw” is more associated with stylised snapshot views captured for advertising purposes, is beyond the scope that can be discussed here. However, it should be mentioned that a basis of early

⁷² Elste, “Landowska to Leonhardt,” 15. For one eyewitness account that rejects the idea that revival-era harpsichordists such as Fernando Valenti played with a “claw” hand, see Mark Kroll, “Letter to *Early Music*,” *Early Music*, 43/3 (2015): 553.

to mid-twentieth century technique for revival harpsichordists who were trained by Landowska was that all three joints of the finger were highly developed and utilised in a curved and high finger style technique as shown in Fig. 3.9.⁷³

Fig. 3.9. Figures 17c and d; 18. Denise Restout, *Landowska on Music* (1964).

There was not, in fact, a homogeneous approach to revival harpsichord technique in evidence throughout the twentieth century. There are videos, for example, of Karl Richter (1926–1981) playing a German revival harpsichord in recordings of J. S. Bach’s *Brandenburg Concerto* No. 3 in G major, BWV 1048, in the late 1960s for ZDF (Zweites Deutsches

⁷³ See Ruth Dyson, “Bend the Finger at all Three Joints: A First-Hand Record of Landowska’s Teaching Methods,” *Early Music* 3/3 (1975): 240.

Fernsehen). Richter can be seen to play from a great height above the keyboards and with such velocity and weight that it bears a closer similarity to piano technique than what is commonly used for historical harpsichord technique today. One can reasonably conclude that he was transferring much of his own piano technique to the instrument – adapted, however, to the revival harpsichord.⁷⁴ In another video of Richter performing Bach's *Chromatic Fantasy and Fugue* in D Minor, BWV 903, in 1969,⁷⁵ one can easily observe a down-up motion of the wrist, a “locked” thumb position in line with playing a modern piano, and the use of arm weight in a manner that is inconsistent with current historical harpsichord technique. Interestingly, Harich-Schneider instructed readers in 1960 that a performer should use “active, elastic fingers, not hampered in the least by arm weight.”⁷⁶ To fully understand twentieth-century revival harpsichord technique, one would need to consider an individual performer's approach and perhaps also to recall that many famous revival harpsichordists were largely self-taught, including Chonjacka and Kipnis.

If we fast forward to a present understanding of revival harpsichord technique, few performers can claim a direct lineage to revival harpsichordist teaching, as does Knoblochová, who has been taught and mentored by Růžicková. Iranian-American harpsichordist Mahan Esfahani (b. 1984) performed a recital in 2010 on a Pleyel revival model at the Library of Congress, which was recorded and can be viewed on their website.⁷⁷ An excerpt is given below of the transcript to a question and answer session that followed Esfahani's recital, which raises several thought-provoking questions about the current state of knowledge about revival harpsichords and technique:

Male Speaker:

I've never heard you play before and I can't guess how much of what happened is a re-creation of Landowska and this together. But how much of it is you? That leaves me hanging. It's clear that the lack of staggering caused you to play in a way that's

⁷⁴ Karl Richter and the Münchener Bach-Orchester performed and recorded all *Brandenburg Concerti* in the late 1960s, for broadcast on the German ZDF channel, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ehbar90jHz8&feature=youtu.be>.

⁷⁵ Karl Richter, *Chromatic Fantasy and Fugue*, D Minor, BWV 903, Archiv Produktion, 1969, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7zvylv7uwyE&list=RDrsalW5MrbMc&index=3>.

⁷⁶ Harich-Schneider, *Harpsichord*, 15.

⁷⁷ Mahan Esfahani, “Mahan Esfahani: Harpsichord Concert,” webcast, Library of Congress, May 29, 2010, https://www.loc.gov/today/cyberlc/feature_wdesc.php?rec=5124.

very unusual. I've never seen anybody using such physical force on anything that's called a harpsichord before. But I can see why you had to, there's no question about that. And I wonder do you make a specialty of playing on things like this?

Mahan Esfahani:

Whether I re-created her performance or not is for her to judge.

It's between Landowska and myself. And such that it is-you know because the instrument is not staggered . . . Landowska set up the harpsichord so that all of the registers go off at once which is very taxing on the player because the force has to be so intense, so heavy, that you hit all four or five strings at once, it's very strange. And I had had some experience with playing those before, and I noticed throughout the week of working with this instrument that I was forced to take this sort of technique. There was really no other way. I would say I noticed that if I used a little less force, one set of strings wouldn't be used. That would sound like it was a diminuendo. I'm not sure that she did that. There's not a lot of evidence in her recordings to suggest that. But certainly mostly out of technical laziness I did that. And so, yes the approach to this instrument is very different from any harpsichord. One or two recitals on one of these maybe every couple of years is alright. But I wouldn't want to be playing them regularly. And we know that a number of her students weren't able to handle the technique and ruined their hands as a result.

In this post-recital discussion, Esfahani stated that his experience with revival models was infrequent. He was also aware of a need to adapt his technique to play on the heavier action of the Pleyel. As to the lack of staggering that was mentioned, I have not found evidence that revival harpsichords were necessarily unstaggered. He also mentioned that the 4' spoke first, as is typical for a historical harpsichord. One can only speculate as to whether the instrument technicians responsible for the Library of Congress Pleyel believed that setting up the other registers to fire at once was a historically accurate choice. It seems to be no longer common knowledge as to what, if any, stagger was set up for revival instruments in the last century. McAllister has pointed out that the ¼ inch key dip for Pleyel harpsichords

provided ample space for all registers to be staggered, which is one indication that these instruments were likely to have had staggered registration.⁷⁸

Another point that arose in the Library of Congress transcript discussion, was that an expert historical harpsichord performer such as Esfahani may only play on a revival model now and then. As mentioned earlier in the chapter, Knoblochová understands there is a need to teach and re-discover how to play revival harpsichords, because in many cases a direct connection with how to play revival models has been lost. Perhaps similar to the ways in which historical harpsichord techniques had to be “rediscovered” or reinvented later in the twentieth century, harpsichordists who are now interested in revival models need to learn how to play them safely and effectively. An optimal set-up of the instrument in terms of its stagger and the potential for lightening the keyboard action may also be a key component in encouraging harpsichordists (along with pianists and organists) to approach these instruments.

Part Three: Case Studies

Four approaches have been considered in this chapter concerning the treatment of revival works since the apparent obsolescence of revival instruments:

- Performance on an alternatively-scored instrument, such as the piano.
- Historically-informed performance on a revival instrument—often with a desire to closely match the make and model for which the work was originally conceived.
- Neglecting a work entirely if deemed too difficult to transfer to another instrument, as is often the case for Xenakis’s *Khoai*.
- Altering details such as registration, dynamics, articulation and pitch for performance on a historical harpsichord. In this case, experience with or knowledge of revival models can be used to inform performance solutions.

⁷⁸ Email from McAllister, August 16, 2017.

3.12. Three Case Studies – Bergman, Milhaud and Child

The following three case studies of revival harpsichord compositions focus on the last scenario listed above. The third case study does not concern a work written during the revival harpsichord period, but was in fact composed in 2005 for a revival Herz model. The work was intended to be playable on a variety of harpsichord types, and so the 16' stop indication is marked as optional. Revival works generally can be placed along a spectrum of transferability. Rorem's *Spiders* is relatively easy to transfer, for example, as the primary issue is one of how to realise dynamics, but for works that are less polyphonic, their aesthetic is often far removed from the Baroque and thus transfer of these works can be more challenging.

Komboi for Harpsichord and Percussion (1981) by Xenakis and *Convertability of Lute Strings* (1992) by Michael Nyman rely on effects that include repetitive or frequent accents. According to Jane Chapman, it can be easier to produce such accents on revival harpsichords than historical models.⁷⁹ Harpsichordist Paul Jacobs (1930–1983), known for interpreting Elliot Carter's works on Challis harpsichords, thought revival instruments suited revival works from the twentieth century in part because their style did not often require the lighter sound of historical models.⁸⁰ This is true of many sections of *Energien*, op. 66 (1970) by Erik Bergman, the work which is the focus of the first case study.

3.13. Erik Bergman's *Energien*, op. 66 (1970)

Bergman (1911–2006) was an influential Finnish composer who taught composition at the Sibelius Academy in Helsinki. As Matti Tuomisto described Jukka Tiensuu's recording of *Energien* for his 1989 *Exuberant Harpsichord* CD: "*Energien* begins with primitively resonant harmonies, out of which the narrative develops with powerful strokes, urged on by some life-force within it, and devoid of any predetermined structural programme."⁸¹

Tiensuu selected a revival harpsichord by Wittmayer for this recording that had five pedals and four hand stops, including a 16'. The harpsichord on which I performed *Energien* in 2016

⁷⁹ Chapman, "Notes Inégales," 67.

⁸⁰ Lindorff, "Contemporary Harpsichord Music," 65.

⁸¹ Matti Tuomisto, booklet notes to *Exuberant Harpsichord*, 6.

(see Appendix III), was a French historical harpsichord made by David Rubio in 1982. I tried to mimic the forward momentum Tiensuu achieved in his 1989 recording, along with the dense sound quality of the Wittmayer, but the historical harpsichord's tendency toward crisp articulation, different tone colours than those of a revival harpsichord, and the difficulties that arose in following the indicated registration, demanded a different approach. While my resulting interpretation was determined by what sounded best on the historical harpsichord on hand, it was still informed by my experiences playing the work on various revival models, as well as listening to Tiensuu's interpretation and thinking about its intended meaning and impact as it was designed for revival instruments.

Phrases form sections within the work that merge into and out of each another, expressing the "many energies," indicated by the German title, *Energien*. These sections are frequently bookended by fermatas or rests, including a major structural pause at bar 44. Bars 45–69 convey a mysterious mood via changes in tempo, texture, dynamics and registration. Following a fermata prior to bar 70, a new section begins with a shift in dynamics, tempo and a return to the tremolandi ideas from bars 30–43. Many dynamic changes, such as the *forte* at bar 60–61, presented difficulties until I realised that playing such bars on the upper manual instead of the lower manual, both sounded louder and was more effective than changing stops.

Process

The results of altering the work for a historical harpsichord are found in Appendix IV, which is a critical edition that also corrects printing errors and misleading accidentals from the original 1972 Fazer edition. I struggled to comprehend the aesthetic of *Energien* until I played it on revival instruments at the D.B.im and began to understand the ways in which it was more "idiomatic" to a revival instrument than to a historical harpsichord. Playing the work on a variety of revival harpsichord models contributed to my ability to engage with something that felt like authenticity. In particular I could imagine the intended impact and reverberation of accented block chords with an added 16', appreciate the array of colours available on a revival model and ability to change registration with pedals. Without this reference point, I would have been less aware of what was potentially missing in transferring the work to historical harpsichord. Experience on revival models affected my

interpretive process and resulting performance. I found, for example, by lengthening tone clusters at the beginning of *Energien* on a historical model, I could deemphasise the distinctive reattack function of each chord and reserve this effect for where I wanted higher degrees of accentuation.

