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Abstract: Some twenty ivory stringed instruments preserved in three main collections and corresponding to an instrumentarium in use at the end of the Middle Ages and the beginning of the Renaissance form a very homogeneous group. These instruments seem to have been made by the same workshop at the very end of the nineteenth century. Are they attempts of reconstruction or counterfeits?
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Copies, Replicas, Pastiches and Forgeries in Instrument-Making

As in all fields of arts and crafts, the authenticity and forgery of musical instruments were questions that initially concerned those who built and traded them but later began to interest historians of instrument-making and later still organologists. Thus, as early as the sixteenth century, despite the establishment throughout Europe of guilds regulating the instrument-making trade via very protective statutes, the best craftsmen were sometimes counterfeited by their competitors. The lawsuit brought in 1557–1559 by Gaspard Duiffoprucart against Benoît Le Jeune in Lyon, who had used the Füssen luthier’s trademark on several of his guitars, already bears witness to the practices of forgers. The most complex case is that of the forgeries of Antwerp harpsichords by Parisian makers in the eighteenth century. The distinction between a rebuilt Flemish instrument that had been ravalé (“artistem coupé & élargi” as described in L’Art du faiseur d’instruments de musique published in 1785) and a “clavecin fait par Goujon et qui a pour titre Hans Ruckers”, a counterfeit

1 Tricou, “Duiffoproucart”.
appearing in the inventory of the workshop of Jean-Henri Hemsch in 1769, often eluded the customers of these craftsmen. How can one distinguish between imitation and fraud or detect undeclared subcontracting? Various cases that have been studied illustrate the difficulty of knowing the intentions of instrument-makers with regard to their clients.

If we now look at the instruments made during the period of the early music collectors, i.e. above all those from the middle of the nineteenth century, we witness the coexistence of attempts to reconstruct completely lost instruments (e.g. those of the Middle Ages) known from texts and visual sources, instruments copied from historical models in order to be able to perform once again the repertoires of their period (as part of the movement to rediscover early music following the retrospective international exhibitions) and also the manufacture of faithfully reproduced or imitated instruments to satisfy an ever-growing antiques and second-hand market, whereas genuinely historical specimens are sometimes unica. Individual parts of authentic instruments can also be incorporated in forgeries to a varying degree for the sake of greater credibility. The most famous forgery workshop is that of the Florentine antiques dealer Leopoldo Franciolini (1844–1920), who even printed several catalogues of the instruments he offered. His work is the easiest to identify and the most greatly studied since Edwin Ripin’s publication. While many of his “Harlequins”, mainly keyboard and plucked instruments, are today in public museums, other areas of instrument-making have been affected by the creation of pastiches (or by re-cutting and reassembling) in the domain of the violin, notably ones purporting to be from the sixteenth century or belonging to the Cremonese school. The case of the Stradivarius violin Le Messie was, for instance, the subject of intense controversy between 1999 and 2002.

But the desire of public collections to be able to collect specimens from the great workshops, regardless of instrumental category, has led to the construction of whole series of instruments sold as being from the Baroque period but in fact built at the end of the nineteenth century. They have only the outward appearance of their models and have only recently been “unmasked”. The cases of Hotteterre’s transverse flutes and of the small ivory pastoral bagpipes are equally characteristic of this instrumental workmanship aimed at collectors and musical instrument museums at the time of their creation and, in more recent times, of the scientific methods used to detect them by organologists active today.

Prior to considering this phenomenon that has affected collections of musical instruments, it should also be remembered that collections of decorative arts, whether held by specialized museums or the departments of major national institutions, also tend to include

---

3 Pollens, “Christoph Gottlieb Schröter”; Laubhold, “Sensation or Forgery?”; Skowroneck, “Harpischord of Nicholas Lefebvre”; Hellwig, “Hamburg and Paris”.
4 Ripin, *Instrument Catalogs of Leopoldo Franciolini*.
5 Gétreau, “French Market”, 112–113; see also Moens, “Vuillaume”.
7 Powell, “Hotteterre Flute”.
8 Libin, “Seeking the Source”.
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### Table

Provisional list of ivory instruments built in North Italy between c. 1870 and 1920.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Inv. or Cat. details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lute “DG”</td>
<td>Inv. n. 03384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lute “LM”</td>
<td>Inv. D. AD 23456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tromba marina</td>
<td>Inv. D. AD 40 376 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tromba marina “LM”</td>
<td>Inv. D. AD 40 376 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archet</td>
<td>Inv. D. AD 40 377 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archet</td>
<td>Inv. D. AD 40 377 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viola da Braccio “SM”</td>
<td>Inv. D. AD 40378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archet</td>
<td>Inv. D. AD 40386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebec “LM”</td>
<td>Inv. D. AD 48900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harp “LM”</td>
<td>Inv. D. AD 40383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebec</td>
<td>Cat. 2018 n° 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spinett ottavina “OPUS SEXTUS MUTINENSIS”</td>
<td>(2007 Christie’s Paris), Cat. 2018 n° 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lute “HM”</td>
<td>Cat. 2018 n° 163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olifant</td>
<td>Cat. 2018 n° 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lira da braccio</td>
<td>Cat. 2018 n° 164 bis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tromba marina “LM”</td>
<td>Cat. 2018 n° 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorder</td>
<td>Cat. 2018 n° 166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spinett ottavina “OPUS SEXTUS MUTINENSIS”</td>
<td>Anc. coll. B. Oger Paris</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
musical instruments acquired or donated because of their refined craftsmanship and the precious materials of which they are made, such as ivory. Among these treasures, some have also recently been “desacrated”, such as the famous “medieval ivory harp” in the Louvre. In similar vein, the aim of the present contribution centres on an exceptional set of ivory instruments, most of which are held by the Musée de la musique in Paris (Figure 1), a lute preserved in the United States at the National Music Museum in Vermillion (South Dakota), a second set in private hands and some isolated specimens. Here is the provisional list, with an indication of the instruments’ respective origins (see Table).

