

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I: SURVEY OF HISTORICAL OBOE MAKERS	2
APPENDIX II: SURVEY OF HISTORICAL OBOE PLAYERS	30
APPENDIX III: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF 8- TO 11-KEYED FRENCH SIMPLE SYSTEM OBOES	34

APPENDIX I:
SURVEY OF HISTORICAL OBOE MAKERS

The greatest challenge for the modern-day hautboist confronted with nineteenth-century repertoire in the workplace, above and beyond actually learning how to master the instrument (and make reeds for it accordingly), lies in finding and gaining access to an appropriate oboe, whether it be a copy or an original that is in good playing condition. As stated at the outset of this study, at the time of writing there are no commercially available copies of nineteenth-century oboes. Only six oboe makers worldwide¹ have attempted to copy Romantic models, and even they have only produced a handful of non-commercialised prototypes based on German originals.

This is a problem truly unique to historical oboists, seeing as how flautists, bassoonists and clarinetists are now able to depend on reliable builders who produce nineteenth-century facsimiles. Makers such as Schwenk & Seggelke are copying clarinets at 438 Hz after Kayser and Ottensteiner,² whereas Guntram Wolf (Cranach, Germany) produces three replicas of late Romantic bassoons (models by Schemmel, Ziegler, and Grenser-Wiesner, all pitched at 440 Hz).³ Nineteenth-century flutes are now being sold by Martin Wenner (Singen, Germany), who produces an 1835 Viennese model by Koch pitched at “a= 442 Hz (optimal pitch), [which] can be changed from a=445 Hz to a=430 Hz by using [a] tuning slide.”⁴ Flute maker Boaz Berney of Montreal, Canada offers two models by Koch, one from 1815 and another from 1825. Both of these are “pitched between A=430Hz and A=440Hz, with the optimal pitch being somewhere in the middle, around A=435Hz.”⁵ An interesting observation is that none of these builders are currently copying French Romantic instruments.

To address this predicament, I have carried out a survey of historical oboe makers to ascertain why so few of them currently copy ‘Romantic’ instruments (I intentionally exclude here later Classical models fitted with extra keys). Producing a new prototype obviously requires a large financial investment. Do makers wittingly avoid replicating later oboes because the financial resources required to produce them outweigh the return on investment? Is there a fear of not being able to market these new products? Or is it simply a lack of expertise? The goal of this

¹ These makers include Olivier Cottet, Hans-Peter Westermann, Alberto Ponchio, Marc Ecochard, Pau Orriols and Filip Frydrysiak.

² https://www.schwenk-und-seggelke.de/en/klarinetten_historisch.php, accessed 07/02/2022.

³ <https://www.guntramwolf.de/de/instrumente/historisch/fagotte-basshorn>, accessed 21/09/2020.

⁴ <https://www.wennerfloeten.de/en/products/transverse-flutes/st-koch/>, accessed 21/09/2020.

⁵ <http://www.berneyflutes.com/the-flutes/keyed-flutes>, accessed 21/09/2020.

case study has been to better understand the stakes for these builders, shed light on their perceptions of modern nineteenth-century historical performance practice and the role they feel they play in it, and to gain insight on their concerns regarding commercialising these later models.

Over the course of this study, data was collected by contacting a panel of eight historical oboe builders in Europe and North America by email and inviting them to partake in structured interviews. My stance during all correspondence with these participants has been an objective one, and my goal was to display as neutral an attitude as possible in order to avoid influencing any of the respondents. A series of 16 questions were posed to each of the following participants:

1. Henri Gohin (FR)
2. Filip Frydrysiak (PL)
3. Mary Kirkpatrick (USA)
4. Alfredo Bernardini (IT)
5. Sand Dalton (USA)
6. Randall Cook (CH)
7. Richard Earle (UK)
8. Marc Ecochard (FR)

The complete results of this survey may be viewed on the spreadsheet following this section.

Questions for Historical Oboe Makers:

1. What are your perceptions of modern nineteenth-century historical performance practice?
2. Do you feel that the HIP movement is pushing the boundaries of historical performance forward into the nineteenth century? If so, how do you feel about that, and what role do you feel you play in today's HIP of the nineteenth century?
3. What do you think the stakes are for your clientele, that is to say, modern historical oboists?
4. Have you ever experimented or considered experimenting with nineteenth-century oboe models? (Have you ever built a nineteenth-century oboe prototype?)
5. If so, have you ever received requests from clients to copy nineteenth-century models of oboes, or has it been out of personal curiosity?
6. If you were to begin copying a C19 model, which would it be and why? At what pitch would you make your C19 model(s)?
7. What pitch do you believe Romantic repertoire is being performed at these days? 430? 435? 438/440? Or all of the above?
8. What are your concerns regarding commercialising "later" nineteenth-century instruments?
9. Do you feel that the ROI (return on investment) in building nineteenth-century oboes would be insufficient?
10. How do you proceed when selecting which models of eighteenth-century models to copy?
11. The majority of makers nowadays are copying the Stanesby oboe for C18. Why do you think that is?
12. What is the most time-consuming activity in copying oboes?
13. What is the most expensive activity in copying oboes?
14. Aside from the obvious additional keywork, how would building a C19 oboe differ from building a C18 oboe?
15. What would it take to convince you to begin copying nineteenth-century oboes? How many requests/committed purchases would be "sufficient"?
16. Would you feel comfortable tuning a C19 instrument after turning it? Or would you entrust that procedure to a performer with whom you would be willing to work in tandem?

KEY LEARNINGS

AN AWARENESS OF PARADOX

Perhaps the most significant key learning that emerged from this study is that all respondents were well aware that an increase in the performance of ‘historically informed’ nineteenth-century repertoire has created a challenge for their historical oboist clientele in the workplace, and that this phenomenon has opened a gap between demand and supply. For instance, Earle considers that:

in the UK there is a problem finding the right instruments for 19thC repertoire, and many who do play it play on historical instruments, not modern copies. I have been asked about making copies of a German romantic oboe.

Now retired from performance, Earle is a former professional oboist and with several ensembles has participated in recordings of canonical nineteenth-century repertoire.⁶ Well aware of the recent advances being made in nineteenth-century performance practice, he at the same time underlines the field’s subjective and speculative nature:

There is no doubt that the historical approach to performance practise is moving into the 19th century, and much is being understood about various aspects of string and wind playing. So, yes, I think the boundaries are being pushed, but there are no ultimate right answers. The only purpose for more knowledge about how music was played at any point in history is to inject more life into its performance now, otherwise it’s just theory.

Likewise, as a formerly active historical oboist, Cook was also mindful of the predicament of instrument scarcity. Like many, he has been witness to a sort of nonchalant, ‘whatever works’ approach currently adopted by many woodwind instrumentalists in the workplace, and of the hodgepodge instrumentarium now used to perform Romantic works:

Too many people are asking me about Triebert oboes, or instruments that are similar. There was such an incredible variety of oboes at the turn of the [nineteenth] century, and experimentation with bore designs, wall dimensions, oboe bells, and amounts of keys. As I’ve felt with Classical oboes, too many people wanted to have ‘octave keys,’ which were never meant to be octave keys, but rather a key that you would touch quickly to do a slur that otherwise would not be possible on a two-keyed oboe. I see the same thing happening with the 19th century, with [performers using] really late-styled oboes with way too many keys.

⁶ For example, as a member of John Eliot Gardiner’s *Orchestre révolutionnaire et romantique*, Earle participated in the 1993 recording of Berlioz’s *Symphonie Fantastique*, performing on the original violetwood oboe by Brod now housed in the Bate Collection, Oxford.

Marc Ecochard, equally aware of the HP movement's encroachment on later repertoire, notes that historical oboe builders are often called upon to restore original instruments, but cautions that their repair work should strictly be limited to non-invasive acts:

The progression towards 19th-century repertoire is not a new phenomenon among musicians who specialise in 'historical' interpretation. Philippe Herreweghe in particular has distinguished himself for many years now with recordings of Bruckner, Mendelssohn, Schubert, Schumann, Dvorak. [...] Original 19th-century [woodwind] instruments - flutes, oboes, bassoons - still in playing condition are more common and accessible than older instruments; musicians have therefore naturally turned to them. When repair work on these original instruments is required, the builder [...] can only intervene in terms of a slight restoration or repair the keywork, but in no case should they tamper with the acoustic properties of the instrument, which is essential to preserve in its original state (both bore and acoustic length).

A LACK OF PERSONAL INTEREST

One recurring observation was that the majority of the builders surveyed do not have a personal interest in nineteenth-century music performed on historical instruments. This is hardly surprising, seeing as how several of them are not oboists to begin with and only four of the respondents have, or have had, active performing careers as primarily *baroque* oboists (Bernardini, Earle, Cook and Dalton). Dalton explains:

I don't have much interest in the music of the later 19C. The music of the 17 & 18Cs are what have always appealed to me and only those early 19C composers (such as Mendelssohn, Schubert, Beethoven) who learned their trade in the late 18C and in whose music I can still hear the ideals of the previous centuries. I'm not against modern [historical] oboists having a desire to explore and play oboe music from after 1830 or so, but I just don't share it.

Bernardini specifies that his own area of expertise ends with Beethoven, and is clear on his position as a performer:

Personally I find performance of 19th C. music extremely different from that of 18th C. and, while I like to listen to it, I have so far refrained from playing it, because I find it too difficult to adapt to completely different musical esthetics to what I usually do, as in the articulation, the mentality of intonation (high leading notes, etc.), besides of course getting used to a very different reed, oboe and its key system. Besides, I feel there is still enough to discover about the 18th C. oboe and its repertoire and I prefer to devote myself to that. I [therefore] play no role in performing 19th C. music: at the moment, my repertoire stops at early Beethoven, with some very rare exceptions. Nevertheless, I think it's great if people specialize in this repertoire, especially if they do it conscientiously and not just look for a scoop or for a commercial outcome. As it often happens in HIP, some of the initiatives give clear priority to an easy solution at the expenses of an accurate approach. For example, using a Triebert oboe to play Schubert, Schumann or Brahms makes less sense to me than using a modern oboe. But is everybody prepared to play on reeds with a 30/35 mm long staple and a reed of 10mm wide with a short scrape, as we know them from many historical examples?

Bernardini's commentary alludes to another example of the HP movement's 'selective use of historical evidence': above, he refers to a type of reed that, while original, is not copied by any historical oboists today.⁷

Kirkpatrick, much like Taruskin, values individual musicality above simply using the 'right' hardware. She feels that:

⁷ Bernardini is referring to a type of reed specimen found with a Koch oboe, c.1850, which is considerably wide and tied onto a remarkably short staple (see Chapter VII: Reeds). Incidentally, none of the respondents in the following hautboist survey attest to using this type of reed.

*performances can have a quite different ethos, regardless of whether they have exactly the right instruments. For me, qualities of musicianship, such as overall timing and expression, far outweigh the effect that authentic instruments would have. I heard one “authentic” 19th century chamber ensemble that I would not care to listen to again; tempo rubato was like a closed book to them... Or, I might choose to listen to the Prague Chamber Orchestra play Mozart, which I know they do well, on modern instruments, over hearing an unfamiliar “authentic” group on classical ones. How well a group plays *Mozart* (or Brahms, or whatever) is what matters to me. If what authentic instruments can add to a performance really does add, to something already wonderful and totally *in* a style, and thus serves to bring out what is being revealed of the music even better, then I'd say it's worth it.*

KEYWORK AS AN OBSTACLE

Another takeaway from this study is that many makers view the intricate keywork of later Romantic models as a significant obstacle in copying them. This is well articulated by Cook:

I have no desire to make copies of any of those [C19] oboes. Not because I don't like them, but the keywork would be an incredible monetary expense.

Bernardini also notes that elaborate keywork can be a deterrent for the builder while underlining the fact that historically, woodwind makers only developed a single model per instrument (i.e. Golde, although he may have made improvements to it as the years went by, only made *one* oboe model), as opposed to current practice where a historical oboe maker must offer one, if not two or three, different models *per* period and *per* pitch level (for example, French baroque at 392 Hz, German baroque at 415 Hz, classical at 430 Hz, oboe d'amore and oboe da caccia at 415 Hz, etc.):

The problem is that making an oboe with a 13 or more keys system is a completely different work than making a baroque or classical oboe: the key system, and the wood work to hold the keys if these are mounted on wood is very much time-consuming, especially if you just make a few of them. You also need different tools and machinery. We should realize that a maker like Golde ONLY made such model, even if continuously changing little details, and had a routine, machinery, etc. especially for that. Therefore, the problem is deciding to undergo this big investment or not. I am not surprised that many makers are reluctant to develop their workshop to this field. However, I often try to convince the better equipped to go for it, because if they manage to make a good product, I am sure there are many players that are interested.

Earle agrees that key making is a lengthy and costly operation:

To make instruments of this complexity needs a big investment in machinery and personnel, and I'm not interested in going down that route. [...] In terms of time spent (and time is money, after all!) [the most lengthy procedure] is making and fitting keys, esp[ecially] on keyed classical oboes.

This is further echoed by Ecochard:

For the builder of baroque and classical instruments, who most often works alone, the manufacture of a romantic oboe represents a significant investment which may require the collaboration of one or two people, particularly for the creating the keywork, which has an obvious impact on the overall cost, which in any case is much higher than for a baroque instrument.

The manufacture of a complex key system is therefore collectively perceived as both expensive and time-consuming. This is hardly surprising, seeing as how key building was often outsourced to metallurgical suppliers as early as the 1840s, when oboe building was industrialised in France.

