Almost seven years ago in the pages of this journal we explored some of the questions raised by the infrequent recordings of nineteenth-century music on period instruments.1 The time elapsed since may have been relatively brief, but it has witnessed a dramatic growth in awareness of performance issues in music after 1800—and a flood of new releases. Not only is it none too soon to reconsider both the issues and their merits, but this may well be the last time it will be practical to discuss either with any degree of comprehensiveness, if present trends continue, by the end of the 1980s there will be a surfeit of so-called authentic performances circulating, with debate necessarily focusing upon individual releases rather than overall objectives.

It is all too easy to exaggerate the influence to date of the historical performance movement, but let us review for a moment the gains of the last several years. In 1977 there were some thirty discs of nineteenth-century music on period instruments available in this country; over the last seven years this number has swelled to almost 125, an impressive surge by any standard. The prestigious PolyGram family of labels now devotes its entire L'Oiseau-Lyre series to historical performances, presenting many Classical and Romantic works. Not to be outflanked, Harmonica Mundi has countered with Pro-Arte. Smaller labels like Astrée, Claves, Titanic, and Toccata are scrambling to corner their share of the growing market.

Who would have predicted, five years ago, that Christopher Hogwood would be conducting at the Hollywood Bowl—not just once but in...
successive seasons? And although my notion that “it would be splendid if a major recording firm would pick [Malcolm Bilson] up” was soon answered by a contract and several fine disks from Nonesuch, even my most optimistic projections were outstripped by Deutsche Grammophon’s engaging of Bilson to record on fortepiano over the next several seasons the complete Mozart concerti with John Eliot Gardiner. These last years have also witnessed a steady growth in the performer base: today we can hear on fortepiano not only Badura-Skoda and Bilson and Demus, but Binns, Burnett, Dähler, Hogwood, Hoogland, Junghanss, and Lubin as well. It is too early to tell which, if any, of these artists will emerge as major mainstream interpreters; much may depend, as we shall see shortly, upon the instruments themselves.

And there is more. Not only have sympathetic critics like Andrew Porter and Nicholas Kenyon written thoughtful and provocative reviews for the New Yorker of increasingly plentiful performances—both recorded and live—on original instruments, but voices of the Establishment, like Donal Henahan of the New York Times and Michael Walsh of Time, have also filed approving accounts of recent developments. A share of historical recordings regularly receives high marks in the pages of High Fidelity, Stereo Review, Gramophone, and other trade magazines. It is true that most of the music under discussion has been largely by Bach and Haydn and Mozart rather than Beethoven and Schubert or beyond; more important to our purposes is that it has now become acceptable to re-examine not just obscure corners of the repertoire, but the war horses themselves.

In musicological circles, performance practice is at least officially sanctioned at meetings, specialized conferences, and in scholarly journals—even if a patronizing whiff sometimes lingers on. The generous coverage in The New Grove (to be improved upon even further in the forthcoming New Grove Dictionary of Musical Instruments) has filled in many longstanding gaps in general knowledge. Under new editorial leadership, one of the most articulate and widely-read organs concerned regularly with performance practice, Early Music, has broadened its scope to include at least occasional Romantic forays. Finally, the issuing of the first “complete” set of a body of well-established repertoire—in this case the thirty-two piano sonatas of Beethoven performed by Malcolm Binns on instruments from the collection of C. F. Colt—must be viewed as a milestone that one hopes can be repeated in the years ahead.

These successes are genuine, and many of them will doubtless prove lasting. Indeed, it is their very magnitude that obliges both the leaders and participants in the Romantic performance movement to reassess their motivations and goals. Although recordings do not tell the whole story, they are representative of what has been going on for the last several years. Collectively, they point up three factors that, in spite of the recent growth, do not seem to have changed substantially since the early 1960s. First, the interest in nineteenth-century performance practice continues to center primarily around the piano. In our original checklist of about thirty discs, all but three involved music for or with piano. Among the recent crop of some ninety-five discs, a dozen do not employ the piano, a proportion only slightly reduced from seven years previously. In one sense this is hardly surprising: the piano is, after all, the fulcrum of Romanticism: its solo ideal. On the other hand, a view of the nineteenth-century that excludes opera and orchestral music can scarcely be considered complete or even representative.

Second, the nineteenth-century historical performance movement has been, and continues to be, European-based. Only six of the recordings in the present checklist were made by non-Europeans—all Americans, as it turns out; a seventh features an American soprano accompanied by a European pianist on a European label. The original reason for this state of affairs may be that the instruments themselves were by and large to be found in Europe. Although the
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firm of Neupert pressed its Mozart fortepiano model into service for the Mozart bicentennial in the mid-1950s, most European performer/collectors [such as Paul Badura-Skoda, Jörg Demus, or Richard Burnett] have continued to favor originals, reflecting to some extent the Old World bias—one not entirely without foundation—that they don't make them as well anymore. For relatively modest outlays, it was possible for Europeans to assemble impressive and important keyboard collections. Assuming such instruments could still be located, an equally interested American, bucking the vagaries of export restrictions and shipping arrangements, faced an uphill battle.

There is also the circumstance that Europe has traditionally provided a more congenial atmosphere for the cultivation of performers with iconoclastic leanings: Arnold Dolmetsch at the turn of the century, Landowska in the '20s and '30s, Thurston Dart in the immediate postwar period, and the Leonhardts, Harnoncourts, Hogwoods, Gardiners, Maiers, and Schröders of the last two decades. European education in general remains more humanistically based than its American equivalent, and even the strictly conservatory-trained performer is likely to have at least some exposure to organology or musical iconography [perhaps along with a dose of classics or Arabic], from which the study of historical performance flows quite spontaneously. European performers—most especially the English—have also proved to be more articulate spokespersons for their causes, facilitating acceptance by a larger public. Few leading American performers, for example, could cross conversational swords with Christopher Hogwood, whose speaking engagements with the BBC have covered practically every corner of the musical universe. And finally, there has been a cosmopolitan musical environment—best exemplified by London, but to a considerable extent by Paris and Vienna as well—that provides nearly full-time work for a reasonable number of historical-performance practitioners. The closest American analogue remains Boston [most of whose early music activities took root in the workshop of Frank Hubbard], where audience size has never quite caught up with the supply of performing musicians.