The Earliest Surviving “All-Ivory” Lute?

During the summer of 1993, while studying at the Metropolitan Museum in New York with the aid of a Senior Fellowship from the Markoe Fund, I was able to work in the instrumental collections of the museums of Yale, Boston, Washington and Vermillion. In this last-named museum I discovered a treble ivory lute (Figure 2) whose label in the display case intrigued me greatly, and I photographed it in addition to the instrument. The label read: “NMM 3384. Treble lute, stamped D.G., Venice, ca 1550 | Perhaps the earliest surviving ‘all-ivory’ lute, dated | by some experts as early as 1500. Fir belly. Combined | neck and upper block and a lower block provide strength. | Ex. Coll. Lord Astor, Cliveden-on-Thames. | Witten-Rawlins Collection, 1984.”

At first glance, I thought this was the twin brother of an instrument I had studied in September 1979 at the Musée des Arts décoratifs in Paris and which I had regarded in my descriptive notes made at the time as a “reconstruction” (Figure 3). I was able to examine at close hand the Vermillion instrument and its documentary file. Back in Paris, and reporting on my stay to my colleagues at the Musée de la musique – in particular, Joël Dugot, who was in charge of the plucked instruments in our museum, which was then preparing to open on its new site at La Villette – I discussed the uncanny resemblance of this lute to the existing specimen in the store rooms of the Musée des Arts décoratifs in Paris. We were in the process of negotiating the imminent deposit of this collection at the Musée de la musique. This “twin” lute belonged to a group of ivory instruments with a striking homogeneity in the workmanship of this material used for large veneer bands. In the years that followed I renewed contact with André Larson, director of the

10 My deepest thanks to all the colleagues who have helped me over the decades in these investigations: among them, the late André Larson, John Koster, Joël Dugot, Gabriele Rossi Rognoni, Jean-Claude Battault, Elisabeth Wiss, Jean-Michel Renard, Alan Rubin, Andreas Schlegel, Denzil Wraight and Fabien Guilloux.
11 Deposited there by the Musée des Arts décoratifs of Paris in 1994.
12 My descriptive notes indicate that I had considered this group of ivory instruments referred to in Table as “Reconstitutions”. I had also noted that this lute was marked “LM”. In 1980 I published an account of the rarest specimens of this collection: those “di fattura certa”. See Gétreau, “La liuteria nelle collezioni pubbliche francesi”.
Vermillion collection. Let me salute his memory by transcribing the following letter that he sent me on 25 May 2000 after I had informed him of the striking similarities between the two lutes and of my conviction that they must have been built by the same craftsman, probably at the end of the nineteenth century.

Dear Flo,

We are always interested in learning more about our instruments.

Charles Beare definitively believes that his lutes are early examples, and we want to believe that the one in the Witten-Rawlins Collection is also an early instrument. However, we have long realized that it is possible that they were built in the 19th century, since nationalism and the resultant interest in historicism led to the building of exotic decorative objects, when historic objects were not easily available. Personally, I find all of that to be an interesting study, and we like to ascertain the truth, whenever we can. On the other hand, I also know of too many instances where well-intentioned people want to think that something is not what it is, only to find out later that the object truly is what it is supposed to be – they just didn’t know how to look or they saw only what they wanted to see, trying to confirm a conclusion that they had reached prematurely. Therefore, it is only reasonable, it seems to me, to assume that objects – like people – are what they purport to be, until there is definite proof that they are not.

A number of people have looked at the ivory lute. There is a wide array of opinions about the dating, ranging from the 15th century (Paul O’Dette, Friedemann Hellwig) up through the 16th century. Some people, including Herbert Heyde and myself, have thought that the belly might be later. At best, it seems to have been “cleaned” in an unfortunate manner. It might well be that it is a later replacement. Perhaps the question can be answered in part with dendrochronology; certainly, we would be happy to cooperate, if you want to explore that possibility.

At this point, nobody has questioned the ivory work. Exactly what can be done to make an objective, scientific analysis of the ivory, I do not know. We have not had the belly off nor do we have any photos, other that what you already have. It was x-rayed once, sufficient to show the barring [...] but not powerful enough to show details. Once again, however, we would be happy to cooperate, if Dugot wants to come and have a look. It would be interesting to see just how he performs such an examination [...]. With warm best wishes,

André.

In 2006, Joël Dugot published his irreplaceable systematic catalogue of lutes in the Musée de la musique in Paris. He proposed to structure his work according to three categories allowing one to clarify their dating and authenticity: The ancient lutes; The instruments built during the twentieth century; The instruments of doubtful authenticity.