3.14. Darius Milhaud's *Sonata for Clavecin (or Piano) and Violin*, op. 257 (1945)

Style and Tempo

The second case study is Milhaud's *Sonata for Clavecin (or Piano) and Violin*, op. 257 (1945). The following score examples are reproduced from the autograph manuscript (a full copy of which is found in Appendix V) and an early copy of the 1946 Elkan-Vogel edition in the Ralph Kirkpatrick Archive at Yale University. Of the five pieces written by Milhaud (1892–1974) that include harpsichord, two are for violin and harpsichord. The first was *Dixième sonate de Baptist Anet* in D major, op. 144 (1935), a free transcription of a sonata by eighteenth-century French violinist Jean-Baptiste Anet. Milhaud's *Sonata*, op. 257 was composed a decade later, while he was lecturing at Mills College in Oakland, California during the Second World War. The *Sonatina for Violin and Harpsichord* by Piston mentioned earlier in this chapter was written the same year as Milhaud's op. 257 and was similarly dedicated to Alexander Schneider and Kirkpatrick, who premiered the two works at New York City's Town Hall in 1945. The duo recorded Piston's *Sonatina*, but not Milhaud's op. 257.⁸² Milhaud's op. 257 has been recorded by Charles Castlemann and Barbara Harbach (1983); Roger Elmiger and Micheline Mitrani (1989); and Linda Burman-Hall and Laura Albers (2004).⁸³

Milhaud's op. 257 is broadly Neoclassical in style and infused with "Provençal" influences, modality and bitonality. The connection between Milhaud's native Provence to his works was described by Christopher Palmer with statements such as: "once we have experienced

⁸²Kirkpatrick and Schneider, *Walter Piston/John Cage Modern American Music Series*. The harpsichord used was Dolmetsch-Chickering's No. 55; see Richard Rephann, "Dolmetsch-Chickering Instruments at Yale," *Newsletter of the American Musical Instrument Society*, xxi/2 (June 1992): 2, <http://amis.org/publications/newsletter/1991/21.2-1992.pdf>, accessed September 27, 2016.

⁸³Linda Burman-Hall and Laura Albers, *Music of Darius Milhaud*, Kleos Classics, recorded 2004, KL 5131; Roger Elmiger and Micheline Mitrani, *Darius Milhaud and Vittorio Rietti*, recorded 1989, Gallo, GALL 585; Castleman, Charles and Barbara Harbach, *Music by Milhaud, Piston, Adler, Martinů, Rubbra, Dvorák*, recorded 1983, Albany Records, TROY 041.

. . . the real Provence we can never listen to Milhaud's earthy, chunky, robust music the same way again.⁸⁴

Milhaud's opening movement is headed "Nerveux," which suggests a fast tempo, but is not a clear indication of speed. Milhaud penned "3'30" at the end of the first movement on the autograph manuscript, with no timings given for the other movements. Three recordings of Milhaud's op. 257 are not played as fast—Elmiger and Mitrani is recorded at 4'47, while the Castleman/Harbach interpretation is of a similar duration at 4'50. Linda Burman-Hall and Laura Albers' recording time was 3'56; in my own live performance in September 2016 (see Appendix III), violinist HyeWon Kim and I played with nearly the same duration at 4'00. Figs. 3.10 and 3.11 show two similarly-shaped numerals, indicating it was most likely the composer who placed the 3'30 indication in his autograph manuscript.

Fig. 3.10. Left side: Duration marked at the end of the first movement, Darius Milhaud's *Sonata for Clavecin and Violin*, op. 257. Manuscript. US-NH, RKA: MSS 11 Box 6, Folder 13.

Figure 3.11. Right side: Milhaud's op. 257, second movement, bar 30.

Manuscript. US-NH, RKA: MSS 11 Box 6, Folder 13.

In two live performances in 2016, Kim and I opted for a driving, steady rhythm for the first movement with some flexibility, particularly at phrase endings. Certain passages such as those at bars 85 and 86 in this movement (see Appendix V for the full score), I interpreted in a slight *inégaies* fashion for scalar patterns. Linda Burman-Hall's 2004 recording is notable for the use of a 1950s Pleyel, which is particularly effective at the close of the second movement where a single 16' is indicated. Nearly every chord in the second movement was spread in their recording. I found approaching the movement as a straightforward French

⁸⁴ Christopher Palmer, "Darius Milhaud: Poet of Provence," introduction to *My Happy Life* (London: Marion Boyars, 1995), 10.

folk melody with minimal spreading (as suggested to me by Mark Kroll), very effectively conveyed the movement's "Calmé" marking and also provided rhythmic clarity. The sound of Burman-Hall's revival Pleyel was most differentiated to me from historical models in that the pluck was more noticeable than that of a historical harpsichord. At times, her Pleyel sounded like a guitar, particularly in combination with Burman-Hall's interpretative choice of frequent chordal arpeggiation.

In the first movement, Burman-Hall performed the final chords with very short articulation, which I believe resulted in a loss of sound and opportunity to hear the 16'. In the Harbach and Mitrani recordings, the *ff* ending of the first movement was also played without an increase in volume from preceding bars. One idea would have been to double selected pitches to mimic the 16' to boost the bass on a historical instrument (mentioned in the performance notes, Appendix VI).

I particularly enjoyed Mitrani's articulation, where repetitive short-long rhythms were emphasised in the third movement (for example, at bars 113–116). Without highlighting this articulation, I believe the movement lacks rhythmic impetus. Taken at a slightly slower tempo, as in our performance (see Appendix III), the rhythm suggests a sarabande.

3.15. Score Discrepancies in Milhaud's *Sonata*, op. 257

There are some details in Milhaud's autograph manuscript that are missing in the only published version of this work, available from Elkan-Vogel.⁸⁵ The autograph manuscript held at the Ralph Kirkpatrick Collection at Yale University's Irving S. Gilmore Library shows all registrations marked in pencil by Kirkpatrick, which were then subsequently adopted in their entirety for the 1946 Elkan-Vogel edition.⁸⁶ The Yale Archive also holds Kirkpatrick's copy of the 1946 Elkan-Vogel publication. Pasted inside the front cover of Kirkpatrick's published copy is a typewritten note: "The registration was made by Ralph Kirkpatrick for a Challis harpsichord, and may be altered according to the instrument used. Minor gradations of registry are not indicated." See Fig. 3.12 below.

⁸⁵ Darius Milhaud, *Sonata for Clavecin (or Piano) and Violin*, op. 257 (Bryn Mawr, PA: Elkan-Vogel Inc., 1946).

⁸⁶ Research at Yale University was undertaken July 21 and 22, 2016.

Fig. 3.12. Note on registration. Milhaud's op. 257. Elkan-Vogel, 1946.
US-NH, RKA: MSS 11 Box 1, Folder 19.

When I purchased my 1946 Elkan-Vogel copy in 2015, there was no such commentary on registration included. Kirkpatrick had corrected the misprinted word "registry" in his copy with an "s" (shown above in Fig. 3. 12 in red pen), and similarly corrected five wrongly-printed notes for bars 19–20 in the first movement (see Fig. 3.13 below). Fig. 3.14 shows the autograph manuscript as having the correct pitches.

Fig. 3.13. Milhaud's op. 257, first movement, bars 19–20, harpsichord.
1946 Elkan-Vogel. US-NH, RKA: MSS Box 1, Folder 19.⁸⁷

⁸⁷ Photo by the author.

Fig. 3.14. Milhaud's op. 257, same bars (19–20). Manuscript.
US-NH, RKA: MSS Box 6, Folder 13.

The second movement of the 1946 Elkan-Vogel publication also has seven asterisks without a corresponding commentary. These are explained only in Kirkpatrick's handwriting in the autograph manuscript at Yale University as "Sounding At written pitch" (see Fig. 3.15).

Fig. 3.15. Milhaud's op. 257, second movement, page 10. Manuscript.
US-NH, RKA: MSS Box 6, Folder 13.⁸⁸

⁸⁸ Photo by the author.

Furthermore, a mistake at bar 80 of the first movement in the autograph manuscript is likely (Fig. 3.16), where an e-natural⁴ is notated instead of an expected f⁴, which would match the material presented an octave higher in bar 12 (see Fig. 3.17).

Fig. 3.16. Milhaud's op. 257, first movement, bar 80. Manuscript.
US-NH, RKA: MSS Box 6, Folder 13.

Fig. 3.17. Milhaud's op. 257, first movement, bar 12 (both hands are in treble clef, but are mislabelled as bass clef). Manuscript. US-NH, RKA: MSS Box 6, Folder 13.

3.16. Performance Notes to Milhaud's op. 257

As I developed an interpretation of Milhaud's op. 257 and discovered discrepancies between the autograph manuscript and the 1946 Elkan-Vogel edition, I realised that a critical edition for this work would be as appropriate as for Bergman's *Energien*. For the

purposes of this dissertation, however, comments are provided as performance directions and can be used in conjunction with a reproduction of the autograph manuscript provided in Appendix V to serve a related purpose. These notes to performance for Milhaud's op. 257 are located in Appendix VI, including additional errata as those discussed in Section 3.15 above.

3.17. Example of the 16' in Recent Compositional Practice: *Concerto for Harpsichord and String Quartet* by Peter Child (2005)

MIT composer and Professor Peter Burlingham Child (b. 1953) spoke with me in his office on July 15, 2016 about the *Concerto for Harpsichord and String Quartet* he wrote for Peter Gombosi in 2005. Gombosi's father was the well-known Hungarian musicologist, Otto John Gombosi. Having grown up with music, Peter and his wife Carolyn decided to commission works by Child to mark significant events in their lives, of which this *Concerto* is the fourth. The instrumentation of harpsichord and string quartet was pre-determined by Gombosi, and was inspired by the performers who feature on the 2007 premiere recording of this work on the Lorelt label.⁸⁹

Gombosi commissioned the *Concerto* shortly after receiving a terminal diagnosis. Subtitled "In Memoriam Peter Gombosi," Child explained to me that the work is not depressing in nature, but rather celebrates a life well-lived, as expressed in the final "elegiac postscript" named after John Donne's poem, "Valediction, forbidding mourning."⁹⁰

The notation of an optional 16' stop in the two internal movements reflects the registration of the late-model Eric Herz revival instrument available to Child at MIT.⁹¹ Although the work is an unusual instance of a revival harpsichord influencing more recent compositional practice, it is significant that the full registration possibilities of a Herz revival harpsichord were employed, indicative of a decrease in the stigmatisation of the 16' stop early in the twenty-first century. The *Concerto* can be easily adapted to either a revival or historical two-

⁸⁹ Peter Child, *Tableux: Chamber and Choral Music of Peter Child* with Lontono, Maggie Cole, harpsichord, Lorelt, 2007, LNT 125.

⁹⁰ Email from Child, September 30, 2016: "The words [of this poem] express the spirit in which Peter [Gombosi] wanted to be memorialized or celebrated in the piece."

