THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

THE IMPACT OF CULTURE, ORGANISTS, AND THEOLOGY ON THE PROFESSIONAL SUCCESS OF HERMAN SCHLICKER

A DOCUMENT

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of

DOCTOR OF MUSICAL ARTS

By

JOEL CRAIG SPROAT, JR.
Norman, Oklahoma
2013

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/319436

THE IMPACT OF CULTURE, ORGANISTS, AND THEOLOGY ON THE PROFESSIONAL SUCCESS OF HERMAN SCHLICKER

A DOCUMENT APPROVED FOR THE
SCHOOL OF MUSIC

BY

Dr. Marvin Lamb, Chair

Dr. John Schwandt, Co-chair

Dr. Frank Riddick

Dr. Zoe Sherinian

Dr. Donald Maletz

© Copyright by JOEL CRAIG SPROAT, JR 2013
All Rights Reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many thanks to those who helped me with the research and writing:

Dr. John Schwandt, my teacher and mentor for the past nine years, who led me to this topic, offered insights and suggestions, and guided me through the entire process. Everyone needs to be pushed now and then, and I probably would not have begun this degree, let alone finished it, without his encouragement and motivation.

My committee members, who gave their critical and helpful commentary and suggestions.

Those who agreed to be interviewed and opened up their files and collections. They gave me a better understanding of Schlicker as a person and allowed me access to key documents without which I could not have written this document: Justin Matters, Benjamin Hadley, Donald Ingram, Ken List, Stanton Peters, Donald Rotermund, and Manuel Rosales.

Schlicker's daughters, Maria Dinwoodie and Elizabeth French, for their gracious help.

The Boston chapter of the American Guild of Organists for its assistance, especially Barbara Owen, who helped with my research in the Biggs archives, offered suggestions, and led me to sources I might not have considered.

My family and friends who continually offered their encouragement and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES vi

ABSTRACT vii

Chapter 1. Introduction and Historical Background 1

Chapter 2. Schlicker's Early Career 18

Chapter 3. The Importance of Prominent Organists to Schlicker's Success 35

Chapter 4. Schlicker and the Lutheran Sound 109

Conclusion 140

BIBLIOGRAPHY 146

Appendix A. Specification of a Model Tellers-Kent Organ, 1921 149

Appendix B. Specification of the 1933 Schlicker organ at First Presbyterian Church, Dunkirk, New York 151

Appendix C. E. Power Biggs's Sketch for a Potential Schlicker Advertisement 153

Appendix D. Letter from Herman Schlicker to E. Power Biggs, March 6, 1957 158

Appendix E. "The Organ – Today and Yesterday" by Herman L. Schlicker 163

Appendix F. IRB Authorization for Interviews 173

LIST OF FIGURES

1. Specification of the organ at First Presbyterian Church, Dallas, Texas, by Ernest Skinner 4

2. Specification of the "Praetorius Organ," Freiburg University, Breisgau 8

3. Specification of the Schlicker Organ at Kenmore Presbyterian Church, Kenmore, New York, 1949 38

4. Specification of the Cambridge Portativ, Schlicker Organ Company, 1953 73

5. Specification of the 1953 Holtkamp organ at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis 119

6. Specification of the 1971 Schlicker organ at Grace Lutheran Church, Albert Lea, Minnesota 120

Abstract

Herman Schlicker had a profound influence on the direction of American organ building because he was able to capitalize on a number of contemporary movements which allowed him to sell a product that he was already producing to a national market looking for the sound and the aesthetic his organs provided. This document explains how the early music revival, the Orgelbewegung (organ reform movement), and a reawakening in American Lutheranism of its own musical heritage spurred a reaction against the Romantic organs of the early twentieth century and created a market for organs capable of playing both early and modern music with a clarity and brilliance that had been unattainable on organs built by the previous generation.

An examination of correspondence demonstrates how Schlicker's work and personality impressed his early clients and allowed him to establish a business in the midst of the Depression of the 1930s. Schlicker also collaborated with key figures such as Robert Noehren, E. Power Biggs, Clarence Mader, Paul Bunjes, and Paul Manz who in turn promoted his work and not only gave him national exposure and recognition as an organ builder but also actively encouraged churches and academic institutions to purchase his organs. This enabled Schlicker to avoid reliance on traditional commercial advertisement to promote his company. The document will also examine the roots of Schlicker's success within the Lutheran church through an examination of the theology of Lutheran worship and music as expressed in the 1940s and 1950s and how the music of Lutheran composers such as Paul Manz equated the sounds of Schlicker's organs with the sounds of Lutheran music.