For the latter, here are the criteria that enabled him, by defining their characteristics, to justify his classification:

Among the collection of Western lutes kept at the Musée de la Musique, there are about fifteen instruments of a sufficiently typical construction to be able to classify them not as fakes, which would imply that existing instruments have been copied, but rather as pseudo-instruments, in the sense that the latter are intended to lie about their true origin, without having certain characteristics found on authentic instruments. [...] These are [...] instruments made much more recently, at a time when collectors of musical instruments, becoming more and more numerous, favoured the activity of some workshops, especially in Italy, by directing it towards the production of instruments likely to satisfy customers whose organological knowledge was still sufficiently imprecise to allow them to be misled. This period can be dated from the last third of the 19th century to the beginning of the 20th century, and as the craftsmen involved had neither authentic models (ancient lutes are indeed very rare) nor sufficient knowledge – the tradition of making them having died out in the 18th century and documentation being then almost non-existent – the models produced, by the naivety of their style, are today quite easy to identify.

First of all, the general level of craftsmanship of these instruments is very poor: lack of precision, lack of care in the execution of work requiring meticulousness (roses, bridges, etc.). The choice of materials is also of poor quality: for the soundboards, not spruce but rough pine (the number of strips is frequently greater than two); for the cases, wood of little value, covered if necessary with very dark varnish, or even paint to hide the many defects. The aesthetics of the bodies are not derived from the ancient lute school but from the Neapolitan mandolin, which was then in full expansion [...].

Some of these instruments bear labels with more or less fanciful Latinised names, and even, in rare cases, iron marks. Finally, certain configurations of neck or pegbox, the height of aberration, lead to instruments that are not even playable.15

The last two pages of Joël Dugot’s catalogue are devoted to the “twin” ivory lute of Vermillion. He describes it as “Anonymous lute, 19th century”, marked on the end-clasp “LM” – “a probable reference to Laux Maler”. Referring to the group of ivory instruments to which it belongs, Dugot mentions its strong resemblance to the Vermillion lute (number of strings, mark “DG”) and claims that it was sold in 1983 at Sotheby’s. But in fact the negotiation over the Witten-Rawlins collection was carried out directly with the Berlin and Vermillion museums, and the latter won the deal. Dugot points out the shape of the bridge of the Parisian lute and likens it to the existing bridge on the lute by Magno Dieffopruchar in Charles Beare’s collection in London,16 concluding: “All this makes it possible to assume that all the instruments mentioned here were originally part of the same collection.”17

15 Ibid., 125.
16 Smith, History of the Lute, 72 (figs. 33–34). See also the “Extant Lutes Database” maintained by the Lute Society of America, Item 632.
If we compare the lute in Vermillion and the lute in Paris (Figures 2 and 3), we notice their great likeness. It is true that the curve of the back is rounder in the Parisian example, and the dimensions are slightly different. The end-clasp shows differences in cutting, and in both cases their height corresponds to that of known later lute models. Their iron marks (“LM”) are identically conceived (Figure 4), probably in reference to prominent Renaissance makers, but no historical instruments bear such marks made with a hot iron stamp on ivory; usually and traditionally such marks are engraved in ivory, a fact making these marks suspicious. On the Paris lute the neck is a little shorter and the shape of the pegbox more rectangular (Figure 5), approaching that of the Charles Beare lute already mentioned. The ivory veneer inside does not lie within the historical tradition.

It should be noted that in his catalogue entry Joël Dugot mentions X-rays of the Paris lute showing that the joint between neck and body is not reinforced by a nail. All historical lutes are built with such a nail, a detail that leads an observer to suspect a non-historical construction. Moreover, the dendrochronology carried out by John Topham in 2000 on the sound-board of this instrument did not yield any comparable result (the analytical report he carried out for both bass and treble concludes: “The sequence did not cross-date significantly with any of the available chronologies or instrument sequences”). The wood of the sound-board is a reddish Mediterranean coniferous wood with a very broad fibre.

On the Vermillion lute one notices that the end-clasp is less deeply curved, the bridge is made of ivory and the pegs are identical to those of the Paris instrument and also of the previously mentioned lute belonging to Charles Beare. What model could have inspired the maker of the two lutes? Dugot suggested Melozzo da Forli (1438–1494), referring briefly to the frescoed angels in the Basilica dei Santi Apostoli in Rome, today located in the Città del Vaticano, Musei Vaticani (Figure 6). In fact, the shape of the body is very similar and the rose seems to be inspired by one of the three lute-playing angels. However, the neck and pegbox are not visible on the fresco, nor is the shape of the bridge. There the instrument does not display on its sound-board a moustache – a feature obviously borrowed from another source, bearing in mind that this constructional detail does not appear before 1520 in the visual sources.

Here is the record of the Vermillion lute as it appeared on the museum’s website in 2021:

5-course treble lute. Maker: D.G. Date: 1480–1930 ca. Place Made: Venice, Italy, Europe. Signed. This ivory lute is of a style seen in Italian iconography of the end of the fifteenth century.

---

19 Melozzo da Forli (1438–1494), Angel, in profile, playing a lute, detached fresco on cadorite, 117 × 93.5 cm, decoration of the apse basin from basilica dei Santi Apostoli a Roma, c. 1472–1475 (Città del Vaticano, Musei Vaticani, Inv. 40269-14-10).
21 This online entry includes a number of elements from the Catalogue of the Monaco public auction of 2018 that we will discuss later: notably the mention of the “Angelic Concert”.
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century. A number of instruments, apparently of a set, in this style survive, of varying quality. Included are a number of lutes, a rebec, a lira da braccio, a spinet, a harp, and a tromba marina. The authenticity of these instruments is a subject of disagreement among experts, and it is also possible that some, but not all have earlier components. A set of these instruments, called “The Angelic Concert” was purchased by the Roman antiquities dealer Giuseppe Sangiorgi from the collection of the late Modena instrument collector Count Luigi Francesco Valdrighi in 1909. The instruments were dispersed to a variety of buyers through the end of the 1930s, and currently instruments of this type can also be found in the Paris museum collection and private collections. It is not clear how many date to Valdrighi’s time, or before, or were made to fill out the set under the supervision of Sangiorgi. Hence the possible date range of construction runs over five centuries.

