

Hautboy Types

**Bruce Haynes (with some additional material from
Cecial Adkins)**

**Being a collection of postings to the Hautboy
Listserv May - June 2001**

INTRODUCTION

For more than a generation now the harpsichord has been conceived in generally recognized types, based first of all on national styles; the concept of a "French double" is immediately understood, for instance, and the difference in sound between Italian and Flemish instruments is clear in most listeners's ears. I thought of contributing a discussion on hautboy types. My main motive is to get feedback from the many knowledgeable people - it would be useful to me (and I hope to others) to hear what kinds of reactions these proposals might provoke.

The initial important step in defining hautboy types was begun over a half-century ago by one of the first active researchers into the history of our instrument, Eric Halfpenny. One of his most important published studies involved classifying hautboys by the style of their outside shape, or turning profile ("The English 2- and 3-keyed Hautboy," *GSJ* 2, 1949, p. 10). Although Halfpenny's study was based on English models, it is now clear that there was no particular distinction between English and Continental types, so his classifications are valid for hautboys all over Europe. A generally recognized system of typing hautboys is useful, as it makes it easier to describe hautboys quickly, and to compare styles in different periods.

Halfpenny's Type A and Type D hautboys can be divided into three variants. He isolated two other types, B and C, to which I propose adding one more, Type E. I will describe these categories, A1, A2, A3, B, C, D1, D2, D3, and E, in what follows. I'll contribute this in serial form, one type at a time. I look forward to your comments as inspiration strikes you!

One of the challenges of this medium is that pictures are difficult to include and complicated for readers to access. If ever an article needed pictures to illustrate its points, this is it. The first hurdle is to make sure we are all in agreement about the names of the parts of the hautboy, so the different types can be meaningfully compared. Cecil Adkins and I spent some years developing a terminology that is now fortunately in print and can be found in the 2d edition of the *New Grove* (18: 259 - there is one mistake there, as the "tone-hole cove" is called a "cover"), and in the *FoMRHI Quarterly* 83 (April 1996), pp. 31-34. A German version of this terminology is in the new *MGG*, 7:513-16. Jan Bouterse used a similar Dutch terminology in his important new dissertation, *Nederlandse Houtblaasinstrumenten en hun bouwers, 1660-1760* (Utrecht, 2001). These diagrams show the standard turning elements in

use from the late 17th to the early 19th centuries, although many instruments differed in details.

We can be fairly sure that Type A was generally made in the period before 1730, while the others were made later, but our knowledge of dating hautboys is still meagre, so it is not possible to be completely sure which types belonged to specific periods. Type D2, it seems, belonged exclusively to the classical period. The nine categories, placed next to each other for comparison, are about to appear in print in two places: the upcoming number of *Tibia*, and in my new book *The Eloquent Oboe* (OUP, appearing this June).

CECIL ADKINS NOTE

As you know, from our many discussions about this classification problem, I have difficulty with Halfpenny's classification. My reservations were first expressed in my Milhouse article in *JAMIS* 22 (1996), 42-88. Halfpenny presented the first organized attempt to classify oboes according to their exterior shape, and the first to suggest some evolutionary trends in English oboes in the eighteenth century (*Galpin Society Journal* (March 1949), 10-31). Halfpenny grouped early oboes into four categories (A,B,C, and D), which ranged from an elaborate Baroque style through two progressively simpler forms and then returned to a more elaborate style--the classical oboe--at the end of the 18th century. As I understand your ideas, you have expanded these four categories to five, several of which are subdivided in order to account for prominent structural variations. I have worked out the attached table (Halfpenny-Haynes Comparison).