A COSTLY AND TIME-CONSUMING ACTIVITY

A wide array of activities was given in response to the question: “*What is the most time-consuming activity in copying oboes?*” Replies included:

1. The construction of reamers (Bernardini, Kirkpatrick, Earle, Frydrysiak);
2. Key building (Gohin and Earle);
3. Research into finding, measuring and developing a good model (Bernardini, Kirkpatrick, Frydrysiak);
4. Wood seasoning (Dalton) and the preparation and treatment of boxwood blanks before drilling (Ecochard);
5. Instrument tuning (Dalton and Cook).

When asked to describe the most *expensive* aspect of oboe building, responses were also varied: while travel fees (to visit museums for research and measuring) were identified by two respondents, half of the builders listed their *time* as being the most costly activity in oboe manufacture, whether it be spent turning wood, tuning, building keys, or researching new models. Randall Cook and Richard Earle also acknowledged the large investment required in purchasing and maintaining tools and machinery.

SELECTING A MODEL TO COPY

Insight was gained into how and why builders choose one model to copy over another. In this case, the question posed was limited to eighteenth-century models, since I was aware approaching this case study that all of the respondents specialised in making *baroque* oboes. Today, the vast majority of oboe makers copy an English model by Thomas Stanesby Sr. (London, c.1700; the original specimen is housed in the Bate Collection, Oxford), and this was an opportunity to ascertain why that was. The results were edifying. In response to the question: “*The vast majority of makers nowadays are copying the Stanesby oboe for C18. Why do you think that is?*”, Frydrysiak, a builder from Poland, remarks that many hautboy teachers have adopted this model, and that their students, eager to emulate their mentors, prefer to use the same equipment:

[It is] just because of “commercialization.” In XVIII [there were] so many makers in Europe, but we use copies [of] only a few makers. I think it's [an absurd] situation. It is interesting for me when oboists play Bach's music on copies of English instruments (in the first half of XVIII musicians did not move as freely as today; woodwind makers also). So, it is a little funny for me: Bach music on Stanesby, but Classical music (even English, Italian) almost only on Grundmann's copies. Stanesby is most popular, because most teachers play Stanesby oboes. It is simple rule: teacher use Stanesby, students want play Stanesby too, so majority of makers make Stanesby (the right of the free market) . From the other hand for example some oboists in UK plays copies of Paulhahn oboe (really great instrument!) and still in UK many oboists play this type of oboe. Of course, because famous UK oboists play it before. I think only few individual[s] manage to “oppose” their teachers and seek their own way.

Earle echoes this opinion, warning that the Stanesby ‘trend’ has resulted in a homogeneity of tone colour. He states that:

It's largely a matter of fashion, like in modern playing, you want to have the kind of instrument your teacher or a player you admire has, and to sound like him or her. So you get everything sounding more and more alike...

Dalton assumes the same, attributing the proliferation of the Stanesby model to:

Current market forces influenced by popular teachers and performers.

For his part, Ecochard draws attention to the fact that the original Stanesby Sr. oboe was not pitched at 415 Hz, but rather somewhat lower, closer to 405 Hz.

Oboes by Stanesby Sr. and Jr. were among the first instruments (along with Denners and Paulhahns) to be “copied” as early as the late 1960s, to be played at 415 Hz. The

problem with Stanesby's instruments is that all the originals (apart from perhaps an oboe which is in the Bate Collection at Oxford) are at "English" pitch between 405 and 408 Hz. The first copies made, which respected the acoustic length of the original models, were obviously too low; playing them at 415 Hz created problems.

Bernardini and Cook are equally aware of this, the latter stating:

I am quite sure the existing Stanesby instruments were NOT a-415.

Earle draws attention to the fact that many of the instruments sold as Stanesby copies by modern makers "bear little relation to the originals in their internal dimensions." Indeed, many makers who copy the Stanesby model have dealt with this discrepancy in tuning by shortening the top joint of the instrument from the bottom end, which in my experience has often created an imbalance in octave voicing. Earle's observation matches Ecochard's earlier comment (see Chapter 3: Physical Characteristics):

Apart from some copies which attempt to reproduce original tuning, most modern hautboys have gradually moved away from the tuning of original instruments in order to come nearer to equal temperament; this adaptation is a result of the requirements of musicians and customers and is a consequence of their use of different fingerings and reed setups from those prevailing at the time the original instrument was made. More or less consciously, the modern maker adapts his copy to modern ears. A modern hautboy is almost never a true copy of an original instrument.

Finally, an instrument's market potential was identified as a factor in selecting which models to copy by both Frydrysiak and Gohin, the former stating: "Will there be buyers for such an oboe?"

The question "What would it take to convince you to begin copying nineteenth-century oboes? How many requests/committed purchases would be 'sufficient'?" elicited strong reactions from some of the interviewees and revealed that some builders are toying with the idea of experimenting with nineteenth-century models. While three of the respondents, renowned for their eighteenth-century copies, have no interest in developing Romantic models (Dalton, Kirkpatrick and Cook, who simply stated: "I've never built a 19th century oboe, and never will"), three makers have already produced nineteenth-century prototypes (Earle, Ecochard and Frydrysiak; these models are, however, German). Earle reveals that the instruments he built were inspired by an original specimen, but heavily modified:

I did build a pair of prototype oboes on which my colleague and I played a lot of 19thC repertoire. They were based on the J. F. Floth model of 1807, which I was

already copying, but made in blackwood with some extra keys: low B and a ring system [brille] for 1-fingered F#, but they couldn't really be called copies of anything [...] We played them at a higher pitch, too: 438 Hz. These oboes were a result of desperation: we needed something to play this music on, and in the '90s there were no copies around nor were originals easy to come by, and they worked well.

Gohin, Frydrysiak and Ecochard display an interest in copying Romantic oboes, the former asserting that it would simply take a minimum of 5 or 6 orders for him to begin developing a new nineteenth-century model.

PITCH

Personal experience, as well as that of my professional colleagues (see Appendix II), has revealed that Romantic repertoire is now being performed at several different pitch levels, including 430, 435, 438 and 440 Hz, and that the HP movement is still in search of a pitch standard for nineteenth-century works. Because of this phenomenon, the need for today's historical woodwind performer to have access to an instrument, or rather several instruments, which are practicable at pitch levels ranging from 430 and 440 Hz is crucial. I was therefore curious to discover builder perceptions of current professional practice and to take note of any discrepancies. In response to the question “*What pitch do you believe Romantic repertoire is being performed at these days? 430? 435? 438/440? Or all of the above?*”, half of the respondents (four out of eight) believed that a higher pitch level of between 438 and 440 Hz was now commonly in use. Being former performers themselves, both Cook and Earle were well positioned and had empirical knowledge on the subject. Cook hints at the incongruity between modern convention and historical veracity, stating that:

[pitch] was always very frustrating for me, since essentially all of my original oboes were around 438-440, and the orchestras that I worked with insisted that we play at a-430, which is completely unacceptable.

Earle alludes to the lack of pitch standardisation in current practice:

I have personally played 19thC music at all those [four] pitches, but most people are playing at 438-440, which seems to be roughly the area that most surviving instruments play.

Three builders, presumably because they did not have first-hand experience with professional practice (current or former), simply stated they did not know the answer to this question.

CONCLUSIONS

This study confirms that collectively, makers are aware of the growing demand for copies of nineteenth-century oboes, and that marketing these instruments would not pose a challenge. Bernardini goes so far as to insist that “*putting on the market a good 19th C. oboe is indeed a good investment.*” Nonetheless, all of the builders surveyed recognise that embarking on a new project of such complexity represents a large investment, both financially and time-wise, which many are unwilling to make.⁸ Indeed, developing a new model is a large scale operation that requires months of planning and preparation: identifying and locating a nineteenth-century model that would be commercially viable, developing reamers and crafting elaborate keywork (and potentially a tuning slide mechanism) are only some of the costly and time-consuming activities involved in such a venture.

We can therefore gather from the above that the business of building nineteenth-century oboe replicas is still very much in its infancy, with only a handful of prototypes ever produced. Apart from two or three isolated builders, there appear to be no concrete plans for developing further models in the short or long term. This suggests that the current shortage of commercially available instruments is set to escalate as more historical oboists appear on the job market while an increasing amount of historically-informed performances of Romantic repertoire are added to concert programmes and festival rosters. An enterprising, younger maker would therefore face little or no competition were they to embark on copying nineteenth-century models at the time of this study. This also implies that, for the time being at least, historical oboists will have to continue the perilous activity of locating and obtaining unpredictable antique instruments to continue plying their trade.

⁸ With several respondents aged above 60, age and health issues were identified as deterrents for developing new Romantic models.

	1. Filip Frydrysiak (PL)	2. Alfredo Bernardini (IT)
FORM OF REPLY AND DATE	Email, received 30 June 2019	Email, received 15 July 2019
What are your perceptions of modern nineteenth-century historical performance practice?	In my opinion is still not enough performances of XIX century music (Romantical in different pitches) on original instruments and it's copies. I have heard some concerts, but majority of them are music from the beginning of XIXc, so in fact Classical music, not Romantical. If musicians use oboes, they usually use original oboes from the middle XIX c or from the end of XIX, eventually copies of Grenser (with additional keys) or Floth copies.	Personally I find performance of 19th C. music extremely different from that of 18th C. and, while I like to listen to it, I have so far refrained from playing it, because I find it too difficult to adapt to completely different musical esthetics to what I usually do, as in the articulation, the mentality of intonation (high leading notes, etc.), beside of course getting used to a very different reed, oboe and its key system. Besides, I feel there is still enough to discover about the 18th C. oboe and its repertoire and I prefer to devote myself to that.
Do you feel that the HIP movement is pushing the boundaries of historical performance forward into the nineteenth century? If so, how do you feel about that, and what role do you feel you play in today's HIP of the nineteenth century?	I am sure that definitely yes! I mean, HIP movement is pushing the boundaries of historical performance forward into the nineteenth century. I think, that it's time to play majority of XIX composers on original instruments; similar to situation when pioneers began play Baroque music on original instruments, original pitches. My role can only be modest - I make copies of Kuss oboe, although because of that I hope my role will be a little bigger :-)	As above, I play no role in performing 19th C. music: my repertoire stops at the moment at early Beethoven, with some very rare exception. Nevertheless, I think it's great if people specialize on this repertoire, especially if they do it conscientiously and not just look for a scoop or for a commercial outcome. As it often happen in HIP, some of the initiatives give clear priority to an easy solution at the expenses of an accurate approach. For example using a Triebert oboe to play Schubert, Schumann or Brahms makes to me less sense than using a modern oboe. But is everybody prepared to play on reeds with a 30/35 mm long staple and a reed of 10mm wide with a short scrape, as we know them from many historical examples?
What do you think the stakes are for your clientele, that is to say, modern historical oboists?	I can say about situation in my country (usually I don't speak about it with clients/musicians from other countries : it is rather something like taboo). In Poland stakes for modern historical oboists are very polarized. It is depend of course which oboist play, how famous. If an oboist is famous, stakes are very reasonable; the majority of musicians who have been contracted for permanent contracts, concerts and tournee are paid separately (additionally).	I have completely quit oboe making some 10 years ago, so I don't really know. I think switching oboes is a difficult thing, especially when you don't want adaptations and shortcuts.
Have you ever experimented or considered experimenting with nineteenth-century oboe models? (Have you ever built a nineteenth-century oboe prototype?)	Over the years I have built a few prototypes of the nineteenth century oboes (German). Within last year I have made two prototypes of Kuss and three final copies of Kuss oboe (one for Margaret Friedrich from Germany, second for the Fryderyk Chopin University of Music in Warsaw and third for myself). Now I am making three next copies of Kuss for clients from Japan, USA and Germany.	No, but I have offered some consultancy to oboe makers about what instruments to go for and how to solve some problems with bore and holes.
If so, have you ever received requests from clients to copy nineteenth-century models of oboes, or has it been out of personal curiosity?	Two yes; I received questions about build XIX c instruments ,I mean true Romantical oboes. But I am deeply convinced ,that building any oboe without personal curiosity it could not have a sense.	I receive all the time the question "who makes romantic oboes?", this is why I insisted with some quality makers to go for it.
If you were to begin copying a C19 model, which would it be and why? At what pitch would you make your C19 model(s)?	I decided to build copy of Kuss, because in my opinion the model which I measured is one of the best and most interesting oboes from XIXc. Also because the construction of the oboe Kuss was a huge challenge, because it requires a completely new workshop of tools and methods of doing. I make my Kuss oboes exactly as original- thanks to tuning slide it has many options of tune- practical range of tune is c.445 to even 430. Most comfortable pitch is 442 (!). But even 430 is in tune in all scale (not ideal, but good); it is because of the construction of the bore and tuning slide.	I guess the most significant model is the Golde from Dresden, which was very popular and appreciated also in the second half of the 19th C. It is the closest instrument to important repertoire such as Schumann and Brahms. There are many originals of that around. The Kuß model from Vienna was also very much in use until 1850 and in some countries after that. Excellent oboes. Trieberts are great oboes, but I suppose they are very local to France, therefore useful for Cherubini, Berlioz etc.
What pitch do you believe Romantic repertoire is being performed at these days? 430? 435? 438/440? Or all of the above?	As we know all these pitches are good; unfortunately we live in "standardized world", so you know, it could be a big problem with too many pitches. For sure many of XIXc makers also felt a lot of tuning issues and that's why some of them did slide tuning (there were different types of this invention; some were made entirely of wood , while others , the most advanced (like Kuss) are a combination of wood and brass). Although in my opinion 430 is suitable for music from the beginning of XIX. For later repertoire 430 is rather too low. Of course, an important clue should be original instruments and their pitch. Discovering, once again, the wealth of old pitches can be very instructive for us and, above all, give new, extraordinary musical experiences.	Complicated subject, but I guess 438 or 440 are very common pitches for these instruments.
What are your concerns regarding commercialising "later" nineteenth-century instruments?	I am not sure exactly what you mean; I think, I am afraid, that it may happen the same as with baroque and classical oboes - from many years I have been observing that for musicians (both amateur and professional), it is less and less important whether the instrument meets the criteria of the genuine copy. The most important thing is that the instrument should play nicely, regardless of whether it has anything to do with the original (I mean, of course, not the appearance, but the most important features, i.e. bore, finger holes, type of mouthpieces, etc). It's a bit like they've lost the idea of reaching for historical oboes. Perhaps the reason is the commercialization of the playing on historical oboes in general. Many years ago, the enthusiasts who were looking for the "truth" dealt with it. Today, playing historical oboes is almost like pop culture. It is interesting, because about three years ago a Harpsichord maker (If I well remember Christopher Brodersen, but I'm not sure) wrote to me, and said that with his instruments is similar situation. Too much not genuine copies... For the sake of explanation, let me add that, of course, I do not mean faithful reproduction of medium-quality instruments. I am saying that if there are (they exist!) wonderfully playing originals, we should not process them, just as we do not rework Bach's scores, for example. We should just copy them in my opinion.	The problem is that making an oboe with a 13 or more keys system is a completely different work than making a baroque or classical oboe: the key system, and the wood work to hold the keys if these are mounted on wood is very much time-consuming, especially if you just make a few of them. You also need different tools and machinery. We should realize that a maker like Golde ONLY made such model, even if continuously changing little details, and had a routine, machinery, etc. especially for that. Therefore, the problem is deciding to undergo this big investment or not. I am not surprised that many makers are reluctant to develop their workshop to this field. However, I often try to convince the better equipped to go for it, because if they manage to make a good product, I am sure there are many players that are interested.