We will now look at other instruments that appear to be made by the same hand, most likely an Italian maker working in the very late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries: instruments that have formed part of at least three renowned collections (see Table).

**The Five Other Ivory Instruments from the Musée des Arts décoratifs Deposited in the Musée de la musique in Paris**

The first of these is a six-stringed viola da braccio (Figure 7). It has a body that is asymmetric as regards its upper and lower parts; its fingerboard and neck are made of ivory; its sound-board is made of the same resinous wood as that of the lutes studied above. It bears a stamped mark in Gothic letters, “GO” (probably in reference to Georg Ott). This is of a design somewhat different from the one used for the lute previously studied. Its body is very shallow. Its pegbox is almost heart-shaped. The angelic musician playing the viola da braccio painted by Melozzo da Forli shows a specimen with comma-shaped sound-holes – but these are shorter, wider and placed in line with the curves of the body (Figure 8). We may therefore surmise that the maker had taken note of other visual sources – for example, the angel in the central panel of a triptych by the painter Marco d’Oggiono (c. 1470–c. 1540), *Virgin and Child with Angels*, in the Polyptyque Crespi preserved in

---

22 It should be noted, however, that this set of instruments is not described in the two lists of instruments in the possession of Valdrighi: Valdrighi, *Nomocheliurgografia* (1884), 292–293 (“Documenti”): “LXXXIV. Sec. XIX, Valdrighi Luigi-Francesco. – (Collezione strumentistica)”. Nor does it appear in the supplement published in 1888: “Corollarii. IV Collezione Valdrighi” (Valdrighi, *Nomocheliurgografia* [1888], 33–43). The fifth supplement, published in 1894, says nothing new about Valdrighi’s collection, which means that if this group of instruments really belonged to him, it must have been made between 1894 and his death in 1899. See n. 49.

23 Joël Dugot, who was kind enough to examine the instruments with me in September 2021, specifies in a note dated 17 January 2022 that the wood used in all the instruments studied here is a “coniferous wood with a broad or even very broad fibre of a reddish colour, perhaps a Mediterranean pine”. An identification by the National Music Museum’s laboratory would be welcome.
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Blois museum. It should also be noted that the design and positioning of the sound-holes in this source are also slightly different from those adopted by the maker.

The rebec, marked “ML” (in reference to Laux Maler), is quite spectacular, having a ribbed body extending over the entire surface of the back of the neck (Figure 9). Its ivory fingerboard extends over more than a third of the soundboard. Its pegbox is quarter-circular and has three strings. The model painted by Melozzo da Forli in the hands of a different angel may have partially inspired the maker, but his painting shows neither the neck nor the pegbox of the instrument (Figure 10). We can observe here a sort of “contamination” of the lute-making tradition used for the rebec, since the bottom of its body shows an end-clasp, which is not at all usual in the visual sources for this type of instrument in the late Middle Ages and early Renaissance. Another source of inspiration for the rebec, especially its long overlapping fingerboard and the shape of its pegbox, could be the plate published by Sebastian Virdung (Musica getutscht, 1511, reproduced in Figure 11).

The ivory harp belonging to the same set of instruments (Figure 12), marked “LM”, has a very special feature: its body has a clearly arched profile, a feature that does not seem to be found in visual sources until the seventeenth century, such as in the painting by Jan De Bray (1627–1697) representing David before the Ark (1674). Also uncommon in the models depicted is the tapered joint of the column and neck proposed in the reconstruction. An engraving by Israel van Meckenem (1475–1503) (Figure 13) dating from the very end of the fifteenth century offers a possible model, but it is more likely that the Italian maker was additionally inspired by the young child harpist painted between 1492 and 1494 for the fresco Music by Bernardino di Betto called Pinturrichio (1454–1513) in the Borgia Apartments of the Vatican.

A first tromba marina with two strings and six ribs assembled (Figure 14) uses the same type of wood as the previous instruments. The joins of its ivory plates and the black wood purfling are very carefully executed. In Cecil Adkins’ seminal monograph on the tromba marina this instrument is listed among the twenty-one specimens (out of 188 analysed) belonging to his category “D”, which includes models of all morphologies but possessing a fixed bridge not allowing the emission of harmonics. He does not date the instrument, describing it as follows:


24 Marco d'Oggiono (c. 1470–c. 1540), Virgin and Child with angels, [La Vierge à l'enfant avec deux anges musiciens (luth et vièle), entourée de Saint Pierre et Saint-Jean Baptiste], “Polyptyque Crespi”, 144 × 74 cm (Blois, Musée des Beaux-Arts, MNR 270 and 271), https://www.photo.rmn.fr.