I think your explanations of these categories impart a good sense of the structural differences between the groupings, though it seems to me that your extra categories, while necessary for a full explanation, somewhat confound the original chronology established by Halfpenny. Nonetheless, the working out of the ideas (both yours and Halfpenny's) suggest that the reversal of the trend toward simplification of the elaborate Baroque style in the first half of the eighteenth century, and the subsequent return to its many shapes a generation later, was hardly more than serendipitous. About this Halfpenny wrote: "The final form of the simple hautboy, and the type to which additional keys were subsequently added, is a curious reversion to the highly ornamental outline of the Baroque pattern but with some modifications. It is almost impossible to suggest any reason for this remarkable change in fashion. . . . The most prominent feature of Type D is a return to the bulbous top in an exaggerated form with is aptly typified by Adam Carse as 'onion-like'." According to your draft on turning types mentioned above: "Observing these types, the original trend seems to have been toward simplification; Type A2 was less complicated than A1, B less than A2. From about mid-century, however, designs again became more complex. Type E, which may have derived from B, again had more beading, and the classical hautboy, evolving from Type D1 was almost as complex in profile as A2."

My main difficulty with all of this is not the individual classifications, but lack of continuity between them. Was the "reversion to the highly ornamental style" just that, or can continuity be found in the "promising line of inquiry" you suggest in installment two with the remark "to compare the features of hautboys by makers outside of France who first copied French Type A1 models, like Richard Haka (who worked in Amsterdam, c1661-?1699), Andreas Bauer (Leipzig, a1678-1717), and Christoph Denner (Nürnberg, c1678-1707)."

Such a line is not just “promising,” however, for there is an established evolutionary connection between the type A1 (through Denner) and the type D groups that was forged by successive (generational) developments in Nuremberg, Leipzig, Dresden and Vienna. Indeed, the Dresden oboe, which culminates this century of development, was the prototype of all of the type D2 and D3 instruments which are found all over the continent in the last decades of the 18th century. While this substantiates your observation: “. . . it is now clear that there was no particular distinction between English and Continental types, so his [Halfpenny’s] classifications are valid for hautboys all over Europe.”, it cements the relationships in a way not understood by him. At the same time it also refutes his chronology of the types A B C D, and should provide you with a more sound basis for your typological comparisons.

While not necessary for you, much of my above explanation will help provide some orientation for those readers of the list not into this aspect of oboe studies. The details of the German connection can be found in the JAMIS article mentioned at the beginning.

TABLE 1. Cecil Adkins Comparison Table

Halfpenny			Haynes	
A	Basically Baroque elaborate architectural turnings	before 1734	A1	Earliest identifiable oboes c. 1670-1704
			A2	Common International type c. 1670-1763
			A3	Predominantly Dutch c. 1700-1744
B	Reduced, less attractive turnery	1730-1765	B	French, vertically symmetrical baluster ^a 1730 - 1740
C	Straight top	1765-1790	C	Italian-English straight top 1730 - after 1800
D	Classical, return to an exaggerated form of A.	after 1789	D1	Rococo (Type A2), International after 1760
			D2	Classical oboe 1770-1828
			D3	Extreme, elaborate turnery late 18th c
			E	French, stretched form of A2 around 1750

a. Bruce: “misleadingly identified as French and its dates are more definite than I had intended to indicate. But this is a mere quibble.

TYPE A1

Type A1, apparently the earliest true hautboy, appeared at the end of the 1660s, and examples were probably current until the end of the 17th century in France. It is shown in works of art from 1684 to 1704, but might have been made later. It shows certain external features that did not persist, such as the lack of a bell lip, and square or rectangular tone-hole covers. The baluster was not necessarily a quirk ogee (the inverted “vase”) as it was later to become. Mounting studs are associated with this type. Some specimens are exceptionally short, while aggregate tone-hole size is relatively large, averaging 18.8 (I use “aggregate tone-hole size” to mean is the total of the diameters of holes 1, 2, 5, and 6).

One problem with defining Type A1 hautboys is that, although we know they existed, very few original examples survive. As more discoveries are made and instruments are more carefully studied, it will be possible to understand this category better. One promising line of inquiry is to compare the features of hautboys by makers outside of France who first copied French Type A1 models, like Richard Haka (who worked in Amsterdam, c1661-?1699), Andreas Bauer (Leipzig, a1678-1717), and Christoph Denner (Nürnberg, c1678-1707). Common traits in instru-

ments by these makers would probably have been present on the original models they copied.