Chapter 1

Introduction and Historical Background

In the first half of the twentieth century, American organists negatively reacted to the orchestral instruments that organbuilders were producing. This reaction, which came to be called the organ reform movement, regarded the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as the high-point of organ construction and design, and builders sought to use the design principles behind these classical instruments as the basis for the construction of modern instruments. Builders such as Walter Holtkamp and G. Donald Harrison introduced their own ideas and received acclaim for their instruments, which welded their new ideas with their personal interpretation of the principles behind classical instruments. Herman Schlicker (1902-1974), however, brought something unique to the organ building world. Schlicker's concepts of organ design and voicing techniques that he learned as an apprentice in Europe enabled him to produce a clear and brilliant sound with his classically-voiced stops and balanced ensembles. This attracted a group of very influential organists such as Robert Noehren, E. Power Biggs, Paul Manz, and Clarence Mader who, through their recordings and endorsements, gave Schlicker's work national exposure and created a demand for his product.

Schlicker did not establish his business in 1932 with the intention of advancing the organ reform movement in America. His early instruments do not show a radical break with the American romantic sound of the 1930s. As he continued building, though, he developed his own version of the "classical" organ, rooted in the ideas of the German Baroque tradition, yet capable of playing a wide

variety of repertoire demanded by organists of the mid twentieth century. Because this was the type of instrument which produced the clear, articulate sound organists were seeking in the 1950s and 1960s, musicians received his work enthusiastically, and this positive response helped Schlicker rise to national prominence as an organbuilder who successfully translated the concepts of the North German Baroque organ into the twentieth-century American musical and theological context undergoing significant changes. The early music revival began around the turn of the century and intensified as publishers released editions of the music of Renaissance and Baroque composers. This stimulated interest not only in the music but also the instruments on which it should be performed. American organists traveled to Europe in the 1930s and 1940s, heard Renaissance and Baroque organs, and learned of the Orgelbewegung, the organ reform movement which sought a return to the principles of construction and design upon which the North German organ was built. They subsequently carried these ideas and ideals back with them to America. At the same time, Lutherans sought to recover and renew their own musical heritage and desired an instrument which could successfully render this music.

Schlicker was able to capitalize on these contemporary movements, and this allowed him to sell a product that he was already producing to a national market looking for the sound and the aesthetic his organs represented. The early music revival, the Orgelbewegung, and a reawakening in Lutheranism of its own musical heritage spurred a reaction against the Romantic organs of the early twentieth century and created a market for organs capable of playing both early and modern

music with a clarity and brilliance that had been unattainable on organs built by the previous generation. Schlicker took advantage of the situation by collaborating with key figures in these movements such as Robert Noehren, E. Power Biggs, and Paul Bunjes; they in turn promoted his work and not only gave him national exposure and recognition as an organbuilder but also actively encouraged churches and academic institutions to purchase his organs. This enabled Schlicker to avoid reliance on traditional commercial advertisement to promote his company. An examination of the correspondence and published writings of these musicians will demonstrate how he was able to allow his products and promoters to speak for themselves and, unlike other organ builders, not rely on print advertising to create new business.

When Schlicker came to America in the 1920s, the prevailing style of organbuilding was the orchestral organ, an instrument characterized by powerful tone and stops at the fundamental 8' pitch meant to imitate the various members of the orchestra. In the absence of widely available, high-quality recordings, the organ brought music to towns and audiences who might otherwise not have the opportunity to hear orchestral music. In response to the musical demands, organbuilders began constructing instruments geared toward transcriptions of this repertoire. This brought about serious changes in the tonal makeup and construction of organs.

Orchestral organs placed an emphasis on 8'[1] fundamental tone at the expense of stops of higher pitch which reinforce the harmonics of the 8' stops. Figure 1 gives

[1] An 8' stop speaks at written pitch. 16' and 32' speak lower than written, and stops that speak higher than written have smaller values such as 4', 2 2/3', etc.

the stop list of the organ at First Presbyterian Church, Dallas, by Ernest M. Skinner, the preeminent builder of the era, illustrates this lack of upperwork.