27 Adkins and Dickinson, Trumpet by Any Other Name, 2:471, no. D15. Six bars are given. Adkins mistakenly identifies its inventory number as 40376B instead of 40376A.
The second tromba marina (Figure 15), is a monochord with a triangular body. It is of a much simpler construction (with a wooden rosette cut into the sound-board). It is marked “LM” in Gothic lettering. Adkins places the instrument among the thirty specimens of his “A” group, which comprises instruments without independent necks. He describes it as follows:

Decorative triangular instrument with interior end frame and five sets of ribs. Triangular lining at seams. Fixed bridge (type 12) of ivory and rosewood. Ornate rose carved from belly. Half-round neck with lute-style pegbox.

The visual source used here could be, as for the previous rebec, a plate in the Virdung handbook (Figure 11). The represented instrument has only a single string and a kind of openwork pegbox. It cannot therefore be compared with the model visible in the famous painting attributed to the workshop of Jan van Eyck, *The Fountain of Grace* (a panel painted around 1454 and held by the Museo del Prado) nor with the painting most commonly employed for the reconstruction of trumpets marine: that by Hans Memling dated 1488 and held by the Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten in Antwerp; there, the represented instrument has two strings, a circular front pegbox, frets and a Gothic-shaped sound-hole. On the other hand, it could be likened to what seems to be the only representation of a tromba marina in fifteenth-century Italian painting: the *Adoration of the Magi* by Bartolomeo Suardi known as Bramantino (c. 1465–1536), datable to around 1490 and preserved in the Biblioteca Ambrosiana in Milan. There, in the background, an angel plays a triangular tromba marina held aloft.

**Related Ivory Instruments in Recent Auctions**

In 2009, Gabriele Rossi Rognoni, the then curator of musical instruments at the Galleria nazionale d’arte in Florence, was made the offer of the purchase of five ivory instruments by the Casa d’Aste Pandolfini (Figure 16). In order to judge the appropriateness of such an acquisition he wrote a detailed report by contacting myself, Joël Dugot, Jean-Michel Renard and Friedemann Hellwig. The proposed set consisted firstly of a triangular *ottavina* spinet, ivory plated (compass c/e–c′′′ with short octave), stamped “OPUS SEXTUS MUTINENSIS” at the front side of the wrest plank. Rossi Rognoni considered the instrument to be Italian, mid-seventeenth century, but felt that the mark was not credible (but he added “Sono invece storicamente accurati tutti i dettagli costruttivi, estetici e funzionali”). It refers to the maker Sesto Tantini, a maker recorded in documents in the

---

29 Adkins and Dickinson, *Trumpet by Any Other Name*, 2:303, Bl. Six bars are given.
31 Adkins and Dickinson, *Trumpet by Any Other Name*, 2:529, fig. 36.
33 Rossi Rognoni, “Relazione sulla datazione”. 
State Archives of Modena between 1461 and 1490. Tantini worked for Ercole d’Este and is listed alongside the transcription of these documents in Valdrighi’s book on makers as the oldest known maker of keyboard instruments in Italy.\(^{34}\)

This spinet was submitted to the Musée de la musique in March 2007 by the Parisian office of Christie's, which was seeking authorization to export it from the country (Figure 17). Jean-Claude Battault, conservation technician for keyboard instruments in this museum, had noted in his examination report the many historically coherent details of the construction, but also the many variations and approximations in their realization, and above all the great resemblance of the instrument to another spinet sharing morphology, compass and maker’s mark that he had been responsible for restoring in 1987 while apprenticed to the harpsichord maker and dealer Claude Mercier-Ythier in Paris. This other spinet is reproduced in Mercier-Ythier’s 1990 book: “Epinette dite ottavino attribuée à Mutinensis et modifiée par L. Franciolini (Anc. coll. B. Oger Paris)” (Figure 18).\(^{35}\)

The decoration of the outer case with its lid is very reminiscent of a small Oktav-Querspinett in the Deutsches Museum, for which Hubert Henkel, in his systematic catalogue of the collection, considered the instrumental part to date from the second half of the seventeenth century, and the outer case and stand to be the work of Leopoldo Franciolini, the well-known harpsichord forger in Florence.\(^{36}\) The instrument reproduced by Mercier-Ythier was the subject of critical and pertinent comments by Allegria Andereg (alias Felia Bastet, translator into French [1981] of Frank Hubbard’s seminal book),\(^{37}\) who, in a handwritten note, the knowledge of which I likewise owe to J.-C. Battault, rightly remarked on the faulty and suspicious character of the Latin inscription in modern characters (this should indeed be “Opvs Sexti Mvtinensis”), the unusual pattern of the rosette, the unexpectedly curved shape of the bridge and a keyboard compass consistent only with later instruments, which led her to believe that this nineteenth-century spinet (which, she noted, did not appear in the various Franciolini catalogues published by Ripin) might have been “made from some old body parts, perhaps from the seventeenth century”.

Rossi Rognoni further considered authentic the unmarked ivory alto recorder, which he dated to the first third of the eighteenth century. An inspection of the bore of the instrument would undoubtedly be indispensable for confirmation of this identification. It should not be forgotten that recorder making continued well into the nineteenth century, as Douglas Macmillan shows in his various writings.\(^{38}\)

---

34 Valdrighi, *Nomocheliurgograpia* (1884), 90 (Tantino, Costantino, Modena, 1419–1472, org., clavic. et manoc.; Tantino, Sesto, 1461–90, strumentaio); 216 (Notice 3119); 243, 248–249 (Tantino Sesto); 244–248 (Tantino Costantino).
37 Hubbard, *Le clavecin*.
On the other hand, Rossi Rognoni did not fail to notice the striking similarities between the Paris lute, the Vermillion lute and the one offered by the Pandolfini auction house: a rather simple end-clasp, an ivory bridge merging features belonging to the other two lutes, a different rose and the stamped mark “HM” (and no longer “DG”). The set of instruments on offer also included a rebec, identical in every respect to the one in Paris, and a triangular-bodied trumpet marine marked “LM” but having two strings. Its rosette, different from that of the two Paris trombe marine, was directly carved from the sound-board.

