

CORRESPONDENCE

A REPLY TO GRAHAM NICHOLSON

Graham Nicholson (Letter to the Editor, *Historic Brass Society Journal* 7 [1995]: 216-220) states that the sleeve of the very end of the Haas instrument of 1688 has been soldered into the mouthpipe. This is not the case. The diameter of the mouthpipe is 7 mm. I have used the information from Rainer Egger's examination of the instrument, as described in E. Tarr, "Das gewundene Jagdinstrument von J.W. Haas," *Brass Bulletin* 54 (1986): 13, n. 13."

Regarding Reiche's instrument I can only repeat: A reconstruction of this instrument is impossible if we cannot find the instrument itself. The portrait of Reiche is not a blueprint and a reconstruction after the portrait can only be a reconstruction after the portrait.

Reine Dahlqvist
Göteborg, Sweden



A REPLY TO MATTHEW CRON

In 1698, Weigel stated that French and English trumpets were a second and a third higher than the German trumpet, respectively. This was echoed by other writers, including Friese. Altenburg stated that the German trumpet was pitched in D or E \flat (*Cammerton*), the French in F, and the English in G—assertions that have been doubted by many modern researchers. Now Matthew Cron ("In Defense of Altenburg: The Pitch and Form of Foreign Trumpets," in this issue of *HBSJ*) believes that Weigel, his followers, and Altenburg in fact refer to the field trumpet.

Weigel does not regard the trumpet as an instrument primarily of military use. He regards it as a musical instrument, gives its scale (compass), and shows how skilled trumpeters could play in *tono secundo* and produce the chromatic notes b \flat ' and f \sharp '. Then (p. 235) he writes that the trumpet was previously used in war and is still used to give signals.

Did Janowka know Weigel's work? He may have, since his example showing that skilled trumpeters could produce the notes b \flat ', f \sharp ' (and b \natural ') is very similar to Weigel's; or this merely a coincidence?

Friese's booklet was published in 1709, at which time it was listed in a catalogue of new books for the Easter fair in Leipzig.¹ It was later reprinted in one of the editions of *Der vornehmsten Künstler- und Handwerker Ceremonial-Politica* (vol. 3; Leipzig, 1728).

Now to Altenburg, who states that the F trumpet introduced by the French and that the G trumpet is customarily used by the English. These statements must be compared with

French and English sources, and I can only refer to my article in *HBSJ*.² Francoeur wrote in 1772 (*Diapason gèneral de tous les instruments à vent*) that the pitch of French trumpets was E, but also mentioned the existence of trumpets in F. Laborde wrote in 1780 (*Essai sur la musique*) that the French trumpet was in E, and if a trumpet in F were required it had to be made to order. If F trumpets had been introduced and common in France surely their availability would not have been so limited.

We have no English source that can confirm that the English trumpet was a third or a fourth higher than the ordinary German trumpet. Falbout, writing around 1700, does not give any support, and Marsh, writing around 1807, stated that its highest pitch was F. Had the English trumpet customarily been pitched in G, surely Marsh would have noted this.

Cron writes, "The large number of sources that Altenburg drew on and the amount of contact he had with other trumpeters attest to the reliability of his information and demonstrate that he accurately describes the pitch of foreign trumpets." In an accompanying note (n. 71), Cron lists the sources cited by Altenburg. But what of these sources? What do Forkel, Mattheson, L. Mozart, and Quantz have to say about the pitches of trumpets in other countries? To what extent do early Roman authors such as Catullus, Ovid, Pliny, Tacitus, and the Jewish writer Josephus, all of whom lived 1600-1800 years before Altenburg, confirm trumpet pitches in the 18th century?

Altenburg's information on trumpeters in other countries is in fact quite limited. We might expect information on organization, education, duties, function, etc., but Altenburg gives only some hints on salaries and uniforms. How much contact did he in fact have with his contemporary trumpeter colleagues? His list of famous trumpeters in "neuen Zeiten" is extremely limited; one could expect much more.

