

Harpsichord & *fortepiano*

Vol. 18, No. 2 Spring, 2014

© Peacock Press.

Licensed under [CC BY-NC 4.0](#).

You are free to share and adapt the content for non-commercial purposes, provided you give appropriate credit to Peacock Press and indicate if changes were made. Commercial use, redistribution for profit, or uses beyond this license require prior written permission from Peacock Press.

Musical Instrument Research Catalog
(MIRCat)

INTERVIEW WITH RICHARD TROEGER

H & FP: How did your musical career begin?

RT: In no unusual way, I imagine. After starting on the piano at age eight, I dropped my teacher at age 11, because she tried to discourage my interest in the Fitzwilliam Virginal Book. I began playing the harpsichord at 12, and the clavichord around 15, after I assembled a kit from a California maker. (Fortunately, I obtained better instruments soon.) I read extensively on music theory, performance practice, sang in a choir, etc. I played a few recitals when in high school; went on to college and finally a doctorate, playing, and eventually writing, along the way.

H & FP: Who were your greatest teachers and inspirations?

RT: I was self-taught until college. I never had a clavichord or fortepiano teacher, although the clavichord itself is the best teacher. It quickly tells you when something is not working, as any clavichordist will confirm. At Indiana University, I was assistant to Anthony Newman, a brilliant musician whose playing personality happens to be quite different from mine. I think that kind of contrast can be productive. I learned a great deal from him. He never required that students imitate him, but pursued what was logical on this or that basis. I've never wanted to imitate any particular player, although it can be a productive exercise, like an actor assuming different personae; and I don't like the concept of belonging to a given school. I think it's very important for students to hear different players and approaches—and to play varied instruments. Listening to what the instrument offers is a major factor, or should be. With experience of diverse players and approaches, you can learn what works—and what doesn't. For example, excessive detachment in some cases leaves the audience with more ictus than pitch. Sometimes the question remains: how was that done? For example, I heard Leonhardt

try to get a masterclass participant to reproduce his way of attacking a single, four-note chord. They repeated it, back and forth at the same instrument. He remained inimitable, and his chord sounded as if coming from a different harpsichord. One hears many such instances, but this example was so striking that people were talking about it the rest of the day. It confirmed to any doubters le Gallois' famous remark about Chambonnières' touch.

H & FP: When did you first encounter the harpsichord? The clavichord?

RT: I rather naturally fell in love with the instruments (including the fortepiano) and their repertoire at the same time. I believe I first encountered the harpsichord through recordings played on the radio, and then library books and recordings. I first saw a harpsichord at age 11. In the mid-1960s, the instrument was quite popular. Probably the first thing I heard (on the radio) was Kinloch Anderson's rendition of the Ricercar in three parts from Menuhin's recording of the Musical Offering. I found out later that I was hearing a Goff harpsichord. Landowska's recordings were broadcast frequently and she had a tremendous presence and rhythmic integrity which—instrument or other factors notwithstanding—should not be ignored. But at the same time I was discovering the antiques. Leonhardt was a contrasting experience, also very commanding, although as I (like everyone) discovered, his most lively playing was not on records. It is my impression that he, as an instrumentalist, possessed the most complete command I've heard of the harpsichord's resources. It was altogether an interesting time to grow up in regard to the harpsichord. Every player seemed to have a different kind of instrument and approach. Kirkpatrick and Kipnis were among the few who seemed to take

seriously the cultivation of both the harpsichord and the clavichord, which seemed to me quite basic. Some of the keyboard scene was bizarre, but the variety was fascinating. The first harpsichord I ever heard at a concert was a Dowd (I was 15), and my own first proper harpsichord was by that maker. When still in my teens, I had the opportunity to play several original antique instruments, both harpsichords and clavichords—naturally, a formative experience.

Regarding the clavichord, I should add that I tried drawing various designs from data and inventing my own (just to see what would happen with bridge shapes, etc.); obtained recordings by Fritz Neumeyer (playing an 18th-century instrument) and others. I was not impressed by the kit I'd built, but shortly after (a lot happened in my mid-teens) I met Ron Haas, who has made several instruments for me: Italian- and Hass-based harpsichords; clavichords after anonymous fretted instruments, J.H. Silbermann, and Friederici. It was only a bit later that I got into playing the fortepiano as well. (I also studied violin, but that was not my path.)

H & FP: What is your favourite repertoire? For listening? For playing?