⁹¹ This instrument was one of the last built before Herz' retirement in 1995. MIT no longer owns the harpsichord, but not due to authenticity concerns. Child, interview with the author, MIT, July 13, 2016.

manual harpsichord, in part because of the relatively few registration changes (which were in part notated by harpsichordist Maggie Cole, who premiered the work).

The compositional methods used in preparing the score included carefully mapped out pitch relationships. This is an unusual technique for Child, but one that aided in planning the tritones and perfect fourth relationships that particularly underpin the second movement.

In the first movement, “Berceuse,” phrases seem to alternatively ask and answer questions as the melodic inflection rises and falls between the harpsichord and string parts. Helpfully for the performer, Child clearly stemmed together which notes are held or should receive a staccato/portato articulation throughout this movement, as shown in Fig. 3.18.

Gentle, serene $\text{♩} = 52-56$
 Principal line: molto semplice

Violin 1
 con trillo
 p

Violin 2
 con trillo
 accompagnando, molto semplice
 p

Viola
 con trillo
 accompagnando, molto semplice
 p

Cello
 con trillo
 accompagnando, molto semplice
 p

Harpsichord
 I x8' + 4'
 I II I

Fig. 3.18. Peter Child, *Concerto for Harpsichord and String Quartet* (2005), “Berceuse,” bars 4–8.⁹²

⁹² Score available from the composer: <http://web.mit.edu/child/>.

The second movement, “Chorale-cadenza: *Ein’ feste Burg*,” presents fragments of Martin Luther’s sixteenth-century hymn tune cast in a “stridently” polytonal scheme, with each member of the string quartet playing in a different key. Child’s purpose was not to be “whimsical,” but rather to reinforce the strength of the chorale tune. The harpsichord interrupts the chorale with cadenza-like arpeggiations, while the string quartet represents the chorale in “a time-world built with solid bricks of a mighty fortress.” The harpsichord, on the other hand, “lives in an improvisatory world,” reflecting the “elasticity of time.”⁹³

The third movement, “Gombosi Chase,” is a scherzo based on the Gombosi “family whistle.” This identification “whistle” is based on a quick, “chirpy triplet figure (D–B–G–C) in a ‘Tà-ka-ta-Tà’ rhythm [that] captures “the hurly-burly, rough and tumble of having children running around the house.”⁹⁴ Both inner movements are scored for “optional 16” (see Figs. 3.19–3.21).

Fig. 3.19. Child, *Concerto*, harpsichord in treble clef, second movement, bar 25 with optional (+16').

Fig. 3.20. Child, *Concerto*, third movement, bar 25 with optional (+16').

⁹³ Interview with Child, MIT, July 15, 2016.

⁹⁴ Child, booklet notes for *Tableux*, 3; Interview, MIT, July 15, 2016.

Fig. 3.21. Ibid., harpsichord, bars 94–97, etc. with optional (+16').

The 16' stop on revival and also historical harpsichords patterned after instruments such as by Hass, are no longer as negatively received as they were in the decades following the Second World War. Although this registration is unusual in a post-revival period contemporary harpsichord work, there is a sense of normalcy rather than exceptionalism to the use of an “optional 16'” in this *Concerto* by Child.

3.18. Summary I: Evaluating Differences

The stigmatisation of revival harpsichords after the Second World War and particularly during the late 1960s and 1970s was not only due to intrinsic design flaws, such as a lack of brilliant sound and resonance, but also resulted from the widely-held perception that revival models were a mistaken concept, especially for early music performance. As Harvard music Professor Anne Schreffler's booklet notes explained for a recording that featured primarily revival harpsichord music with the Rembrandt Chamber Players in 1992: “Although Landowska promoted Baroque music, her instrument was a completely modern construction that did not sound at all like a Baroque harpsichord. It was therefore more appropriate for the new works she commissioned.”⁹⁵

The harpsichord chosen for this recording, however, was not a revival harpsichord, but one based on the 1769 Taskin model made famous as a model for revival harpsichords at the 1889 Paris Exposition. Justifying the use of a historical harpsichord for compositions from 1926–1962 that included Manuel de Falla's *Concerto for Harpsichord, Flute, Oboe, Clarinet,*

⁹⁵ Anne Schreffler, booklet notes for *20th Century Baroque: Modern Reflections on Old Instruments*, Cedille Records CDR 90000 011, 1992, 1.

Violin and Cello and Elliot Carter's *Sonata for Flute, Oboe, Cello and Harpsichord*, Schreffler wrote that the historical harpsichord was:

not "authentic" for the Falla and Carter works, which were written for instruments that included a sixteen-foot register (the performer plays down an octave to match that sound where appropriate). But its lively sound and greater sensitivity of key action allows it to achieve intrinsically the sound which those larger instruments achieve mechanically.⁹⁶

The idea that historical harpsichords are preferable for revival works is frequently based on criteria of a better sound and key action. A "lively sound" and greater range of articulation are thought to replace the variety of sounds resulting from a revival harpsichord's "mechanics." The historical harpsichord on this recording was therefore intended to fulfill a composer's notion (and notation) of sound in ways only achievable on a historical harpsichord, rather than the instrument type for which these compositions were originally written. While trade-offs between mechanics and what can be accomplished through more sensitive key action and brilliant sound are acknowledged, the substitutions do not compare like with like; just as the Buff stop does not equal the sound of the Lute stop, but is a reasonable choice nonetheless.

Another point made by Schreffler was that the sound of a missing 16' can be "matched" by playing an octave lower "where appropriate." In *Energien* (1970), the middle section is marked *sempre* 16'. While it is possible to relocate many of the pitches an octave lower on a historical harpsichord, due to range limitations some notes cannot be repositioned, and "where appropriate" becomes in effect *where possible*.

Lastly, if it is claimed that a revival harpsichord does "not sound at all like a Baroque harpsichord," then the harpsichordist can only attempt to match or find musical substitutions for a composer's indications, not for a revival harpsichord's distinctive sound *quality*.

⁹⁶ Ibid., 4. Two other works on this CD were Ilja Hurník's *Sonata da Camera* (1953) and Domenick Argento's *Six Elizabethan Songs* (1962).

3.19. Summary II: Selected Suggestions for Altering Revival Works for Historical Harpsichord

In addition to discussions of specific alterations that can be made to revival scores such as Bergman's *Energien* and Milhaud's *Sonata*, op. 257 in this chapter, it can also be helpful to develop an overall approach to altering revival scores for performance on historical models.

Numerous challenges face the performer wishing to perform a revival work on a historical model. Among these are the potential difficulties in accessing scores. Many scores are no longer published, and those that are available may have incorrect passages along with missing (or misleading) information. It is the recommendation of this dissertation that increased attention be given to revival scores and that they be examined to determine which are most in need of a critical edition.

Such editions would not only rectify mistakes and omissions, but also provide support to performers, particularly those who are unfamiliar with revival repertoire or how revival harpsichords differ from historical models. A central aim of this dissertation has been to help make the individual performer more aware of the differences between revival and historical models and how these distinctions may impact the interpretation of revival works on a historical harpsichord.

The following comments provide selected generalisations that can be applied to revival scores when adapting them for performance on a historical harpsichord. Suggestions focus on alterations for a two-manual historical harpsichord, as revival compositions were most often written for a double-manual revival instrument. Adaptation of works to a single-manual harpsichord of any kind might require additional considerations that are beyond the scope of this dissertation. These suggestions are not intended to replace an individual performer's choices, but to enhance performance decisions where needed.

An initial step is to identify score indications, editorial remarks and prefaces that relate specifically to a revival harpsichord. These may not all be immediately obvious, such as when a reversal of hands on the manuals is required, as is the case when an upper Lute stop indication for the upper manual needs to be moved to the lower if one wishes to use the Buff stop.

Registration

For changes involving the registration of a [+ or - 4'], it can be advantageous to reduce the frequency of change, especially when risky or distracting manoeuvres may occur in attempting to follow the original registration. Frequent changes of a 4' stop are not as highly discernible on a historical harpsichord as on many revival models. The variations in colour and dynamics that were likely intended by such changes might instead be created through differentiation of articulation or rhythmic emphasis on a historical harpsichord.

Differences in tone colour between the lower and upper single 8' strings can be greater on a French historical double-manual instrument, for example, than on a revival harpsichord. Leaving historical harpsichord manuals coupled even when not indicated in the score, can allow for the nasal quality of the upper manual to blend in with the sound of the lower 8' strings, which greatly assists tonal balance for split-keyboard playing and manual changes. Otherwise, changing manuals can have a jarring, rather than a musical effect. Unless, of course, such high contrasts are an attribute of the work in question.

Keep in mind that performance practice on a revival harpsichord requires manual jumps as well as pedal changes. Manual changes on historical as well as revival harpsichords can more easily occur where revival composers have allowed for these with rests and pauses. Where manual or registration changes are not easily achievable on a historical instrument, shifting the location of a register or dynamic change can be a good solution and is often preferable to deleting changes in tone colour. Overall, however, there will likely be a reduction in the number of changes in registration and dynamics for a given composition.

Knowing that registrations were written for a specific model or were created at the suggestion of a particular performer, can encourage an interpretive freedom and deepen our understanding of the score.

Dynamics

Dynamic indications in contemporary harpsichord scores are commonplace, as suggested in Vincent Persichetti's preface to *Second Harpsichord Sonata*, op. 146 (1981): "In those works where the registration is not indicated [or is unavailable], the performer should allow the

dynamics and musical content to create the register settings.”⁹⁷ This can be positively valued, rather than focusing on the frequent assumption that dynamic indications are the result of composers who have written a piece for pianoforte and merely affixed the label “for harpsichord.”

The “overplucking” feature available on certain revival models can create an increase in the volume of sound as the plectrum is driven more closely into the string, resulting in graduated dynamics. Half-hitching on instruments such as by Challis or Goff allows for the option of a half or fully engaged register. Graduated dynamic changes can be made on a historical harpsichord by adding or subtracting pitches and altering articulation.

Practicing multiple registration solutions for passages with graduated dynamics can leave the performer free to make alterations with ease during performance. I found this approach worked well particularly for ensemble works that included Milhaud’s op. 257, Ibert’s *Deux Interludes* (1946) and Bohuslav Martinů’s *Promenades* (1939).

Articulation

As suggested earlier in this chapter, a performer who is familiar with differences in touch, key responsiveness and the sound of a revival harpsichord, may find it appropriate to lengthen the articulation of some passages to mimic a revival harpsichord. On the other hand, the character of the work may come alive when the articulation matches what the historical harpsichord on hand can best produce. Both approaches were applied in my performance of Paul Ben-Haim’s *Sonata a Tré for Harpsichord, Guitar and Mandolin* (1968). I mimicked the other, lighter plucked instruments in this ensemble during much of the outer fast movements, but in places such as the entire second movement, I chose to consider the potential influence of a revival harpsichord and altered the score and my interpretation of it accordingly. Allowing the influence of a revival harpsichord is not restrictive, but rather can enlarge the available choices.