Thus at the moment, Type A1 actually serves as a general repository for instruments that are clearly hautbois, were made “early,” and whose features diverge in some way from Type A2 hautbois (that is, standard “baroque hautbois”). Whether instruments within this category do indeed have shared characteristics is not even yet certain.

Examples of Type A1 hautbois include:

- ⤴ Dupuis (Berlin 2933)
- ⤴ Martin (Paris E.210, C.470)
- ⤴ Anonymous Brussels 423
- ⤴ Anonymous Paris E.108
- ⤴ Anonymous Paris E.980.2.149)

TYPE A2

Type A2 is generally thought of as the standard baroque hautboy shape, and with good reason. It is by far the most common, and seems to have been in vogue among makers from the very beginning (about 1670) until at least the 1760s. It is shown in works of art from 1672 to 1763. It includes rich beading, often with complex curves on the centre and bell balusters. The finial was turned both with and without a surmounting ring. The turning profile of the top joint was shallow, but the bell flare was frequently sharp. Although box was normal, other woods were used. The earliest instruments of this type typically show abundant use of ivory tips and occasional tortoiseshell stain.

Type A2 hautbois include:

- ⤴ Anon (? Bressan) (Oxford: Bate 200)
- ⤴ Anon (Paris: Musée de l'Armée)
- ⤴ Colin Hotteterre (Brussels 2320)
- ⤴ Debey (Bate 2)
- ⤴ Rouge (Paris E.979.2.12)
- ⤴ Rippert (Leipzig 1312, Geneva [La Ménestrandie])
- ⤴ Stanesby Sr (Horniman 232, Horniman 277)
- ⤴ Stanesby Jr (Honma, Horniman 1969.683)
- ⤴ Bradbury (Piguet)
- ⤴ Rottenburgh Sr (Pourtois, Piguet)
- ⤴ Naust (Haynes)
- ⤴ Anciuti (Pistoia, Bernardini)
- ⤴ Desjardin[s], Jean-Baptiste (Winston-Salem, NC 0-113)
- ⤴ Rouge (DCM 423)
- ⤴ Stanesby Sr (Hamamatsu ex Rosenbaum A-0166R)
- ⤴ Rottenburgh Sr (Brussels 2608)
- ⤴ Scherer (Munich 66-88)
- ⤴ Anciuti (Rome 0827 and 0828)
- ⤴ Christoph Denner (Nürnberg MI 155, x Nürnberg MI 153, Berlin 2942, St Petersburg 508)
- ⤴ Jacob Denner (Nürnberg MI 90, Vienna 332 [7289], Yale 3411.78, MMA 89.4 1566, St Petersburg 1135, Nürnberg MI 89, Nürnberg MIR 371, Nürnberg MIR 372, Nürnberg MIR 370)
- ⤴ (David?) Denner (Venice Cons. 34)
- ⤴ Paulhahn (Vienna: Harnoncourt)
- ⤴ Gahn (Milan: Cons.)
- ⤴ Oberlender Sr (de Vries)
- ⤴ Königsberger (Nürnberg MIR 368)
- ⤴ Eichentopf (Halle MS 420, Lisbon MIC-0106)
- ⤴ Schuechbaur (Venice Cons. 33)
- ⤴ Haka (Dombrecht)
- ⤴ Aardenberg (de Vries)
- ⤴ Terton (Smithsonian 208.185)
- ⤴ Steenberg (de Vries)
- ⤴ Schlegel (Basel 1878.16)

Type A2 hautboys would of course have played most of the best known “baroque” literature written before 1730. But this type needs to be further subdivided into instruments that play best at about A-415 or above and those built for lower pitches (about A-403 and A-392). This distinction can be of considerable importance to players, as the techniques, fingerings, and reeds are noticeably different for hautboys at lower pitches, even if the instruments are similar in appearance and show no obvious outward differences.