To be sure, some of this may be about to change. For one thing, cities like Los Angeles and New York are experiencing an unprecedented growth of interest in historical performance, rapidly approaching a level that can attract and hold first-class performers. For another, the building of replicas has secured a strong foothold in America, which now boasts a dozen world-class early keyboard instrument makers, and may over the next decade corner the market on historical pianos as well. The best copies by Philip Belt of Mozart's 5-octave Walter concert instrument compare favorably with the best-known originals; some would even argue that they surpass them in reliability and purity of tone, as the originals themselves must have in Mozart's day. A few intrepid builders are now stretching the outside of the envelope by building the first prototypes of 6- and 6½-octave pianos; although the engineering problems are considerably greater than those of the smaller instruments, they are slowly being solved. It remains to be seen what influence this renaissance will have upon historical performance in America.

Third, although fresh repertoire is being introduced continually, the nineteenth-century historical performance movement continues to feed heavily on Beethoven and Schubert. In our original survey, only two discs contained at least a full side of music not by one of these two Viennese masters. In the most recent batch, about twenty discs contain no music by either, all but three are for or with piano, and only nine are on labels that enjoy wide distribution. All together there are just ten recordings devoted to music composed after 1830, and all of these involve the piano.

Given that Beethoven and Schubert represent both the culmination and dissolution of Viennese Classicism, it stands to reason that they are natural targets for a movement that has marched steadily forward through Mozart and Haydn. It will be interesting to see whether interest stalls at around 1830, and whether it remains fixed upon the piano. In either event the importance of historical performance for the Romantic century will remain sharply circumscribed. This would be an altogether ironic outcome for an era that, in terms both of measure and of variety, prized color above all else. For this reason alone I would argue that the period
in which original instruments and performance practices are most indispensable is indeed the nineteenth. That such an argument runs counter to virtually every popular assumption about Romantic performance undermines only its implementation, not its essential validity.

The successes and limitations just outlined inevitably cast their shadow over any evaluation of the current ferment. Many of the virtues and deficiencies that crop up are manifestations of a movement struggling to emerge from its cocoon, like a butterfly, it has an instinctual sense of destiny, but at the same time it is reluctant to undergo the necessary transformation. The launching pads for this transformation can be logically sought in incremental extensions of previous activities, of which two of the most stimulating have been the release by the Collegium Aureum of both Beethoven’s “Eroica” Symphony [8; numbers are keyed to the checklist concluding this essay] and his Missa solemnis [17].

In the mid-1960s this pioneering group was recording Bach and Handel; in the early ’70s they moved on to Haydn and Mozart, and now Beethoven. The Collegium Aureum has always been easy for even the general listener to digest, both because of their careful attention to intonation and ensemble and because their performing style is perhaps not so very different from that of a well-disciplined modern orchestra. Under the vigorous leadership of FranzJosef Maier the strings project a round and spacious tone that is frequently vibrato-based—a vibrato echo by the winds—and probably activated by Tourte bows. No ghost of Leopold Mozart lurks here. The Collegium Aureum has never gone in for low pitch, keyboard continuo in Classical symphonies, or other purist articles of faith. Whether as a string quartet or the thirty-two-piece ensemble used for the “Eroica” [with the strings disposed 6-5-3-2-2, as in the 1805 premiere], they have always recorded in a live acoustic [most frequently the Cedernsaal of the Renaissance Schloss Kirchheim], which imparts to their performances a vibrant sheen generally absent from modern orchestral sound. Even in the largest American cities there are remarkably few halls that treat the music of the nineteenth century kindly. Plush carpeting, cushioned seats, upholstered walls, acoustical tile, cavernous shapes—all of these suit Stravinsky’s Petrushka admirably, while conspiring to suck the life out of the staples of Romanticism.

A reviewer is likely to jump to the Trio of the “Eroica” Scherzo to test the valveless horns, and sure enough there is considerably more color and nuance [especially the stopped c² and a¹, pungent though non-abrasive] in this section. But rather than a series of similarly dramatic differences between the Collegium Aureum and, say, the Cleveland Orchestra under Szell (or even the Vienna Philharmonic under Schmidt-Isserstedt), there is a much more subtle but pervasive difference in the overall palette of sound. After several hearings of the Collegium Aureum, modern performances begin to sound excessively dense, compacted, and even colorless, more like a uniform brick wall than a decorated eighteenth-century altar. This remains true in spite of the fact that both Szell and Schmidt-Isserstedt choose more courageous tempi in the outer movements. It is not so much that the Collegium Aureum winds, for example, can be heard more easily; they can, but not for the reason that the less reinforced strings are dramatically softer. What we are aware of instead is the greater musical space between tiers of sound, permitting individual voices and nuances to slip effortlessly through—although the bassoon used here is less penetrating that its modern counterpart.

One byproduct of this transparency is that the overall dynamic range is increased, particularly at the soft end. The Collegium Aureum’s rendition of the B phrase in the opening section of the Funeral March, for example, begins from a genuine piano, not the mf to which we have become accustomed. When it is time to cut loose, as in the triadic explosions of mm. 76 and 98ff., it is astonishing how much sound thirty-two pieces can generate; on this smaller scale Beethoven’s reliance on the brass for dynamic reinforcement seems even more dramatic. The outcome of all this is a highly successful, taut reading that in crucial respects reintroduces a revolutionary dimension smothered since the advent of outsized Brahms orchestras.

For the Missa solemnis the Collegium Aureum employed the same basic orchestra as for the “Eroica,” augmented by a fourth horn, three trombones, organ continuo, a chorus of
about forty, and four soloists (with women sopranos and altos, as in the original performance). This is somewhat smaller than that used for the premieres of the Kyrie, Credo, and Agnus Dei at Beethoven’s academies of May 1824, though it doubtless reflects the actual forces frequently available for some time after that. Several of the same distinctions pointed up in the “Eroica” apply here as well. In particular, the timpani function as an audible agent of rhythmic organization, rather than being buried at the bottom of the pile. The ambitious fugues that conclude both the Gloria and the Credo breathe more naturally. In the end, however, listeners are apt to favor one reading or another depending upon whether the passage in question is epic or intimate. There is no question that in places such as the Qui tollis of the Gloria the chamber-sized forces project a more personal tone; on the other hand it is hard to do without the sweep and grandeur at the opening of this same movement, as in the standard performances of Klemperer and von Karajan.