⁹⁷ Vincent Persichetti, *Second Harpsichord Sonata* (Bryn Mawr: Elkan-Vogel, Inc., 1983).

Conclusion

Chapter One began by tracing the foundations of the harpsichord building revival from the late nineteenth century into the twentieth century. This included the Paris Exposition of 1889 and subsequent revival models that were constructed with an aim of combining elements of antique harpsichords and modern piano manufacturing. The hybrid nature of revival harpsichords is somewhat analogous to the development of the automobile that occurred in the same period late in the nineteenth century. Viewing revival harpsichords as a changing technology adapted to suit market demand, provides an opportunity to more easily conceptualise the revival type of harpsichord beyond current notions of popularity or whether one type is better than the other instead of simply different.

Inventor and futurist Ray Kurzweil, who among other achievements was the principal inventor of the world's first keyboard synthesiser, outlined "Seven Stages in the Life Cycle of a Technology."⁹⁸ He named the harpsichord and the horse and buggy as prime examples of the final stage, the "obsolescence" of a technology. Taken in Kurzweil's sense, any harpsichord built and used today is an instance of a revival of an obsolete technology. Such revivals do not directly figure into Kurzweil's model, but there would be room to speculate further on how to model the importance of a revived technology within his framework as well as the continued use of the "revival" harpsichord.

Revival harpsichords are widely considered obsolete today, having been largely replaced by historical reproductions during the last two-thirds of the twentieth century. Like vinyl records, which will account for approximately 6% of total music sales in 2017, revival harpsichords represent a revival of interest in a once popular technology.⁹⁹ Those who enjoy vinyl records or revival models do so despite the perceived disadvantages of these technologies and their lack of a prime position in the market. Interest is based, rather, on a personal engagement with the medium and the attraction of finding something special and

⁹⁸ These seven stages are: precursor, invention, development, maturity, false pretenders, obsolescence, and antiquity. See for example, Ray Kurzweil, "Kurzweil's Rules of Invention," *MIT Technology Review*, May 1, 2004, <https://www.technologyreview.com/s/402705/kurzweils-rules-of-invention/>.

⁹⁹ Jordan Passman, "Vinyl Sales Aren't Dead: The 'New' Billion Dollar Music Business," *Forbes*, January 12, 2017, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/jordanpassman/2017/01/12/vinyl-is-officially-booming-the-new-billion-dollar-music-business/#45a2f7404054>.

authentic in their use. For the revival harpsichord, a perception of authenticity is particularly related to the repertoire that was initially composed for these instruments.

The case made in favour of placing a current value on revival harpsichords does not suggest a merely uncritical stance. Chapter Two explored a range of positive and negative views of revival harpsichords in the past and present. Section 2.5 focused on an aspect of revival harpsichord reception that is often overlooked—the quality of restoration and possibility of improving on the sound and functionality of the instrument. Questions of restoration and maintenance of older revival harpsichords, their current use and the ongoing tradition of new construction at the J. C. Neupert company in Bamberg, Germany, point to the present status of the revival harpsichord’s obsolescence as potentially multifaceted or impermanent, as suggested by the title of this dissertation.

Chapter Three examined a selection of works written for revival harpsichords, including Erik Bergman’s *Energien*, op. 66 (1970), for which a critical edition has been created for this dissertation. This chapter included perspectives on instrumentation and a search for solutions when transferring revival works to historical harpsichords. Whether a revival or historical harpsichord is utilised in the performance of revival repertoire, gaining an appreciation and understanding of revival harpsichords can positively impact the performance of such works. That revival harpsichord technique today is little understood and has few frequent practitioners needs to be taken into account, along with a consideration of how to achieve a revival of techniques appropriate to these instruments.

The “which instrument debate” needs to be solved by each performer for every revival work. At present, this process is more commonly debated for early music than for works written for revival harpsichord. Having an increased familiarity with revival instruments, along with their history, can be essential to making informed performance choices when altering revival works for a historical harpsichord. One might even conclude after such considerations that certain works are, after all, best suited to revival instruments.

Appendices I–VI

I. Summary of Selected Builders and Harpsichordists¹

Builder Name	Established	Associated Harpsichordists	Special Features	Apprenticeship
Ammer (Alois, 1902–1946; Michael, 1905–1946) ²	Began making revival harpsichords around 1927 in Germany; historical models from 1974. ³	Isolde Ahlgrimm, Zuzana Růžicková, and other Eastern European performers	“Bach disposition” with the 4’ on the top manual.	Joined the family piano business. Affiliated with Leipzig University Instrument Museum.
Challis (John, 1907–1974)	American; first harpsichord made in 1925. Established business in 1930 and sold instruments from the following year. The only harpsichord builder active during WWII.	Fernando Valenti Ralph Kirkpatrick (a 1943 model) Paul Jacobs for Elliot Carter’s works	Coupling the two 8’ registers does not couple the keyboards. First used leather plectra, then Delrin. Wooden soundboards until ca. 1950; metal used thereafter for stability.	Father’s jewellery and watch store from age 13; with Arnold Dolmetsch in Haslemere between 1926–1930. ⁴
Dolmetsch Arnold (1858–1940) ⁵	Worked in England, the United States, and France.	1907 model, No. 60, was purchased for Kirkpatrick in 1934; had been	Some harpsichords have a vibrato device.	Father was an organ builder and in the piano trade.

¹ Sources are footnoted where not obtained from <http://jsebestyen.org/harpsichord/audio.html>, accessed October 11, 2014.

² See www.ammer-cembalo.de for workshop locations: Eisenberg in Thüringen (1927–1972); Leipzig/Wiederitzsch (1974–1988). Following the death of both brothers in 1947, Renate Ammer became Managing Director of Ammer KG, which was the only firm building historical keyboards in Eastern Europe for decades.

³ Ibid. Jürgen Ammer began building historical harpsichords in 1974.

⁴ Haney, “Portrait of a Builder,” (1969): 14–23.

⁵ The Dolmetsch firm made one revival model until closing shop in 2010. From their website: “The large concert harpsichord remains one of the few models designed for this 20th century repertoire. Modern performers who play these works on ‘historical’ instruments are no more ‘historically informed’ than those who perform early repertoire on 20th century conceptions of the harpsichord.” <http://www.dolmetsch.com/ourharpsichords.htm>, accessed February 9, 2016.

	First harpsichord built in 1894.	previously borrowed by Ferruccio Busoni, then sold to Lotta van Buren. ⁶	Tone was purported to be more “mellow” than a Pleyel. ⁷	Trained as a piano maker. Influenced by the Arts and Crafts Movement.
Érard (Sébastien 1752–1831)	Piano firm established in 1777. Only made fourteen revival harpsichords. Became part of Pleyel in 1961 after merging with Gaveau in 1960.		1896 model had pedals, but not in 1889. 1889 model had 1 x 8’ in leather and the other 8’ voiced in bird quill.	
Goble (Robert, 1903–1991) ⁸	Made 750 keyboard instruments 1937–1981, including 80 concert models. A family business; first historical reproduction model 1970.	George Malcolm, Raymond Leppard, Genoveva Gálvez	Their tone is “very satisfactory.” ⁹	Dolmetsch apprentice from 1925–1937. ¹⁰
Goff (Thomas, 1898–1975)	Began in the early 1950s; designs based on Kirkman late- 18 th century models. ¹¹	Sylvia Marlowe, George Malcolm, Valda Aveling, Thurston Dart	Unnaturally short to fit the workshop attic in his London home. Half-hitching; internal aluminium	Influenced by Dolmetsch; apprenticed to builder Herbert Lambert.

⁶ Kirkpatrick, “Fifty Years,” 34; Rephann, “Dolmetsch-Chickering Instruments at Yale,” 2.

⁷ Schott, “The Harpsichord Revival,” 92.

⁸ www.gobleharpsichords.co.uk.

⁹ Zuckermann, *Modern Harpsichord*, 123.

¹⁰ Elizabeth Goble studied harpsichord and viol from Dolmetsch and ran the workshop with her husband. She decorated soundboards with techniques learned from Mabel Dolmetsch. See Andrea Goble interview in Paul, *Modern Harpsichord Makers*, 99.

¹¹ <http://www.baroquemusic.org/goff.html>.

			frame; 2–7 pedals.	
Pleyel (Ignaz Josef, 1757–1831)	Piano firm established in 1807.	Wanda Landowska, Sylvia Marlow, Alice Ehlers and Rafael Puyana	1889 model had leather quilling and 6 pedals; <i>Grand modèle de concert</i> was premiered in 1912.	
Neupert began as a piano firm in 1868 by Johann Christoph Neupert (1842–1921)	The first company to mass produce harpsichords— from 1906 and the only company to still make them; historical copies from 1973. ¹²	Antoinette Vischer, Elisabeth Chojnacka, and nearly every harpsichordist in the first half of the twentieth century	The 4' is on the top manual. While playing a note on the lower manual, the coupler cannot be employed. Some with hand stops feature half-hitching.	
Rutkowski (Frank, b. 1932) and Robert Robinette, 1929–2007)	Established in 1957 built ca. three harpsichords per year.	Igor Kipnis	Aluminum frame	John Challis (Rutkowski)
Sperrhake (Kurt 1907–1991)	Harpsichords from 1948. By 1968 they were the world's largest manufacturer of harpsichords, with sixty employees.	Worldwide distribution; Elisabeth Chojnacka		Originally sold Ammer pianos and harpsichords.
Wittmayer (Kurt 1917–1997)	Established ca. 1929.	Malcolm Hamilton	An electronic model was available.	

¹² In 1906 the three sons of J.C. Neupert began what was considered the “pioneering” work of building harpsichords, see “Firmenporträt,” <http://www.jc-neupert.de/de/node/7>, accessed October 14, 2014 and translated by the author.

II. Registration Combinations on Alastair McAllister's 1963 Pleyel¹³

Total: 48

U8 = Upper 8' and L8 = Lower 8'

Four sets of strings: U8, L8, 16', 4'

Five sets of jacks: U8, L8, 16', 4', Lute

Seven pedals from left to right: L8 – 16' – 4' – Buff – Coupler – Lute – U8'

The Buff damps the U8; the Lute (on the upper manual) and L8 pluck the same strings.

U8

U8 + Buff

Lute

U8 + Lute

U8 + Buff + Lute

X 2 when coupled down to the lower manual, with L8 off. McAllister: "This results in a subtle change of sound because the jacks' speed of attack affects the ictus at the start of the sound, and they are operated by different key lever lengths."¹⁴

= 10

L8

4

16

L8 + 4

L8 + 16

L8 + 4 + 16

4 + 16

16 + Lute + 4

Lute + 4

= 9

¹³ This list does not include additional registration combinations that are created when playing two manuals simultaneously.

¹⁴ Email from McAllister, October 25, 2016.