TYPE A3

Type A3 is a profile used by some Dutch makers, current from the end of the 17th century and persisting possibly as late as the 1760s. It shows unusually sharp flares at both ends: the finial and short bell, and an “emphatic roundness” (Adkins 1990:46) at the balusters. Aggregate tone-hole size is typically on the small side, averaging 15.8, but bores are relatively wide: the length is standard.

Examples (selection):

- ⤴ Haka (Stockholm 155, x Berlin 936, Amsterdam: de Vries)
- ⤴ Heerde (Brussels 177)
- ⤴ H. and F. Richters (apparently exclusively; see Adkins 1990 and Bouterse 2001)
- ⤴ Rýkel (The Hague Ea 6-x-1952)
- ⤴ Wýjne (v.d. Grinten)

Although Dutch makers are associated with Type A3, many are also survived by Type A2 hautboys, and Haka and Rýkel are survived by both types. Rýkel’s trade card, dated 1705, shows hautboys of Type A2.

TYPE B

Type B probably appeared in the 1730s or 40s, but there are too few survivors to securely date it. It is not shown in any known works of art. The Stanesby Jr in the Bate Collection is a beautiful example (cf. *The Eloquent Oboe*, Illustration 31-4), and the shape of the top joint of this hautboy resembles the bell of a Stanesby Jr bassoon dated 1747 in the possession of William Waterhouse (a picture of this bassoon is published in Young 1982a, Plate VI). Survivors are known from France, Holland, and England. In Type B, beading is simplified or absent, the bulge that takes the place of the top baluster is symmetrical and unframed by beads. The walls of the top column are unusually thick (giving it a particularly warm tone). The center “baluster” is similar to the corresponding point on Stanesby’s traversos. The Stanesby Jr has key bosses instead of rings. Aggregate tone-hole size is large, averaging 18.1.

Examples (selection):

- ⤴ Deschamps (London: T. Bingham and Berlin 2934)
- ⤴ Van de Knikker (DHgm Ea 14-x-1952 and Ea 3-x-1993)
- ⤴ Thomas Lot (Bate 24; shown in the oboe article of the *New Grove*)
- ⤴ Martin Lot (x Berlin 2947)
- ⤴ Schuchart (Glasgow A42-68ao)
- ⤴ J. Crone (Markneukirchen 1116)

TYPE C

Type C is commonly known as the “straight-top.” It represented an abandonment of the traditional unity of design turnery between the three joints, each with its matching upper baluster¹. The top joint of Type C was turned without finial, baluster, or beads, but slightly conical in profile. The center joint and bell retained balusters, normally reinforced with ivory or metal. The first datable indications of the existence

1. Superficially at least the shape of each baluster is similar: an “inverted vase.” Of course the top baluster has an additional finial above it (usually a spool shape)

of Type C come from northern Italy; Anciuti began making Type C's possibly as early as c1709 (cf. London: V & A 23/2); one of his straight-tops is dated 1738 (Rome 1094). Ghezzi's caricature of the hautboist "Giuseppe," showing a Type C, was probably made before 1730. Straight-tops were evidently common in Italy by the 1740s and 50s. Tirabosco's portrait of the famous hautboist Matteo Bissoli shows him holding a very thin, straight-topped hautboy. The other country where Type C was popular was England (Halfpenny, in fact, considered the straight-top model "typically English"); it appeared there into the 19th century. Straight-tops appear in works of art from c1746 to 1789.