	3. Mary Kirkpatrick (US)	4. Henri Gohin (FR)
FORM OF REPLY AND DATE	Email, received 23 July 2019	Email, received 25 June 2019
What are your perceptions of modern nineteenth-century historical performance practice?	I haven't heard much, living in Ithaca, NY, Sometimes music at Cornell uses their various historic pianos.	Il me semble qu'elle reproduit avec un léger décalage la démarche des interprètes de musique baroque et Renaissance ; recherche d'authenticité, notamment par l'usage d'instruments originaux ou de copies.
Do you feel that the HIP movement is pushing the boundaries of historical performance forward into the nineteenth century? If so, how do you feel about that, and what role do you feel you play in today's HIP of the nineteenth century?	Sure, why not... I even heard a saxophone ensemble who made it their mission to buy and restore instruments from the *early 20th* century, to get closer to the light, vibrant sound they were intended to have -- wonderful young musicians, and they played right here in Ithaca. If so, how do you feel about that? -- I feel that performances can have a quite different ethos, regardless of whether they have exactly the right instruments. For me, qualities of musicianship, such as overall timing and expression, far outweigh the effect that authentic instruments would have. I heard one "authentic" 19th century chamber ensemble that I would not care to listen to again; tempo rubato was like a closed book to them... Or, I might choose to listen to the Prague Chamber Orchestra play Mozart, which I know they do well, on modern instruments, over hearing an unfamiliar "authentic" group on classical ones. How well a group plays *Mozart* (or Brahms, or whatever) is what matters to me. If what authentic instruments can add to a performance really does add, to something already wonderful and totally *in* a style, and thus serves to bring out what is being revealed of the music even better, then I'd say it's worth it. And what role do you feel you play in today's HIP of the nineteenth century? -- None, sorry, except as occasional appreciative audience member.	Oui sans aucun doute, malgré le plus grand nombre d'originaux disponible, il sera sans doute nécessaire de recréer des fac-simile ou même des instruments inspirés des originaux ayant des caractéristiques correspondant à certaines demandes spécifiques des musiciens. Je n'ai à ce jour pas développé de modèle pour cette période.
What do you think the stakes are for your clientele, that is to say, modern historical oboists?	I'm not sure I understand the question. I haven't talked with players about reconstructing (or playing) 19th-century models, if that's what you mean. I am only guessing, but I can imagine that as one gets later, in HIP, it gets harder to switch gears back and forth. I think that if one is already very comfortable with classical oboe, it is then not too hard, or would not seem weird to one's following, or for someone hiring, to venture into the romantic. But for someone known, say, for how they interpret early French music, to be hired to play Brahms just because they had the right oboe for it, hm, I think I'd want to hear them first, if you know what I mean. To launch into C19 HIP seems to me a risky proposition for both player and maker. But people can have many different motivations for doing things. Supposing one had the thought that the modern oboe had gone too far in its development -- BTW I really don't know what I'm talking about here! -- then might one wish to demonstrate the virtues of a simpler model, even for playing "modern" music? Do modern oboes makers keep making little "improvements" all the time? I'm only guessing here...	Je ne suis pas hauboïste mais il me semble qu'il est important pour un musicien voulant épouser ce mouvement de se procurer le ou les instruments répondant aux opportunités de création musicale qui peuvent se présenter.
Have you ever experimented or considered experimenting with nineteenth-century oboe models? (Have you ever built a nineteenth-century oboe prototype?)	No.	Non jamais
If so, have you ever received requests from clients to copy nineteenth-century models of oboes, or has it been out of personal curiosity?		
If you were to begin copying a C19 model, which would it be and why? At what pitch would you make your C19 model(s)?	I don't know; I'd need a lot of advice.	Dans tous les cas je le ferai en réponse à une demande spécifique d'un musicien, avec une préférence pour un modèle au clétage simplifié, pour des raisons de commodité, sans exclure d'autres modèles plus sophistiqué par la suite.
What pitch do you believe Romantic repertoire is being performed at these days? 430? 435? 438/440? Or all of the above?	I don't know.	Ce que j'ai pu rencontrer comme demande dans le domaine des flageolets était plutôt vers 430
What are your concerns regarding commercialising "later" nineteenth-century instruments?	It seems a very small niche market at the moment.	Je n'ai pas de préoccupation particulière pour la commercialisation de mes instruments puisque je travaille toujours sur commande.

	5. Dick Earle (UK)	6. Randall Cook (CH)
FORM OF REPLY AND DATE	Email, received 28 September 2020	Email, received 27 September 2020
What are your perceptions of modern nineteenth-century historical performance practice?		
Do you feel that the HIP movement is pushing the boundaries of historical performance forward into the nineteenth century? If so, how do you feel about that, and what role do you feel you play in today's HIP of the nineteenth century?	There is no doubt that the historical approach to performance practise is moving into the 19th century, and much is being understood about various aspects of string and wind playing. So, yes, I think the boundaries are being pushed, but there are no ultimate right answers. The only purpose for more knowledge about how music was played at any point in history is to inject more life into its performance now, otherwise it's just theory. But I don't have any role in this development any more. I'm not making instruments or playing the music of this period.	I really don't pay too much attention what is happening with historical wind playing and the 19th century. Too many people are asking me about Triebert oboes, or instruments that are similar. There was such an incredible variety of oboes at the turn of the century, and experimentation with bore designs, wall dimensions, oboe bells, and amounts of keys. As I've felt with Classical oboes, too many people wanted to have „octave keys“, which were never meant to be octave keys, but rather a key that you would touch quickly to do a slur that otherwise would not be possible on a two-keyed oboe. I see the same thing happening with 19th century, with really late styled oboes with waaaaay too many keys.
What do you think the stakes are for your clientele, that is to say, modern historical oboists?	I'm not sure that this question applies to me. I know that in the UK there is a problem finding the right instruments for 19thC repertoire, and many who do play it play on historical instruments, not modern copies. I have been asked about making copies of a German romantic oboe, but more of that later.	
Have you ever experimented or considered experimenting with nineteenth-century oboe models? (Have you ever built a nineteenth-century oboe prototype?)	I did build a pair of prototype oboes on which my colleague and I played a lot of 19thC repertoire. They were based on the JF Floth model of 1807, which I was already copying, but made in blackwood with some extra keys: low b and a ring system for 1 finger # but they couldn't really be called copies of anything, though the bore of Floth's oboes are more like later oboes than earlier ones. We played them at a higher pitch, too: 438. These oboes were a result of desperation: we needed something to play this music on, and in the '90s there were no copies around nor were originals easy to come by, and they worked well.	I have no desire to make copies of any of those oboes. Not because I don't like them, but the key work would be an incredible monetary expense.
If so, have you ever received requests from clients to copy nineteenth-century models of oboes, or has it been out of personal curiosity?	I have been asked but have always said no!	
If you were to begin copying a C19 model, which would it be and why? At what pitch would you make your C19 model(s)?	I've always been interested in the Sellner system oboes of the 1st half of the 19th century. Many of them have tuning slides which allow them to played at between 430-440, which would be useful. I think these will be popular model. Also, I was always on the lookout for a mid-century German oboe to play at 438-440, but never found the right model.	
What pitch do you believe Romantic repertoire is being performed at these days? 430? 435? 438/440? Or all of the above?	I'm sure all of the above. I have personally played 19thC music at all those pitches, but most people are playing at 438-440, which seems to be roughly the area that most surviving instruments play if they are not made for 'high' pitch. You are probably aware that in England, at least, there were two pitch standards in the later 19th century and early 20th, and many players had instruments at both pitches, 'high' and 'low'. Military bands, for instance, seem to have played at 'high' pitch, around 452, but many orchestras as well. There are quite a few of these instruments knocking around, and it's good to know when looking for originals!	Pitch!! That was always very frustrating for me, since essentially all of my [original] oboes were around 438-440, and the orchestras that I worked with insisted that we play at a-430, which is completely unacceptable.
What are your concerns regarding commercialising "later" nineteenth-century instruments?	There are many good original instruments surviving from this period. I've owned quite a few in my time, both French, German and English. To make copies of such instruments is really beyond the capabilities of makers like me who work alone. These instruments were the product of much larger concerns with specialists doing various aspects of the work.	

	7. Sand Dalton (USA)	8. Marc Ecochard (FR)
FORM OF REPLY AND DATE	Email, received 25 September 2020	Email, received 28 February 2021
What are your perceptions of modern nineteenth-century historical performance practice?	I don't have much interest in the music of the later 19C. The music of the 17 & 18Cs are what have always appealed to me and only those early 19C composers (such as Mendelssohn, Schubert, Beethoven) who learned their trade in the late 18Th and in whose music I can still hear the ideals of the previous centuries.	La progression vers le répertoire du XIXe siècle n'est pas un phénomène nouveau parmi les musiciens pratiquant une interprétation «historique». Philippe Herreweghe en particulier s'est illustré depuis de nombreuses années déjà par ses enregistrements de Bruckner, Mendelssohn, Schubert, Schumann, Dvorak. Si l'interprétation sur instruments modernes a prévalu dans un premier temps, un certain nombre d'orchestres, surtout dans les pupitres d'instruments à vent, se sont adaptés aux instruments XIXe dits «romantiques» par opposition aux instruments baroques et classiques. Les instruments originaux du XIXe siècle - flûtes, hautbois, bassons - encore en état de jeu sont plus nombreux et plus accessibles que les instruments plus anciens ; les musiciens se sont donc naturellement tournés vers eux. Lorsqu'une intervention sur ces instruments originaux est nécessaire, le facteur, indépendamment d'une expertise détaillée, ne peut intervenir qu'au niveau d'une éventuelle restauration ou réparation du cléage, mais en aucun cas au niveau d'une intervention sur le corps sonore de l'instrument qu'il importe avant tout de préserver dans son état original (perce et longueur acoustique).
Do you feel that the HIP movement is pushing the boundaries of historical performance forward into the nineteenth century? If so, how do you feel about that, and what role do you feel you play in today's HIP of the nineteenth century?		Answered above
What do you think the stakes are for your clientele, that is to say, modern historical oboists?	I'm not sure what you mean by "stakes". I'm not against modern oboists having a desire to explore and play oboe music from after 1830 or so, but I just don't share it.	Si la tendance actuelle est à l'utilisation d'instruments originaux dans les orchestres, un certain nombre de musiciens souhaitent cependant utiliser des copies, dans le but de s'adapter au diapason courant de l'orchestre, le plus souvent plus haut que le diapason de l'instrument original.
Have you ever experimented or considered experimenting with nineteenth-century oboe models? (Have you ever built a nineteenth-century oboe prototype?)	No. I have stopped with the oboes from the early 19C with added keys.	J'ai récemment réalisé un instrument d'après un hautbois à 13 clés du facteur danois Johannes Selboe. Le client, hautbois solo d'un orchestre en Allemagne, souhaitait une copie au diapason de l'original (435 Hz) ainsi qu'une tête plus courte pour pouvoir jouer l'instrument en orchestre à 442 Hz. Les demandes de clients pour des copies de hautbois romantiques sont encore très rares et principalement motivées par une adaptation au diapason moderne.
If so, have you ever received requests from clients to copy nineteenth-century models of oboes, or has it been out of personal curiosity?	Again, no.	
If you were to begin copying a C19 model, which would it be and why? At what pitch would you make your C19 model(s)?	N/A	Indépendamment du modèle d'après J. Selboe que j'ai déjà réalisé, je serais intéressé par une copie de C. F. Golde et pour les hautbois français par une copie de Brod.
What pitch do you believe Romantic repertoire is being performed at these days? 430? 435? 438/440? Or all of the above?	I don't know. Somewhere around 440 I would expect.	Je n'ai pas d'information sur les diapasons d'usage actuels dans l'interprétation historique de la musique romantique. J'imagine que le hautbois ou la flûte donnent leur diapason. Pour ce que je connais des instruments de cette époque, le diapason le plus fréquent devrait se situer autour de 435 Hz.
What are your concerns regarding commercialising "later" nineteenth-century instruments?	Yes, very likely.	Tout dépend de la demande et elle est actuellement assez réduite.