GREAT		CHOIR	
Bourdon	16'	Chimney Flute	8'
Diapason	8'	Gamba	8'
Clarabella	8'	Dulciana	8'
Octave	4'	Flute	4'
Rohr Flute (Sw.)	8'	Clarinet	8'
Flute Celeste (Sw.)	8'	Harp	8'
Flute (Sw.)	4'	Celesta (from Harp)	4'
Cornopean (Sw.)	8'		
French Horn	8'	PEDAL	
Chimes	8'	Resultant	32'
		Major Bass	16'
SWELL		Bourdon	16'
Bourdon	16'	Echo Lieblich (Sw.)	16'
Diapason	8'	Contra Oboe (Sw.)	16'
Rohr Flute	8'	Octave (ext.)	8'
Salicional	8'	Gedeckt (ext.)	8'
Voix Celeste	8'	Still Gedeckt (Sw.)	8'
Flauto Dolce	8'	Chimes (Gt.)	8'
Flute Celeste	8'		
Flute Triangulaire	4'		
Mixture	III		
Contra Oboe	16'		
Cornopean	8'		
Vox Humana	8'		

Figure 1. Specification of the organ at First Presbyterian Church, Dallas, Texas, by Ernest Skinner. *Source:* Orpha Ochse, *The History of the Organ in the United States* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1975), 355.

The majority of the ranks are at the fundamental (8'), and three are at 16', sounding an octave lower. The Swell does contain a Mixture, but its inclusion is noticeable only because of the lack of upperwork in the other divisions. Furthermore, the Pedal contains only two independent ranks of pipes, requiring the extensive borrowing of stops from the Swell and the coupling of manuals to the Pedal in order to support

the other divisions, thereby prohibiting it from playing an independent voice in polyphony.

Classical builders, as well as Schlicker in his mature style, organized their divisions by the choruses created by stops of different pitch levels. However, the Skinner organ, because it is focuses on 8' pitch, considers each division as a collection of different tonal colors. Skinner and others developed stops that were meant to imitate orchestral colors as closely as possible. When transcriptions from orchestral scores became a large part of the repertoire, organists regarded stops such as the Orchestral Oboe, Saxophone, French Horn, and others necessary to reproduce the music as closely to the original as possible. Organists created ensemble by combining the various colors together. In the absence of mixtures, reeds and small-scaled, keen strings added brightness to the sound. The preponderance of 8' stops also allowed for a wide variation in dynamics among the stops. Orchestral music, and much of the romantic music of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, often requires large contrasts in dynamics and the ability to move smoothly between *pianississimo* and *fortississimo*. Builders created a gradation and inequality in the volume and intensity of the stops.

Organs of the early twentieth century also differed from classically designed organs in their construction and placement. The advent of reliable electricity allowed for steady wind at higher pressures. Without the limitations of human power, electric blowers could produce wind pressures many times greater than before. Whereas pressures between 2 1/2" and 5" were common in the nineteenth century, builders now commonly employed 10", 15", or even up to 25" of wind.

Higher pressures such as these gave an intensity to the tone and pushed it into the room. Sufficient strength to move into a room became important because builders began to place pipes within chambers separate from the listening area. The pressures therefore became necessary in order to allow the pipes to be heard throughout the room. The pressures also changed the manner in which builders voiced the pipes to create and adjust their tones. Closed-toe voicing, in which the hole at the bottom of each pipe is fairly small, became necessary in order to counteract the increased pressure coming from the chests into the pipes. On the lower pressures previously used, the toes were fairly open because the pressure of the air in the chest and the pressure just inside the pipe was more balanced. Also prevalent was the increase of nicking, the introduction of indentations on the languid[2] of the pipe which remove the ambient sounds created by the initial rush of wind over the languid of the pipe. Nicking creates a smoother attack, a sound much desired in playing which required the subtle entry and shading of the various colors of the organ.

