

FROM

Richard Griscom and David Lasocki. *The Recorder: A Research and Information Guide*. New York: Routledge, 2003.

1789. Dart, Thurston. "Bach's 'Fiauti d'Echo.'" *Music & Letters* 41, no. 4 (October 1960): 331–41.

Argues that Bach's *fiauti d'echo* are bird flageolets in G sounding an octave higher than written. Dart's reasoning in support of the flageolet is tenuous and many of his conclusions are not convincing. He notes the numerous references in London newspapers between 1713 and 1718 to James Paisible's performances on an "echo flute." If performances on the "echo flute" were popular, Dart suggests that we might expect to find contemporary tutors for the instrument, but there are none. Possibly laymen referred to the "echo flute" by another name, just as they called the recorder a "flute" and the chalumeau a "mock trumpet." If so, Dart sees the French flageolet as the likely candidate for "echo flute" because of its popularity at the time. He then addresses the question of how Bach might have become familiar with the flageolet in Cöthen. Musical and political links existed between London and Berlin at the time.

Dart also presents musical reasons for using instruments sounding an octave higher than written: "[T]he inescapable fact remains that the gentle sounds of two treble recorders are quite inaudible during a considerable part of the work. . . . The only solution to all the problems encountered in the Brandenburg concerto is to assume that the *flauto d'echo* parts sounded an octave higher than written." This conclusion is supported by a letter in 42, no. 1 (January 1961): 101 by Peter F. Williams, who notes that certain eighteenth-century organs included stops with the designation "echo," which seems to have been an octave coupler. The fault with Dart's suggestion that the instruments were flageolets in G is hidden away in a footnote (p. 340): "the low F in bar 183 of the first movement is outside the compass of the instrument." Dale Higbee takes note of this problem with Dart's theory in 43, no. 2 (April 1962): 192–93 and argues that the intended instruments are altos in F. He suggests that Bach used the designation *echo* "because of the way they answer (or echo) and interchange with each other."

Dart's thoughts on the roles of the recorder and flageolet in the Baroque are also a part of his "Performance Practice in the 17th and 18th Centuries: Six Problems in Instrumental Music," in *International Musicological Society: Report of the Eighth Congress, New York 1961*, vol. 1: *Papers* (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1961), 234–35.

1790. Krainis, Bernard. "Bach and the Recorder in G." *American Recorder* 2, no. 4 (fall 1961): 7.

Suggests the possibility that the "flauto I" part of the Brandenburg Concerto no. 4 was written for recorder in G rather than F. Letter from Wesley M. Oler in 4, no. 3 (August 1963): 22 cites several references to Paisible's "echo flute" in English newspapers. Oler follows up in 4, no. 4 (November 1963): 21 by acknowledging Thurston Dart's earlier consideration of the Paisible echo flute (see item 1789), which had been brought to Oler's attention after writing the letter.

1791. "Bach's Brandenburgs and the Recorder." *Recorder and Music Magazine* 1, no. 4 (February 1964): 113.

Summarizes the discussion of the *fiauti d'echo* controversy in Norman Carrell's *Bach's Brandenburg Concertos* (London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1963). For some time, it was thought that the term *d'echo* simply referred to the echo effects in the slow movement, but the discovery of references to an "echo flute" in London newspapers dating from 1713–18 suggests that perhaps Bach had a specific instrument in mind. Cites a number of problems with Thurston Dart's theory (see item 1789) that the intended instrument might have been a flageolet in G. Carrell supports the use of recorders. Internal evidence—and Bach's practice in other works—leads him to conclude that the appropriate instruments are a pair of altos: one in G and one in F. Beverly Smith argues in favor of two altos in F in a letter in 1, no. 5 (May 1964): 154. More letters in 1, no. 6 (August 1964): 185.

1792. Montagu, Jeremy. "What Was the Flauto d'Echo?" *FoMRHI Quarterly*, no. 23 (April 1981): 20–21.

By comparing the Fourth Brandenburg Concerto with Bach's arrangement of it as the Concerto in F Major for Harpsichord, Two *Fiauti à bec*, and Strings (BWV 1057), Montagu comes to the conclusion that the *fiauti d'echo* were not plain recorders but capable of making a genuine echo. Considers "the only probability" that they had "some mechanical device such as an additional thumb or finger hole which would increase the area of open hole and thus sharpen the pitch just enough to compensate for the drop in air pressure of the *piano* passages."