	1. Filip Frydrysiak (PL)	2. Alfredo Bernardini (IT)
Do you feel that the ROI (return on investment) in building nineteenth-century oboes would be insufficient?	I don't think so. As I wrote above, musicians asked me about Romantical oboes. Although probably I am not objective, because my costs are "only" my work, time; moreover I make all oboes, keys, reamers, other tools for making oboes, by myself. And I love what I do. I love new challenges. So, I don't think that making Romantical oboes would be not profitable. Maybe the question for makers should be: do you want to have so many , hard time-consuming , difficult work with romantical oboe (while doing one such instrument, you could make 15-20 ordinary oboes) ? :-) Another thing is that many people expect quite cheap instruments and they don't have awareness that a romantic oboe such as Kuss must be much more expensive, because it requires much, much more work. Some works can be doing partially with half-mechanical tools, but majority of work must be hand job. It is no other way.	No, see previous answer.
How do you proceed when selecting which models of eighteenth-century models to copy?	In my opinion the most important are: the condition of the original instrument; how sound it has and how is the pitch of it. in second place: how the maker was known and from what country he came from. In third place: will there be buyers for such oboe?	I am always intrigued by many models. I also try to use instruments that are close to a particular repertoire.
The vast majority of makers nowadays is copying the Stanesby oboe for C18. Why do you think that is?	Just because of "commercialization" . In XVIII was so many makers in Europe, but we use copies only a few makers. I think it's absurdly situation. It is interesting for me when oboists play Bach's music on copies of English instruments (in the first half of XVIII the musicians did not move as freely as today ; woodwind makers also). So, it is a little funny for me: Bach music on Stanesby, but Classical music (even English, Italian) almost only on Grundmann's copies. Stanesby is most popular, because most teachers play Stanesby oboes. It is simple rule: teacher use Stanesby, students want play Stanesby too, so majority of makers make Stanesby (the right of the free market) . From the other hand for example some oboists in UK plays copies of Paulhahn oboe (really great instrument!) and still in UK many oboists play this type of oboe. Of course, because famous UK oboists play it before. I think, only few individualists manage to "oppose" their teachers and seek their own way.	Because it's a beautiful model. Besides, I believe that Stanesby oboes are the closest to the original French oboe of around 1700, but at higher pitch (405/410?). Their resemblance with the Hotteterre in Brussels is striking.
What is the most time-consuming activity in copying oboes?	Most time consuming is... thinking about it: do it or not to do :-D Seriously: paradoxically, building an oboe (maybe except Kuss) takes relatively the shortest time. I do not count the time needed for an oil bath . All preparatory work preceding the construction of the instrument lasts the longest . The longer it lasts, the more seriously we take this job. I mean: measuring of an original; interpretation of measurements (mainly I am concerned about correct reading of bore parameters) ; design of tools (reamers); making tools; design and reconstruction of a bore and reed; And really the most time-consuming activity is: over twenty years of own experience. Funny but true. This is very important in this job.	Making an 18th C. oboe is a nice balance from the search of a good model, the making of the reamers the preparation of the wood, the turning work, drilling the holes, cutting and laying the keys, the after-cosmetics. I liked spending a good month together with a finished oboe to do fine checking of the bore and the holes while playing on them a little every day. I can imagine that making a 19th C. oboe with its more complicated keys system doubles or more the production time.
What is the most expensive activity in copying oboes?	Most expensive activity is traveling to museums / collectors and time spent measuring instruments; expensive is also traveling by car for longer distances (fuel, hotels, time). It is difficult to use airplanes, because for measure oboes I need a lot of specialized expensive tools, so the risk of losing my luggage would be a disaster. And of course expensive is a time when I prepare materials/tools for making an oboe. Also time for making reamers (very time-consuming, so in my case- expensive activity, because at that time I can't do other oboes).	Making oboes is not expensive, unless you have other people or companies making reamers, keys etc. for you. The price of the wood is relatively low compared to the price of an oboe.
Aside the obvious additional keywork, how would building a C19 oboe differ from building a C18 oboe?	For obvious reasons, I can speak the most matter-of-factly about building of oboes after Kuss. The fact is that it is one of the most (or the most) advanced construction from all oboes in history (I am during prepare special website about this oboe). Keys of course, as you know for sure, are much difficult to make, because are full "3D", not as in XVIII oboes- from brass sheet. It has riveted springs, and riveted octave key. But definitely the most different is the bore of Kuss. All oboes need high precisely bore, keeping the proportions, etc. but Kuss needs all much precisely. And it needs completely new set of reamers (it has a bore made up of a dozen cones, unlike any previous oboe, so we can not use any reamers for both baroque and classical instruments or Floth for making bore of Kuss, even partially). Another thing: wooden blocks for keys. As I wrote earlier, all blocks must be hand-carved; also thumb rest. This is a big difference compared to the 18th century , simple oboe body. And of course really big difference: tuning slide mechanism. It is genial solution, but very difficult for working and it requires very much skill from the maker.	Understanding that tuning a romantic oboe has different esthetics than tuning an 18th C. It is obvious that after 1800 makers try to correct the typical pure or meantone notes of the earlier oboes. The method by Vogt and the AMZ article über die Oboe of January 1812 are enlightening on this subject.
What would it take to convince you to begin copying nineteenth-century oboes? How many requests/committed purchases would be "sufficient"?	I'm convinced. Kuss is a great instrument and I'm happy that I can make it. Moreover, I am able to do other romantical oboes. All is depend of oboists...	I would insist with any technically skilled makers that putting on the market a good 19th C. oboe is indeed a good investment.

	3. Mary Kirkpatrick (US)	4. Henri Gohin (FR)
Do you feel that the ROI (return on investment) in building nineteenth-century oboes would be insufficient?	The more specialized and small a market is, the more global it is, so for the few makers who *do* set up to make 19th C. models, ROI could work out. This argument might also apply to players, in your question #3. A player could enhance their career by gaining a reputation for excellent and authentic 19th century performances. Have you thought of talking to makers of modern oboes about this too? (Going from the other direction...) You might find some sympathy for "going historic," you never know. They have a lot more technology at their fingertips, development might be easy for them. In any case they could offer an interesting perspective.	C'est une question un peu compliquée, cela dépend de la complexité du modèle et du nombre d'instruments d'un même modèle demandés.
How do you proceed when selecting which models of eighteenth-century models to copy?	I have been guided partly by personal discoveries based on my own trials while visiting museums -- having been lucky enough to get started in the early days of Early Music, when museums were welcoming! -- and partly, or perhaps mostly, by encouraging advice and tips both from oboe players and from other makers. Then I am also guided by my own sense of how successful a model is being -- how well it's doing as a tool to bring music of its day to life. I try to cover a range -- two 415 models plus one early French at 392, and one early classical at 430.	Principalement en m'adaptant à la demande des musiciens.
The vast majority of makers nowadays is copying the Stanesby oboe for C18. Why do you think that is?	There are a lot of Stanesby Sr. oboes still in existence, luckily. My 415 Bradbury happens to be quite similar in design. It is a robust and reliable type, clear at the top, singing in the middle, warm at the bottom -- when everything is in balance and working right, I find the early English type thrilling to listen to, embodying the quote about the Hautboy: ... "that, courage sets on fire"... There is a balance of firmness and lightness -- a richness of harmonics, probably. At one time, when I was starting out, Denners were more common, also Schlegel and Paulhahn. I thought to try something different, and I'm glad I was encouraged (by Friedrich von Huene, actually) to measure the original Bradbury in York.	Le modèle est bien connu et fonctionnel, c'est une bonne raison de le choisir...
What is the most time-consuming activity in copying oboes?	Development! That includes measuring, making reamers, then making more reamers when the first ones turn out a little too big -- because I had to adjust for pitch, or because my understanding of how a bore changes over time has changed. I also make multiple reamers per joint -- in keeping with original bore profiles, and in order to have a better chance to get everything in balance. I keep learning all the time and try to keep an open mind about how to make a really excellent instrument that the player can forget about while playing because it expresses the music so well and easily (ideally!) Also I think sometimes of the 18th century makers and how quickly they developed what they did -- and then the style and fashion changed and they had to change along with... Now we have the benefit of more time to get all kinds of little variables in balance, while keeping faithful to how the oboe fits and reveals the music of its time.	Le clétage quand il est compliqué
What is the most expensive activity in copying oboes?	Travel, for research, networking, HIP courses and exhibits, and so on, for me. For some it might be buying wood, but I was lucky there.	Même réponse que précédemment, en fait en facture instrumentale historique à vent, la matière première n'est pas coûteuse, c'est donc le temps passé qui représente l'investissement principal.
Aside the obvious additional keywork, how would building a C19 oboe differ from building a C18 oboe?	I'm not sure -- probably compared to building a classical oboe, it would be even more the case that everything becomes more critical.	Une diminution du diamètre de la perce notamment à l'entrée
What would it take to convince you to begin copying nineteenth-century oboes? How many requests/committed purchases would be "sufficient"?	For myself, at age 69 and with some health issues, it would not make sense for me to venture into 19th C. oboes, and I am simply preferring to stay with two-keyed oboes. If I find energy to develop anything new, it might be a more "Bach" type of 415 oboe, or a d'amore, or a 4 or 5-keyed bassoon.	Cela dépendrait du modèle, mais 5 ou 6 demandes seraient suffisantes

	5. Dick Earle (UK)	6. Randall Cook (CH)
Do you feel that the ROI (return on investment) in building nineteenth-century oboes would be insufficient?	For me, definitely! As I said above, to make instruments of this complexity needs a big investment in machinery and personnel, and I'm not interested in going down that route.	
How do you proceed when selecting which models of eighteenth-century models to copy?	I have always tried to start with an original that plays well. When I started out, in the late '70's, I was lucky enough to be able to play on and measure the Denner, MIR370 in Nürnberg, which was the oboe that was most copied back then. It played beautifully and I made many copies of it. But in the end I wasn't satisfied with the response of the lower octave, and made a copy of one of the Stanesby Senior oboes in the Horniman Museum in London. This was a bit of a gamble, because the museum wouldn't let me measure or try the oboe, but I had measurements from Paul Hailperin. I had to modify it in small ways to play at 415 because it was made for 405-407, but it has served my purposes well for many years.	YES. The „ROI“ in building 19th century oboes would be impossible. The costs of coming up with a prototype, with multiple keys would be a daunting task and expense. For the great part of my life, I was an oboe player and sought after performer. I came into oboe making late in life, and I stick to the models that I have always made. My experimentation came with coming up with a suitable French baroque pitched oboe, which leads to another discussion. a-392, or more around a-400-405? It is clear to me that a-392 is strictly a 20th century fabrication, so that keyboard players can just lower, or raise the transposing keyboard, and tune a FEW notes, for the appropriate temperament.
The vast majority of makers nowadays is copying the Stanesby oboe for C18. Why do you think that is?	I'm not sure. Thomas Stanesby was a great maker, as was his son, and the instruments are well worth copying. Having said that, many of the 'copies' I've seen bear little relation to the originals in their internal dimensions. I think perhaps the original design can be almost infinitely elaborated to suit many different playing styles. When I started making Stanesbys, there was only one other maker doing the same. I've always thought variety was a good thing in copying instruments as well as in playing styles. It's largely a matter of fashion, like in modern playing, you want to have the kind of instrument your teacher or a player you admire has, and to sound like him or her. So you get everything sounding more and more alike...	Stanesby oboes. Hmm... Yes. It does seem to be the modern oboe maker's choice, (or the choice of the players). I think they are elegant, and good for both orchestral and chamber music work. My Bradbury copies are similar to Stanesby, to a point. The original oboe that I copy really played at a-415, where I am quite sure the existing Stanesby instruments were NOT a-415.
What is the most time-consuming activity in copying oboes?	Reamer making! And preparing and drilling billets.	The most time-consuming activity when making oboes ? TUNING !! Especially d'amores. There are so many variables, and boxwood can be WONDERFUL, or extremely time-consuming. There is a very delicate balance between undercutting, or NOT, or making slight changes in the bore, for specific tuning issues.
What is the most expensive activity in copying oboes?	The most expensive element is the investment needed for tools and machinery. But in terms of time spent (and time is money, after all!) is making and fitting keys, esp on keyed classical oboes.	Most expensive activity in copying oboes? Hmm.... keeping all equipment up and running, AND keeping well-aged wood, meaning always being on the look-out for another supply of wood that has already been cut and stored. I have been lucky to have wood that has been cut and stored for at least 30 years before it comes into my hands, which means that there is added expense.
Aside the obvious additional keywork, how would building a C19 oboe differ from building a C18 oboe?	It really wouldn't differ at all. Drilling and reaming are the main elements of both. The turning would be less demanding on a 19th century oboe, assuming you're into the period of metal pillars and rods.	
What would it take to convince you to begin copying nineteenth-century oboes? How many requests/committed purchases would be "sufficient"?	I'm definitely coming to the end of my making career and have no interest in taking on a project to make 19th century oboes.	I've never built a 19th century oboe, and never will.