Not all organists accepted the omission of upperwork and the increased intensity of tone as beneficial for the organ and its music. As early as 1906, Albert Schweitzer, the famed physician and organist, called for a return to the standards of organ building which allowed for the performance of Bach's organ works. In *Organ Building and Organ Playing in France and Germany* he decries the insistence on higher pressures and volume as "confused thinking": "Our organs are louder but not as beautiful in tone as older ones. Organs which we built just twenty or more years

[2] The portion of a flue pipe which divides the foot from the body and creates tone as air is blown between its front edge and the lower lip of the pipe.

ago were more artistically toned than those today."[3] Schweitzer criticized organs which produced too much fundamental tone and too little harmonic development because they create a muddiness which obscures the individual voices, making it impossible to play Bach's music and render its polyphony clearly.[4]

To correct what he saw as the deficiencies of the modern organ, Schweitzer offered a number of suggestions, many of which became characteristic of Schlicker's work. First, because he believed beauty in tone was more important than volume, pressures should be lowered and pipes voiced so as to blend in ensemble while maintaining their individual colors.[5] In the 1927 Epilogue he suggests 70-85 mm. (2.76"-3.35") as desirable for foundations and mixtures, allowing higher pressures for reeds.[6] He held Aristide Cavaillé-Coll's instruments in France as modern examples of organs that contained distinct, cohesive choruses on each division. Schweitzer also considered Pedal divisions with only 16' and 8' foundations inadequate to support the manuals and called for the return of complete Pedal divisions with Mixtures.[7]

Schweitzer looked to recent French organs such as Cavaillé-Coll's as models for the future. Meanwhile, in Germany many began looking at the older organs by North German builders as models to emulate. The first significant attempt to create

---

[3] Albert Schweitzer, *Organ Building and Organ Playing in France and Germany*. Trans. William D. Turner from *Deutsche und französische Orgelbaukunst und Orgelkunst 1906; Nachwort über den gegenwärtigen Stand der Frag des Orgelbaues 1927*. (Braintree: The Organ Literature Foundation, 1984), 10.

[4] Ibid, 13.

[5] Ibid, 12.

[6] Ibid, 26.

[7] Ibid, 14.

an organ based on historical guidelines was the "Praetorius Organ" built at the University of Frieberg in Breisgau by the Walcker firm. The designs and scales of the pipes came from Michael Praetorius' "Organographia" in Volume II of his *Syntagma Musicum* of 1618. The stoplist, given in figure 2, represents a radical departure from the prevailing designs of that time with a majority of its ranks above 8'.

OBERWERK		RÜCKPOSITIF	
Principal	8'	Quintadeena	8'
Octava	4'	Blockflöit	4'
Mixture 4 fach, dorinnen		Gemshörnlein	2'
Octav 2' Quint 1 ½'		Zimbel doppelt gar	
Groß Gedact Rohrflöt	8'	klein und scharff	
Nachthorn	4'	Spitzflöit oder	
Schwiegelpfeiff	1'	Spillflöit	4'
Rancket oder stille Posaun	16'	Krumbhorn	8'
Gemshorn	4'		
IN DER BRUST		ZUM PEDAL	
Klein lieblish Gedact flöit,		Untersatz starck	16'
Rohrflöit	2'	Posaunen Basz	16'
Baerpfieff	8'	Singend Cornet	2'
Geigend Regal	4'	Dolzianbasz	8'

Figure 2. Specification of the "Praetorius Organ," Freiburg University, Breisgau. *Source:* William Leslie Sumner, *The Organ: Its Evolution, Principles of Construction and Use*, 3rd ed. (New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1962), 391

Although the organ was modern in that it lacked both casework and mechanical action, and the stop list is not exactly as given by Praetorius, it represented an attempt to recover the concepts of classical organ building, not least of which was the idea of a chorus in each division and the inclusion of upperwork as an essential part of these choruses.

Schlicker moved to America in 1925 just as the ideas of the Orgelbewegung were gaining traction in Germany, but musicians began expressing these ideas during his apprenticeship and early career in Europe. The movement's proponents pointed to historical organs as models for future organbuilding, and Schlicker had opportunities to study both the tone and construction of these instruments when he worked in Germany, Denmark, and France. When he came to America, then, concepts such as lower pressures, the importance of ensemble, and classical pipe construction were not new to him but were rather part of his natural aesthetic. Although his early work did not demonstrate a radical break with the prevailing style, as the next chapter demonstrates, it shows glimpses of these principles which later defined his mature style.