With manuals coupled, but the L8 turned off:

U8 + 4

U8 + 4 + Buff U8 + 4 + Lute U8 + 4 + Lute + Buff

16 + U8

16 + U8 + 4

16 + U8 + 4 + Buff

16 + U8 + 4 + Buff + Lute

16 + U8 + Buff

16 + U8 + Lute

16 + U8 + Lute + Buff

= 11

With manuals coupled, but the U8 turned off:

L8 + Lute	L8 + Lute + 4	16 + L8 + Lute	16 + L8 + 4 + Lute
--------------	------------------	-------------------	--------------------------

= 4

With manuals coupled and both L8 and U8 turned off:

16 + Lute

= 1

L8 + U8

L8 + U8 + Lute

L8 + U8 + Lute + Buff

L8 + U8 + 4

L8 + U8 + 4 + Buff

L8 + U8 + 4 + Lute

L8 + U8 + 4 + Lute + Buff

= 7

$$16 + L8$$

$$16 + L8 + U8$$

$$16 + L8 + 4$$

$$16 + L8 + U8 + \text{Buff}$$

$$16 + L8 + U8 + \text{Buff} + \text{Lute}$$

$$16 + L8 + U8 + \text{Buff} + \text{Lute} + 4$$

$$= 6$$

(key noise only—all registers off x 3 for each manual uncoupled, then coupled, but not particularly utilised in compositions)

$$= 3 \text{ (not counted in total above)}$$

III. Revival Harpsichord Works Performed during DMA Candidature

Paul Ben-Haim (1897–1984) *Sonata a Tré for Harpsichord, Guitar and Mandolin* (1968)
— DMA Lecture recital, Adams Concert Room, NZSM December 1, 2015

Erik Bergman (1911–2006) *Energien für Cembalo*, op. 66 (1970)
—DMA Lecture recital, Adams Concert Room, November 18, 2016

Lennox Berkeley (1903–1989) *Concertino for Recorder (or Flute), Violin, 'Cello and Harpsichord (or Piano)*, op. 49 (1955)
—Piano, Old St. Paul's Church, Wellington, September 3, 2013

Peter Child (b. 1953) *Concerto for Harpsichord and String Quartet: In Memoriam Peter Gombosi* (2005)
—DMA Lecture recital, Adams Concert Room, November 18, 2016

Lou Harrison (1917–2003) *Six Sonatas for Cembalo or Pianoforte* (1943)
—DMA recital, Adams Concert Room, June 12, 2014

Robert Hinchliffe (born 1945) *The Elements for Flute and Harpsichord (or Piano)* (1978)
—NZSM Lunchtime Concert Series, Adams Concert Room, April 1, 2016

Jacques Ibert (1890–1962) *Deux Interludes pour flûte, violon et clavecin (ou harpe)* (1946)
—NZSM Lunchtime Concert Series, Adams Concert Room, 1 April
—Old St. Paul's Wellington, September 6, 2016

Bohuslav Martinů (1890–1959) *Promenades for Flute, Violin and Harpsichord (or Piano)* (1939)
—Old St. Paul's Wellington, September 6, 2016

Darius Milhaud (1892–1974) *Sonata for Clavecin (or Piano) and Violin*, op. 257 (1945)
—DMA Lecture recital, Adams Concert Room, November 18, 2016

Walter Piston (1894–1976) *Sonatina for Violin and Harpsichord (or Piano)* (1945)
—DMA Lecture recital, Adams Concert Room, December 1, 2015

Ned Rorem (b. 1923) *Spiders* (1968)
—DMA Lecture recital, Adams Concert Room, December 1, 2015
—NZSM Lunchtime Concert Series, Adams Concert Room, April 1, 2016

IV. Critical Edition of *Energien*, op. 66

Erik Bergman

ENERGIEN

für Cembalo, opus 66*

Composed 1970

Edited by Kristina Zuelicke (2017)

*The opus number “66” is not included in the original Fazer edition (Helsinki, 1972, F. M. 5238). The Fazer score is available from Hal Leonard (HL. 48000505) and Fennica Gehrman (FG. 042-05238-9), which acquired Fazer Music in 2007.

An autograph of *Energien* is held by the Paul Sacher Foundation in Basel, Switzerland in the Bergman Collection. Unfortunately, I was unable to consult the autograph in person prior to dissertation submission; the Foundation neither makes nor distributes copies.

Energien, op. 66

für Cembalo

Erik Bergman (1970)
[Edited by K. Zuelicke]

♩ = 116

I
2x8' 4' *ff*

6

8 *sempre marcato*

11 $\frac{5}{2}$

14

17 *mf* *f*

19 *ff*

23

25 *crescendo*

27 *ff*

30 *mp* *mf* *mp* *mf* 3

34 *ff* *mp - mf* 10 16

37 *mf* *mp* *mp* *mf*

40 *mf* *f* *quasi ff* *ff* - 4' - C + Buff

$\text{♩} = 100$ 8' + Buff (sempre)

45 *p* 8vb I (loco)

47

(8)-----

49

(8)-----

50

(8)-----

51

(8)-----

52

(8)---] $\frac{1}{4}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ loco

53

53

mp

56

56

1+5
4+16

2/4

1+5
4+16

59

59

1+5
4+16

1+5
4+16

3/8

60

60

II *f*

7/16

7/16

62 I

62 I

p

II

7/16

7/16

2/4

64

I *pp* II *mp* + 4' - Buff

66

I *f* 8' 4'

68

p 1+5 4+16 - L8' 4'

♩ = ca 120

f 2x8' 3 marc.

75

3

♩ = ca 100

II + 4 I 5

86 7

ff *f*

92

II *mp* I *f*

98 ♩ = ca 84

I *mp* I *mf* *f*

104

ff

108

CRITICAL COMMENTARY – *ENERGIEN*, OPUS 66 BY ERIK BERGMAN

Editorial Policy and Purpose

This dissertation edition facilitates performance of Erik Bergman's *Energien* for solo harpsichord on historical harpsichords having the disposition: two 8' keyboards with a 4' and Buff stop operated from the lower keyboard. The source edition published by Fazer in 1972 was scored for revival harpsichords having two 8' keyboards, a Lute stop on the upper manual, a 4' on an unspecified manual, a 16' on the lower manual and foot pedals to assist rapid changes of registration. Areas such as bars 22–26, where a "16' + 4'" registration is indicated, cannot be performed unchanged on historical harpsichords that do not possess a 16' stop. Graduated dynamics and frequent changes of dynamics additionally require adjustment when performed on a historical harpsichord.

Besides altering Fazer registrations for performance on a historical harpsichord, a secondary aim of this edition is to provide a more legible score by regularising beaming, rhythmic errors and other inconsistencies. Where changes are significant, these appear in brackets. Missing or unnecessary courtesy accidentals are regularised and listed in the Critical Notes below, as are contradictions or inaccuracies of time signatures and clefs.

Editorial changes relate to Fazer indications wherever possible. Manual registrations are added by the editor with original registrations indicated in the Critical Notes. Certain interpretive decisions shift the location of dynamics or provide a simplification, such as are described in the Critical Notes for bars 18–20 and 22–29.

Minimal articulation is added in brackets, suggesting directions in which performers might take their own performance decisions. Performance of this work on a historical harpsichord, as is the case for any work on any type of harpsichord, relies in part on variations in articulation provided by the performer to help create the impression of dynamic shading and phrasing.

Symbols

Keyboards are marked I for the lower manual and II for the upper. Manual indications are not bracketed, as none appear in the Fazer edition. Similarly, all fingering is editorial and are without brackets or description.

8' = one set of strings sounds at written pitch on each keyboard (L8', U8')

C = a coupler combines two sets of 8' strings of the lower and upper keyboards

4' = a set of strings that sounds an octave higher than written pitch

Laute = Lute stop, replaced in bars 45–66 by the Buff stop

Tempi

Tempi in the Fazer edition at bar 1 and at bar 45 are handwritten in pencil in the edition from Hal Leonard ordered in 2013 and from Fennica Gehrman in 2015. The assumption is that tempi were omitted from the typesetting, but are the composer's instructions. All tempi seem appropriate within the context of the piece.

CRITICAL NOTES

American Standard Pitch Notation is used and refers to written rather than sounding pitch.

lh = left hand

rh = right hand

Bar Numbers and Remarks

1 original registration is *Tutti*

2 beat 3 lacks a quaver rest

9–11 lacks a metre change

17 unnecessary sharp rh f-sharp⁴ beat 4

18 unnecessary sharp in lh f-sharp⁴ beat 5

18–20 These bars are marked *f* before a return to *ff* at bar 21. As there is no rhythmic break that allows for an easy registration change, a potential distinction between *f* and *ff* is not made. The crescendo indicates a possible successive lengthening of articulation in bar 20.

21 courtesy accidental e⁴ lh lacks parentheses

- 22 original registration is 16' 4'
- 26–29 A crescendo that begins in bar 26 arrives at *ff* in bar 29. This performer's edition retains a simplified *ff* marking throughout these bars, with minimal suggestions of articulation added to assist the crescendo. One might successively lengthen articulation in bar 28.
- 26 misleading parentheses around a-natural⁵ rh beat 4 and c⁴ lh beat 7; unnecessary parentheses a⁴ lh beat 7
- 27 misleading natural sign e⁵ rh beat 1
- 29 courtesy accidental lacking c⁵ lh beat 1
- 30–32 dynamics not regularised into position
- 32 lacks parentheses around b-natural³
- 38–39 dynamics not regularised into position
- 45 original registration is "16' (*sempre*)" for the lower staff and "8' + *Laute (sempre)*" for the upper staff. Beats 7–9 in the upper staff are originally indicated "16'," returning to "8' + L" in bar 46.
- 49 misleading courtesy accidental e-flat⁵ lh last semiquaver
- 51 missing courtesy accidentals on g³ and a³ lh beat 2; parentheses around a-flat⁴ rh beat 2
- 53 lacks parentheses around a-natural⁴ rh beat 1; incorrect parentheses around a-flat³ rh final beat
- 56 lacks parentheses around c-natural⁴ and d-natural⁴ rh
- 58–59 incorrect treble clef
- 59 lacks courtesy accidental lh e-natural² beat 1
- 61 lacks parentheses a-natural² lh beat 1
- 62 incorrect time signature of 3/4
- 63 lacks parentheses d-natural³ rh beat 3
- 67 unnecessary courtesy accidental f-natural⁴ rh beat 1
- 68 redundant f-double-sharp³ lh beat 3; original registration is 8' 4' for the upper staff.
- 69 original registration is 4' (upper staff).
- 70–75 lacks demisemiquavers in beat 1; the original has semiquavers. Alternative interpretations are demisemiquavers for the last four notes, or a change in time signature to 4/8 for these bars.