The heavy reliance upon vibrato and portamento provides a more serious obstacle to appreciating the Collegium Aureum’s performances. However, beautiful in other respects, concertmaster Maier’s rendition of the soaring Benedictus solo could just as well be Fritz Kreisler’s. I would be hard pressed to point out any significant differences between the vocal styles applied here and those in any of a half dozen representative modern recordings. There is something specious about arguing for instrumental authenticity while largely ignoring the vocal domain. It is certainly true that we know less about vocal techniques and performance styles in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries than we do about instrumental performance. But that is no reason to abandon the search. Too often in the Collegium Aureum Missa solennis the vocal-instrumental mixture stratifies into oil and water—soprano Sylvia Geszty employs a wide vibrato even by modern standards—rather than projecting a convincing blend. It is a tribute to the participants, headed by conductor Wolfgang Gönnenwein, that the performance often rises above these limitations to include many sustained passages of great beauty.

The Collegium Aureum celebrates its twentieth year in 1984, having amassed a catalogue of recorded performances that includes late string quartets of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven; the “La Reine,” “Jupiter,” and “Eroica” symphonies; Beethoven’s Septet, op. 20; Mozart’s C-Major (K. 467) and Beethoven’s Fourth and Triple Concertos, the Missa solemnis; and Schubert’s “Death and the Maiden” Quartet and “Trout” Quintet. They have much to be proud of. If, in light of the contributions of more youthful, radical groups like the Academy of Ancient Music and the Quartetto Esterházy, their performances appear to be haunted by lingering modernisms, it is not from lack of extraordinary polish and musicianship. One hopes that the next generation of performers on original instruments can make an equally lasting contribution, for unless these groups evince equal amounts of curiosity and commitment, the orchestral experiments of the Collegium Aureum will mark an end rather than a beginning.

In the field of chamber music the most intrepid group of explorers over the last several years has been The Music Party, a flexible ensemble headed by clarinettist Alan Hacker. Hacker is, by even the most rigorous standards, an extraordinary performer, combining an expressive, speaking tone on a variety of instruments with virtuosic abandon. The intonation problems that we are told plagued all performances before the introduction of Böhme keying systems are happily absent here. Several of his group’s recordings, such as that of Hummel’s Clarinet Quartet (47), demonstrate how a work can be rescued from mediocrity by a sympathetic performance radiating the colors envisaged by its composer. Hummel will never become a great architect, but in the Music Party’s reading his sensitivity to nuance and shading far surpasses the Biedermeier mentality of his generation. And it is hard to imagine Weber’s Grand Duo (51) having been performed with more gusto and flair by Heinrich Bärmanthan by Hacker. Not all of the digging for fresh repertoire yields gold; Glinka’s Trio Pathétique (51; inexplicably employing a bassoon built almost sixty years before the work was composed, and sounding appropriately out of place) scarcely merits a revival. One earnestly hopes that a
quintet and two sonatas by Brahms lie in Hacker’s recording future.

In the recent rush of recordings no single group has exercised a monopoly on the rediscovery of neglected works. A sensitive and polished performance of Beethoven’s Serenade, op. 25, highlights a disc using instruments from the collection of the Metropolitan Museum of Art [5]. No rendition known to me captures the delicacy and charm of this work so persuasively while paying equal attention to matters of articulation and phrasing. A few more such releases could begin to reverse the otherwise grim image of museum-related recording projects. Although marred by an abysmal piano and occasional intonation problems, countertenor René Jacobs’s offerings of Ariette e cavatine by Donizetti, Bellini, Schubert, Rossini, and Beethoven [67] present a fresh perspective on operatic vocal types in the first quarter of the nineteenth century. Schubert’s delightful setting of Metastasio’s “Da voi, cari lumi” is by itself worth the price of the album, and there are few singers of the repertoire who could not learn much from Jacobs’s skilled application of vocal floritura. Only slightly less eclectic is an entire album devoted to nearly two-dozen Lieder of Václav Jan Tomášek, most of whose texts—including Erlkönig, Am Flusse, and Rastlose Liebe—were also set by Schubert. While visited less by divine inspiration than his Viennese contemporary, Tomášek’s dramatic faculties are fully the equal of the poetry [his setting of Wer kauft Liebesgötter! is as ingratiating a strophic song as any Schubert ever wrote], buttressed by lively piano accompaniments presented here with refreshing clarity on a healthy 1816 Streicher.

Perhaps the most welcome development over the last several years has been the gradually increasing availability of multiple performances of the same work. Until more of these are in circulation it will be all too tempting for both advocates and detractors of historical performance to pit the historical version against a host of modern interpretations. Although restricted at present to a modest number of items [Beethoven’s Septet, op. 20, Schubert’s Schöne Müllerin and Winterreise, the three sonatinas for violin and piano, op. 137, and solo piano works of Beethoven and Schubert], these are enough to demonstrate that “authentic” performances are no more definitive than “Urtext” editions. The opening Allegro con brio of Beethoven’s Septet—now available in no fewer than three historical performances [3, 4 in the present checklist, 15 in my previous one]—provides a perfect example. In spite of their more transparent textures, none of the historical performances by Die Instrumentisten, the Divertimento Salzburg, or members of the Collegium Aureum begins to approach Beethoven’s admittedly brisk metronome marking of $d=96$. In varying degrees all three ensembles treat this movement as gemütlich salon music, with metronome speeds in the low to mid 70s. It takes a reading on modern instruments by the Boston Symphony Chamber Players (Nonesuch N-78015; the violinist of this group, Joseph Silverstein, is perhaps not coincidentally a superb performer on historical violin) to deliver close to Beethoven’s tempo with the requisite brio. The $d=82$ of the Boston group never sounds frantic, and one could well imagine a performance on historical instruments that breathed naturally at very close to Beethoven’s own marking.

As Rudolf Kolisch established more than forty years ago, there is nothing to be gained by clinging literally to all of Beethoven’s metronome markings, especially those added many years after the creation of a work. At the same time, these same markings are the surest guides we have to the character of specific movements; regardless of the kinds of instruments used in the Beethoven Septet, this music is ill served by taking, as does the Divertimento Salzburg, the final Presto at two-thirds of the tempo specified by its composer. Such recordings only underscore the organic interrelationships among the various components of musical performance. Without careful attention to each, the claims advanced by the advocates of “authenticity” sound hollow indeed.

But it is to the large corpus of music for or with piano that we are forced to return. For most people who have brushed up against nineteenth-century period instruments at one time or another, it is the “fortepiano” that comes most readily to mind and ear, and the predominance of piano recordings bears this out. Sixty percent of the historical recordings to date have been for solo piano, and another quarter use it in concert with other instruments or voices. At
present nineteenth-century historical performance is, for all practical purposes, historical pianos. How, then, do we evaluate the increasingly plentiful recordings on these instruments? The only clear verdict to date is that for now we must be far more concerned with the sounds emanating from them than with individual performances upon them. This myopic, unbalanced view of performance must sadly prevail until more satisfactory instruments are widely available; to adopt any other stance is simply to put one’s head in the sand. For many observers—among these the most outspoken—there is no point in trying to pass judgement on sounds produced by either replicas or restored originals. We cannot, so the familiar argument goes, know what Beethoven’s or Schumann’s or Liszt’s pianos actually sounded like in their day; we can only, through personal preference, choose one present-day sound over another. We cannot divine what a nineteenth-century contemporary would have praised or condemned.