Then there is the problem of coiled trumpets and *trombe da caccia*. In a few German sources we encounter references to Italian *welsch* or coiled trumpets, most notably the portrait of Gottfried Reiche, holding a coiled instrument, and Praetorius' depiction of an almost identical instrument, which he calls *Jägertommet*. The existence of music with parts for *trombe da caccia* has led to the conclusion that Reiche's instrument was a *tromba da caccia*, an instrument used especially in Italy.

The term *welsche Trompete* appears as early as 1542, but at that time it denotes a French trumpet (*welsch*=foreign: Italian, Spanish, or French).³ We meet the term again almost 160 years later when Weigel writes, "Man findet eine Gattung von gewundenen Trompeten / und sind die Italienische oder Welsche bey die sechsmalen herum gewunden (One also finds a class of coiled trumpets, and [they] are the Italian or *Welsche* which are wound six times around⁴)." This was subsequently repeated by other writers. But more important still is Altenburg's remark, "Hier verdient wol die sogenannte Inventions- oder italiänische Trompete den ersten Rang, weil sie, wegen der öftern Windung, auf eine bequeme Art inventirt ist. Sie sind vorzüglich in Italien gebrüchlich (Here the so-called "Invention" or "Italian" trumpet deserves the highest position, since it, because of its many coils, is made in such a commodious form. It is very commonly used in Italy)." But do his writings really support the use of a coiled trumpet in Italy? We cannot ignore the fact that he described the *Jägertrommet* as "eines vielmal enge gewundenen Horne (a horn with many tight coils)."

He also regards it as an obsolete instrument. This makes it very difficult to believe that his *Inventions- oder italiänische Trompete* was more or less identical with Praetorius' *Jägertrommet* or Reiche's instrument. Nor does he say that the instrument is *gewunden*, but "wegen der öftern Windung auf eine bequeme Art inventirt ist." This could in fact refer to the short-model folded trumpet with two loops such as those in F by H. Jahn from 1735 and J. L. Ehe from about 1735 in the Musikinstrumenten-Museum in Leipzig (no. 1820-21 and no. 1822-23). Another instrument in the same pitch and shape by J.J. Schmied from 1772 disappeared during World War II.

These instruments are also convenient to hold since they are short, about 36-37 cm. A similar instrument in E \flat by F. Ehe in 1741 measures 41 cm. Such instruments may well have been used by the *Regimentspfeifer der Infanterie*, and it is quite possible this is the instrument meant by Altenburg. But as to its origin and preferred use in Italy, one can only speculate.

Thus the only source for a coiled trumpet, called "Italian," is in fact Weigel, and those who quoted him or quoted his followers. Surely if this instrument had been common in Italy, F. Bonanni would have mentioned it (*Gabinetto armonica*, 1722; *Description des instruments harmoniques en tout genre*, 1776).

Cron has attempted to locate as many scores as possible with *Trombe da caccia*, yet this makes sense only if it can be proved the *tromba da caccia* is not an alternative for *corno da caccia*.⁵ He has also tried to find evidence for the use of *trombe da caccia* or coiled trumpets in Dresden. He mentions Vivaldi's concerto RV 5674 with parts for *trombon da caccia*. This work might have been written for Pisendel when he visited Venice, but Vivaldi scholars are nowadays quite uncertain.⁶ There are however parts for this work in Dresden, in Pisendel's hand, for *primo cornu da caccia* and *corno 2.^{do}*

No autograph has survived for Hasse's *Cleofide* (Dresden, 1731). The most important copies are a score and parts (but lacking individual parts for brass) preserved in Dresden. The score contains lines designated for *trombe*, *corni*, and *corni da caccia*, but none for *trombe da caccia*.⁷

Handel had nothing to do with the performance of his *Poro* in Hamburg in 1732. It was arranged and given the title *Cleofida* so as not to be confused with another *Poro* presented in Hamburg previously. As Kleefeld does not mention his source, it is of course impossible to say in which number the *Trombe da caccia* are prescribed, but most probably it is an inserted Italian aria as in Keiser's *Circe*. A score in Hamburg (Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, MB 1610, a rather late score) has no parts for *trombe da caccia*.