	7. Sand Dalton (USA)	8. Marc Ecochard (FR)
Do you feel that the ROI (return on investment) in building nineteenth-century oboes would be insufficient?	I choose based on the connections between the music I'm interested in and makers who were close to it. Example: cantatas of J.S. Bach and the workshop of Eichentopf.	Pour un facteur d'instruments baroques et classiques, qui le plus souvent travaille seul, la fabrication d'un hautbois romantique représente un investissement important qui peut nécessiter la collaboration d'une ou deux personnes, particulièrement pour la réalisation du clétage, ce qui a un impact évident sur le prix de revient, de toute façon beaucoup plus élevé que pour un instrument baroque.
How do you proceed when selecting which models of eighteenth-century models to copy?	I really don't know. Current market forces influenced by popular teachers and performers?	Le premier critère de sélection des instruments que je copie est celui du diapason. Pour les hautbois à 415 (diapason d'usage le plus usité actuellement mais le moins fréquent parmi les instruments originaux), je recherche l'original dont le diapason se rapproche le plus de 415, de manière à rester le plus proche possible de l'équilibre sonore de cet original et de ses caractéristiques dimensionnelles. Dans ce domaine de diapason, (entre 410 et 420 Hz) on trouve principalement des instruments allemands au « cammertone A » et des instruments italiens, qui ne demandent que peu ou pas d'ajustements dimensionnels ou d'intonation. A 415, je réalise des instruments d'après J. Denner, Castel (italien), anonyme allemand, J.H. Eichentopf, accessoirement Stanesby. Le problème est exactement le même pour les hautbois de diapason plus bas, unifiés à 392 Hz comme diapason d'usage, alors que pratiquement tous les instruments originaux se situent entre 398 et 405 Hz. Les hautbois classiques, dont le diapason a été unifié à 430 Hz, sont en fait plus bas (vers 420 Hz pour les hautbois français), ou plus haut (vers 435 Hz pour les hautbois allemands). Lorsque le matériel d'anche utilisé ne permet pas un équilibre satisfaisant des registres à l'un ou l'autre de ces diapasos d'usage, un ajustement dimensionnel de l'instrument devient nécessaire. C'est la raison pour laquelle les adaptations de longueur et d'intonation que le facteur est amené à faire par rapport à l'instrument original empêchent, par simple honnêteté intellectuelle, d'utiliser le terme de copie. Le deuxième critère est celui de l'accessibilité de l'instrument original ou sinon des plans précis qui ont pu être réalisés. Rien ne vaut le contact réel avec un instrument original pour comprendre les intentions du facteur et les traduire au mieux dans les instruments qui s'en inspirent. Lorsque ce contact n'est pas ou plus possible, c'est par le recours à un plan détaillé (surtout au niveau de la perce et de son évolution) que l'on peut réaliser un instrument. Lorsque le matériel d'anche utilisé ne permet pas un équilibre satisfaisant des registres à l'un ou l'autre de ces diapasos d'usage, un ajustement dimensionnel de l'instrument devient nécessaire. C'est la raison pour laquelle les adaptations de longueur et d'intonation que le facteur est amené à faire par rapport à l'instrument original empêchent, par simple honnêteté intellectuelle, d'utiliser le terme de copie. Le deuxième critère est celui de l'accessibilité de l'instrument original ou sinon des plans précis qui ont pu être réalisés. Rien ne vaut le contact réel avec un instrument original pour comprendre les intentions du facteur et les traduire au mieux dans les instruments qui s'en inspirent. Lorsque ce contact n'est pas ou plus possible, c'est par le recours à un plan détaillé (surtout au niveau de la perce et de son évolution) que l'on peut réaliser un instrument.
The vast majority of makers nowadays is copying the Stanesby oboe for C18. Why do you think that is?	I'm guess seasoning the wood takes the most time (months, years!)	Les hautbois des père et fils Stanesby ont été parmi les premiers instruments (avec les hautbois de Denner et Paulhahn) à être « copiés » dès la fin des années 1960 pour être joués à 415 Hz. Le problème avec les instruments de Stanesby, c'est que tous les originaux (à part peut-être un hautbois qui se trouve dans la Bate Collection à Oxford) sont au diapason « anglais » de 405 à 408 Hz. Les lères copies, réalisées en respectant les longueurs acoustiques des instruments originaux, étaient évidemment trop basses; jouées à 415 Hz, elles présentaient des problèmes
What is the most time-consuming activity in copying oboes?	In the long run, I've probably spent more time on reed design and tuning techniques than anything else.	Traitement et stabilisation des ébauches de bois durant 2 à 4 mois, qui seront ensuite percées et tournées.
What is the most expensive activity in copying oboes?	My time!	L'accord, bien que je n'ai jamais évalué en terme de prix de revient la valeur de chaque étape de fabrication. L'accord ne peut être réalisé que par le concepteur de l'instrument.
Aside the obvious additional keywork, how would building a C19 oboe differ from building a C18 oboe?	Not much.	Clétage mis à part, un hautbois romantique de facture artisanale présente les mêmes caractéristiques acoustiques qu'un hautbois classique ou baroque; les étapes de fabrication et les méthodes d'accord sont les mêmes (cf. Lettre de C.F. Golde).
What would it take to convince you to begin copying nineteenth-century oboes? How many requests/committed purchases would be "sufficient"?	At 68 years old, I'm not interested in beginning a new project like this.	Simplement que l'on me demande de réaliser une copie.

	1. Filip Frydrysiak (PL)	2. Alfredo Bernardini (IT)
Would you feel comfortable tuning a C19 instrument after turning it? Or would you entrust that procedure to a performer with whom you would be willing to work in tandem?	Yes, I feel very comfortable. It is one of the biggest pleasure of stage of building. So that I can entrust this procedure to the performer, first I would have to give him/her my reamers ... because the real oboe tuning is based on a properly drilled bore! Finger holes are just an addition, like frosting on a cake. I am always ready for creative cooperation. This can be very evolving for both sides.	I consider myself much more a performer than a maker. Generally speaking I think it's always a good idea to have a maker work in tandem with a player, especially if the latter manages to be objective and constructive. Oboe playing can be very subjective, I guess because of the reed and the embouchure and it's very easy to lose the sense of direction...
Additional comments	<p>Personal digression (most probably too honest):</p> <p>Referring to your thoughts in email (before the questions), I must say that no one copies oboes of the Kuss/Koch type, because ... they can't.</p> <p>Also because everybody do not want to undertake such time-consuming, complicated work. But for understandable reasons, they will not tell you this directly.</p> <p>I will give you this example: in 2017, Margaret Friedrich from Heidelberg ordered the oboe Kuss by me. When we met - while I was measuring the original in the beginning of 2018 - confessed face to face in a conversation that she wrote to many oboe makers in this case, but nobody answered her... and she did not write anything about the possible price! Simply, nobody wanted to make such an instrument.</p> <p>The truth is that an oboe like Kuss or Koch is a huge challenge for anyone who hasn't done this type of oboe before. I also - some 10 years ago - I would not undertake such a task.</p> <p>These types of instruments really require new skills and a new tooling workshop (that's all I wrote about when answering your questions).</p> <p>Of course, when we are seriously thinking about such an undertaking, the calculation of all costs and the anticipation of their amortization are also of great importance.</p> <p>I think that there will not be as many buyers of Kuss copies as compared to the popular baroque or classic oboes. I mean not only professionals - although certainly not every oboist is so versatile, to play on romantic instruments - but also pupils and students (usually the largest group of clients). And this is because learning to play oboes usually involves the following conception: learning on modern oboe, then on baroque oboe, classical oboe and, eventually, on romantic oboe. In my opinion, it's a bit absurd, because it excludes the possibility for great individualists who can be outstanding, for example in a playing of romantic oboes (as we know, it is a completely different way of playing, instruments), and do not necessarily want to play baroque instruments. Musicians in the nineteenth century probably didn't know this order in teaching :-)</p>	

	3. Mary Kirkpatrick (US)	4. Henri Gohin (FR)
Would you feel comfortable tuning a C19 instrument after turning it? Or would you entrust that procedure to a performer with whom you would be willing to work in tandem?	No, I would not, and yes, I would rely on a good player's help to make sure I was "on the straight and narrow."	Je pense que l'accord ne me poserait pas de problème, cela dit il faut parfois ajuster l'accord avec le musicien mais cela peut changer avec l'interprète...
Additional comments		

	5. Dick Earle (UK)	6. Randall Cook (CH)
Would you feel comfortable tuning a C19 instrument after turning it? Or would you entrust that procedure to a performer with whom you would be willing to work in tandem?	If I were to make such an instrument I'd definitely tune it myself, but would be happy to adjust tuning to suit individual players - as I do currently.	
Additional comments		<p>(I hope my replies can help you with your Doctoral work.). I just re-read your second paragraph. In MY playing days, it was never a question, of trying to find a suitable copy of an original 19th century oboe. The only person that I know of who tried, was Paul Hailperin, and to my knowledge he only made one copy of a Küss oboe that he has / had, in his possession. Marie Wolff, in Vienna, had it for awhile, (but was not so happy with it, I think). PLUS, it was very expensive, and for good reason.</p> <p>Maybe it is a different situation for players looking for playable 19th century instruments. I always had a modern oboe mindset, where I was taught that you can play a modern oboe for 7 years, and then you need a new one, because of the modification of the bore, from playing.</p> <p>I felt it would be a crime to ruin an original oboe in MY lifetime.</p> <p>Oboe bores are TINY. What I find interesting is that some of the most famous players these days are using their oboes that they started with. Players feel too much pressure to always play their very best, using an instrument they know VERY well, and not try to get used to a new instrument. What I find interesting is that ONE of those players came to have some work done on her oboe, and she tried one of my new middle joints, but using her top joint and bell. She decided that she wants a new oboe, but with the measurements of especially her oboe bell. I took the measurements, and she sent me photos afterwards. I sent her the new, complete oboe a few weeks ago, and she is SHOCKED at how wonderful the new oboe is. (what a surprise?).</p> <p>O.K. I guess that is enough for now. Re-reading your fourth introductory paragraph, I would have to say that especially in these very, very strange times, WHO can afford to experiment, either from the player's side, and certainly from the maker's time and expense.</p>

	7. Sand Dalton (USA)	8. Marc Ecochard (FR)
Would you feel comfortable tuning a C19 instrument after turning it? Or would you entrust that procedure to a performer with whom you would be willing to work in tandem?	I've never been in it for the money anyway. There must be a younger maker out there who would want to pursue this, no?	n/a
Additional comments	<p>In 40 years, I've learned a lot about tuning 2-key oboes and their cousin the 8-key. What I'm not comfortable with is all the time and effort it would take to even get to the point of tuning a later 19C instrument: such as research and examination of originals, reed design, reamer making, a new key making technique, etc.</p> <p>The French conservatoire-style oboes of the 2nd half of the century are essentially identical to modern oboes made today. Why not just play this "Romantic" music on them?</p>	