Examples (selection):

- ⤴ Anciuti (V & A, Y3; Rome, Y6)
- ⤴ Cosins (Nürnberg MIR 375)
- ⤴ Palanca (Vindelle: Ecochard)
- ⤴ Stanesby Jr (Hamamatsu A-0243R)
- ⤴ Gedney (Vermillion 5298, Christie's sale, 12 June 1996)
- ⤴ Cahusac Sr (Horniman 14.5.47/88)
- ⤴ Miller (Bate x20, Brussels 964)
- ⤴ Milhouse (Bate 26, Hamamatsu A-0244R)
- ⤴ Goulding (Edgware: Boosey & Hawkes 203)
- ⤴ V. Panormo (Piguet)

Stanesby Jr is survived by a Type C, and two by his apprentice Caleb Gedney are extant. There is a good chance that the straight-top model, which Anciuti was already making in the 1730s, was brought from Milan to London by Giuseppe Sammartini, who was very much the superstar instrumentalist in England from 1729 (Handel wrote fabulous solos for him in operas, which he played as a soloist, not being a member of the opera orchestra). With its obviously different appearance, the Type C could well have been associated with him.

The player shown in the frontispiece to *The compleat tutor for the hautboy*, brought out in about 1746 by John Simpson, is probably Sammartini, to judge from the resemblance of the subject to a picture of Sammartini called "Concert Italien." The player is holding a Type C hautboy, and whoever he was, it is clear that the Type C was in use in England in the 1740s. Stanesby's straight-top (and others like it that have not survived) was most likely made before Sammartini's death in 1750 (Stanesby himself died in 1754). Soon afterwards, Type C became all the rage in England, so it is likely that from the 1740s many English and Italian hautboists would have used such instruments.

TYPE D

Halfpenny called this "the final form of the simple hautboy, and the type to which additional keys were subsequently added." The earliest examples probably date from about the middle of the 18thC. Three variants are contained in this Type.

TYPE D1

Type D1 first appeared in the so-called "rococo" period. It used elements of both the standard baroque Type A2 and the later "classical" Type D2. Type D1 had fewer beads than Type A2 (as Michel Piguet pointed out, the lower bell waist bead disappeared, for instance), and the embellishments it retained were very thin and fine. The profile of the top column was often concave rather than straight. It had a rounded centre baluster like Type A. The bell formed a single simple flare from top to bottom below a symmetrically-centred baluster; there were normally only two beads or bead complexes on the bell, one at the waist and the other about where the upper flare beads were placed on Type A2. The slightly expanded rim blended into the flare. Type D1's generally had narrow minimum bores. Extant hautboys of Type D1 were made all over Europe. To judge from pictures, they had appeared by

at least the 1760s (a Type D1 survives by Gottlieb Crone, who died in 1768, and Palanca, who is survived by several Type D1's, had stopped working by ca.1770). They continued to be made into the 19th century. Examples:

- ⌘ Palanca (Bologna 1800, Brussels 422, Musashino A720, Bernardini, Berlin 5336)
- ⌘ Crone (Utrecht: Ehrenfeld 8, de Vries)
- ⌘ M. Lot (Brussels 1980)
- ⌘ A. Grenser, dated 1790 (Leipzig 3524)
- ⌘ C.W. Sattler (Piguet, Linz Mu 115)
- ⌘ Mason (Honma)
- ⌘ Astor (de Vries)
- ⌘ Rocko Baur (Linz Mu 45 [117], Milan Cons. 117)
- ⌘ Lempp (Linz Mu 120 [116])
- ⌘ Schlegel (de Vries, Piguet)
- ⌘ Delusse (de Vries, Burgess, Piguet #9, Paris 1186/1113, Paris C.479, E.367, Paris C.480, E.387, Paris C.481, E.263, Paris E.1807)
- ⌘ Goulding (Horniman 14.5.47/18, 1969/682)

TYPE D2

This is the form generally thought of as the “classical” hautboy. It is shown in works of art from c1770 to c1828. One of the ways it differed from Type D1 was the placement of the bulge on the balusters, which was clearly higher. The centre baluster was also sharply hooked; Cecil Adkins (1999:117ff) compares this shape to the Greek “hawksbeak” moulding. Most turning gestures were “proud” and thin (e.g. Floth). The bell rim, unlike Type D1, was quite prominent. Minimum bores of surviving examples vary between 4.4 and 5.0, with an average of 4.7.