The report on *Waldhörner und Jägertrompeten* from Basel in 1710 has always seemed doubtful to me, and after a search in the original manuscript (*Basler Chronik*, 1545-1743), I found the reading *Waldhörner oder Jägertrompeten*. *Jägertrompete* here is an alternative for *Waldhorn*, and this must also apply to the *Jacht-Trompeten* in Wertheim in 1740.

Cron writes, "During the 17th and 18th centuries coiled instruments were used for hunting and in the infantry" He thus uses a passage from Altenburg concerning the use of a trumpet of special shape in German infantry music about 1770 and later to prove the existence of coiled trumpets, particularly in Italian but also German infantry music as

early as the 17th century. Up to the middle of the 17th century, infantry music consisted of fifes and drums, and sometimes only drums. The trumpet was only used in the cavalry. During the second half of the 17th century, the oboe and bassoon were established as infantry instruments in France. In Germany a shawm band began to be used but towards the end of the 17th century and the beginning of the 18th this was replaced by an ensemble of oboes and bassoons. This also influenced English military music.

The trumpet was probably first introduced into infantry music in Prussia and Brandenburg around 1720 or earlier, as mentioned by H.F. von Flemming (*Der vollkommene teutsche Soldat*, 1726). It has also been stated that the field- or cavalry trumpeters protested against this. Flemming continues that “in Engelland ebenfalls soll geberüchlich seyn (they should likewise be very useful in England).” This may be so, since Handel composed about 1734 a march for trumpet, two oboes, and bass in D (HWV 416). Information on the use of the trumpet in English infantry music is otherwise extremely uncertain up to about 1760. Concerning Italian infantry music we have no reliable information at all for the period in question. There is no support in the sources for a coiled trumpet in Italian infantry music, nor in German, and above all not in the 17th century.⁸

Reine Dahlqvist
Göteborg, Sweden

NOTES

¹ A. Göhler, *Verzeichnis der in der Frankfurter und Leipziger Messkataloge der Jahre 1674 bis 1759 angezeigten Musikalien* (Leipzig, 1902-3), no. 81.

² “Pitches of German, French, and English Trumpets in the 17th and 18th Centuries,” *Historic Brass Society Journal* 5 (1993): 29-41.

³ In a letter dated 15 October 1541, J. Neuschel mentions twelve German and twelve *welsche oder französichs* trumpets, but he generally prefers the term *welsch* in other letters. These “large” French trumpets were provided with banners and used by the emperor’s trumpeters.

⁴ Cron’s translation.

⁵ The use of the brass instruments in Pergolesi’s stage works has been investigated by A. Odenkirchen (*Blechblasinstrumente in den Bühnenwerken Pergolesis*, Studi Pergolesiani 1 [1986], pp. 89-102), who came to the conclusion that *tromba da caccia* must be a horn.

⁶ Cf. P. Ryom, *Répertoire des oeuvres d’Antonio Vivaldi: Les compositions instrumentales* (Copenhagen, 1986), p. 688.

⁷ This work was performed in Venice in 1736 but revised with twelve new arias. No autograph has survived, but in a copy we find *trombe* as well as *trombe da caccia*, but this has nothing to do with a performance in Dresden.

⁸ Italians were thus not acquainted with a coiled trumpet as an infantry instrument. The use of *trôbe di caccia de guerra* in J.C. Bach’s *Catone in Utica*, should of course mean that the horns (*trombe da caccia*) should be doubled by trumpets (*trombe di guerra*) an octave higher. This score is by the way not an autograph, as no autograph exists, only a copy written by two (possible three) different copyists.