	1. Hélène Mourrot (FR) (28/01/2021)	2. Stefaan Verdegem (BE) (25/06/2022)
1. In the workplace, are you often called on to play nineteenth-century orchestral or operatic repertoire? If so, do you feel like you have the appropriate equipment/right tools (instruments and reeds) to fulfil your professional duties and reach your goals and requirements as a performer?	Je n'ai pas du tout été formé à ça au départ. Je faisais que du moderne d'un côté et que du baroque et classique de l'autre, je ne faisais pas du tout d'instruments XIXème. Au début, aux Siècles, je ne voulais pas en faire, parce que je n'avais pas d'instrument et j'estimais que je ne savais pas le faire. Je ne me sentais pas légitime. Un jour, François-Xavier Roth m'a appelé pour m'encourager à m'y mettre, c'était un peu urgent, il y avait un projet dans deux mois. Les Siècles ont des instruments qu'ils avaient acheté il y a longtemps, deux Trièbert originaux qui sont très beaux mais qui avaient été déjà beaucoup joués. Je m'en faisais une montagne, je me suis dit que ça va être affreux, je ne voulais pas le faire. Comme Roth m'avait demandé exprès, j'ai pris un mois pour travailler. J'ai emprunté cet instrument Trièbert à 13 clefs en palissandre avec un joli clétage en argent fin, c'est un très bel instrument, mais qui n'a pas été beaucoup joué. En fait, ça marchait assez bien dès le départ. Comme j'avais fait beaucoup de classique, j'avais pris mes anches classiques et ça marchait plutôt bien. Comme l'instrument n'était pas à moi, j'ai cherché pendant des années. J'ai essayé de faire faire des copies, sans succès. J'ai cherché des originaux et ceux que j'ai vu passer était à 8000 euros, je n'avais pas les moyens. J'ai continué à jouer ces instruments qui ne m'appartenaient pas, et j'ai enfin trouvé aux enchères de Vichy il y a deux ans un Trièbert original en buis qui est très beau, et que j'utilise aujourd'hui aux Siècles.	The 19th century operas I played and/or recorded are Manfred, Parsifal, Tristan, Faust (Gounod) La Mort d'Abzl (Kreutzer). I am going to do a complete Ring, and hope to do more on period instruments. Also I did many oratorios like Das Paradies und die Peri, Deutches Requiem, Paulus, Elias, Christus and so on. I always try to come as close as possible to what might have been the instrument originally used for the performance. Then starts the search for a matching reed.
2. Have you found C19 copies of oboes to be readily available? If so, which makers come to mind? If not, why do you feel there aren't?	Je crois que les facteurs hésitent à faire des copies car ça fera des instruments assez chers à cause du clétage. A mon avis, les facteurs se sont pas très intéressés à en faire car ils sont peut-être pas très sollicités par les musiciens. Je pense que ça représente beaucoup d'investissement et de travail et c'est pas facile à vendre, et en plus c'est quand même assez cher. Comme tu le sais déjà, il y a Ponchio commence à faire des Golde, donc pas des copies d'originaux français.	Collectors, auctions, internet finds, second hand sites, specialized sites and so on. Also, people sometimes contact me when they have an oboe for sale.
3. If someone were making copies of Romantic oboes, would you be interested in purchasing one?	Oui, éventuellement.	Yes, if it is better than the originals I have.
4. At what pitches are you being asked to perform Romantic repertoire?	En général, à 438 Hz. Ça m'est arrivée une fois de jouer à 435, mais ce n'était pas pour du Berlioz. Aussi, une fois à 440.	430-435-438-440 Herz
5. Are there dangers/risks, limitations, and compromises you feel you face when performing nineteenth-century repertoire? If so, what do you consider to be difficult, frustrating, unusable or unacceptable? Have you ever felt like you've needed to 'invent' solutions to reach your professional goals/demands?	J'ai un peu tout fait sur le tas. J'ai eu un instrument dans les mains, j'ai mis une anche dessus, et j'ai commencé à jouer. Dans un premier temps, je n'avais même pas regardé une tablature [de doigts]. Après, oui, mais au départ, j'ai surtout essayé de voir ce que j'arrivais à en faire. De toute façon, les compromis, c'est le jeu des instrumentistes, quel que soit le répertoire. Il y a toujours des risques et des compromis entre le choix historique et nos oreilles de 2021, et ce que demande un chef, et le rapport à l'ensemble du groupe, etc. De toute façon, ce n'est qu'un compromis quelque part. Ma solution pour faire face à ça, pour me sentir légitime, c'est d'être très sérieuse, de travailler, je passe beaucoup de temps, à faire des anches, en essayant d'avoir quelque chose qui me semble le plus cohérent possible vis-à-vis du contexte. Berlioz c'est quand même pas n'importe qui, de savoir de qui on parle, dans quel contexte les pièces ont été créées, et qu'est ce que ça veut dire par rapport au groupe. Pour moi, c'est beaucoup une question par rapport au groupe, au collectif. Je crois que notre cuisine n'est pas si importante que ça, il faut que ça fonctionne, mais surtout il faut aussi être capable d'être à l'écoute, vraiment de l'instrument au sein du groupe. Le truc d'avoir raison tout seul, moi j'ai jamais vraiment cru. Une chose c'est la documentation, de savoir ce qu'on fait en conscience, mais j'ai du mal à croire que la documentation soit la vérité absolue. Quelque part, avoir raison envers et contre tout sans se soucier du collectif, il faut un minimum se fier à son intuition et à sa perception des autres, et ça c'est très 2021. Aussi, la façon dont on s'exprime n'est pas la même. Il n'y a pas d'objectivité à mon sens.	The whole thing is that most of the repertoire is well known and has been recorded outstandingly by (modern) orchestras, so one will always be compared to that, whether you like it or not. This being said, the performance on period instruments should have some added value compared to the modern interpretations, either in interpretation either in the colors of the period instruments. Sometimes it is really difficult to play the parts well, and beyond. One needs full technical control, excellent intonation and tone quality, and great musicianship. All this together may be hard, especially if your period instrument doesn't function well or doesn't match the requested pitch.
6. From a practical point of view, are you more comfortable (stylistically and technically) performing repertoire from the beginning/middle/end of the C19? To what extent do you find this to be connected with the choice of instrument and reed set-up? If so, which instruments do you use? If not, why do you think that is so?	Je fais le début et la fin XIXème, mais je suis plus à l'aise sur le début. C'est ce que j'ai fait le plus et c'est ce qui m'attire plus. Pour ce répertoire, je joue sur ce Trièbert original que j'ai eu à Vichy. Selon les anches que je mets dessus, il peut être à 435 ou 438, mais pas 430. 440, il faut vraiment le pousser. Je pense qu'il est parfait à 435, mais je le joue plus à 438.	Every instrument, composer, period has its own particularities... I came to a point in my career that I think everything is difficult when it comes to solid basics.
7. For reeds in general (415/430/Romantic), do you hand shape or use a shaper tip?	Je fais tout à la main.	Hörtnagl, I have c20 shapes
8. Have you ever experimented with hand gouging? If yes, please explain why. If not, why?	Non. J'en ai pas fait, un peu par paresse, un peu parce que je joue beaucoup d'instruments et je n'ai pas envie de passer ma vie à faire des anches, donc c'est une question pratique surtout.	Yes, 30 years ago, it was no success, probably because I didn't have decent tools.
9. How do you view nineteenth-century solo repertoire for oboe? Do you feel that we, as oboists, have a good knowledge or awareness of the Romantic repertoire for our instrument? If not, why do you think that is?	Je me suis pas mal renseigné là-dessus, en outre parce que j'ai dû enseigner, j'ai fait des stages, j'enseigne régulièrement le hautbois romantique français. J'ai des étudiants qui sont venus me voir de Saintes, qui voulaient apprendre à jouer du hautbois romantique français, donc j'ai quand même beaucoup cherché. Mais, par exemple, les oeuvres de Vogt ne sont pas faciles, donc pour commencer ces instruments-là, ce n'est pas très accessible. C'est assez virtuose, ça demande une vraie maîtrise technique, au niveau des doigts, il y a toujours cette co-habitation de doigts anciens et modernes, ce n'est pas simple. Pour commencer, je trouve [ces oeuvres de Vogt et Brod] pas idéal. Ça doit participer au fait qu'on ne joue pas très souvent ces oeuvres sur instruments d'époque. Aussi, il y a un effet de mode je crois. C'est un peu démodé, après, moi je trouve ça assez mignon. Je trouve ça pas désagréable. Après, il y a toujours la comparaison avec tout le répertoire XIXème pour le violon ou le piano, ce qui crée un côté dévalorisé et délaissé mais je trouve ça un peu dommage en fait. Vendre des disques avec du Vogt, ça se mérite!	Compared to flute or clarinet the solo repertoire is small, and I think I know most pieces. The chamber music combination pieces are often more interesting than the solo pieces.
10. What are your thoughts on the use of vibrato in historical repertoire, be it eighteenth- or nineteenth-century?	Et pour répondre à ta question, non on ne me l'a jamais demandé explicitement, mais je crois que je vibre un peu les notes longues pour les faire vivre... Plus ou moins consciemment! J'ai lu tout un tas de trucs là dessus, dont l'article que je te mets en pièce jointe, sans vraiment réussir à avoir une idée tout à fait claire là dessus, j'ai fini par me dire que je faisais le choix de vibrer uniquement dans les solos, avec parcimonie, plutôt pour faire vivre des notes longues (comme on le ferait avec des flâtements en musique française). En gros...	Most of the people, even the so called (or auto-declared) specialist have no idea. In both France and Germany it was kind of taboo or even forbidden, so we can only guess and listen to the earliest recordings. I do believe that some vibrato might have been used, but never very prominent or pronounced, as an element of the sound. From 1900 on it started to be accepted.

	3. Leo Duarte (UK) (21/01/2022)	4. Geoffrey Burgess (USA) (21/01/2022)
1. In the workplace, are you often called on to play nineteenth-century orchestral or operatic repertoire? If so, do you feel like you have the appropriate equipment/right tools (instruments and reeds) to fulfil your professional duties and reach your goals and requirements as a performer?	I am often called on to play this repertoire, yes. I feel like I have a good amount of the appropriate instruments to play on (though there are big holes in my collection for the Nineteenth Century). A particular difficulty of mine is French instruments (1810-1850). Reeds... well... I mean, there are never enough reeds. And as for appropriate reeds. It would be a great day that I felt able to go into an orchestra with a sound which I felt was appropriate to the C19th and wouldn't get me sacked immediately...	Not frequently, but I do have a number of possibilities.
2. Have you found C19 copies of oboes to be readily available? If so, which makers come to mind? If not, why do you feel there aren't?	I've ordered one of Frydrick Fridrisiak's Viennese Küss copies (https://vienneseoboe.com). I've taken a big gamble as it's expensive and I haven't been able to try an example of it because of the pandemic travel restrictions. But it's an important one where my collection is lacking and the tuning slide is a very attractive element. I reckon that the intricate keyword of the C19th oboes puts makers off. That, in addition to choosing a good model to copy. Given that there was such an explosion of inventiveness in the C19th it would be a shame if we all started playing own identical instruments (I'm thinking of the hegemony which now exists in Baroque and Classical oboes, which is all well and good because players are playing well, but the lack of variety could be a bit dull or dangerous.).	They are only just starting to appear. Apart from early 19th-c. designs that are basically Classical instruments with added keys, such as Grenser, Floth that have been available already for several decades. Otherwise, for most post Beethoven the offerings have been fairly thin on the ground, and because the projects have been exceptional, and infrequent, there has not been the need for many players to invest in the equipment, so most have relied on original instruments.
3. If someone were making copies of Romantic oboes, would you be interested in purchasing one?	YES, YES, YES!	No. I have enough originals in playable condition that I can manage without.
4. At what pitches are you being asked to perform Romantic repertoire?	A430, A437, A438, A440, A442 I've been asking the orchestras I work with to consider Dispason Normale (A435) for repertoire c.1850-1900 but there is considerable resistance to the idea, sadly.	438-440
5. Are there dangers/risks, limitations, and compromises you feel you face when performing nineteenth-century repertoire? If so, what do you consider to be difficult, frustrating, unusable or unacceptable? Have you ever felt like you've needed to "invent" solutions to reach your professional goals/demands?	All of the above, yes. 1. Reeds/Sound concept - I think there would need to be a really concerted effort between all of us playing on C19th century instruments to bring back the reedier, more plaintive sounds which were probably common in the C19th. 2. Playing on original C19th instruments always feels immoral. Pouring water down them for day after day and then putting them in a cupboard for a few months can't be good for them. I've bought some instruments which I use as war horses and some which I keep for special occasions, but it's not an ideal system. If good copies were available that would be great! 3. Glides, finger-vibrato, rhythmic alteration etc - All of these musical elements which we read were common in the C19th are basically banned in orchestras today. The amount of times I get nasty looks from a flute player for doing a simple ornament in a Mozart opera is bad enough. I've occasionally tried to go further in the C19th repertoire, but for a start I'm not as well practised in gliding as I'd like to be, secondly, my colleagues often aren't prepared to embrace the soundworld, and lastly the conductors often are "modern" conductors with little or no sympathy for Romantic style. I'm sure there is more to add here, but I have to do some scraping today...!	The pitch is a big limitation. When we need to set a pitch that is non-standard it will take a good deal of time for the ensemble to find the pitch, be comfortable with it and begin to start making music rather than being in constant trepidation of sounding out of tune. Then there are performance-practice details that come naturally to original instruments that do not match with current expectations. The use of portamento, tempo fluctuation, non-alignment in ensemble, and limited use of vibrato. Many times, we are expected to sound just like modern instruments, so the process can be quite frustrating and the end result of limited value. We adhere to Schumann, even though it is unlikely to have been conceived for oboe, and fortunately it has stimulated several players to find music through arrangements, but we still balk at the operatic fantasies because they are not "great" music by "great" composers. It's true that they make greater demands on the player to bring personality to the music.
6. From a practical point of view, are you more comfortable (stylistically and technically) performing repertoire from the beginning/middle/end of the C19? To what extent do you find this to be connected with the choice of instrument and reed set-up? If so, which instruments do you use? If not, why do you think that is so?	I don't feel more uncomfortable in any part of the repertoire really. The early French repertoire is a challenge unless I happen to be able to find the right instrument, but otherwise I feel I've done enough research across the century that none is more or less comfortable than the rest.	The challenges are amplified with chromatic harmony. When we hit late Wagner and Brahms or Mahler, equipment is really vital. Without brille for F# and easy access to Bb and C keys in mid register, passage work is complicated and intonation can be problematic. How up-to-date were 19th-c. oboe builders able to be relative to musical developments and the demands placed on performers by composers?
7. For reeds in general (415/430/Romantic), do you hand shape or use a shaper tip?	Hand shape.	Combination. A shaper tip as a guide for hand shaping.
8. Have you ever experimented with hand gouging? If yes, please explain why. If not, why?	Yes, many years ago, but not any more. I wasn't very good at it and didn't have anyone to help or mentor me sadly. I would be up for giving this another go though!	Tried it on and off over the years; harder for me to make that work for the smaller reeds for Romantic oboes.
9. How do you view nineteenth-century solo repertoire for oboe? Do you feel that we, as oboists, have a good knowledge or awareness of the Romantic repertoire for our instrument? If not, why do you think that is?	If I'm honest, I don't view the solo repertoire with any great fondness (with five or six notable exceptions). I have a horrible suspicion that it lacks the profundity and depth which I want to engage with. I hope that this is something to be proved wrong! The other difficulty is finding the right keyboard instrument to perform with. I find that the blend between the oboe and the piano in any era is problematic, but if you try to play oboes and pianos from different periods then things become very unsatisfying very quickly.	No, we do not. We have been told for too long that there is none! It's music that takes finesse. Even where students are raised on a strict diet of Barret études, the stylistic parameters of 19th-c. interpretation remain very rigid.
10. What are your thoughts on the use of vibrato in historical repertoire, be it eighteenth- or nineteenth-century?	I think that we haven't yet even opened the box which contains the colours our C19th predecessors used! This is true particularly in a solo context, but presumably also in an orchestral context where we have a solo part to play. I think this is also true of the C18th repertoire too. I'm not convinced that we've removed the technique far enough away from the C20th technique to make it's impact properly felt. It's going to take a lot of hard work and putting up with a lot of ridicule before we get anywhere probably...	It's a topic that is constantly changing, and I think that when we listen to what people are doing around the world now, we'll notice that there has been quite a shift from even 20 years ago, and certainly from ideals we hear on recordings from the early half of the 20th century. But there is as much synchronic variation between styles in different areas and schools as diachronically over time.