Type D, like Type A, was popular during a period of stability. Both types served as “classic” shapes recognized everywhere as a consistent standard over the period of at least a generation. The proportions of Type D contrasted with Type A, however. The top baluster was quite pronounced compared to that of A2 models (such as Jacob Denner’s or Paulhahn’s). The bell had a complex double-flare, the portion below the flare beads being less flared and almost vertical. Late 18th-century hautboy balusters followed much more strictly the principles of classic geometric proportion, quite literally reproducing the antique Greek shapes that inspired molding design (cf. Adkins 1999:119ff). By contrast, the balusters of earlier 18th-century hautboys were freer and less literal in following classical principles. It is as if the Type D profile was a self-conscious attempt to improve on the Type A by being more “correct;” this may reflect a general respect for formalism in the classical period. The shape of late 18th-century balusters, which to modern eyes seem exaggerated, was quite stylized and consistent.

Examples:

- ⌘ Rocko Baur (Kremsmünster: Preiss)
- ⌘ Hammig (Linz Mu 121)
- ⌘ Cahusac (RCM 326 0/1)
- ⌘ Collier (Maunder, Piguet)
- ⌘ Goulding (Halfpenny, Hamamatsu)
- ⌘ W. Milhouse (Hamamatsu, Victoria)
- ⌘ J. Crone (de Vries, Lisbon OB.15, MIC.0615)
- ⌘ Engelhard (Leipzig 1324, Piguet)
- ⌘ A. Grenser (Piguet, Leipzig 3524)
- ⌘ H. Grenser (New York, Leipzig 1317, Hamamatsu)
- ⌘ Grundmann (Berlin, Vermillion, Piguet, RCM 75, Leipzig 3499, 1330, Hamburg 1912.1551, 1912.1552, etc.)
- ⌘ Floth (Haynes, Yale)
- ⌘ Kirst (Piguet)
- ⌘ C. Sattler (Linz)
- ⌘ Doleisch (Prague)
- ⌘ Hammig (Vienna, Linz)
- ⌘ Delusse (Paris C.1114, E.1187, de Vries)
- ⌘ Prudent (Brussels 3116)

Considering how quickly the types were changing, state-of-the-art equipment was evidently important to have, and by 1770 it is probable that most players were switching to the new D2. Thus presumably most music written after that date was played on this model, which apparently satisfied everybody for some time. It remained in vogue until the first decade of the 19th century (the Grensers and Grundmann/Floth changed their models only slightly during that period).

TYPE D3

This Type differed from the D2 in the very high top baluster bulge, which was even more extreme than those of Grundmann and Floth, being in a higher position and using a sharper swelling, and comparable to the high hooked center baluster bulge on Type D2. It is not shown in any known works of art. The center baluster of Type D3 could be either rounded or hooked. The bell flare was complex.

The known examples probably date from 1760-1790:

- ⤴ Biglioni Y3 (Bernardini)
- ⤴ Panormo (Vries)
- ⤴ Schlegel (Leipzig 1322)

TYPE E

Surviving examples of Type E, which are fairly common, were primarily made in francophone cultures (France, the Austrian Netherlands, and Switzerland) in the decades before 1750 and until the end of the century. (A *Vox Humana* by Ioanni Panormo is also a Type E profile.) Type E is shown in works of art from c1750 to 1761. The instrument gives the impression of a Type A2 that had been stretched: Type E's are among the longest hautboys that survive, and the swellings at the balusters and bell flare are very gradual and "streamlined;" beads are present but the smaller flat fillets that in Type A2 accompanied them on either side are often missing. Tone-holes are relatively small.