The organ reform movement coincided with two other trends in the larger musical world: the rise of neoclassicism and the early music revival. These related movements turned their attentions towards historical music: the latter to rediscover and popularize older music, the former to glean principles that might offer direction to modern composition. Both affected organ construction in the first half of the twentieth century because their proponents began to expect organs to offer certain sounds and play Renaissance and Baroque music that organs recently built in the romantic, orchestral style were unable to accommodate.

Neoclassicism as a musical term originated as a criticism aimed at composers such as Brahms who looked to compositions of the seventeenth and eighteenth century for models on which to base their own compositions, using forms such as fugue and passacaglia. In the twentieth century, the term is associated

especially with the music of composers such as Stravinsky whose music uses eighteenth-century forms and gestures and is characterized by "objectivity and expressive restraint" and "motivic clarity, textural transparency, formal balance, and reliance upon stylistic models."[8] The "abstract, absolute, architectural, pure, concise, direct, and objective" music of neoclassical composers stood in opposition to the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century music which was "illustrative, metaphysical, sentimental, symbolic, prolix, vague, and subjective."[9] Herbert Gotsch identifies three effects this aesthetic had on composition: the movement away from illustrative music to abstract forms, the movement away from the orchestra to smaller ensembles where color is neglected in favor of more neutral tones, and the lessening of dynamic range.[10]

The requirements neoclassic compositions placed on organ design coincided with the Orgelbewegung's rejection of what were seen as the excesses of the romantic organ. Stops imitative of orchestral instruments were rejected in favor of Principal tone, the truly distinctive and neutral tone of the organ. Smaller, clearer, brighter ensembles replaced louder, heavier combinations. Whereas stops on the romantic organ differed greatly in dynamic range, the individual stops in the classic ideal are more balanced in volume because they are voiced in respect to their place in a division's ensemble.

---

[8] *The Harvard Dictionary of Music*, ed. Don Michael Randel (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1986), s.v. "neoclassical."

[9] Scott Messing, *Neoclassicism in Music from the Genesis of the Concept through the Schoenberg/Stravinsky Polemic* (Rochester: University of Rochester Press 1998, rep. 2007), 88.

[10] Herbert M. Gotsch, *A Study of the Orgelbewegung and the Organ Music of Two of Its Contemporaries* (DMA document, Northwestern University, 1965), 12.

Hugo Distler's choral and organ music reflects his study of Baroque music, and, in the spirit of neoclassicism, he unites older forms and textures with twentieth-century harmonies. His *Partita on "Nun komm der Heiden Heiland*," Op. 8/I, demonstrates the effects neoclassicism had on organ music and what composers expected from organs. The 1637 Stellwagen organ at St. Jacobikirche, Lübeck, inspired the music. The texture is thin throughout, rarely containing more than four voices and very often two or three. Distler reinforces this clarity with quartal and quintal harmonies, which create a hollow, more detached sound than triadic harmonies. In addition, Distler's registration indications emphasize the desire for lightness and clarity. He never calls for multiple stops at the same pitch level on the same division unless one is a reed in addition to a Principal or flute. This requires the reeds to be voiced with the flue pipes so as to color but not overpower the ensemble. He therefore builds ensembles vertically, not horizontally. He often calls for gapped registrations with combinations such as 16' and 4' or 8' and 2' which create an open, hollow sound.

The structure of the various movements also hearkens back to early models. The second movement, the Chorale with Variations, has seven variations which, in addition to the theme, match the eight stanzas of the chorale. However, the treatment is abstract, and Distler eschews text painting in favor of objective presentations of the melody, thereby adhering to the neoclassic aesthetic by avoiding any personal interpretation or emotional response. Distler looks backward in his recovery of the bicinium texture, not used in chorale preludes since Johann Krebs in the eighteenth century. To present the theme, Distler uses a sixteenth-

century setting by Baltasar Resinarius. The chaconne of the third movement also hearkens back to Baroque forms.