- 73 lacks intensification; a-flat⁴ lh beat 1 added with corresponding courtesy accidental rh beat 1
- 84 redundant flat on b-flat⁴ rh beat 5. The 4' register is needed at some point in this section to intensify dynamics. The 4' is placed at bar 84 in this edition, which is easier to perform than at bar 86 where the *ff* occurs. A change to the upper manual for the right hand at bar 83 assists a dramatic tonal rise in the following bars and can assist the addition of the 4' at bar 84 if no stop change assistant is available. Performers may wish to add the 4' at bar 86 instead or at bar 80, where it is facilitated by a crotchet rest.
- 90 A change from *ff* to *f* is indicated for two bars. This has been eliminated as this negligible gain in dynamic contrast does not outweigh the potentially distracting stop change.
- 94 lacks parentheses around e-natural² lh beat 1

V. Manuscript of Darius Milhaud's *Sonata for Clavecin (or Piano) and Violin*, op. 257 (1945):

Handwritten musical score for orchestra, page 2. The score is written on five systems of staves. It includes various musical notations such as notes, rests, and dynamic markings like "mp" (mezzo-piano) and "f" (forte). There are also circled numbers 20, 25, 30, and 35, likely indicating measure numbers. The notation is dense and includes many accidentals and slurs.

Handwritten musical score, page 143, featuring five systems of music. The notation is complex, involving multiple staves and various musical symbols.

The systems are numbered in circles: (40), (45), (50), (55), and (60).

Key markings and annotations include:

- mf* (mezzo-forte)
- f* (forte)
- mp* (mezzo-piano)
- II 8'* (Second ending, 8 measures)
- Relp* (Relievo)
- II 8'* (Second ending, 8 measures)
- II 8'* (Second ending, 8 measures)

The score is written on five systems, each consisting of multiple staves. The notation includes various musical symbols such as notes, rests, and dynamic markings.

Handwritten musical score on five systems of staves. The notation includes various musical symbols such as notes, rests, and dynamic markings like *mp* and *mf*. A circled number "65" is visible in the upper right corner of the first system. The manuscript is written in ink on aged paper.

Handwritten musical score on five systems of staves. The notation includes various musical symbols such as notes, rests, and dynamic markings like *mp* and *mf*. The score is numbered with circled numbers 80, 85, 90, and 95. A handwritten '51' is visible in the top right corner. A small box containing the number '330' is located in the bottom right corner of the page.

II Calme

Handwritten musical score for "II Calme". The score is written on five systems of staves, each system containing two staves. The notation includes various musical symbols such as notes, rests, and dynamic markings like *pp* (pianissimo). The score is marked with circled numbers 1 through 5, indicating measures or sections. The handwriting is in ink on aged paper.

Impulse
x 111 writing

A handwritten musical score for the song 'The Rose Tree'. The score is written on five systems of three staves each. The first system is marked with a circled '10' and the tempo 'Allegro'. The second system is marked with a circled '20' and the tempo 'Andante'. The third system is marked with a circled '30'. The fourth system is marked with a circled '40'. The fifth system is marked with a circled '50'. The music is in 4/4 time and features a melody in the upper staff and accompaniment in the lower two staves. The handwriting is in ink on aged paper.

III Clair et Vif

5

8

12.11

Handwritten musical score on five systems of staves. The notation includes various musical symbols such as notes, rests, and accidentals. Measure numbers 35, 40, 45, 50, and 55 are circled at the beginning of their respective systems. A handwritten number '9' is visible in the top right corner. The score is written in a cursive, handwritten style.

Handwritten musical score on five systems, numbered 65, 70, 75, 80, and 85. The notation includes staves with notes, rests, and various musical markings.

System 1 (65): Includes the instruction *l. = l'précédente* and a circled number 10.

System 2 (70): Continuation of the musical notation.

System 3 (75): Continuation of the musical notation.

System 4 (80): Continuation of the musical notation.

System 5 (85): Continuation of the musical notation, including markings such as *pizz*, *archet*, and *up*.

Handwritten musical score on five systems of staves. The notation includes treble and bass clefs, key signatures, and various musical symbols such as notes, rests, and dynamic markings.

System 1: Measures 95 to 100. Includes a circled measure number 95 and a circled measure number 100. The notation is dense with many notes and rests.

System 2: Measures 101 to 106. Includes a circled measure number 101. The notation continues with complex rhythmic patterns.

System 3: Measures 107 to 114. Includes a circled measure number 110. The notation shows a change in the musical structure, possibly a new section or a variation.

System 4: Measures 115 to 120. Includes a circled measure number 115. The notation continues with complex rhythmic patterns.

System 5: Measures 121 to 126. Includes a circled measure number 120. The notation shows a change in the musical structure, possibly a new section or a variation.

Dynamic markings include *ff* (fortissimo) and *f* (forte). The notation is handwritten and appears to be a working draft or a composer's sketch.

Handwritten musical notation on three staves. The first staff begins with a circled measure number 125. The notation includes various musical symbols such as notes, rests, and accidentals.

Handwritten musical notation on three staves. A circled measure number 135 is visible at the beginning of the first staff.

Handwritten musical notation on three staves. Circled measure numbers 140 and 145 are present at the start of the first and second staves, respectively.

Handwritten musical notation on three staves. A circled measure number 150 is located at the beginning of the first staff.

Handwritten musical notation on three staves. A circled measure number 155 is at the start of the first staff.

Michael
Mich. 27/Jul 8 and 14+5

VI: Performance Notes to Darius Milhaud's *Sonata for Clavecin and Violin*, op. 257, for a Double-Manual Historical Harpsichord

I. Nerveux:

—Change the opening registration to 2 x 8', reserving the 4' for the crescendo at the end of bar 68 or the *ff* at the downbeat of bar 70.

—Errata in bar 9: rh should be in treble clef.

—Diminuendo effects such as at bar 23 are created by moving the final two (or four) semiquavers to the upper manual. The reverse can be effected at bars 60 and 69 for a crescendo. For material such as bars 24–27, overlegato can be used to create a diminuendo at the end of each bar.

—Shift accents such as at bar 29 to the lower, coupled keyboard for greater impact.

—Lh at bar 39 moves to the coupled lower manual to match the *f* marking; rh joins lh one beat later. Both hands remain on the lower manual through the downbeat of bar 41.

—For bars 52–53, rh on the lower and lh on the upper manual to bring out the melody.

—Arpeggiate lh bar 74 beat 2.

—Play from bar 81 without 4'.

—From bar 92 to the end, add 4'. Doubling assists the *ff* marking: Play the lh an octave lower with the addition of d³ for bars 92 and 93. The lowest sounding pitch d² is held throughout these two bars to substitute for a 16'.

II. Calmé:

—Switch Kirkpatrick indications for bars 1–9 so that rh hand plays the top line on the lower manual (1 x 8'). This creates a smoother-sounding melody and uses the nasal quality of the upper 8' on a French historical double for accompaniment.

—Overlegato works well for bars 11–12 and in all similar legato passages in this movement.

—16' and 4' passages from bar 17 are not possible on most historical harpsichords, so add the Buff stop for bars 23–25 to match the *pp* marking of the violin. Play the final chords in bars 22 and 25 with arpeggiation to assist the tenuto marking and indicate a change in mood for bar 26.

—The upbeat to bar 31 deserves arpeggiation for the tenuto and on the same chord in bar 31.

—The crescendo in bar 37 is assisted by having the rh join the left on the lower manual from beat 2.

—At bar 44 I suggest playing the lh on the upper manual, with the rh on the lower single 8', then both hands on the lower manual in bar 45. The final bar is more colourful if played on the upper manual.

III. Clair et Vif (translates as “Bright and Vivid”):

—As for the first movement, *f* and *ff* can be differentiated by first beginning without the 4' and engaging it later (i.e. bar 14). Articulation of successive, arpeggiated chords can be played somewhat separated (but not clipped) where the violin is marked *pizzicato*. The length of chords throughout depends on desired dynamics and phrasing.

—For static areas such as bars 54–59, a pattern of legato for one bar, then a more separated articulation for the next bar is effective.

—Errata for the 1946 Elkan-Vogel edition: bar 17 lh is not g-natural but g-sharp³ in the manuscript; bar 63 lh b³ has been cut off; bar 86 lacks lh g³; bar 104 in the manuscript seems to have a d⁴ in the rh final beat and the violin part has an incorrect crotchet rest in the 1946 Elkan-Vogel edition, where there should be a quaver rest.

—In bars 63, 143, 145–146 and 153–154, choose notes to double in the lh for an increase in sound.

Bibliography

Archival Material

Ralph Kirkpatrick Papers, Yale University Music Library Special Collections. MSS 11: Box 1, Folder 19; Box 3, Folder 7; Box 6, Folder 13.

Printed Material

Abel, N/A. "House Review: New Acts – Sylvia Marlowe." *Variety* (Archive: 1905–2000) 138/7 (Apr 24, 1940): 20. <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1505795099?accountid=14782>.

Adlam, Derek. "Magnano Clavichord Symposium." *Early Music* 22/3 (1994): 533.

Anon., Robert Morley & Co. *The Musical Times* 111/1541 (September 1970): 870.

———. "Activities of Musicians Here and Afield." *New York Times*, April 17, 1932, 162.

———. "Landowska Decorated for Service to French Art." *New York Times*, October 4, 1925, 193.

———. "Pastism and Futurism." *The Tatler* 678/52 (June 24, 1914): 386.

———. "Busoni at the Harpsichord." *Music Trade Review* 51/10 (September 3, 1910): 18.

———. "Some Artistic and Historical Pianos." *The Tatler* 94 (April 15, 1903): 112.

———. "Bach and the Harpsichord," *The Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art* (December 15, 1894): 654–655.

———. *Vocal Magazine*, Volume II. Edinburgh: C. Stewart & Co., 1798. National Library of Scotland, "Scottish and English songs, military music and keyboard music of the 18th and 19th centuries contained in about 100 volumes selected from the collection of Alexander Wood Inglis of Glencorse (1854–1929)." <http://digital.nls.uk/94604312>.

Barnes, John, "Hugh Gough." *The Galpin Society Journal* 51 (July 1998): 7–11.

Battault, Jean-Claude. "Les clavecins Pleyel, Érard et Gaveau, 1889–1970." In *Music of the Past – Instruments and Imagination*, edited by Michael Latcham, 193–211. Proceedings of the 2004 Harmoniques International Congress, Lausanne. Bern: Peter Lang, 2006.