	5. Paolo Grazi (IT) (29/01/2022)	6. Mark Baigent (UK) (06/02/2022)
1. In the workplace, are you often called on to play nineteenth-century orchestral or operatic repertoire? If so, do you feel like you have the appropriate equipment/right tools (instruments and reeds) to fulfil your professional duties and reach your goals and requirements as a performer?	No. Since I totally disagree with Singers aesthetic, I try to avoid to play opera... No. I have some original instruments but I didn't found an appropriate setting for none of these.	Not so often but yes mostly the right instruments after years of collecting. There are always specific instruments we don't have depending on how accurate to the piece you want to be instrument-wise. The trouble with originals is finding instruments that work at pitches required.
2. Have you found C19 copies of oboes to be readily available? If so, which makers come to mind? If not, why do you feel there aren't?	Westermann copy (with three octave keys!) and Ponchio copy from Golde. Both are usable but still not completely well balanced. I think the final setting of staple/reed is still to be found.	Not really. I mostly own originals. The copies aren't always very good if they exist because they are not tried and tested to the same degree as 415 baroque.
3. If someone were making copies of Romantic oboes, would you be interested in purchasing one?	Yes.	Yes but they cost a lot more than originals and one doesn't fit all countries and periods so you need lots of different ones.
4. At what pitches are you being asked to perform Romantic repertoire?	438/440	435, 438
5. Are there dangers/risks, limitations, and compromises you feel you face when performing nineteenth-century repertoire? If so, what do you consider to be difficult, frustrating, unusable or unacceptable? Have you ever felt like you've needed to 'invent' solutions to reach your professional goals/demands?	At the present state of work there are two main problems: 1) The instruments are not still focused and without an appropriate setting. 2) we are not used to play romantic instruments; we do it too little and so we are not able to lead makers in the right direction to improve the instruments.	Working at pitches that aren't what the oboes are made at so everything is compromised.
6. From a practical point of view, are you more comfortable (stylistically and technically) performing repertoire from the beginning/middle/end of the C19? To what extent do you find this to be connected with the choice of instrument and reed set-up? If so, which instruments do you use? If not, why do you think that is so?	I try to play C19 as much as possible with two keys 430 instrument! If not, I have an original Bormann I manage to use around 440 but I still don't feel comfortable with it.	I'm not sure of any major differences. I always try to have instruments from every 25 years or so to fit in with their development. I use French oboes for French rep. German for German rep etc.
7. For reeds in general (415/430/Romantic), do you hand shape or use a shaper tip?	Hand shape about 8,7/9,0 width.	Shaper tip then hand finished shape and scrape.
8. Have you ever experimented with hand gouging? If yes, please explain why. If not, why?	Yes, I did it but with normal gouge, not the old one (pulling gouge). The result was not so interesting.	I have the tools but it creates too many more variables for consistency.
9. How do you view nineteenth-century solo repertoire for oboe? Do you feel that we, as oboists, have a good knowledge or awareness of the Romantic repertoire for our instrument? If not, why do you think that is?	Late C19 solo repertory for oboe is almost not existing! I think the most interesting repertory is the orchestral one. It would be nice to know more about tempo interventions in interpretation of romantic music. I think that in our time we are very focused on precision of performing ensemble (I mean verticality of the ensemble) that it doesn't seem like it was in post-romantic performance and maybe as it was before.	Yes, a growing awareness of what's out there but considering we were fed that there is a dearth of 19th century repertoire, there is actually a LOT out there. Not always the best quality music, but it is of its era.
10. What are your thoughts on the use of vibrato in historical repertoire, be it eighteenth- or nineteenth-century?	I hate continuous vibrato (like singers) but I think it can be used in a smooth way, in the middle of a note and not too fast in speed. Is a question of personal taste but there are also statements of important authors (e.g., Saint Saens) against the excess of vibrato	I don't believe it should be used but more and more people are doing it. Yes for odd notes etc., but constantly it is wrong.

	7. Masamitsu San'nomiya (JAPAN) (07/02/2022)	8. Taka Kitazato (NL) (01/05/2022)
1. In the workplace, are you often called on to play nineteenth-century orchestral or operatic repertoire? If so, do you feel like you have the appropriate equipment/right tools (instruments and reeds) to fulfil your professional duties and reach your goals and requirements as a performer?	BCJ even plays Mendelssohn's vocal music and symphonies. There are no plans after that. I have some 19th century original oboes.	Yes, yes.
2. Have you found C19 copies of oboes to be readily available? If so, which makers come to mind? If not, why do you feel there aren't?	I know a few copy makers. For example, Pau [Orriols], Hans Peter Westermann, etc.	It's very difficult to find original C19 instruments. C19 instrument builders continued working with boxwood. The smallest diameter of the top joint, between 4.2 and 4.5 mm, is very narrow. With boxwood, the dry/wet cycles over 100 years caused bore shrinkage, making originals very problematic. Many models have a tuning slide. The gap created by the slide also shrinks over time, creating leaks which make playing originals very challenging. These are two reasons why makers began working with hardwoods such as ebony and grenadilla. Furthermore, the elaborate keywork was an additional challenge. It is much easier to find C19 flutes and clarinets in good condition compared to the oboe, or else early C20 oboes...
3. If someone were making copies of Romantic oboes, would you be interested in purchasing one?	I'm not interested in 19th century copies. Because we have a chance to get the original oboes. Baroque oboe does not.	No, I have a large collection.
4. At what pitches are you being asked to perform Romantic repertoire?	BCJ is at 432 recently. It was suggested by me. As more and more members use original instruments, it's a pitch that can be harmonized with copied instruments. If the number of original musical instrument users increases, it should be 435 to 438.	440 Hz comes from the 1930 2nd London International Pitch Convention (first one was in 1885). At the 1st International Pitch Convention in Vienna, they decided on 435 Hz (French diapason normale). That means that between 1885 and 1930 all instruments were made to play at 435. Therefore, when Orchestre des Champs Elysées started, we played at 435. The first oboe (Marcel) was playing a Jehring instrument in boxwood at 435, but the 1st clarinet was playing a 440 instrument. So we made a compromise to begin playing at 438. 435 is better. Vienna is 445, 446...much higher (for Zuleger oboes). So with Marcel we began playing on copies by Guntram Wolfe pitched at 438...these instruments were not very good. So I had to retune to whole instrument. But now I have my own collection which I use.
5. Are there dangers/risks, limitations, and compromises you feel you face when performing nineteenth-century repertoire? If so, what do you consider to be difficult, frustrating, unusable or unacceptable? Have you ever felt like you've needed to 'invent' solutions to reach your professional goals/demands?	I think it's best to choose an instrument that is directly linked to the repertoire. However, at this stage, it is difficult to get everything in the woodwind section. I want to use original instruments as much as possible, even in different times and regions. Because it sounds convincing. As a later goal, we would like to play with all the matching instruments.	To find the balance of the instrument is the most difficult thing. Even if you find instruments in good condition, there are no staples, no reeds, no dimensions. You have to find a proper staple and a proper reed. Then you deal with the balance, from the lowest note to the highest note, this has to be in tune... you have to draw a line somewhere.
6. From a practical point of view, are you more comfortable (stylistically and technically) performing repertoire from the beginning/middle/end of the C19? To what extent do you find this to be connected with the choice of instrument and reed set-up? If so, which instruments do you use? If not, why do you think that is so?	I play the instrument using Brod and Golde tube sizes. (I have an original Golde tube.) I think the difference between French and German is big. It has reed size, timbre, resistance, and that in mind. Brod, Triebert, Loree, etc. are thin, short-scraped reeds. Lohner, Wiesner, Golde, Hajek, Zuleger, are thicker than French and have longer scrapes and shorter tubes. However, I can't play music that is technically difficult! Pasculli and Ravel...	I prefer modern! (laughs). Anything from 2022 (laughs). The human being is not stupid. It likes comfort. The two-keyed oboe was perfect. Adding keys just add problems.
7. For reeds in general (415/430/Romantic), do you hand shape or use a shaper tip?	I make it with a hand shape.	Shaper tip.
8. Have you ever experimented with hand gouging? If yes, please explain why. If not, why?	I use a gouging machine. Hand gouging is difficult.	No. Gouging for me is a waste of time. I'll do it in the next life!
9. How do you view nineteenth-century solo repertoire for oboe? Do you feel that we, as oboists, have a good knowledge or awareness of the Romantic repertoire for our instrument? If not, why do you think that is?	We don't know a lot of repertoire. I definitely want you to excavate! We should play more of Vogt's work.	Why don't we have C19 repertoire as oboists? Because of keywork. Also, modulation challenges. Conical bore with 10 fingers...it's a challenge. Then we have to find the right reeds, staple...The oboe is not well-adapted to this music. The flute and clarinet, they were much better suited to the nineteenth century.
10. What are your thoughts on the use of vibrato in historical repertoire, be it eighteenth- or nineteenth-century?	I think it should be used aggressively. However, not continuous! Musically.	I like it. Without vibrato, from the beginning to the end of the C19 is a bit odd. In the entire history of music it was never used before? I can't believe this. The question is <i>how</i> to use vibrato. <i>No vibrato vs. sempre vibrato</i> ...A tiny bit of vibrato used to make a note shine, to be more expressive, that I really like.

	Measured by:	Key system	Materials	Bore conicity/scaling (ratio of bore diameter to length) = acoustic length / minimum bore) lower = less conical, higher = more conical	Aggregate tone hole diameter (total of diameters of holes 1, 2, 5, 6)	Body length	Top joint length (body + tenon)	Middle joint length (body + tenon)	Bell length	Acoustic length (from top to middle of hole 6)
Brod (379/483)	Michel Gérard	9 silver keys	? Maple (on MDLM website - doubtful) with silver tips			579 mm				
Delusse (367/479) Sallantin's oboe	Michel Gérard	12 silver keys	Cedar with silver tips		3 3 5 5 TOTAL = 16 (Gérard, imprecise)	563 mm (Musée website) 561 (Gérard)	209 + 22 = 231	207 + 26 = 233	145	209 + 113.5 = 322.5
Delusse (387) Vogt's 1st oboe, with three different corps de rechange	Michel Gérard	2 copper keys	Boxwood with ivory tips		Corps 1: 2.7 3.4 Corps 2: 2.8 3.4 Corps 3: 2.7 3.2 Bottom joint: 5 5 Total 1: 16.1 Total 2: 16.2 Total 3: 15.9	568 mm	Corps 1 (longest): 214 + 21 = 235 Corps 2: 207 + 22 = 229 Corps 3 (shortest): 204 + 22 = 226	231	141	
Delusse 263 Vogt's 2nd oboe, which he acquired in 1825.	Michel Gérard	7 silver keys	Boxwood with ivory tips		3 3 5 5 TOTAL = 16 (Gérard, imprecise)	566 mm (both Musée website and Gérard agree)	216 + 24 = 240	206 + 24 = 230	144	216 + 113.5 = 329.5
Delusse E2180	Bruno Salenson	2 silver keys	Ebony with ivory tips	66.13	2.4x2.46=2.43 2.68x2.5=2.59 4.55x4.9=4.73 4.13x4.17=4.15 TOTAL = 13.9	577 (576.45)	216 + 21 = 237	214 + 26 = 240	146.45	330.7
Delusse E2182	Bruno Salenson	2 silver keys	Boxwood	66.52	2.46x2.34=2.4 2.74x2.8=2.77 4.8x5.7=5.25 4.05x4.15=4.10 TOTAL=14.52	570	218 + 20 = 238	207 + 26.5 = 233.5	144.8	332.6
Cottet Golde copy RAM	Christopher Palameta	12 nickel keys	Boxwood with ivory mounts	66.23	2.75 3.3 4.75 4.75 TOTAL=15.55	558.4	207.7 + (19.7) = 227.4	205.7 + (19.5) = 225.2	145	311.3
Triebert RAM	Henri Gohin	10 brass keys	Boxwood with ivory tips	70.88	?	556.7	212.2 + (20.7) = 233.1	204.0 + (23.9) = 228	140.5	322.5
Anonymous French, cocuswood	Henri Gohin	11 nickel keys	Cocus wood with ivory tips	72.49	2.8x2.6=2.7 3.35 5.25 4.85x4.75=4.8 TOTAL=16.1	562.6	210.8 + (22.3) = 233.2	208.2 + (22.5) = 231.0	143.6	322.6
Brod	Christopher Palameta	13 silver keys	Cedar with silver tips	67.5	3.0 x 3.15 = 3.08 3.3 4.55 x 4.65 = 4.6 4.4 x 4.3 = 4.35 TOTAL = 15.33	594.5	218 + (20) = 238	207 + (19) = 226	169.5	324
Triebert (ex. Verdegem)	Christopher Palameta	12 silver keys	Rosewood with silver tips	69.68	2.7 x 2.5 = 2.6 3.1 x 3.0 = 3.05 4.8 x 5.0 = 4.9 4.45 x 4.45 = 4.45 TOTAL = 15	572.8	215 + (17) = 232	214.8 + (20.2) = 235	143	327.5
Adler	Henri Gohin	10 brass keys	Boxwood with ivory tips	71.54	2.62x2.5=2.56 2.8 4.6x4.5=4.55 4.3x4.2=4.25 TOTAL=14.16	563	218.8 + (22.2) = 241	205.2 + (22.0) = 227.2	139	325.5
Buffet-Crampon	Henri Gohin	12 silver keys	Stained boxwood with silver tips	68.25	14.93 total	587.1	213.6 + (16.2) = 230	205.5 + (24.7) = 230.5	168	324.2
E. Jehring, Leipzig c. 1880	Christopher Palameta	14 nickel keys	Ebony	64.15	3.2 x 3.0 = 3.1 3.45 x 3.25 = 3.35 4.9 4.82 TOTAL = 16.17	564.6	217 + (20.5) = 237.5	204.6 + (20.4) = 225	143	324
Buffet système 4 ex. Westermann	Christopher Palameta	13 brass keys	Stained boxwood with brass ferules		3.4 3.44x3.36 = 3.4 5.45x2 = 5.3 5.1 TOTAL=17.2				132	
Triebert système 4 ex. Coppens	Christopher Palameta	14 nickel keys	Palissander with nickel ferules		3.4 4.1 Z 4.8				94	
Tulou MIM	Stefaan Verdegem			70		563 mm	213 + 17.2 = 230.2	205 + 26 = 231	145	322
Breton MIM	Stefaan Verdegem	11 brass keys	Boxwood with ivory mounts	75.06976744		596.3mm	216.6mm + 21.1mm = 237.7	209.2mm + 17.5 mm = 226.7	170.5mm	322.8
Bormann MIM	Stefaan Verdegem	11 silver keys	Boxwood with ivory mounts	75.13953488		565.7mm	211.3mm + 20.3mm = 231.6	208.5mm + 24.6 mm = 233.1	145.9mm	323.1
Ponfoort MIM	Stefaan Verdegem	11 brass keys	Boxwood with brass ferules	74.41860465		550 mm	209 mm	206 mm	134 mm	320
Ponfoort 2 MIM	Stefaan Verdegem	14 brass keys	"Probably boxwood with brass ferules"	79.25		549 mm	228 mm + 19 mm = 247	192 mm + 20 mm = 212	128 mm	317
Schott 1 MIM	Stefaan Verdegem	12 brass keys	Boxwood with ivory mounts			542 mm (with shortest tuning slide)	c. 210.5mm + n.m. (TJ stuck).	c. 200.5 mm + n.m. (MJ stuck).	130.1 mm	311 mm (with shortest tuning slide)
Schott 2 MIM	Stefaan Verdegem	12 brass keys	Boxwood with ivory mounts			545 mm	212 mm + 17 mm = 229	201 mm + 20 mm = 221	131 mm	312 mm
Triebert 1 MIM	Stefaan Verdegem	12 brass keys and 2 rings	Boxwood with ivory mounts	76.42857143		558 mm	208 mm + 21 mm = 229	207 mm + 24 mm = 231	143 mm	321