This same set of instruments was later offered for public sale in Monaco in April 2018 (Figure 19). This sale included the lute, the rebec, the tromba marina, a lira da braccio not reproduced in the catalogue, the ottavino, which on this occasion was no longer considered to date from the seventeenth century, and the alto recorder “made between the seventeenth and the first half of the eighteenth century”. The text describing these instruments in the catalogue traced back the genealogy of this set of instruments and stated that it came from Valdrighi and from the opera singer and collector Evan Gorga (1865–1957):

In 1909, Giuseppe Sangiorgi, one of Rome’s most important antiquarians, bought a set of ivory instruments known as “the Angelic Concert”. They came from the collection of Count Valdrighi of Modena, a famous historian and musicologist [...].

Evan Gorga immediately bought the set and blocked the deal, but due to a lack of funds was unable to honour his commitments. The instruments were then dispersed. Our collector never stopped looking for them. After years of investigation, he managed to reconstitute the Concert Angélique as best he could. He would not be able to enjoy it for long. The disaster of the Second World War forced him to part with his latest acquisitions. Giuseppe Sangiorgi died and he sold the instruments to his successor. They have remained in the family since, and have been the subject of several exhibitions.

\[39\] Auction catalogue: Hôtel des ventes de Monte Carlo, Mobilier-Objets d’Art, 28 avril 2018, “Instruments de musique”, 62–65, nos. 162–167. We have to note that the existence of these instruments in the Valdrighi collection is verified by no publication written or authorized by its collector. See note 49.

\[40\] Jean-Michel Renard is the author, and I thank him for confirming this.

\[41\] On Evan Gorga, see Cionci, *Il tenore collezionista*. See also the review of that book in Meucci, review of *Il tenore collezionista*. See also Ambrosini, *Evan Gorga al CNR*.

\[42\] “Giuseppe Sangiorgi, un des plus importants antiquaires de Rome achète en 1909 un ensemble d’instruments en ivoire appelé ‘le Concert Angélique’. Ils proviennent de la collection du Comte Valdrighi de Modène, célèbre historien et musicologue [...]. Evan Gorga se porte immédiatement acquéreur de cet ensemble, bloque l’affaire mais faute de moyens ne parvient pas à honorer ses engagements. Les instruments sont alors dispersés. Notre collectionneur n’aura de cesse de les rechercher. Après des années d’enquête, il parvient à reconstituer du mieux qu’il peut le Concert Angélique. Il ne pourra en profiter longtemps. Le désastre de la deuxième guerre mondiale le pousse à se séparer de ses dernières acquisitions. Giuseppe Sangiorgi est décédé et c’est à son successeur qu’il revend les instruments. Restés depuis dans la famille, ils donneront lieu à plusieurs expositions”. We have to note that the two ivory trombe marine that formerly belonged to the Marquis de Ganay and are today in the Musée de la musique both bear a label reading “Douanes Expositions”. They may have been exhibited together.
This auction catalogue concludes this presentation with the following remark about their dating and attribution:

Very little is known about these ivory instruments, which were made in the 19th century but are still of the highest quality. A set of similar instruments is kept at the Cité de la Musique in Paris; a lute comparable to the model shown here is on display at the National Museum (Vermillion, S.D. U.S.A.). Other pieces are in private collections.\(^{43}\)

The detailed auction catalogue entries of all these instruments (rebec, spinet marked “OPUS SEXTUS MUTINENSIS”, lute, olifant, lyra da braccio, tromba marina), are considered as nineteenth-century instruments. Only the recorder is described as “made between the seventeenth and the first half of the eighteenth century”. Again, the common points between these ivory stringed and necked instruments are: the wood of the soundboard (a coniferous wood with a wide or very wide fibre and a reddish colour, which we hope will one day be identified by the team of the National Music Museum) and its thickness (between 2.5 and 3 mm); the flat soundboards for lutes, rebecs, viola-lira da braccio and trumpets marine; the cutting of the ivory into large slabs; the pegs of the lutes and rebecs; the marks (with Gothic letters) never observed on authentic instruments.\(^{44}\)

It also seems possible to link them to a five-string lira da braccio belonging to Jean-Michel Renard (Figures 20a and 20b).\(^{45}\) The shape of its pegbox is quite similar to that of the viola da braccio in the Musée de la musique (Figure 4). However, its case has a very thick upper part, wider than the lower part, with central, parallel and symmetrical inwardly directed sound-holes, and a back and ivory veneer indicating the same type of work as the instruments we have already examined. The top wood is always the same, as are the thicknesses (between 2.5 and 3 mm). Inside this instrument we observed in 2006 a handwritten label stating: “A[ndrea]. POSTACCHINI/ reparavit”. This violin maker did indeed exist: he was born in Fermo in 1786 and remained active in that town until 1862. The labels of his mature period read “Andreas Postacchini Firmanus fecit sub titulo S. Raphaelis Archang”.\(^{46}\)

This violin maker, whose violins imitated Stradivari’s models, is referenced in Luigi Valdrighi’s book on instrument makers.\(^{47}\) He also appears twice in the printed catalogues of the famous forger Leopoldo Franciolini, but there as a guitar maker.\(^{48}\) However, his

---

\(^{43}\) “On sait très peu de choses concernant ces instruments en ivoire fabriqués au XIX\(^{e}\) siècle, qui relèvent toujours d’un travail de grande qualité. Un ensemble de même nature est conservé à Paris à la Cité de la Musique; un luth comparable au modèle présenté ici est exposé au National Museum (Vermillion, S.D. U.S.A.), D’autres pièces font partie de collections privées”.