1793. Higbee, Dale. "Bach's 'Fiauti d'Echo.'" *Galpin Society Journal* 39 (1986): 133.

Reconsiders the identity of the *fiauti d'echo*. Proposes that the “echo” is not a description of the instrument but rather the manner in which it was played—offstage, to provide a genuine soft answering effect. Bernard Krainis describes his theory that the instrument was an alto recorder fitted with a “whisper key” in *American Recorder* 29, no. 2 (May 1988): 76.

1794. Martin, John. “Echoes from the Past.” *Recorder: Journal of the Victorian Recorder Guild*, no. 9 (February 1989): 1–3.

Summarizes the views of various authors from Carl Dolmetsch (1941) to Dale Higbee (1986) on the identity of the *fiauti d'echo*. Concludes that they were probably altos in F, or altos in G and F; or else the term is a simple misprint. Continued by items **1795** and **1797**.

1795. Morgan, Fred, John Martin, and Malcolm Tattersall. “Echoes Resounding.” *Recorder: Journal of the Victorian Recorder Guild*, no. 10 (December 1989): 19–24.

A series of letters to the editor continuing Martin’s speculations on the identity of Bach’s *fiauti d'echo* (see item **1794**). Morgan supports the idea that they were altos in G and F. Tattersall demolishes Dart’s idea that they were flageolets. Martin cites historical evidence for his new belief that they consisted of two recorders fastened together to play loud and soft. Tattersall concludes that “the issue is ultimately unresolvable.” Continued by item **1797**.

1796. Marissen, Michael. “Organological Questions and Their Significance in J.S. Bach’s Fourth Brandenburg Concerto.” *Journal of the American Musical Instrument Society* 17 (1991): 5–52.  
A slightly updated version of chapter 2 from item **1787**.

1797. Lasocki, David. “More on Echo Flutes.” *Recorder: Journal of the Victorian Recorder Guild*, no. 13 (July 1991): 14–16.

A follow-up to items **1794** and **1795**. Refutes John Martin’s suggestion that Bach’s term *fiauti d'echo* was a misprint. Then asserts that there are only two general avenues of approach to the identity of those instruments: Bach had in mind an instrument called an echo flute, or else the instruments were plain recorders and the appendage “d’echo” referred to an echo effect, either literal or figurative. Taking the first approach, shows that James Paisible’s echo flutes were at least similar to ordinary recorders, adds two references to support John Martin’s theory that they could have consisted of two recorders fastened together, and modifies Dart’s belief that they could have found their way to Berlin and Bach. Taking the second approach, reports a reference to “flauti eco” in 1704, but opts for Michael Marissen’s view (see items **1787** and **1796**) that Bach intended a figurative echo.

1798. Lasocki, David. “Paisible’s Echo Flute, Bononcini’s *Flauti Eco*, and Bach’s *Fiauti d’Echo*.” *Galpin Society Journal* 45 (March 1992): 59–66.

An extended version of the arguments presented in item **1797**.

\* Martin, John. *The Acoustics of the Recorder*. Cited above as item **681**.

1799. Power, Tushaar. “On the Pitch Dispositions of Bach’s *fiauti d'echo* and Other Treble Recorders.” *Galpin Society Journal* 47 (March 1994): 155–60.

Power develops a case for one of the two *fiauti d'echo* that J.S. Bach scored for in his Brandenburg Concerto no. 4 being an alto recorder in G (the other being the standard alto recorder in F). The gist of his argument is that when Bach’s recorder parts descend to f<sup>1</sup> he never requires the instrument to produce ff<sup>3</sup>; and that when Bach does require ff<sup>3</sup> of an alto recorder, the part never descends below g<sup>1</sup>. Michael Marissen (see item **1800**) convincingly, for our money, shows that these conditions do not in fact hold up to scrutiny.

1800. Marissen, Michael. “Bach and Recorders in G.” *Galpin Society Journal* 48 (March 1995): 199–204.

Marissen, replying to an article by Tushaar Power (item **1799**), claims that, in arguing for recorders in G, Power made a high number of errors that confound his argument. Power, in response, says that Marissen’s argument “rests on numerous unqualified assumptions . . . a presumed intimacy with J.S. Bach,” and faulty logic. One of the difficulties of debating such an issue is that there are many theories chasing a small and ambiguous body of evidence. Reply by Power on pages 265–69.