	Minimum bore	Reed well diameter	Reed well depth (if cylindrical)	Bore at bottom of TJ	Bore at top of MJ	Bore at bottom of MJ	Bore at top of bell	MJ socket (length + diameter)	Bell socket (length + diameter)	URL	Remarks
Brod (379/483)										https://collections.musee-philharmoniedeparis.fr/doc/MUSEE-0161654	
Delusse (367/479) Sallantin's oboe			??							https://collections.musee-philharmoniedeparis.fr/doc/MUSEE-0161654	"Transformé par Charles Triebert. A appartenu à Antoine Sallantin (1755-1830)." Bell with two resonance holes. One fitted with a key, the other obstructed. Has thumb-plate over 1st hole.
Delusse (387) Vogt's 1st oboe, with three different corps de rechange				Corps 1: 10.3 Corps 2: 10.1 Corps 3: ?						https://collections.musee-philharmoniedeparis.fr/doc/MUSEE-0161654	Has two corps de rechange, and although the instrument only has two remaining keys, holes for F# and low C-corrector indicate it originally had four keys. Played by Vogt up until 1825, at which point he switched to a 7-keyed instrument, see entry below. Bell has two tuning holes, one of which would have been closed by C-corrector key.
Delusse 263 Vogt's 2nd oboe, which he acquired in 1825.										https://collections.musee-philharmoniedeparis.fr/doc/MUSEE-0161554/haubois	Played by Vogt after 1825. Bell originally has two resonance holes. One was filled and the other was fitted with a C-corrector key, as on RAM Triebert specimen. No octavev. Low C, C#, E-flat, B-flat, A-flat, F#, C-corrector. Donated to the museum before July 1864 by Vogt himself, aged 83 (Gétreau).
Delusse E2180	5	7.2		9.86	10.4	14.55	19				
Delusse E2182	5	6.9/7.1		9.46	10.2	14.5	18				
Cottet Golde copy RAM	4.7	6.9	n/a	10	11.1	14.3	15.05	20.6 / 15.8	20.6 / 21.6		
Triebert RAM	4.55	7.0 — 6.5	16.2 (conical)	9.9	10.9	14.0 ? 14.4 ?	19.88	21.6 / 15.6	26.0 / 22.0		Ex. Paul Goodwin.
Anonymous French, cocuouswood	4.45	7.2	20.5	9.7	10.5	14.5	15	23.7 / 15.6	22.5 / 21.0		
Brod	4.8 (?)	7	18.75	9.95	10.95	15	15.45	22.05 / 16.5	19.3 / 21.1		
Triebert (ex. Verdegem)	4.7	6.9	15.6	9.8	10.8	14.2	15.4	17.2	25.5		
Adler	4.55	7.0 — 6.2	19.2	9.5	10.4	14.6	17.7	22.2 / 14.7	22.2 / 21.0		
Buffet-Crampon	4.75	7.2	16.7	9.7	10.3	14.5	14.5	18.8 / 16.2	25.2 / 20.8		
E. Jehring, Leipzig c. 1880	5.05	n/a	n/a	10.3	10.45	14.7	17.75	20.9 / 17.0	20.9 / 20.8		
Buffet système 4 ex. Westermann	4.2	7.05	16.2	10.45	10.55	n/a	n/a	20.1 / 15.8	n/a		
Triebert système 4 ex. Coppens	4.4	6.8	18.2	10.2	10.6	18.3	20.5	18.2 / 15.8			
Tulou MIM	4.6	6.9, metal lined, but not cylindrical		9.7	10.7	15.3	16.3				
Breton MIM	4.3	6.9mm		9.0mm	9.3mm	14.4mm	14.6mm			http://brusselsmimoboccollaction.kcb.be/instrument-checklist/breton/	Verdegem: "Oboe in Brod or early Triebert style, including key lay-out, baluster and long bell. This oboe shows many similarities to the Triebert oboe no. 35 in the De Vries Collection (1999) p. 24, the latter having a longer bell. J. D. Breton is primarily known as a flute maker."
Bormann MIM	4.3	6.5mm		9.7mm	11.0mm	14.5mm	18.6mm			http://brusselsmimoboccollaction.kcb.be/instrument-checklist/bormann/	
Ponfoort MIM	4.3	6.7 mm	17 mm	8.9 mm	9.9 mm	14.1 mm	14.2 mm			http://brusselsmimoboccollaction.kcb.be/instrument-checklist/ponfoort-i-2615/	Dated 1852
Ponfoort 2 MIM	4	6.7 mm	16.8 mm	8.2 mm	10.4 mm	14.3 mm	15 mm			http://brusselsmimoboccollaction.kcb.be/instrument-checklist/ponfoort-i-2616/	Dated 1855
Schott 1 MIM	4.5 mm (bottom of tuning slides).	6.7 mm (on both tuning slides).		n.m.	n.m.	n.m.	n.m.			http://brusselsmimoboccollaction.kcb.be/instrument-checklist/2332schott/	Verdegem: "Between 1824 and 1840", "12-keyed Sellenner-type oboe". Has tuning slide. Short tuning slide = 51.1 mm. Long tuning slide = 54.2 mm.
Schott 2 MIM	4.6 mm (measured from the top, the tuning slide being stuck)	6.7 mm		8.3 mm	11.4 mm	14 mm	17.6 mm			http://brusselsmimoboccollaction.kcb.be/instrument-checklist/schott-3579/	Verdegem: "Between 1824 and 1840", "12-keyed Sellenner-type oboe". Has tuning slide (which is stuck).
Triebert 1 MIM	4.2	6.8 mm	17 mm	10.0 mm	10.5 mm	14.7 mm	15.0 mm			http://brusselsmimoboccollaction.kcb.be/instrument-checklist/2318trieberr/	Verdegem: "Probably 2nd quarter of the 19th century"

	Measured by:	Key system	Materials	Bore conicity/scaling (ratio of bore diameter to length) = acoustic length / minimum bore) lower = less conical, higher = more conical	Aggregate tone hole diameter (total of diameters of holes 1, 2, 5, 6)	Body length	Top joint length (body + tenon)	Middle joint length (body + tenon)	Bell length	Acoustic length (from top to middle of hole 6)
Triebert 2 MIM	Stefaan Verdegem	12 silver keys and 2 rings	"Probably kingwood (Bois de Violette) with silver mounts"	73.18181818		563 mm	212 mm + 18 mm = 230	209 mm + 22 mm = 231	142 mm	322
Triebert 3 MIM	Stefaan Verdegem	10 brass keys and 2 rings	Boxwood with ivory mounts	76.9047619		c. 561 mm (bottom mount missing)	n.m.	418 mm + 23.8 mm (sic) (obv. a mistake, should read 218 mm) = 241.8	c. 142 mm (2 mounts missing)	323
Triebert Rijksmuseum "A. B." (BK-2018-31)	Palameta	11 silver keys	Ebony with silver tips		? 3.3 4.9 4.5 x 4.6 = 4.55	562.8 mm	210.4 + 22.1 = 232.5	208.9 + 26.2 = 235.5	143.5	?
Delusse Bate, no. 20	Ken Williams, October 1984.	3 brass keys	Cedar with silver mounts	65.7	2.53 x 2.45 = 2.5 2.79 x 2.9 = 2.8 4.32 x 4.25 = 4.3 4.16 x 4.05 = 4.1 =13.7	571.9 mm	214.3 (+ 21.1) = 235.4	214.6 (+ 26.2) = 240.8	143	324.6 (Ecochard) 328.5 (Williams) (= 214.3 + 112.2 + 2.0)
Nicolas (or Jean?) Wimmen, Bate, no. 222	Charles Wells, 1990.	7 silver keys	Boxwood with ivory mounts	67.96	2.4 2.6 4.7 4.3 TOTAL=14.0	575.9	217.2 (+ 20.4) = 237.6 mm	207.7 (+ 23.8) = 231.5 mm	151	326.2 (217.2 + 109)
Triebert (coll. Verdegem) système 2	Christopher Palameta	12 brass keys	Stained boxwood with brass ferules		3.5 x 3.65 = 3.57 3.5 7. 4.9				140	
LEGEND										
PALAMETA COLL.										
BATE, OXFORD										
RIJKSMUSEUM										
MIM BRUSSELS										
MUSEE DE LA MUSIQUE, PARIS										
RAM, LONDON										
OTHER PRIVATE COLL.										

	Minimum bore	Reed well diameter	Reed well depth (if cylindrical)	Bore at bottom of TJ	Bore at top of MJ	Bore at bottom of MJ	Bore at top of bell	MJ socket (length + diameter)	Bell socket (length + diameter)	URL	Remarks
Triebert 2 MIM	4.4	6.7 mm	17 mm	9.3 mm	10.3 mm	14.4 mm	14.8 mm			http://brusselsmimoboeollection.tech.be/instrument-checklist/2319/trieb-2	Verdegem: "Probably 2nd quarter of the 19th century"
Triebert 3 MIM	4.2	6.7 mm	19.4 mm	n.m.	n.m.	14.4 mm	15.4 mm			http://brusselsmimoboeollection.tech.be/instrument-checklist/trieb-3864	Verdegem: "2nd quarter of the 19th century"
Triebert Rijksmuseum "X.R." (BK-2018-31)	?	7.2	?	9.8	10.3	14.7	17.2	16.1 (diameter)	26.0 (L) 21.8 (diameter)	http://hdl.handle.net/10934/RM10001.COLLECT.703265	Ex. Han de Vries. Keys include octavier and half-hole plate. Found with box of 5 original reeds. Original veneered rosewood case contains player's initials (X.R.) in brass.
Delusse Bate, no. 20	5 (Ecochard)			9.4	10.2	15.6	18.2				Measured by Ken Williams, 5 October 1984. 3rd key F#. "c.1785." on Bate website.
Nicolas (or Jean?) Winnen, Bate, no. 222	4.8			9.8	10.8	14.2				https://www.oxforduniversitystores.co.uk/product-catalogue/music-faculty-bate-collection/music-faculty-bate-collection/technical-diagrams/oboes/nicolas-winnen-oboe-plans	Died in Paris in 1833, fl. in Paris 1788-1833. Langwill on Winnen: "Presumably of German extraction [like Adler], like G. TRIEBERT who from 1804 worked for him." But Bate oboe likely by his son, Jean Winnen (due to maker's mark). Jean Winnen in Langwill: "J. Paris, 1833-1867. [...] Paris 21 January 1795 - 12 November 1867. [...] successor to his father, later signing with a Frenchified spelling of his name." "7 silver keys (C#, C, Eb, F, F#, G#, Bb), early 19th c. A=c. 430." (website). Oboe probably dates from c. 1840. Remarkable long key for left little finger to operate hole for low C#. G# key on lower joint (uncommon on contemporary French models).
Triebert (coll. Verdegem) système 2	4.25	6.8	16.9	9.5	10.5	14.7	14.95	20.2 / 15.5			
LEGEND											
PALAMETA COLL.											
BATE, OXFORD											
RIJKSMUSEUM											
MIM BRUSSELS											
MUSEE DE LA MUSIQUE, PARIS											
RAM, LONDON											
OTHER PRIVATE COLL.											