RT: In my youth I began collecting historical piano recordings, which tell one a great deal about changes in playing style. But fine singing is paramount—especially, I think, for instrumentalists, because we can lose sight of the vocal aspects of making music. As to repertoire, I love to play Scarlatti particularly, the virginalists, and of course J.S. Bach—although after recording so much of Bach on the clavichord, I have needed a break! (The clavichord is a very intense instrument.) Haydn on the clavichord is wonderful; it's my belief that that was a primary sound for him. Also, although I'm a late bloomer in this, I love to improvise in several styles. On a really appealing instrument, you can seek out what makes that instrument blossom. For sheer listening, Wagner's operas are one of the most compelling experiences I know; and they're

especially poignant for me because I have a strong bent toward mythology and the relationship of psychology to mythology. (Excuse me if that sounds pompous; I don't know how else to put it briefly.) Also, naturally, Mozart's operas; Elgar (especially conducted by the composer); Binchois; Byrd choral music; 17th-century English ensemble music. Chopin, particularly as heard in recordings by Koczalski and Cortot. Favourite (recorded) singers include Kathleen Ferrier (the most elegiac voice imaginable), Lisa della Casa, Elisabeth Schumann (a Mozart singer par excellence), Frida Leider, Friedrich Schorr, and Martha Mödl. (A rarely issued 1953 *Ring* under Keilberth captures her at her peak.) In more recent times, the Wagner singing of Jeannine Altmeyer and Waltraud Meier. I should also mention string quartets and quintets. Yes, I go to present-day performances, but I'm very fond of the Pro Arte Quartet recordings from the 1930s.

H & FP: Your book, *Technique and Interpretation on the Harpsichord and Clavichord* (1987) was well received. What led you to write your book *Playing Bach on the Keyboard* (2003)?

RT: The two books are aimed at different audiences. The chapters generally go by the same topics, but the commentary and what's covered are different. The harpsichord/clavichord book is focussed on "how do these instruments work musically and what approaches can one take?" I was trying to discuss possibilities, not be prescriptive. I suppose it was partly in reaction to the doctrinaire attitudes one sometimes encounters. (In the Bach book, I included a little appendix on performance-practice myths.) The Bach volume is narrower in focus, and a sort of primer-plus for the interested newcomer, covering the types of repertory found in Bach, instruments (including the modern piano), continuo-in-a-nutshell, dances, ornaments, etc. Each chapter includes recommendations for further reading; and I tried to dovetail with the book by Anthony Newman (to which I contributed) and that by Paul Badura-Skoda (who, by the way, loved my Ron

Haas/Hass harpsichord so much that he ordered one for himself). I also included a summary of the subject of musical rhetoric. With all the emphasis today on the figures, it's important to remember that the rhetorical model embraces larger as well as smaller structures and is a very good basis for relating the whole to its parts, and the parts to the whole. It's a complete compositional model, and an effective, lively, dramatic one that speaks very directly to the performer. What is the focus of a given movement? What contrasts does it show? How does it evolve, develop? The rhetorical model assists finding, and answering, such questions, and to characterizing what you find. The question naturally remains, how and to what extent did players tend to point up events and details? I imagine the scene was more varied than today's. But thinking through rhetoric, one is at least approaching the earlier process for hearing and deciding.

Regarding the Bach book, I've been told that I put more emphasis on the clavichord, in the instruments section, than on the harpsichord. Well, when I wrote the harpsichord/clavichord book, no one had explored the clavichord much, in print, as to actual playing technique and the nature of the beast. (And unfortunately, the more responsive a clavichord is, the more difficult it usually is to control.) Then, there was another aspect that required emphasis. It has been too often said that Bach's normal experience of the clavichord would be limited to a fretted instrument; and that would bar the clavichord from much of the repertory. (*The Well Tempered Clavier*, for example, is full of semitone dissonances that are impossible on a fretted action.) The discovery of the unfretted clavichord by Johann Michael Heinitz, made in 1716, and other points relating to it, certainly paint a different picture. I discussed all of this in an article, and included data on the instrument.¹ The very fine Austrian builder Thomas Glück and I met in Germany to go examine it for ourselves. Briefly, the Heinitz, although not itself an

especially distinguished piece of work, shows a fully developed unfretted design (very closely related to instruments of a generation later) which was clearly not new in 1716. It has always surprised me that so many people have trouble accepting Bach's use of one of the fundamental, and beloved, keyboard instruments of the time. From Landowska down to the present day, you can find comments suggesting that it can hardly be used for more than finger exercises, that polyphony doesn't work on it, and so forth. (Of course, really good clavichords are comparatively rare.) Well, some considerable while back, to say the least, Albert Schweitzer compared the effect of the clavichord to a string quartet, and I can't imagine a better image. When I worked out the *Art of Fugue* on the clavichord, I was amazed at what could be brought out in comparison to the harpsichord. (I don't mean one is inferior to the other; but obviously, each has special qualities.) I hope some of this comes through on the recording.