1801. Goebel, George H. "New Evidence on the Echo Flute." *Galpin Society Journal* 48 (March 1995): 205–7.

Reports a new source of information about what seems to be an echo flute, although the quotation is puzzling. In his *Elements ou principes de musique* (Amsterdam, 1696), Etienne Loulié, who was among other things a recorder player and teacher, wrote, "Les sons de deux flûtes d'écho sont differents, parce que l'un est *fort*, & que l'autre est *foible*" (The sounds of two echo flutes are different, because one is strong and the other is weak). Goebel takes this to mean that the echo flute was an instrument that could play both loud and soft. But why, then, would one need *two* instruments to play loud and soft? Did Loulié mean that one *half* of an echo flute played loud and the other soft, or is there some other explanation? We already knew that James Paisible was playing on an echo flute in London in the 1710s, but we have only been able to speculate about the nature of that instrument—two recorders tied together?—and Loulié is no help here. Furthermore, as Marissen has previously shown (see items **1787** and **1796**), Bach seems to have intended the *f* and *p* markings in the recorder parts of the Brandenburg Concerto no. 4 to be *tutti* and *solo* rather than soft and loud.

1802. Böhmer, Karl. "Bachs mythologisches Geheimnis: Philip Pickett, Reinhard Goebel und das verborgene Programm der Brandenburgischen Konzerte" [Bach's mythological secret: Philip Pickett, Reinhard Goebel, and the hidden program of the Brandenburg concertos]. *Concerto: Das Magazin für Alte Musik*, no. 109 (December 1995/January 1996): 15–17.

Suggests that the set of six Brandenburg Concertos may have had a mythological program, related to the symbolism of instruments in the Baroque and the decorations and layout of Baroque palaces (such as that of the Margrave of Brandenburg). The First Concerto depicts the Margrave as Hunter, the Second as Hero (with the recorder, oboe, and violin playing Dionysus, Hera, and Apollo to the trumpet's Hercules), and the Third as Muse. In the Fourth Concerto the Margrave is Shepherd, with the recorders playing Pan to the violin's Phoebus/Apollo (or Echo in the slow movement). The program is completed by the Margrave as Lover in the Fifth Concerto and Learned Man in the Sixth.

1803. Martin, John. "Los fiauti d'écho en el 4<sup>o</sup> Concierto de Brandenburgo de J.S. Bach." *Revista de flauta de pico*, no. 4 (January 1996): 13–17.

Spanish translation of appendix 1 from item **681**.

1804. Smith, Mark. "J.S. Bach's 'Fiauti d'écho': Recorders Off-Stage." *FoMRHI Quarterly*, no. 82 (January 1996): 41–42.

Smith considers the question of the placement of the *fiauti d'écho* from Bach's Fourth Brandenburg Concerto on the stage. "Echo" in Bach's time was used with a meaning closer to the original story of Narcissus and Echo in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. Because Echo's love was not returned by the narcissistic Narcissus, "from sheer grief Echo dissolved into nothing but a voice, which awakened only on being called upon by human sounds, when she was able to answer the caller from the hollows and caverns of mountains and groves." Thus an "echo" could be reflected sound or a phrase repeated at a fairly large physical distance by a performer out of sight. On this and other grounds, Smith concludes that the solo violin and *fiauti d'écho* should play offstage in the second movement, walking back during the opening of the third movement. His unsatisfactory explanation for why the solo violin too should be offstage is that the violin had only an accompanying role in the second movement.

1805. Rampe, Siegbert, and Michael Zapf. "Neues zu Besetzung und Instrumentarium in Joh. Seb. Bachs Brandeburgischen Konzerten Nr. 4 und 5" [News on the instrumentation and instrumentarium in Bach's Brandenburg Concertos nos. 4 and 5]. *Concerto: Das Magazin für alte Musik*, no. 129 (December 1997–January 1998): 30–38; no. 130 (February 1998): 19–22.

The third section of this article (which begins in the first installment and concludes in the second) reconsiders the question of the *fiauti d'écho* in the Fourth Brandenburg Concerto. Begins by going over the recent discussions by Lasocki, Marissen, Martin, Montagu, and so forth (see items **1787**, **1792**, and **1794–1800**), and looking at the evidence for an instrument called an echo flute in the late Baroque (Pepys, Paisible, Banister II, Loulié). Then introduces new evidence: the survival of pairs of identical alto recorders by the same maker (Bressan, Heytz)—the relevance of this to the echo-flute question is unclear; and particularly a pair of recorders of different tonal characteristics joined together at the head and foot joints by brass flanges (anonymous, Saxon, late eighteenth century; Grassi-Museum, Leipzig), which the

authors take to have been an echo flute. Also presents further evidence that Bach's notation (the breaking of beamings plus *f* and *p* markings) in the concerto implies register changes, and therefore he would have needed an echo flute to perform them. The first and third movements of the concerto require only normal alto recorders, so the performers would have switched.