The major appeal of this argument is its simplicity, which, however, does little justice to the traditions of nineteenth-century performance. There is absolutely no evidence, for example, that the nineteenth century either valued or tolerated instruments in poor regulation or overall condition. In 1815 Beethoven wrote to an acquaintance that “Schanz has sent me such a bad one [i.e., a piano] that he will soon have to take it back again.” On the contrary, there is considerable evidence that many of the virtues we prize today in a piano carried the same weight then. Already in the 1770s Mozart had praised Stein’s pianos for their evenness of touch, their quick, efficient damping, their responsive knee-lever mechanisms, and their durability. In describing his attempt in 1823 to display the virtues of both English and Viennese pianos to the Viennese public, Moscheles freely admits that the poorer condition of Beethoven’s Broadwood, and its resultant “muffled tone,” contributed to the local preference for the “clear, ringing tones” of the concert-ready Graf. The nineteenth century is replete with similar accounts.

There is ample room for individual differences as to what constitutes a “clear, ringing tone,” but in reviewing scores of recordings it is at present far easier to ascertain what is not such a tone. A “ringing” tone is not plagued with a hollow, unfocused sound at its core. A “clear” tone is not riddled with what modern technicians refer to as “unison beats,” i.e., beats produced by the irregularities of a single string. Such beats have always been the bane of tuners, for it makes the tuning of three (or even two) strings to precisely the same pitch virtually impossible. The vast majority of modern technicians attributes the presence of unison beats in a piano to deterioration of strings at the end of a wear cycle (generally falling, depending upon the use to which the piano is put, somewhere between ten and twenty years), and in most cases restringing an otherwise sound instrument solves the problem. It is one of the ironies of historical restorations that, because of the frequent unavailability of suitable modern wire, we often go to great lengths to locate or salvage original wire whose very age may contribute greatly to the problems it is supposed to solve.5

The piano recordings available to date fall largely into two general categories, those whose instruments do not meet even minimal standards of purity and regulation, and those that, while still haunted by problems, offer at least a glimpse in to a lost sound world. Except for the marvelous replica by Philip Belt of Mozart’s concert Walter instrument (7, the considerably lower tension on these early frames has permitted the solving of their major problems), there is as yet no third category of eminently satisfactory instruments. The former list is not a short one. It includes nos. 10 (with isolated exceptions), 12, 13, 22, the Graf on 53, 55, 56, 58, 59, the Schneider on 62, 64, 67, two of the Broadwoods on 68, and most of the instruments on 70.

The most regrettable casualty is doubtless entry 10, whose dozen discs present for the first time all of Beethoven’s keyboard sonatas under
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3Anderson no. 539.
4Charlotte Moscheles, Life of Moscheles, With Selections from His Diaries and Correspondence, trans. A. D. Coleridge (London, 1873), I, 89

5Lest nineteenth-century inhabitants doubt the importance of good wire to nineteenth-century builders, the following excerpt from Clementi to his partner Collard in 1805 (preserved in the Willshire Collection of the Yale University Music Library) is a strong corrective: “Since you find the strings good, send for more immediately, for the tone of instruments depends much on that article; and stinginess in such cases is the highest folly.”
the hands of a single performer on period instruments. The continuing importance of C. F. Colt’s keyboard collection, as well as his own direct contributions to our knowledge of historical keyboard instruments, must be fully acknowledged by anyone working in the field. It is all the more tragic, then, that this anthology captures the collection at a moment when its prize instruments are in considerably less than peak form. The Graf employed in Beethoven’s final sonata, op. 111, can be only a ghost of its former self, and the situation does not improve as one moves backward in time. On top of the general state of disrepair there is the circumstance that the instruments chosen are not at all representative of those known to, and used by, Beethoven. Nowhere in the series do we find Walter or Schanz or Streicher, makers directly associated with the composer. This would be less compromising if the instruments chosen in their stead were at least representative of contemporary Viennese construction. But a 6-foot, triple-bridge Heilman of Offenbach for ops. 22–28, or a largely double-strung Louis Dulcken [which must date from at least fifteen years later than the ca. 1785 attributed to it by Colt] for op. 57, cannot possibly do justice to their assigned works. Many of the overly cautious tempi [cf., for example, the finale of op. 27, no. 1; the opening movement of op. 28; the first movement of op. 111] in Binns’s conscientious if somewhat sternly controlled performances seem dictated by instruments struggling to maintain a precarious tuning and regulation. Further to criticize the general lack of dynamic range or articulative variety does Binns an injustice if for no other reason than the limitations of the instruments at his disposal. The 1825 Haschka used for op. 106 is both the best-preserved and most representative instrument in the anthology [and hence cannot explain the ponderously slow tempo of the opening movement], also being featured in a lovely recording by Binns of Hummels’s unjustly neglected F#-Minor Sonata [46]. For now one can only hope that this nobly-intentioned Beethoven project receives only modest circulation, and that Binns along with other artists will have the opportunity in coming years to repeat the cycle under more favorable conditions.

A less ambitious but more creative victim of poor preservation is Pierre Bouyer’s three-record exploration of keyboard works composed in Europe between 1808 and 1812 [64]. The group of composers assembled, among whom Tomášek ranks as one of the better known, provides a fascinating glimpse into stylistic cross-currents at the end of Beethoven’s heroic decade. Aside from being once again uncharacteristic of contemporary continental pianos, none of the three English [two Broadwoods and a Tomkison; English composers are curiously excluded from the set] or Italian [Molitor] instruments used is in anything like a concert condition.

A more checkered relationship with period instruments has been enjoyed over the last two-and-a-half decades by the Austrian pianist Jörg Demus. Although his own personal collection numbered at one time some fifty instruments, it is almost impossible to escape the conclusion that Demus has been less than passionately concerned with the playing condition of those upon which he has recorded. Several of these—the Nuernberg Graf and Streicher [12]; the Schumann Graf in Vienna [54]; the Beethovenhaus Graf, Stockholm Streicher, and Nürnberg Pleyel [70]—are only embarrassments, both to the reputations of their makers and to a performer of Demus’s accomplishments. At the same time Demus can turn around and produce an exhilarating Faschingschwank aus Wien on a robustly Romantic Streicher of 1841 from his own collection [54; recorded almost twenty years ago but distributed only recently in America]. This same warm instrument was used for a four-hand recording by Demus and Paul Badura-Skoda of Schubert’s Grand Duo, D. 812 [28]; although the tone of a nearly mid-century instrument is perhaps a bit ripe for Schubert, the result is one of the most pleasing four-hand collaborations to date.