\(^{44}\) Hellwig, “Makers’ Marks”, 22–31.

\(^{45}\) France, Bellenaves (03330). This instrument was exhibited at the salon Musicora in Paris in 2006. I warmly thank J. M. Renard for sharing information and pictures relating to it.

\(^{46}\) Vannes, Dictionnaire universel, 286.

\(^{47}\) Valdrighi, Nomocheliurgografia (1884), 73 (no. 2497: “Postacchini Andrea di Amico, Fermo, 1824, ristaur. generico”); Ibid., 198 (“Postacchini. ‘Opus 214’ leggesi in un suo violino a volte piatte, vernice rosso-bruna, fattura ordinaria”).

period of activity seems too early for the set of instruments studied here. Two of his sons were also makers and retained his label. Jean-Michel Renard has also pointed out that the unusual technique of assembling such large sheets of ivory could only have been achieved using a particular method of cutting and peeling: one similar to that used for plywood. Renard was able to find a patent application in Paris at the INPI (Institut national de la Propriété industrielle) made in 1844 by Léon-Joseph-Thomas Alessandri for a “machine à dérouler l’ivoire”. But this is quite early for the group of instruments we are investigating, and there are no sources proving a connection between him and any Italian maker of ancient instruments.

Conclusion

Several illustrious collectors were clients of this maker, whose identity we have not yet discovered: first, but without clear documentation, Luigi Francesco Valdrighi (1827–1899) and his hypothetical “Angelic Concert” inspired by the angels of Melozzo da Forli; after him, Evan Gorga (1865–1857), and also Lord William Waldorf Astor (1848–1919) and the Marquis Hubert de Ganay (1888–1974). All of these men were very wealthy and learned collectors eager to assemble consorts of instruments covering the entire development of European instrument-making since the end of the Middle Ages, even at the cost of obtaining reconstructions when the authentic models could not be found. More items will probably be gradually discovered – such as a further ivory lute, formerly located in Hever Castle, which was “thought to have belonged to Anne Boleyn” but is considered today to be an anonymous instrument built c. 1800.51

As Joël Dugot has pointed out,52 the quality of the work of the enigmatic maker who made these ivory reconstructions is remarkable; his knowledge of early instrument making is solid, even if many details are not historical, in relation to proportions, design, thickness, materials, bracing and certain technical details. It should be added that the instruments preserved in Paris all bear traces of being played, having significant deposits of rosin on their sound-boards – a fact indicative of use in performance. Perhaps the “Angelic Concert” was not merely a symbolic conceit and a reference to the paintings that inspired this instrumentarium. Was Valdrighi, in addition to being a scholar and collector, perhaps an actual practitioner and/or organizer of concerts of early music? There is no source to confirm this at the moment, nor is there any evidence of the presence of

49 This engineer, who applied to the Paris Prefecture for naturalization in 1852, submitted several other patents in 1855 and 1869 (www.inpi.fr/base-brevets-du-19eme-siecle).
50 The so called “Concert Angélique” is never documented by Valdrighi himself, is absent from the lists of instrument belonging to his collection published in 1888 and 1894 and is never discussed in the musical press (the RIPM offers no reference) or in recent publications regarding him: Luccki, “Contributi alla conoscenza”; Meucci, “Valdrighi”, 149; Meucci, “Luigi Francesco Valdrighi”. See also note 20.
51 Austern, “Wax Figure of Anne Boleyn”, 474 (fig. 100.2).
52 Joël Dugot to author, 17 January 2022.
ivory instruments in his collection, a prerequisite for their use. Everything suggests that the investigation presented above needs to be pursued further.

Appendix

Illustrations

Figure 1
The six ivory instruments from the Collection of the Marquis de Ganay deposited in the Musée de la musique. Lute Inv. D. AD 23456; Tromba marina Inv. D. AD 40 376 A; Tromba marina Inv. D. AD 40 376 B; Viola da braccio Inv. D. AD 40378; Rebec Inv. D. AD 48900; Harpe Inv. D. AD 40383. Photo: Florence Gétreau.
Figure 2
5-course treble lute, marked “D G.”, Venice, 1480–1930 c.
(Vermillion, SD, National Music Museum, object number: 03384),
front view. Photo: courtesy of the National Music Museum.

Figure 3
5-course treble lute, marked “LM”, Italy, nineteenth century
(Paris, Musée des Arts décoratifs, on deposit at the Musée de la musique since 1994, Inv. D. AD 23456), front view. Photo: Musée de la musique/Jean-Marc Angles.