H & FP: When teaching, did you feel people needed supplementary material, or were they listening to recordings where the interpretation was lacking, etc.?

RT: Recordings are a blessing if well used —living history—and a curse if merely imitated, as too many students do. More toward your question: in my experience, many mainstream pianists, such as I've sometimes taught in masterclasses and privately, rarely listen to early-music performances or recordings. (I must say that the variation I've found among harpsichord students is more energizing.) Most (not all) pianists want to follow the current mainstream; and as I'm sure your readers know, most regard reading about performance practice as highly esoteric and at a remove or two from life as lived. As to supplementary material, a number of (non-specialist) students had asked during lessons and masterclasses if there were a compendium of the sort of information I was giving them about Baroque performance. I'd cite various books and

articles; but there wasn't a compendium in the sense they were asking. (These were intelligent students, not asking for a *reductio ad absurdum*.) I realized that it might be a good idea to write such a book. The joke is that after one of those masterclasses, I was presented with tapes of the whole thing. I listened at home to catch something I'd said that, as I recalled, wasn't in the book draft so far: and I ended with some 20 pages' worth of brief notes regarding material I'd forgotten to include. The point with performance conventions is that they have to become second-nature and it wasn't surprising that I'd missed this much! But of course it all flows out naturally when talking with students new to these concepts. And modern piano teaching is often quite flatly literalist apropos of the text.

Like any teacher of these things, I try to emphasize the importance of thinking through what evidence there is: from treatises, to notation, to instrumental sound, etc. "How does a harpsichord react when Louis Couperin writes thus-and-so?" "Why is this passage notated as it is?" I have given entire seminars on period notation of performance nuance and we never ran short of material.

Teaching mainstream students, one naturally runs up against mainstream habits, but early music naturally has its fads and sometimes doctrines, like everything else, and one sometimes has to be careful about the early-music mainstream, as well as the general mainstream. At a conference once, I quoted from a significant treatise regarding a common issue and was promptly (and surprisingly) challenged by a colleague. But the book says what I had quoted it as saying, although my quote was from an odd corner of it; as it happens, it didn't at all fit the current doctrine on that subject.

What do we learn from treatises? How thorough is what the authors said, what do they and we (perhaps differently) take for granted? What is learned even from early recordings? There was a fine-spun, gossamer aspect of

pianism current around 1900 that seems (from descriptions) to hearken well back into the nineteenth century. I've not heard anyone play that way post-WW2: it's "old-fashioned." Well, so is Chopin. I'm not sure many mainstream pianists would pay much attention if a recording of Chopin himself could miraculously emerge. (I wonder what would happen if Bach could thus be actually heard.) We've largely discarded *portamento* in singing and string playing, and the comparable effects pianists used to use. Tempi seem to have slowed down, from 19th-century norms (every composer's metronome was, obviously, out of order!) and even from early 20th-century norms. If we miss style information from actual aural evidence regarding 19th- and even 20th-century music, what do we miss from the treatises, regarding earlier music? Independent thought is hard, and it's difficult to escape the common sounds of our own culture, whether H.I.P.-related or all too new. Indeed, some modern classical pianists at times remind me of popular piano-playing styles, without much textural sensitivity. But earlier generations were very eager to sort out the different elements: bass versus actual filler versus melodic parts. And to get back to early music, textural sorting is something the clavichord can teach very well, which in turn can help to sort out one's harpsichord playing.

H & FP: If you felt pedagogy was lacking, what would you be the foundation of an ideal pedagogy of early keyboards in a modern university/conservatory? (Or is that another book?)