Unsatisfactory instruments will ultimately lose favor with both the general public and the professional. Much more problematic are the groups whose shortcomings are less obvious. In one important respect they pose more of a threat to the wholesale acceptance of the Romantic performance movement, for their best examples are just satisfying enough to lull the converted into the conviction that what they are hearing is the composer’s ideal realiza-
tion, a conviction not likely to be shared by a lifetime devotee of ebonized Steinways. At the center of this debate are four varied personalities, three of whom are also important collectors in their own right. Far and away the most seasoned, both as a performer of international stature and as a collector, is Paul Badura-Skoda. Although only in his mid-fifties, Badura-Skoda has three decades of experience with original instruments (not to mention intimate knowledge of the primary sources for the entire Viennese school) under his belt. Long before performing on Grafs and Broadwoods became fashionable, he and his wife, Eva Badura-Skoda, were busy collecting instruments, cultivating a local technician’s interest in restoring them, and, most importantly, asking serious questions about the impact these curious machines exercised upon the music composed for them.

Badura-Skoda’s historical recordings for BASF (Harmonia Mundi) from the early ’70s have been supplanted in recent years by a new series of Haydn, Beethoven, and Schubert releases from Astrée, all with vastly improved playing surfaces. Although outside our immediate purview, the Schantz used for a boxed set of six late Haydn keyboard sonatas is one of the most pleasing original instruments yet on record (Astrée AS 914), with performances to match. If the four discs containing Beethoven’s five late sonatas op. 101, 106, 109-11, and Schubert’s “Wanderer” Fantasy and Moments musicaux, op. 94 (checklist 14-16 and 26) on Badura-Skoda’s own Graf from ca. 1827 are on the whole less successful, it is not from shortcomings in the performances. Rather it is simply the limitations of a heavily strung wooden-frame, at the inevitable cost of volume and would require replacement of many parts that confer a historical value upon it in the first place. Like many originals this Graf has been understrung to prevent further deformation of the frames, at the inevitable cost of volume and power. The rotation of the wrest plank has further eroded down-bearing on the bridge, and from d\textsuperscript{3} on up there are persistent unison beats that undermine the cantabile of singing passages. The shift no longer moves far enough to produce a true una corda, requiring the additional introduction of the moderator to create the illusion. In spite of these unavoidable restrictions, there can be moments of great beauty. I enthusiastically recommend Badura-Skoda’s exquisite rendering of the slow movement of the “Hammerklavier” to anyone who remains skeptical of the reasons for Beethoven’s continued allegiance to Viennese pianos. Similarly, the Graf is a perfect vehicle for the registral writing in the first of the op. 94 Moments musicaux. Better prepared to meet the demands made on it is the ca. 1815 Hasska used in a recent disc containing three middle-period sonatas, including the “Waldstein” [11]. In this sonata’s opening movement the bright, woody tone of the Hasska is put to exuberantly athletic use, while the blurred pedalings that characterize each return of the Rondo theme contain just the right overlay of haze. Few pianists exhibit as much insight into this Viennese repertoire as does Badura-Skoda, whose performances draw out all the colors these instruments have—at present—to give.

A more eclectic path has been pursued over the last fifteen years by the Englishman Richard Burnett, whose growing collection at Finchcocks [a spacious eighteenth-century manor house in Kent, restored to and maintained at close to its original condition] provides perhaps the most authentic—and certainly the most lovely—setting for the study of historical keyboard instruments there is. Burnett has taken great pains to acquire originals whose major structural components are still intact, and his recordings put the best possible foot forward for carefully selected, minimally restored instruments. To me the most valuable lesson to be gleaned from Burnett’s two interesting solo albums on an 1826 Graf [originally restored by Derek Adlam in 1969; 65, 66] is that mere age is as much the enemy of an original instrument as is obvious deterioration. I am not persuaded that retaining the original strings and leather hammer coverings produces an “original” sound. Regardless of how long it has gone unstruck by a hammer, wire that has been sitting in that chemical bath we call air for more than a century and a half will have undergone crystallographic realignment. Without at least a light redrawing it cannot be expected to perform as it did when new. Leather proves to be equally susceptible to change, and no one would claim that a soundboard, even under the best circum-
stances, had an indefinite life span. An even better preserved Graf from ca. 1820 used by Burnett for two early Beethoven violin sonatas (6) is plagued equally by ubiquitous beats, especially in the treble. (Burnett’s reasoning that a 6½-octave Graf might be “the vehicle best fitted to do true justice” to works composed for an instrument about half its weight sounds more pragmatic than philosophical, although the Graf may well blend more gracefully with the fully-modernized Stradivarius used in the recording.)

Such observations, shared by the large majority of musicians for whom I have played these recordings, are in no way meant to detract from the important educational mission of Finchcocks. Thanks entirely to the unstinting efforts of Burnett and his wife (a capable artist in her own right), tens of thousands of visitors over the last several seasons have made the pilgrimage to Finchcocks, with its unparalleled opportunities to see, hear, and experience the evolution of keyboard music through three glorious centuries. Burnett not only puts on a wonderful show, but through his extensive knowledge and enthusiasm he quite literally raises the artistic consciousness of his legions of visitors. His ambitious series of recordings, now appearing on the Amon Ra label, are making available works little known to the musical public. Both he and the Badura-Skodas continue to make their irreplaceable instruments available to qualified students and builders for study. It either were to indulge in the making of wholesale changes to the objects placed in their trust, our knowledge about this period would be irretrievably diminished.