Figure 4
5-course treble lute, marked “LM”, Italy, nineteenth century
(Paris, Musée des Arts décoratifs, on deposit at the Musée de la musique since 1994, Inv. D. AD 23456), detail of the bridge and mark.
Photo: Florence Gétreau.
Florence Gétreau: A Nineteenth-Century Italian Workshop of Neo-Late Medieval and Renaissance Ivory Instruments

**Figure 5**
5-course treble lute, marked “LM”, Italy, nineteenth century (Paris, Musée des Arts décoratifs, on deposit at the Musée de la musique since 1994, Inv. D. AD 23456), detail of the pegbox. Photo: Florence Gétreau.

**Figure 6**
Melozzo da Forli (1438–1494), Angel, in profile, playing a lute, detached fresco on cadorite, 117 × 93.5 cm, decoration of the apse basin from the Basilica dei Santi Apostoli in Rome, c. 1472–1475 (Città del Vaticano, Musei Vaticani, Inv. 40269-14-10). Photo: Wikimedia Commons (public domain).

**Figure 7**
Viola da braccio, marked “GO”, Italy, nineteenth century (Paris, Musée des Arts décoratifs, on deposit at the Musée de la musique since 1994, Inv. D. AD 40378). Photo: Musée de la musique/Claude Germain.
**Figure 8**
Melozzo da Forli (1438–1494), Angel playing a viola da braccio, detached fresco on cadorite, 113 × 91 cm, decoration of the apse basin from the Basilica dei Santi Apostoli in Rome, c. 1472–1475 (Città del Vaticano, Musei Vaticani, Inv. 40269-14-5). Photo: Wikimedia Commons (public domain).

**Figure 9**
Rebec, anonymous maker, Italy, nineteenth century (Paris, Musée des Arts décoratifs, on deposit at the Musée de la musique since 1994, Inv. D. AD 48900). Photo: Musée de la musique/Jean-Marc Angles.

**Figure 10**
Melozzo da Forli (1438–1494), Angel playing a rebec, detached fresco on cadorite, 102.5 × 73.5 cm, decoration of the apse basin from the Basilica dei Santi Apostoli in Rome, c. 1472–1475 (Città del Vaticano, Musei Vaticani, inv. 40269-14-11). Photo: Wikimedia Commons (public domain).
Figure 11

Figure 12

Figure 13
Figure 14
Tromba marina, anonymous maker, Italy, nineteenth century (Paris, Musée des Arts décoratifs, on deposit at the Musée de la musique since 1994, Inv. D. AD 40376A). Photo: Musée de la musique/Claude Germain.

Figure 15
Florence Gétreau: *A Nineteenth-Century Italian Workshop of Neo-Late Medieval and Renaissance Ivory Instruments*

**Figure 16**
Figure 17
Spinett ottavino, marked “OPUS SEXTUS MUTINENSIS”, Italy, nineteenth century (Christie’s, March 2007). Photo: courtesy of Jean-Claude Battault.
Florence Gérreau: *A Nineteenth-Century Italian Workshop of Neo-Late Medieval and Renaissance Ivory Instruments*

**Figure 18**
Figure 19
Ivory instruments sold by the Hôtel des ventes de Monte-Carlo – Vente Mobilier et Objets d’Art, 29 April 2018. Photo from the auction catalogue.

Figures 20a and 20b
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ITALIJANSKA DELAVNICA NEO-POZNOSREDNJEVEŠKIH IN RENESANČNIH GLASBIL IZ SLONOVINE IZ 19. STOLETJA

Povzetek

Raziskavo, opisano v tem prispevku, je sprožilo spoznanje o presenetljivi podobnosti med lutnjo, ki jo hrani Glasbeni muzej v Vermillionu (Južna Dakota, ZDA), in lutnjo iz pariškega Muzeja dekorativnih umetnosti, ki jo od leta 1994 hrani tamkajšnji Glasbeni muzej (Musée de la musique). Zaradi posebnega sloga, uporabljenih materialov in mnogih konstrukcijskih podrobnosti (zlasti načina pritrditve vratu) sta glasbili sprožili vprašanje o dataciji. Joël Dugot je leta 2001 objavil katalog lutenj, shranjenih v pariškem muzeju, in tam razpravlja tudi o tem, da imata zgoraj omenjeni lutnji nekatere skupne značilnosti z večjo skupino glasbil izdelanih iz slonovine v isti delavnici (viola da braccio, rebek, harfa, tromba marina itd.). Videti je, kot da bi tudi obe lutnji lahko izdelala ista roka.

Skupina zelo podobnih glasbil (spinet, lutnja, rebek, lira da braccio in tromba marina) se je leta 2009 znašla na dražbi v Firencah, kjer jih je prodajala družba Casa d’Aste Pandolfini. Glasbila so se nato ponovno javno dražila leta 2018 v Monaku. Ta skupina je homogena in glasbila so zelo natančno izdelana, če sodimo po primerjavi s preživelimi starimi glasbili in ikonografskimi viri. A zbirka izkazuje tudi nedoslednosti, tehnične podrobnosti in nehistorične materiale.

Provenienca teh dveh zbirk glasbil kaže na izdelovalca, katerega stranke so bili pomembni italijanski zbiratelji. Njegova identiteta še ni znana, a je verjetno deloval okoli leta 1900. Sledovi uporabe kolofonije na nekaterih godalih kažejo na njihovo dejansko uporabo, torej lahko sklepamo, da je šlo za del gibanja za oživljanje stare glasbe. Ta razprava prikazuje trenutno in zato prehodno stanje raziskav, saj se mora iskanje dodatnih arhivskih virov in drugih podobnih glasbil nujno nadaljevati.