RT: I'm sure it's another book, or at least institutional catalogue. As to pedagogy, I don't, myself, follow much method; I find that everyone needs a different approach, different repertory, and so forth. But I can say this much. Fundamental, in addition to the usual musical training, would be fluency in playing from figured bass, and beyond that, composing/improvising in a tonal idiom. Unless the student comprehends the grammar of music, and can

learn independently to manipulate its strategies (rhetoric), deeper understanding of why a fine composer proceeded thus-and-so will be lacking, at least to some degree. The experience of composition, even if disappointing, certainly leads to more meaningful projection of the music one is performing. (Obviously, everybody does theory exercises; but I mean really trying to find your own voice, though probably in an older style. One might be surprised. I was.) Also, if you're suggesting an early-music conservatory, there's the research aspect: learning how to research; avoiding simplistic solutions; and being open to new interpretations and syntheses of information, rather than reducing possible approaches to doctrine. On both the musical and merely technical levels, playing both the harpsichord and clavichord —or, say, the fortepiano and clavichord, depending on your interests—is immensely helpful and really should be required. (That dual approach also encourages listening to what the individual instrument responds to in a piece, not to mention making choices and decisions.) Then too, studying the nature of musical notation, and the changing of many conventions in it, is a necessity. (The slur, for example, had an accentual function; it does not mean "legato here only." I wrote an article about this.² It could be a book.) The real foundation, though, is a driving interest in exploration, which seems to be fading in our technology-saturated culture. I gather it's now common to hear even gifted students boast about how little they read. And of course, exploration is difficult when there is no sense of overall context. Students need to read literature, look at paintings, try to write poetry. (Call me an incurable Romantic.) But the thing required above all, I think, is a sense of wonder.

H & FP: You have recorded a lot of Bach on the clavichord. What was that experience like?

RT: Do you know: the clavichord is the most stable early keyboard instrument for tuning, except during recording sessions. The slightest

slip of a unison is magnified on playback. The same is true of the dynamics. One has to get all of the dynamic details and proportions right, since they'll likely be exaggerated in playback. Then, too, you're a martyr to any noise outside: distant cars, communicative dogs, etc. Once, a thunderstorm swept in suddenly and in the middle of the B-Flat Major Sinfonia came a clap of thunder so loud that my hands flew off the keys and I was afraid the equipment was damaged. (It wasn't; but I checked the playback and was startled a second time.) At one recording site, we'd "got the sound," and I'd settled in for actually recording around midnight. (In a chapel without a telephone in the middle of a cemetery.) And during the first take I heard rumbling in the wainscoting of the old building. It returned in the second take. I thought "Can it be rats?" Then on the third take, they gave tongue. Rat squeaks record very well in a quiet chapel. What to do? I went home, gathered up combings from one of my cats (saved for gardening use), spread the combings about the building, and: silence. I had no further trouble with rats, and I recommend this technique to anyone faced with the same problem. But despite such things, I often found new ideas sprouting during the recording. I like to make two or three takes of different interpretations, and see which works best in retrospect.

H & FP: Lawson Taitte, Staff Writer for the *Dallas Morning*, recommends your recording of the Bach Partitas. However he writes, "It can be irritating to strain to hear the music at the properly low playback level. But anybody who loves the music should hear these performances. They're a revelation - way more fun than any of the complete harpsichord versions." What would you say to a concert goer/listener who has only ever heard Bach on the piano?

RT: I think of Mr. Taitte with all the more appreciation, since he responded so well to something apparently unfamiliar to him. (He's of course right to play the recording at low

volume or it can distort, but a clavichord without competition fills one's ears, and one should adjust the phonograph—and playback conditions—with that in mind.) People have said to me after concerts in which I played both instruments, "I came to hear the harpsichord, but the clavichord blew me away!" In the right environment a good instrument carries quite well, as your readers will know. At a concert some years ago, where I used a quite resonant clavichord (a Dolmetsch/Chickering; the original strings were missing anyway, so I'd restrung it by historical norms), a pianist I had last known in grad school came up afterward and I was surprised when she said eagerly, "I've never heard the clavichord before and people always say it's so quiet, but this is a concert instrument!" The acoustics were good; but even so, it was after all a clavichord. She was able to listen to the instrument on its own terms. Both listeners and players have to listen within the terms of the medium. Pardon the truism; but I often ask students, "How is this particular instrument responding to aspects of the texture? Or to factors X, Y, and Z?" From one harpsichord to another, facets of a given work sometimes have to be expressed rather differently. (There's another truism.) Thus, when Scarlatti begins with a single, springboard bass note, what will make it the springiest on the particular instrument? A firm touch? A little agogic space? Following C.P.E. Bach's advice, I tried from early on to cultivate the harpsichord and clavichord simultaneously (later doing this as well with the fortepiano, of course). The harpsichord is often more effective and singing at a slower tempo than the clavichord. The latter requires tempi at which the web of sound sustains, or it can sound rather dry. In fact, it can readily shift from dry to blossoming, and back again, depending on the slightest aspects of tempo, touch, and articulation.