Examples (selection):

- ⤴ Bizey (Boston 17.1910, Brussels 424, Paris C.1112, E.1047, Bate 201)
- ⤴ Gilles Lot (de Vries, Paris E.2181)
- ⤴ Thomas Lot (Piguet, St Petersburg 512)
- ⤴ Martin Lot (formerly Berlin 2947)
- ⤴ L. Hotteterre (Toho Gakuen)
- ⤴ Lott (DHgm Ea 13-X-1952)
- ⤴ J.H. Rottenburgh (Ann Arbor 667 [52], Brussels 4360, Brussels 966, Brussels 2609)
- ⤴ G.A. Rottenburgh (Brussels 2610)
- ⤴ Schlegel (Piguet)
- ⤴ Prudent (St Petersburg 516, Cottet)

Type E resembles Type B, and may have derived from it; some hautboys are in fact hybrids between the two styles (Anon, Oxford: Bate 292 and Thomas Lot, Bate 24). The minimum bores of Type E are generally small, like those of other later models, whereas Type B bores can be quite large.

The Type E was presumably the kind of hautboy used to play the operas of Rameau as well as the regular revivals of Lully's operas (still at about A-392 or A-2), and French chamber music of the "Louis XV" style, such as pieces by Boismortier, Corrette, Lavigne, and the Chédevilles. In France, it was also probably used to play the foreign music that was coming into vogue at the time, including Vivaldi and the galant pieces of Telemann (although players with a non-French inclination may also have been using the latest Italian instrument, the Type D1, probably pitched at about A-435 or A+0).

SUMMARY

No woodwind design lasted for long in the baroque and classical periods. Models of instruments seem to have been changing at something like the same speed as personal computers today, mutating rapidly to meet new or specialized demands, and quickly jumping national borders. It can be argued that no period before or since has seen so much diversity in oboe design. But as far as I can see, all the known hautboys of the 17th and 18th centuries can be reasonably accommodated in the nine categories discussed above.

Observing these types, the original trend seems to have been toward simplification; Type A2 was less complicated than A1, Type B still less than A2. But from about mid-century, designs again became more complex. Type E, which may have derived from B, again had more beading, and the classical hautboy, evolving from Type D1, was almost as complex in profile as the typical "baroque hautboy."

Using letters and numbers to identify the types (as Halfpenny and I have done) may not appeal to everyone. Types could also be named after other elements with which they are obviously associated: "the Lully hautboy," "the rococo hautboy," "the Sammartini hautboy," etc.

As the saying goes,

We find each other in our similarities, and we know each other in our differences.

In discussing the hautboy's history in *The Eloquent Oboe*, it has helped me to have identified certain outward physical characteristics that group hautboys together and yet distinguish them from other groups. It has made it easier to comprehend the many changes in style in the 18thC, and to relate kinds of hautboys to repertoire. Cecil is right to look beyond the neutral categories to see how they relate to each other, but that is too much to ask of this little article, which I hope will encourage others to develop these ideas further.

SOURCES CITED

Adkins, Cecil. 1990. "Oboes beyond compare: the instruments of Hendrik and Fredrik Richters," JAMIS.

Bouterse, Jan. 2001. *Nederlandse Houtblaasinstrumenten en hun bouwers, 1660-1760* (Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Utrecht)

Halfpenny, Eric. 1949b. "The English 2- and 3-keyed Hautboy," GJSJ 2, p. 10.

Haynes, Bruce. (2001). *The Eloquent Oboe (a history of the hautboy, 1640 to 1760)*. Oxford University Press.

Piguet, Michel. 1988. "Die Oboe im 18. Jahrhundert," *Basler Jahrbuch für historische Musikpraxis* XII, 81-107 (+ Beiheft).

Young, Phillip T. 1982a. Twenty-five hundred historical woodwind instruments.

Cecil Adkins. "Oboes beyond Compare: The Instruments of Hendrik and Fredrik Richters," *Journal of the American Musical Instrument Society (JAMIS)* 16 (1990), 42-117. Also *The Double Reed (IDRS Journal)* Vol. 24 No. 2 (2001).

Cecil Adkins. "William Milhouse and the English Classical Oboe," *JAMIS* 22 (1996), 42-88.

Cecil Adkins. "Proportions and Architectural Motives in the Design of the Eighteenth-Century Oboe," JAMIS 25 (1999), 95-132.

Cecil Adkins. "The German Oboe in the Eighteenth Century," JAMIS 27 (2001), 5-47.