Perhaps the two most successful originals yet to be put on disc both received their restorations between ten and twenty years ago at the “Werkstätte für historische Tasteninstrumente” of Martin Scholz in Basel. Aside from turning out instruments whose actions and various pedal mechanisms are quiet and reliable, Scholz has accomplished the seemingly impossible feat of eliminating virtually all traces of unison beats, even in the high treble. The mid-1820s Graf used on an album of Nachstücke (37) also exploits in stunning fashion the potential of the una corda (physically attainable on most Grafs but rarely set up correctly). It is heard to best advantage in the development section of the rarely heard Divertissement über Französische Mo-
tive for piano four-hands (also on 37, and a text-book specimen of sonata form in spite of its designation as a Marche brillante). In two passages that rework the second group [mm. 139, 161ff.], pianists Neumeyer and Junghanns take advantage of the lone pianissimo anywhere in this fifteen-minute work to employ the full shift, although they hold enough in reserve to carry out Schubert’s further directive of diminuendo at mm. 147 and 169, easily the most dramatic moments on the record. (29 is an album devoted entirely to four-hand music of Schubert on this same Graf, though we have so far been unable to locate a copy.) We can only hope that his important collection will continue to grow and develop, despite Neumeyer’s recent death, under the curatorship of four-hand partner Junghanns.

Although he owns only a single instrument—a Brodmann of ca. 1815 also restored by Martin Scholz—Jörg Ewald Dähler has proved to be the most prolific historical recording artist over the last seven years, producing no fewer than eight albums and ten discs (all devoted to Schubert, and including both major song cycles with Ernst Haeflinger) during this period. In terms of purity no other original instrument can compete with this restored Broadmann, and for those who claim that they neither hear nor are disturbed by unison beats I suggest they listen to the opening of the C-Minor Impromptu from op. 90 (38) to discover what life is like on the other side. Not everything about the instrument is ideal; its purity seems to have been achieved at the cost of significant understringing (noticeable as well on the Neumeyer Graf), and the tone is sometimes less warm than steely. Dähler’s Schubert is of the intimate, leisurely variety, occasionally bordering on the fussy, but never unmusical. As with all of the originals discussed above (and those we have been unable to cover), there is much that the curious performer and listener can learn here.

One obvious alternative to even the best-preserved originals is the manufacture of replicas. The success of the Dulcken and Walter copies by Philip Belt and the Heilmann replicas by Adlam-Burnett has emboldened several European and American builders to take the technologically terrifying leap from 5½- into 6-
6½-octave instruments. Two such copies can be heard on records to date. That Christopher Clarke's fresh and clear copy of the ca. 1814 Fritz at Finchcocks has made its recording debut accompanying a harpist playing Boieldieu and Krumpholz [52] should hide neither its beauty nor its significance. Although the large hammer cores softened with only two thin layers of leather and mostly bi-chord stringing represent archaic rather than progressive tendencies in Viennese pianos of the time, the Fritz copy constitutes an important step forward, and we can only hope that the Clarke workshop will be turning out more of these as well as copies of instruments by more established builders. (A 6½-octave Schantz is rumored to be in the works.)

More contradictory is a passionately high-strung and compelling recording of Schubert's posthumous A-Major Sonata by the American Seth Carlin. During the first movement the Smith copy of an anonymous Viennese-type instrument—there is no evidence to support the builder's claim that the original is by Conrad Graf—projects a well-tuned, largely clear though somewhat brittle tone. The Andantino, however, suddenly overflows with unison beats and mistuned octaves, mitigated only slightly in the ensuing Scherzo and Rondo. With repeated listenings the basic sound of the instruments feels increasingly thin and pinched. Nevertheless, in the first movement of the Schubert and throughout the Clarke recording there is a freshness and vitality approached only by Dahler's Brodmann. Although these copies could well benefit from an infusion of mellowness from the best originals, the originals could gain even more from the clarity and immediacy of newly manufactured instruments. In England Derek Adlam has just finished his first 6-octave Streicher copy, and in California Eugene Schachter is putting the finishing touches to a replica of a 6½-octave Graf in his possession. We may well be on the verge of very exciting times for nineteenth-century performance.

The debate as to the relative virtues of originals versus replicas has only begun. It has been going on in the harpsichord world for nearly half a century, and even today there are no unanimously held points of view. At the risk of oversimplification, one can argue that harpsichord builders and restorers are now able to produce successful examples of both types, while post-5-octave fortepiano builders and restorers have not yet proven they can do either. If we review harpsichord recordings from the 1930s (whether Landowska or others), it is immediately clear that the Baroque revival was launched, not with compelling restorations of originals or stunning historical copies, but with instruments like Landowska's panzerized Pleyel that bore as much resemblance to a Ruckers or a Taskin as an all-beef hot dog does to prime rib. It would be both premature and unduly harsh to criticize the Romantic historical performance movement, barely two decades old, for finding itself in similar straits in 1984.

But it is also worthwhile noting that the advocates of the harpsichord were not competing—as must the early piano—against an instrument widely perceived by both audiences and performers as the perfect culmination of a long evolutionary development. For the average music patron, Romantic pianos—or clarinets or hunting horns or singing styles—do not offer a welcome opportunity to hear a work fully realized, only to endure a primitive version borne stoically by a composer who would gratefully have embraced our modern technology [How often is Beethoven's peremptory—indeed, secondhand—remark, "the piano is and remains an inadequate instrument," invoked to dismiss the early piano?] They are no more persuaded or won over by a performance on an ailing nineteenth-century grand than they are by one on a similarly ailing modern Steinway or Bechstein.

Romantic music enthusiasts will ultimately be forced to choose between the cult status which for all practical purposes has already been achieved and the rigorous standards maintained in the world's major concert halls. It is one thing for the initiated to listen with historically sympathetic ears that allow the potential of flawed instruments to come through while masking their defects. It is quite another to expect a justifiably skeptical public to put up on these same sets of ears. There is a tendency for historical performance advocates to view themselves as members of a beleaguered if enlightened elite, charged with preserving an exotic and inaccessible tradition. What is generally forgotten is that in the Vienna of the first quarter of the nineteenth century there was nothing elitist or especially enlightened about perfor-
ming the music of Beethoven or Schubert on Streichers and Grafs. Until and unless the converted make the commitment to the highest professional standards (and these have probably changed less since the nineteenth century than we find ourselves flattered to believe), their impact on the Neville Marriners and Georg Soltis of this world will continue to be negligible. Or, to transfer a metaphor of sight into our discussion of sound, the enthusiastic endorsement of imperfect instruments will continue to echo the unqualified praise of loyal subjects for the emperor's new clothes—and with equally last- ing results. The surest sign that the movement is coming of age will be when the next review of its progress can focus on performance issues rather than the instruments upon which they are fought out.