H & FP: What qualities do you look for in your instruments?

RT: Many people talk of "speaking tones," and as an image for musical discourse it's a good term;

but naturally, keyboard music did not develop in a vacuum. Keyboard players worked with singers and other instrumentalists, and I lean toward instruments with a warm, sustaining sound that can suggest other media, and blend well in ensemble. (My wife, Elaine Fuller, plays the lute, which goes well with my instruments!) Clavichords, particularly, are at their best with a fluid, sustaining tone. (All of these points I have found in various antiques.) And I note that, with better understanding of how to string for different scalings, the notion of a reasonably sustaining tone as an anachronism has rather receded. At the Leipzig collection, where the strings are kept slacked off on some of the instruments, I was allowed to pull to pitch the c^2 course on their short-octave Clavichord #6 (later seventeenth-century; cf. the Henkel book) and it instantly showed a big, round tone that lasted so long I almost got bored timing it. This is quite different from the sometime emphasis on instruments with slighter bridges and more explosive (and smaller) tone of little duration. Even with a mellow-toned harpsichord, there's no need to worry about plenty of accent in a mechanically plucked string. The trick is often to subdue that quality, to allow the instrument to sing, speak, and sometimes exclaim with as much variety as possible. The particular rate and process of decay in the tone has a lot to do with all that, of course. Certainly there are many varieties of each instrument, but certain constants as well. In fact, as the builder Paul Irvin has been pointing out regarding harpsichords, the different national schools used different means sometimes toward similar acoustical ends. I love a good 18th-century French harpsichord, but the more original instruments I had the chance to play, the more I realized that the ubiquitous French double of today and especially yesterday is something of a special beast. All the others have, in their varied ways, a kind of choir-like, voluptuous plainness which is hard to replicate, but worth trying for. With fortepianos, too, I look (to put it too simply) for a

balance between accent in the attack and duration of tone. (Sometimes, antiques in good condition sustain better in the treble than do some modern reproductions.) Hammer leathers that look and feel the same can produce very different timbres. With ephemera of that nature, you have to hope that you're making the right choice.

I should also voice enthusiasm for the Flemish muselaar and the spinets of J.H. Silbermann. It is my feeling that smaller instruments were not compromises of larger ones until late in the eighteenth century, with some forms of the pianoforte. A muselaar is amazingly sensitive to every shift in musical texture; it's like a little ensemble sometimes.

I have mentioned the importance of being open to alternatives —hardly a new notion, but let me give a purely physical example. Received wisdom often holds that the quantity of muting cloth in a clavichord has no influence on the sound. Well, maybe not on some instruments. But experiment confirms that the material and the quantity of it and its particular deployment can enormously affect both touch and sustaining power. Surviving evidence of muting cloth suggests that the original makers did not arbitrarily fill up the area behind the tangents, as one often used to see, and can to this day. You can get more sound and a better touch sometimes, following the Less Is More principle. I don't believe that awareness of the nature of the clavichord has really caught up with the harpsichord. People like lush harpsichords, but a lush clavichord is so "romantic," in quotes, that I think it is sometimes felt to be questionable. Indeed, I've actually heard builders and players say so.

H & FP: When you change from harpsichord to clavichord or vice versa, what challenges do you face? What would you recommend to a novice player who is interested in both?