Distler's neoclassic style thus required an organ which could produce sounds that matched the seventeenth-century organ with which he was familiar. His knowledge of instruments such as these and the music on which he modeled his own stemmed from another contemporary movement: the early music revival. Interest in early music began in the nineteenth century with the revival of interest in and publication of the works of Johann Sebastian Bach. This led to the study and publication of music by composers who predated Bach. Organists such as Alexander Guilmant began programming on their recitals music by composers as early as Girolamo Frescobaldi (1583-1643), music new both to the general public and most organists. Guilmant himself oversaw the publication of multiple volumes of French organ music of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The publisher C. F. Peters published Buxtehude's organ works as early as 1888 (rev. 1903-4), and Bärenreiter-Verlag published multiple volumes of Johann Pachelbel's music throughout the 1930s, enabling the public an opportunity to learn and examine this music.

As this music became more widely known, organists recognized the need for instruments similar to those known by the Renaissance and Baroque composers that could more accurately communicate the period-appropriate stylistic elements. The interest in older music worked in tandem with the Orgelbewegung; as musicians searched for sixteenth-, seventeenth-, and eighteenth-century organs that still existed in order to discover how this music originally sounded, they began to want those sounds on their own organs. According to leaders of the Orgelbewegung such as

Willibald Gurlitt, only then could they truly understand and play the music as the composers intended: "Every piece of music has its innate sound ideal. Every style of composition is necessarily allied with a definite tonal style, a style that can be reproduced at any given time only with the same instruments and instrumentation for which it was originally created, though which means alone it can reveal its true beauty."[11]

If, then, organists wished to play this repertoire, and, as Christhard Marenholz, a leader of the organ reform movement in Germany, stated, "The music of these epochs cannot be cultivated detached from the instruments for which it was conceived and composed,"[12] organists needed instruments built in the style known and expected by early composers. If modern organs were inadequate because they lacked the specific timbres needed and were unable to play polyphony clearly, new organs needed to be built which embodied the sounds and principles of the older, classic organs. This created a market for organbuilders willing and able to produce organs in that style.

As the ideas of the Orgelbewegung moved to America, the reaction varied among organbuilders. Some, like Skinner, largely rejected returning to Baroque ideas and continued building in the familiar romantic style. Others, however, became interested and began experimenting with the designs of their organs, attempting to create instruments which could play both early and contemporary

[11] Willibald Gurlitt, "Zur gegenwaertigen Orgelerneuerungsbewegung in Deutschland." *Musik und Kirche*, I 1929, 21; quoted in Gotsch, 14.

[12] Christhard Marenhoz, "Fuenfzen Jahre Orgelbewegun." *Musik und Kirche* X, 1938, 10; quoted in Gotsch, 13-14.

music. Two builders who became leaders in the organ reform movement in America were G. Donald Harrison and Walter Holtkamp, Sr.

Henry Willis III, owner of the English organbuilding firm Henry Willis and Sons, sent Harrison to the Skinner firm in 1927 with the goal of improving the composition and blend of Skinner's ensemble. Within a few years he became the company's tonal director and, when Skinner was forced out of his own company, he took control of the company's future. Under his direction, the Aeolian-Skinner company (the Skinner company had bought the Aeolian company in 1930) became known for its "American Classic" concept, which strove for clarity and the ability to play music of all periods on one organ. The tonal ideal of this style was the mild voicing of many ranks which combine to make one large chorus.[13] Each division would have its own chorus, but a complete full organ required the coupling of the divisions. This allowed for the performance of polyphony because the Pedal would have its own straight chorus and was not dependant on the manuals for higher-pitched stops to complete its chorus. Other notable characteristics of this style were the elimination of reeds from the Great, necessitating the coupling of the manuals to achieve a full *tutti*; and the centrality of the 4' line (Harrison based his choruses on the 4' Octave).[14]

The American Classic concept was sometimes considered a romantic organ modified to accommodate early music.[15] Harrison himself insisted that he was not

---

[13] Ralph Downes to G. Donald Harrison, December 10, 1954, in *The American Classic Organ: A History in Letters,* ed. Charles Callahan (Richmond: The Organ Historical Society, 1990), 384.

[14] Harrison to Willis, May 7, 1935, in *The American Classic Organ*, 124.