AN UPDATED DISCOGRAPHY OF NINETEENTH-CENTURY MUSIC ON NINETEENTH-CENTURY INSTRUMENTS

As with its predecessor, the following checklist is doubtless incomplete, intended to convey only a broad picture of the recorded coverage since my original article. The arrangement is roughly chronological, first by composer and then within the composer's own output. (Schubert's works are generally referred to by Deutsch numbers, but by opus where the latter is the more common designation.) Anthologies are placed at the end. The cutoff date of 1800 is no less arbitrary than other possible boundaries, and necessarily excludes the rich recent harvest of music by Haydn and Mozart on historical instruments. Data about instruments is taken from the accompanying record jackets, except in those instances where this information is known to be incorrect.

Although a clear distinction is not possible, recordings available in the United States—though often only with difficulty—are presented first, with a few specialty discs placed in an appendix. (A few of these were released some time ago and are now out of print, but have been included for the sake of completeness.) "Availability," as any serious record collector or librarian knows, is a relative term. Unless you live in a large urban area inhabited by dealers who distribute imported recordings, you will discover that many of the items detailed below are not found at your local record store. Several are them are no longer in the Schwann catalogue—although recordings often turn up in retail stores for years after their deletion from Schwann.


2 Titanic Ti-94. "Solo Music for Natural Horn." Includes Haydn: Divertimento a 3 in Eb Major; Beethoven: Sonata for Horn and Piano in F Major, op. 17; and Ries: Sonata for Horn and Piano in F Major, op. 34. Jean Rife, horn; Martin Perlman, fortepianos; Daniel Stepner, violin.

3 Deutsche Harmonia Mundi 1C 065-99 713. Beethoven: Septet in Eb Major, op. 20. Members of the Collegium Aureum on original instruments.


5 Pleiades P 106. Beethoven: Serenade for Flute, Violin, and Viola, op. 25; Charles Nicholson: Variations on Auld Lange Syne. [Also includes works by Pleyel and C. P. E. Bach.] David Hart and Sandra Miller, flutes; Nancy Wilson, violin; David Miller, viola. [Instruments from the collection of the Metropolitan Museum of Art.]

6 Amon Ra SAR 9 [Finchcock Series, vol. 5]. Beethoven: Sonatas for Piano and Violin in F Major, op. 24; and in C Minor, op. 30, no. 2. Ralph Holmes, violin [Stradivarius, 1736]; Richard Burnett, fortepiano [Graf, ca. 1820].

7 Nonesuch N-78008-A. Beethoven: Piano Sonatas in F Major, op. 10, no. 2; and in D Minor, op. 31, no. 2, "Tempest." Malcolm Bilson, fortepiano [copy by Philip Belt of 5-octave Walter, ca. 1781].

8 Pro-Arte PAL-1029 [formerly BASF [Deutsche Harmonia Mundi] EA 229 017]. Beethoven: Symphony No. 3 in Eb Major, op. 55, "Eroica." Collegium Aureum on original instruments.

9 L'Oiseau-Lyre DSLO 535. Beethoven: Songs (includes An die ferne Geliebte and thirteen others). Martyn Hill, tenor; Christopher Hogwood, fortepiano [Andreas Stein, collection of C. F. Col].


11 Astreé AS 73. Beethoven: Piano Sonatas in C
Major, op. 5; in F# Major, op. 78; and in E minor, op. 90. Paul Badura-Skoda, fortepiano [Georg Hasska, ca. 1815].

12 Colosseum SM 632. Beethoven: Works for piano, including the sonatas, op. 13, 90, and 110. Jörg Demus, fortepianos [Graf, ca. 1826; Streicher, ca. 1816].

13 Pro Arte PAL-1026. Beethoven: Adagio, Variations, and Rondo in G Major on Ich bin der Schneider Kakadu for Piano Trio, op. 121a. [Also includes Carl Czerny: Fantasia Concertante for Piano, Flute, and Cello, op. 256, and Ferdinand Ries: Piano Trio in Bb Major, op. 28.] Jaap Schröder, violin; Frans Vester, transverse flute; Anner Bylsma, violoncello; Piet Honingh, clarinet; Stanley Hoogland, fortepiano.


17 Deutsche Harmonia Mundi 1C 157-99 668/69 QA. Beethoven: Missa solemnis, op. 123. Geszty, Soffel, Rendall, Widmer, Suddeutsche Madrigalchor, Collegium Aureum (on original instruments); Wolfgang Gönnenwein, conductor. Two records.

18 Amon Ra SAR 8 (Finchcocks Series, vol. 4). “Clementi, Late Piano Works 1821.” Includes the Sonata in G Minor, op. 50, no. 3, Didone abbandonata—Scena tragica, and Twelve Monferrinas, op. 49. Richard Burnett, fortepiano [Clementi, 1822].

19 Deutsche Harmonia Mundi 1C 065-99 834. 22 Goethe Lieder of Václav Jan Tomášek. Kurt Widmer, baritone; Klaus Lindner, fortepiano [Streicher, 1816].

20 Toccata FCN 53 613. Four-hand music of Weber (Huit Pièces, op. 60) and Diabelli [Sonata in D Major, op. 33]. Fritz Neumeyer and Rolf Junghanns, fortepiano [Streicher, 1816].


24 L’Oiseau-Lyre DSLO 656. Schubert: Three Violin Sonatas, op. 137. Jaap Schröder, violin [Stradivarius, 1709]; Christopher Hogwood, fortepiano [Haschka, ca. 1825; collection of C. F. Colt].


27 Deutsche Harmonia Mundi 1C 065-99 732. Schubert: String Quartet in A Minor, D. 804, Quartettsatz in C Minor, Quartett Collegium Aureum on original instruments.


29 Toccata FSM 53612. Schubert, works for piano four-hands: Grand Rondeau, op. 107; Andante Variations, op. 84, no. 1; Fantasy, op. 103. Fritz Neumeyer and Rolf Junghanns, fortepiano [Graf, ca. 1826].


33 Intercord INT 160.845. Schubert: Die schöne Müllerin, D. 795. Peter Schreier, tenor; Steven Zehr, fortepiano [Könnicke]. Two records.


36 Amon Ra SAR 13. Schubert: Piano Sonatas in G Major, op. 78; and in A Minor, op. 143. Howard Shelley, fortepiano [Johann Fritz, ca. 1814].

37 Toccata FSM 53 620. “Schubert: Nachtstücke.” Includes six songs and the Divertissement...
in E Minor, op. 63. Theo Altmeyer, tenor; Fritz Neumeyer and Rolf Junghanns, fortepiano [same as 30].

38 Claves D 508. Schubert: Impromptus, op. 90, Moments musicaux, op. 94. Jörg Ewald Dahler, fortepiano [same as 30].


43 Claves D 8011. Schubert: Piano Sonata in Bb Major, D. 960; Fantasie in C Major, D. 605A. Jörg Ewald Dahler, fortepiano [same as 30].