RT: Within a concert, if playing both, I begin with the clavichord. Coming down in volume to a clavichord segment from the harpsichord

leaves the audience nowhere for some while. Similarly, as everyone knows, it's inadvisable to begin a recital with a "loud" harpsichord piece: it won't sound loud to the audience at the start. Technically, I find the clavichord more demanding than the harpsichord, and the shift to the harpsichord is easier than the other way. I should say that, generally, I tend to work with one instrument at a time, rather than frequently jump back and forth. That can be revealing, but the main point is to be familiar with the vocabularies and strategies of each type of instrument. As for the novice, I'd suggest beginning with a clavichord, and taking the time to find a good instrument. With the harpsichord, it's fundamental to learn to express everything through the sound of a single 8' stop, and/or two 8' stops together. That's obviously the basis for hearing in terms of the instrument and developing a wide palette of connections and separations of notes, and how these and the varied textures of the piece work together to express the phrases and their interrelationships. As to touch, I'd tell the newcomer to learn to "mould the keys." That is, shift the posture of the hands fluidly on the clavichord's keyboard topography, which is the overall way to avoid blocking and to elicit a good tone; then to let what the clavichord touch thus requires help to shape the hand on the harpsichord as well.

H & FP: You have just written an article for us on Landowska and her instruments. What is particularly interesting for you about her?

RT: Well, the article is rather in the way of archival fun; and while most revival instruments are of no interest to me whatever, I've always found the Pleyel of interest, partly because of its association with Landowska and because almost no one could elicit as much from it as she could. Given the opportunity, it is actually quite arresting to confront what is heard on the old 78s as (almost) live sound. The Pleyel has been considered the source of all evil, etc. And in a

way it was, because some of the instrument's principles were followed, and worse, by others.³ Actually, given the mindset over a hundred years ago, I think it was almost the best Landowska could get, which isn't really saying much. (Even the Dolmetsch/Chickering harpsichords are quite disappointing, really. But she didn't even know these.) With general access to the Pleyel logs I was curious: who originally bought those instruments? How many were in circulation? I was startled when I stumbled upon Landowska's 1913 Berlin teaching instrument years ago; and when I realized what it was, I then wondered about its (unknown) fate between 1913 and my seeing it. She herself was an individual, even unique, voice. (I doubt I could have studied with her, even in that era; the authoritarian approach isn't for me.) Her recordings show amazing rhythmic sensitivity and control, and great detail without losing overall impetus. And she sometimes used arpeggiation of texture and overlegato, whereas her followers almost never did. Of course, the Pleyel has nothing of a good classical instrument's articulatory range; and in her playing there is also pervasive upbeat slurring although she still makes the metre clear. (One often can slur over a barline; I'm not being doctrinaire. There are original slurrings that do just that. It all depends on context.) She's sometimes described as rhythmically eccentric, but in fact she's generally rather "straight," and can make big emphases through the slightest of agogic means. That's control, and whether you agree with her premises or not, the ideas are often so powerfully projected that studying the means by which she achieved her ends is worth considering. But although her success in her time is often attributed to showmanship and charisma: well, most people agree that her musical personality is just as strong on recordings. It leaps out at you. Then too, she succeeded in her cause, while playing an instrument that carried very, very badly. I once played Poulenc's *Concert Champêtre* on a Pleyel and it had to be

amplified; listening to someone play it while I was in the audience area (and the seats empty), the sound died about Row 6, although it was voiced fairly "up". Imagine always dealing with that—and prevailing in the mainstream climate of the time. Very, very impressive. A few of her disciples whom I knew (now dead) did not understand my interest, nor did colleagues of my own: in both cases because I don't follow Landowska's school. Doctrinaire! I'm glad that her proper place is becoming better recognized. But another great guru, Leonhardt, remarked that Landowska in her day was only trying to do what he was attempting in his. A wise point. We have to realize that Authenticity (even "informed performance"; we don't say "authentic" any more) is a chimaera, but one we must pursue. However, authenticity means playing with fire and with personality, as is mentioned in many sources. One must find the logic and shape of a composition, make choices, and project the best one can—from the heart.

¹ Richard Troeger, "Bach, Heinitz, Specken, and the Early Bundfrei Clavichord," in *Music and its Questions: Essays in Honor of Peter Williams*, ed. Thomas Donahue. (Richmond, Va.: OHS Press, 2007): 143-168.

² Troeger, "Thoughts on Articulatory Notation in Haydn's Solo Keyboard Music," in *Essays in Honor of Christopher Hogwood*, ed. Thomas Donahue. (Lanham, Md., Toronto, Plymouth, UK: Scarecrow Press, 2011): 121-136.

³ An aside: The late Howard Schott told me that, once lunching with Leonhardt, he inquired of the great man, "When you go to Hell, and you're given the choice for all Eternity to play either a Pleyel or a typical factory harpsichord, which will you choose?" And the reply was "Oh, the Pleyel, certainly. The others are bourgeois instruments."