- Bavington, Peter. "Arnold Dolmetsch's Clavichord Making in the Years Before 1914." *De Clavicordio VIII* (2007). Proceedings of the 2007 Magnano Clavichord Symposium. <http://www.peter-bavington.com/Bavington-Dolmetsch.pdf>.
- Bedford, Frances. *Harpsichord and Clavichord Music of the Twentieth Century*. Berkeley, CA: Fallen Leaf Press, 1993.
- Bedford, Frances, and Robert Conant. *Twentieth-Century Harpsichord Music: A Classified Catalogue* (Music Indexes and Bibliographies, No. 8). Hackensack, New Jersey: Joseph Boonin, 1974.
- Boalch, Donald. *Makers of the Harpsichord and Clavichord, 1440 to 1840*, edited by Charles Mould. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Botstein, Leon. "Music in History: The Perils of Method in Reception History." *Musical Quarterly* 89/1 (2006): 1–16.
- Brody, Elaine. *Paris: The Musical Kaleidoscope 1870–1925*. New York: George Braziller, 1987.
- Brooks, Christopher. "What Early Music Needs is the Sound of Silence." *Early Music America* 9/3 (Fall 2003): 34–36, 45, 47.
- Butt, John. "Authenticity." *Grove Music Online*. *Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press. <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/46587>. Accessed November 3, 2016.
- . *Playing with History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Byrne-Dodge, Terri. "A Harpsichord Revival in Stonington." *New York Times*, January 6, 1980, 63.
- Carlton, Joseph R. "Radio Review: Program Reviews – "Wanda Landowska." *The Billboard* (Archive: 1894–1960) 54/46 (Nov 14, 1942): 7. <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1032290423?accountid=14782>.
- Chojnacka, Elisabeth. "L'Interprete – la memoire du compositeur (the Performer – the Essence of the Composer)." *Contemporary Music Review* 20.1 (2001): 25–34.
- Chapman, Jane. "An Interview with Brian Ferneyhough: Thoughts on the Harpsichord in *Etudes Transcendentales*." *Contemporary Music Review* 20/1 (2001): 101–105.
- . "Notes Inégales in Contemporary Music?" *Contemporary Music Review* 20/1 (2001): 59–69.
- Cohen, Joel, and Snitzer, Herb. *Reprise: The Extraordinary Revival of Early Music*. Boston: Little and Brown, 1985.
- Davies, Steven. *Themes in the Philosophy of Music*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

- . *Musical Works & Performances: A Philosophical Exploration*. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2001.
- De Michele, Girolamo. "The New Object." In *Beauty*, edited by Umberto Eco and translated by Alastair McEwen, 361–380. London: Maclehose Press, 2004.
- De Man, Annelie. "Contemporary Harpsichord Music in the Netherlands." *Contemporary Music Review* 19.4 (2000): 49–60.
- Dodd, Julian. "Sounds, Instruments, and Works of Music," Michael Morris, "Doing Justice to Musical Works," and Stephen Davies, "Versions of Musical Works and Literary Translations." In *Philosophers on Music: Experience, Meaning, and Work*, edited by Kathleen Stock, 23–51, 51–78, 79–92. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Donington, Robert. *The Instruments of Music*. London: Methuen & Co, 1970.
- Dreyfus, Laurence. "Early Music Defended against Its Devotees." *Musical Quarterly* 69 (1983): 297–322.
- Dyson, Ruth. "Bend the Finger at All Three Joints: A First-Hand Record of Landowska's Teaching Methods." *Early Music* 3/3 (1975): 240–42.
- Elste, Martin. "From Landowska to Leonhardt, from Pleyel to Skowronek: Historicizing the Harpsichord, From Stringed Organ to Mechanical Lute." *Early Music* 42/1 (2014): 13–22.
- . *Modern Harpsichord Music: A Discography*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1995.
- . "Kompositionen für nostalgische Musikmaschinen: Das Cembalo in der Musik des 20. Jahrhunderts," *Jahrbuch des Staatlichen Instituts für Musikforschung Preußischer Kulturbesitz* (1994), 199–246. http://www.sim.spk-berlin.de/uploads/03-forschung-jahrbuch/SIM-Jb_1994-13.pdf.
- . "Nostalgische Musikmaschinen: Cembali im 20. Jahrhundert." In *Kielklaviere: Cembali, Spinette, Virginal*, edited by Dagmar Droysen-Reber. Berlin: Staatliches Institut für Musikforschung Preußischer Kulturbesitz, 1991, 236–277.
- Fausser, Annegret. *Musical Encounters at the 1889 Paris World's Fair*. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2005.
- Germann, Sheridan. "Harpsichord Decoration." In *Historical Harpsichord*, edited by Howard Schott, 1–212. Hillsdale, NY: Pendragon Press, 2002.
- Halton, Rosalind. Review of *History of the Harpsichord*, by Edward Kottick. *Musicology Australia* 27/1 (November 24, 2004): 138–142. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08145857.2005.10416531>.
- Haney, Harold. "Portrait of a Builder: William Dowd." *The Harpsichord* 4/1 (1971): 13.

- . "Portrait of a Builder: John Challis." *The Harpsichord* 2/3 (1969): 14–23.
<https://archive.org/stream/Harpsichordv2n3/harpsichordv2n3#page/n13/mode/2up>.
- Harich-Schneider, Eta. *The Harpsichord: An Introduction to Technique, Style and the Historical Sources*. Basel: Bärenreiter Kassel, 1973.
- Haskell, Harry. *The Early Music Revival: A History*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1988.
- Haskins, Robert. "20th Century American Harpsichord." *American Record Guide* 65/1 (January 2002): 227. <http://search.proquest.com/docview/223386984?accountid=14782>.
- . Review of *Frivolous Harpsichord*. *American Record Guide* 62/5 (1999): 280–281.
<http://search.proquest.com/docreview/223403162?accountid=14782>.
- Haynes, Bruce. *The End of Early Music: A Period Performer's History for the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Henahan, Donal. "Valenti Is a Plugged in, Turned on Harpsichordist." *New York Times*, February 5, 1968, 29.
- Hoffmann, Sabine. "Das Berliner 'Bach Cembalo' aus der Perspektive seiner Restaurierungen und Nachbauten, in *Music of the Past – Instruments and Imagination*, edited by Michael Latham, 151–168. Bern: Peter Lang, 2006.
- Hubbard, Frank. *Three Centuries of Harpsichord Making*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.
- Hunt, Edgar, ed. "Ruth Dyson: An Interview," *The English Harpsichord Magazine* 1/5 (1975): np, <http://www.harpsichord.org.uk/ehm-archive/>.
- Jaffee, Kay. "Boston Early Music Festival and Exhibition. May 26–31, 1981." *The Journal of Musicology* 1/1 (1982): 125–129.
- Johnson, Edmond Thomas. "Revival and Antiquation: Modernism's Musical Pasts." Order No. 3495681. PhD diss., University of California, Santa Barbara, 2011.
- Khadavi, Linda Sue. "Twentieth-Century Harpsichord Music: Selected Playing Techniques." No. 8315202. DMA diss., University of Missouri - Kansas City, 1983.
- Kipnis, Igor. "Review of Frances Bedford *Harpsichord and Clavichord Music*." *Early Keyboard Studies Newsletter* VIII/3 (July 1994), n.p.
- Kirby, Fred. "Harpsichord Output Zooming." *Billboard Magazine*, September 10, 1966.
[http://www.americanradiohistory.com/hd2/IDX-Business/Music/Archive-Billboard-IDX/IDX/60s/1966/BB-1966-09-10-OCR-Page-0050.pdf#search=%22harpsichord output zooming%22](http://www.americanradiohistory.com/hd2/IDX-Business/Music/Archive-Billboard-IDX/IDX/60s/1966/BB-1966-09-10-OCR-Page-0050.pdf#search=%22harpsichord%20output%20zooming%22).

- Kirkpatrick, Ralph. *Ralph Kirkpatrick: Letters of the American Harpsichordist and Scholar*. Edited by Meredith Kirkpatrick. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2014.
- . *Early Years*. New York: Peter Lang, 1985.
- . "Fifty Years of Harpsichord Playing." *Early Music* 11/1 (January 1983): 31–41.
- Kottick, Edward. *A History of the Harpsichord*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2003.
- . *The Harpsichord Owner's Guide: A Manual for Buyers and Owners*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1987.
- Kroll, Mark. "Letter to *Early Music*." *Early Music*, 43/3 (2015): 553.
- . *Ignaz Moscheles and the Changing World of Musical Europe*, Rochester, NY: Boydell and Brewer, 2014.
- . *Playing the Harpsichord Expressively: A Practical and Historical Guide*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2004.
- . "French Masters." In *Eighteenth-Century Keyboard Music*, edited by Robert Marshall, 145. New York: Routledge, 2003.
- . "Keyboard Music." Review of Twelve Contemporary Music Recordings. *Music Library Association Notes*, Second Series, 59/4 (June 2003): 988–993.
- Kurzweil, Ray. "Kurzweil's Rules of Invention." *MIT Technology Review*, May 1, 2004.
- Latcham, Michael. "Don Quixote and Wanda Landowska: Bells and Pleyels." *Early Music*, 34/1 (2006), 95–109.
- Libin, Laurence. "Progress, Adaptation, and the Evolution of Musical Instruments." *Journal of the American Musical Instrument Society* 26 (2000): 187–213.
- Lindorff, Joyce Zankel. "Contemporary Harpsichord Music: Issues for Composers and Performers." DMA diss., Julliard School of Music, 1982.
- Lo, Chau-Yee. "Endangered Species: The Harpsichord and its New Repertoire since 1960." PhD diss., University of Leeds, 2004.
- . "Kenneth Gilbert: An Interview," *The English Harpsichord Magazine* 1/3 (1974): np.
- . "George Malcolm, C. B. E.: An Interview." *The English Harpsichord Magazine* 1/1 (1973): np.
- Mannheim, James. "Review of J. S. Bach Concertos for Solo Harpsichord with Elisabeth Farr." *Allmusic*, 2009. <http://www.allmusic.com/album/js-bach-concertos-for-solo-harpsichord-mw0001416694>.

- McAllister, Alastair. *Talking Harpsichords: Rambling Revelations*. Victoria, Australia: The Rhykane Press, 2012.
- McGeary, Tom, editor. "Frank Hubbard." *The English Harpsichord Magazine* 1/4 (April 1975), np. <http://www.harpsichord.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/Hubbard.pdf>.
- McSwain, Rebecca. "The Social Reconstruction of a Reverse Salient in Electrical Guitar Technology: Noise, the Solid Body, and Jimi Hendrix." In *Music and Technology in the Twentieth Century*, edited by Hans Joachim Braun, 186–198. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000.
- Milhaud, Darius. *My Happy Life*. (London: Marion Boyars Publishers), 1995.
- Monk, Christopher. "Where the Wind Blows," *Early Music* 1/2 (April 1973): 103.
- Moore, Tom. "An interview with Igor Kipnis." *Fanfare* 25/3 (2002): 72–75.
- Neupert, Wolfgang Dieter. "Cembalobau im 20. Jahrhundert." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting for the Bund Deutscher Klavierbauer, Banz Castle, Germany, May 9, 2013.
- Nobbs, Christopher. "Review of *Modern Harpsichord Makers: Portraits of Nineteen British Craftsmen & Their Work*," by John Paul. *Early Music* 10/4 (1982): 533–35.
- Nordwall, Ove. "Ligeti's Harpsichord," *Contemporary Music Review* 20/1 (2001): 71–78.
- Palmer, Larry. "Mario Castelnuovo-Tedesco's *English Suite* for harpsichord at 100." *Diapason* (December 2009): 36–37. <http://www.thediapason.com/sites/thediapason.com/files/webDiap1209p36-37.pdf>
- . *Harpsichord in America: A Twentieth-Century Revival*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993.
- Passman, Jordan. "Vinyl Sales Aren't Dead: The 'New' Billion Dollar Music Business." *Forbes*, January 12, 2017.
- Paul, John. *Modern Harpsichord Makers: Portraits of Nineteen British Craftsmen & Their Work*. London: Victor Gollancz, 1981.
- Pilkington, Vere. "The Harpsichord: Its Present and Its Future," *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association* 62/4 (1935): 25–38.
- Putnam, Hilary. *The Collapse of the Fact/Value Dichotomy and Other Essays*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2002.
- Ragsdale, Dana. "The Revival of the Harpsichord in the Twentieth Century with Particular Attention to the Harpsichord Concerti of Manuel De Falla and Francis Poulenc." PhD diss., University of Cincinnati, 1989.