44 L'Oiseau-Lyre DSLO 571. Schubert: Violin Sonata, D. 574; Mendelssohn: Violin Sonata, op. 4. Jaap Schroder, violin; Christopher Hogwood, fortepiano.

45 Amon Ra SAR 12 [Finchcocks Series, vol. 8]. Hummel: Sonatas for Violin and Piano in Eb Major, op. 5, no. 3; and in D Major, op. 50; Nocturne, op. 99. Ralph Holmes, violin (Stradavari, 1736); Richard Burnett, fortepiano [Graf, ca. 1820].

46 L'Oiseau-Lyre DSLO 530. Johann Nepomuk Hummel: Piano Sonatas in F# Minor, op. 81; and in D Major, op. 106. Malcolm Binns, fortepiano [Haschka, ca. 1825, and Schmidt, ca. 1830; both from the collection of C. F. Colt].

47 L'Oiseau-Lyre DSLO 501. Hummel: Clarinet Quartet in Eb Major; Bernhard Crussel: Clarinet Quartet No. 2 in C Minor, op. 4. The Music Party [Alan Hacker, clarinet; Duncan Druce, violin; Simon Rowland-Jones, viola; Jennifer Ward Clarke, cello].


50 L'Oiseau-Lyre DSLO 553. Weber: Clarinet Quintet, op. 34; Krommer: Clarinet Quartet, op. 82. The Music Party [featuring Alan Hacker, clarinet].

51 L'Oiseau-Lyre DSLO 524. Weber: Grand Duo Concertant for Clarinet and Piano, op. 48; Robert Schumann: Märchenzärtlichungen für Clarinet, Violin, and Piano, op. 132; Mikhail Ivanovich Glinka: Trio Pathétique for Clarinet, Bassoon, and Piano. The Music Party [Alan Hacker, clarinet; Richard Burnett, fortepiano; Duncan Druce, viola; Hansjurg Lange, bassoon].


53 Prelude PRS 2804. “Mendelssohn and John Field: Piano Works Played on Instruments of the Period.” Richard Burnett, fortepiano [Clementi, ca. 1821; Broadwood, 1823].

54 Deutsche Harmonia Mundi 1C 151-99 773/4. Schumann: Piano works, including Kinderzenen, op. 15; Faschingsschwung aus Wien, op. 26, Waldszenen, op. 82. Jörg Demus, fortepiano [Graf, 1839; Streicher, 1841]. Two records.


56 Argo ZK 59. “Chopin Piano Music.” 9 works, including the Fantasie-Impromptu, op. 66; the Ballade in F Minor, op. 52; and the gercuse, op. 57. Kenneth von Barthold, piano [Broadwood, 1848].

57 BASF 25 21577-6. Chopin: Grand Duo Concertant for Piano and Violoncello; Polonaise Brillante for Violoncello and Piano, op. 3; Sonata in G Minor for Violoncello and Piano, op. 65. Anner Blyssma, violoncello [G. Pressenda, 1835]; Gerard van Blerk, piano [Erad, 1840].

58 Pandora PAN 107. Chopin: Etudes, ops. 10 and 25 [complete]. Martha Goldstein, piano [Erad, 1851; collection of Glenn White, Seattle].

59 Pandora PAN 109. “Favorites of Chopin and Liszt Played on a Piano of Their Day.” Martha Goldstein, piano [same as 58].


61 L'Oiseau-Lyre DSLO 539. Liszt: Piano music, including Légendes, Ave Maria, Miserere from Il Trovatore, and three other operatic transcriptions. Malcolm Binns, piano [Erad, 1868; collection of C. F. Colt].

62 Peerless ORYX 803 [The Colt Clavier Collection, vol. 3]. Charles-Valentin Alkan; piano music, including six of the Preludes, op. 31: Le Festin d'Espe from op. 39; and the Allegro Barbaro, op. 50. Ronald Smith, piano [Schneider, 1851, and Erad, 1855; both from the collection of C. F. Colt].

63 Amon Ra SAR 10 [Finchcocks Series, vol. 6]. “Clarinet Collection.” Includes music of Scarlatti,


65 Amon Ra SAR 3. “A Graf Fortepiano Recital.” Music of Schumann [Papillons, op. 2], Liszt [Harmonies poétiques et religieuses], Schubert [Sonata in A Minor, D. 537], and Chopin [Nocturnes in E Minor, op. 72; and Ć Minor, op. post.]. Richard Burnett, fortepiano [Graf, 1826].

66 Amon Ra SAR 7. “The Romantic Fortepiano.” Music of Hummel [Ten Variations on a Theme from Gluck’s Armida], Chopin [Andante spinato from op. 22], Schubert [11 miscellaneous dances], Schumann [Kinderszenen], and Czerny [Five Variations on a theme of Rode, op. 33, La Ricordanza]. Richard Burnett, fortepiano [same as 65].


70 Deutsche Harmonia Mundi 1C 065-99 796/7 (formerly Harmonia Mundi 29 29069/7; listed but not reviewed in original article). “Instrumente der Meister.” Keyboard music of Beethoven, Schubert, Schumann, and Chopin. Jörg Demus, fortepianos [instruments by Walter, Stodart, Streicher, Schweighofer, Rausch, Graf, Gräf, and Pleyel]. Two records.

SPECIALTY RECORDS

71 Deutsches Museum, Munich 0654070. “Music Through Four Centuries.” Keyboard instruments, including music by Beethoven. Li Stadelmann and Heinz Schnauffer, keyboards.

72 Deutsches Museum, Munich M 407700. “Bleichblainsstrumente.” Includes the Beethoven Horn Sonata, op. 17, with a Ziegler fortepiano from 1810, and the Strauss Andante for Horn and Piano with a Blüthner piano of 1924.

73 Colosseum M1010 [45 rpm]. Includes a performance by Ernst Gröschel of Beethoven’s Polonaise in C Major, op. 89, performed on a Broadwood of ca. 1815 from the Rück collection in Nürnberg.

74 Musica Rara MUS 71, side B includes keyboard music by Steibelt [performed on a giraffe piano of ca. 1810 by van der Hoef] and Sydney Smith [performed on a Wornum grand of ca. 1875].


76 Troldhaugen Trolld 2: “Toner fra Troldhaugen: A Recital Recorded in Edvard Grieg’s Home.” Songs and piano pieces recorded on the Steinway presented to Grieg in 1892. Olav Eriksen and Audun Kayser.