- Rephann, Richard. "A Fable Deconstructed." In *Historical Harpsichord*, Volume IV, *Harpsichord Decoration and the Yale Taskin*, edited by Howard Schott, 215–241. Hillsdale, New York: Pendragon Press, 1995.
- . "Dolmetsch-Chickering Instruments at Yale." Newsletter of the American Musical Instrument Society, XXI/2 (June 1992). <http://amis.org/publications/newsletter/1991/21.2-1992.pdf>.
- Restout, Denise and Robert Hawkins, ed. *Landowska on Music*. New York: Stein and Day, 1964.
- Richard, J.A. "The Pleyel Harpsichord," *The English Harpsichord Magazine* 2/5 (1979): np. <http://www.harpsichord.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/pleyel.pdf>.
- Runciman, John F. "Harpsichord and Piano." *The Saturday Review*, October 22, 1910, 514–515.
- Russell, Raymond. *The Harpsichord and Clavichord*. New York: Schribner, 1973.
- . "The Harpsichord since 1800." *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association* 82/1 (Taylor & Francis Ltd, 1956): 61–64. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/765868>.
- Sanderson, Blair. "Review of Monika Knoblochová: *Martinů Harpsichord Works*." *Allmusic*, 2005. <http://www.allmusic.com/album/martinu-harpsichord-works-mw0001390750>.
- Schabert, Gabor J., trans. György Ligeti *in Conversation with Péter Várnai*. London: Eulenburg Books, 1978.
- Schafer, Stephen. "Elisabeth Farr: My Passion is my Profession." *Naxos News*, March 9, 2009. <http://www.naxos.com/news/default.asp?op=580& displayMenu=Interviews&type=2>.
- Schott, Howard and Elste, Martin, "Harpsichord: Since 1940." Edited by Edwin M. Ripin, et al. "Harpsichord." *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press. Accessed April 26, 2013.
- Schott, Howard. "Review of Pioneer Harpsichordists on CD: Great Virtuosi of the Harpsichord." *Early Music* 23/3 (1997): 513–16.
- . "Harpsichord Week in Bruges 1980." *Early Music* 8/4 (1980): 521–522.
- . "Harpsichord Week in Bruges 1977." *Early Music* 5/4 (1977): 545, 547, 549, 551.
- . "Bruges harpsichord week 1974." *Early Music* 3/1 (1975): 52–53, 55, 57.
- . "The Harpsichord Revival." *Early Music* 2/2 (1974): 85–95.
- Schreffler, Anne. Booklet notes to *20th Century Baroque: Modern Reflections on Old Instruments*, Cedille Records. Recorded in 1991. CDR 90000 011, 1992.

- Skowronek, Martin. *Cembalobau: Erfahrung und Erkenntnisse aus der Werkstattpraxis*. Bergkirchen: PPVMedien, Ed. Bochinsky, 2003.
- Spicer, Andi. "Jane Chapman Rocks the Harpsichord." *The Wall Street Journal*, April 3, 2009.
- Steinberg, Michael. "Review of Some Observations of the Harpsichord in Twentieth Century Music in London 1890–94 by Bernard Shaw." *Perspectives of New Music* 1/2 (1963): 189–194.
- Taubman, Howard. "Landowska Offers Unusual Program." *New York Times*, March 4, 1943, 24.
- Thorp, Keith Andrew. "Twentieth-Century Harpsichord: Approaches to Composition and Performance Practice as Evidenced by the Contemporary Repertoire." DMA diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1981.
- Tresch, J. & Dolan, E.I. "Toward a New Organology: Instruments of Music and Science." *Osiris* 28/1 (2013): 278–298.
- Unger-Hamilton, Clive. "Rafael Puyana Obituary: Colombian Harpsichordist at the Heart of the Instrument's Revival." *Guardian*, March 16, 2013.
- Walls, Peter. *History, Imagination and the Performance of Music*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003.
- Wood, Jessica. "Rutkowski and Robinette," *Grove Dictionary of Musical Instruments*. Oxford University Press, 2014. <http://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780199743391.001.0001/acref-9780199743391-e-6462>.
- . "Keys to the Past: Building Harpsichords and Feeling History in the Postwar United States." PhD diss., Duke University, 2010.
- Zuckermann, Wolfgang. *Modern Harpsichord: Twentieth-Century Instruments and Their Makers*. London: Peter Owen Ltd, 1969.

Music

- Ben-Haim, Paul. *Sonata a Tré*. Tel Aviv: Israel Music Institute, 2001.
- Bergman, Erik. *Energien für Cembalo*. Helsinki: Fazer, 1972.
- Berkeley, Lennox. *Concertino*. London: Chester Music, 1961.
- Child, Peter. *Concerto for Harpsichord and String Quartet*. Available from the composer, 2005.
- Harrison, Lou. *Six Sonatas for Cembalo or Pianoforte*. Edited by Susan Summerfield. New York: Peer International Corporation, 1990.
- Hinchliffe, Robert. *The Elements*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980.

- Ibert, Jacques. *Deux Interludes pour flûte, violon et clavecin (ou harpe)*. Paris: Alphonse Leduc, 1949.
- Ligeti, Györgyi. *Continuum für Cembalo*. London: Schott, 1970.
- Martinů, Bohuslav. *Promenades for Flute, Violin and Harpsichord*. Boca Raton, Florida: Masters Music Publications, Inc., 1991.
- Milhaud, Darius. *Sonata for Clavecin (or Piano) and Violin*, op. 257. Bryn Mawr, PA: Elkan-Vogel Inc., 1946.
- Piston, Walter. *Sonatina for Violin and Harpsichord (or Piano)*. New York: Boosey & Hawkes, 1948.
- Rorem, Ned. *Spiders for Harpsichord*. Milwaukee, WI: Boosey & Hawkes, 1969.

Audiovisual Materials

- Attie, Barbara, Janet Goldwater and Diane Pontius. *Uncommon Visionary: A Documentary on the Life and Art of Wanda Landowska*. Video Artists International DVD, 1997, 4246.
- Burman-Hall, Linda and Laura Albers. *Music of Darius Milhaud*. Recorded 2004. Kleos Classics, 2005, KL 5131.
- Castleman, Charles and Barbara Harbach. *Music by Milhaud, Piston, Adler, Martinů, Rubbra, Dvorák*. Recorded 1983. Albany Records, 1990, TROY 041.
- Child, Peter. *Tableux: Chamber and Choral Music of Peter Child*. Lontono, Maggie Cole, harpsichord. Recorded 2006. Lorelt, 2007, LNT 125.
- Elmiger, Roger and Micheline Mitrani. *Darius Milhaud and Vittorio Rietti*. Recorded 1989. Gallo, 2013, GALL 585.
- Esfahani, Mahan. "Mahan Esfahani: Harpsichord Concert." Library of Congress webcast, May 29, 2010. https://www.loc.gov/today/cyberlc/feature_wdesc.php?rec=5124.
- Farr, Elisabeth. *Concertos for Solo Harpsichord*. Recorded 2008. Naxos, 2009, 8572006-07.
- Gardner, James. "The Rise and Fall of Harpsichord 6." Broadcast May 18, 2016. <http://www.radionz.co.nz/concert/programmes/sundayfeature/audio/20179763/the-fall-and-rise-of-harpsichord-6>.
- Honma, Michiyo. *Contemporary Harpsichord*. Recorded 2007. SteepleChase Productions, 2008, KON 32340.
- Kirkpatrick, Ralph and Schneider, Alexander. *Walter Piston/John Cage Modern American Music Series*. Columbia, ca. 1953, ML 4495.
- Knoblochová, Monika. *Martinů Harpsichord Works*. Recorded 2004. Supraphon, 2005, Su 3805-2.

- Kroll, Mark. *The Contemporary Harpsichord*. Recorded 2003. Albany Records, 2004, Troy 668.
- Lewis, Christopher D. *20th Century Harpsichord Music*. Recorded 2014. Naxos, 2015, 8.573364.
- . *Harpsichord Concertos: Rutter, J.: Suite Antique /Glass, P./Francaix, J.* with the West Side Chamber Orchestra. Recorded on the “Eaton Pleyel” in 2012. Naxos, 2013, 8.573146.
- Richter, Karl. *Chromatic Fantasy and Fugue, D Minor, BWV 903*. Recorded in 1969. Archiv Produktion. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7zvylv7uwyE&list=RDrsalW5MrbMc&index=3>.
- Sempe, Skip. “Bach and the Landowska Legacy.” Library of Congress webcast, April 12, 2012. http://www.loc.gov/today/cyberlc/feature_wdesc.php?rec=5986.
- Staier, Andreas. *Hamburg 1734*. Recorded 2004. Harmonia Mundi, 2005, HMC 901898.
- Terry, Carole. *"Something Else to Do": 20th Century Harpsichord Works*. Recorded 1985. CRI, 1986.
- Tiensuu, Jukka. *Exuberant Harpsichord*. Recorded 1987. Finlandia Records, 1989, FACD 367.
- . *Fantastic Harpsichord*. Recorded 1986, 1987. Finlandia Records, 1987, FACD 357.
- Vinikour, Jory. *Toccatas: Modern American Music for Harpsichord*. Recorded 2013. Sono Luminus, 2013, DSL-92174.

Interviews and Correspondence Conducted by the Author

- Child, Peter. Email and MIT from July 13, 2016.
- Downie, Paul. Wellington, August 28, 2017.
- Funaro, Elaine. Skype, April 3, 2014.
- Hinchliffe, Robert. Email, July 28, 2016.
- Hoffmann, Sabine. Interview, Berlin, 2014.
- Knoblochová, Monika. Email, April 21, 2016.
- Kroll, Mark. Email and Boston from June 30, 2014.
- Lindley, Patrick. Skype, email and UCSB from December 4, 2013.
- May, Conny. Palmerston North, New Zealand, August 3, 2014.
- McAllister, Alastair. Melbourne, May 2014 and October 2015, continuing through August 2017 via email.

Neupert, Wolfgang Dieter. Email, October 30, 2014.

Nicolson, Donald. Skype and Melbourne, on March 20 and in May 2014, respectively.

Růžicková, Zuzana. Skype, November 5, 2014.

Spaink, Martin. Email November 1, 2016.

Tiensuu, Jukka. Email November 18, 2014.