[15] Lawrence Phelps, "A Short History of the Organ Revival." *Church Music*, 67:1, (repr. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1967), 14.

attempting to imitate Baroque organs.[16] He did, however, respond to some of the ideas about voicing coming from Europe. He lowered the average pressures on each division, and on an experimental organ built in 1935for the Groton School in Connecticut, he lowered pressures to 2 ½", much lower than the normal pressure of the time.[17] This organ was also distinctive in its lack of an 8' Principal on the Positif, giving its ensemble a brighter, leaner sound. Another important experimental organ was the special installation at Harvard's Germanic Museum (now the Busch-Reisinger Museum). Harrison built this organ for himself as a chance to experiment with design and voicing ideas, and E. Power Biggs convinced him to install it to the museum. Biggs made the organ famous when he began his weekly broadcasts from the organ on CBS beginning in 1942.

Walter Holtkamp followed his own path to reform. The most distinctive feature of his organs was their striking visual display. He brought the organs out of their chambers and placed the pipes in the open, artfully arranged to engage the eyes as well as the ears. Holtkamp first achieved fame when he added a Rückpositiv[18] division to the existing Skinner organ at the Cleveland Museum of Art in 1933. Exposing the pipes allowed him to lower the wind pressures and develop a thinner, lighter sound than most other contemporary builders, and his organs had a natural, slightly unfinished sound that was well suited to the general anti-Romanticism of

[16] Harrison to Willis, August 21, 1935, in *The American Classic Organ,* 144.

[17] Ibid, 123.

[18] A division of the organ located behind the organist.

the time.[19] Holtkamp also moved to a greater use of slider chests,[20] especially on the Great divisions, a return to an older construction principle. He built a handful of instruments with tracker action[21] early in his career but afterwards returned to electric action.

Harrison's and Holtkamp's ideas, while progressive for their time, looked back to classical organbuilding for ideas and inspiration. Their success proved that a market for such instruments existed. These two builders worked in the 1930s and 1940s when the ideas of the Orgelbewegung, neoclassicism, and the early music revival were permeating the American organ culture, and they both responded to the needs and desires of contemporary organists. Schlicker established his own business in 1932, five years after Harrison came to America and just before Holtkamp became famous. He therefore worked in the middle of these same trends. Schlicker's success came because he cultivated personal relationships with key figures in the midst of musical and cultural trends such as the early music revival, the organ reform movement, and a desire for Lutherans to affirm and establish their musical identity.

The next three chapters discuss exactly how Schlicker's work matched these trends and how those who came in contact with his organs helped to promote his work. Chapter two examines Schlicker's early career and demonstrates that his early

---

[19] Jonathan Ambrosino, "Present Imperfect: A Perspective on the Past Century of American Organbuilding." *The Tracker*, Summer 1998, 27-28.

[20] A type of chest on which all pipes for each note on the keyboards or pedalboard are fed by the same channel of air. This is thought by some to produce a better blend of sound than separating the wind supply for each pipe as is in other forms of pipe organ actions.

[21] An action in which each key is mechanically linked to the chests by rods (trackers) which open pallets to allow air to the pipes as opposed to various types of electric and electro-pneumatic actions in which a contact under the key sends an electrical signal to the chests.

organs elicited positive reactions that led to recommendations which gained him further work. Chapter three proves how Schlicker's collaborations with prominent musicians gained him national exposure and how their endorsements of his work led to further contracts. Chapter four focuses on Schlicker's work for Lutheran churches and shows how his organs fit the ideal sound Lutherans at the time desired for worship.

Chapter 2

Schlicker's Early Career

Schlicker's career in organ building began with little public attention, and prior to World War II his work left no indication that it would be considered groundbreaking for American organ building for the next few decades. His conception of the classical style and its adaptation for the twentieth century took two decades to coalesce. His early organs, though, foreshadow later concepts such as a complete Principal chorus that contains voices speaking a large range of the harmonic spectrum above the fundamental 8' pitch on each manual division. His early instruments, therefore, contain the germ of his later ideas, and the sounds produced by his voicing and specifications were different enough that they elicited enthusiastic admiration from his customers whose recommendations contributed greatly to the growth of his business.

Herman Leonhard Schlicker was born in Hohentrüdingen, Germany, on January 31, 1902 into a family of organbuilders. He and his brothers were the third generation to enter the profession. His older brother, Friedrich, apprenticed at Steinmeyer Orgelbau, where Herman began his career, and later established his own firm in Augsburg 1920.[22]

Not much is known about Schlicker's early career in Europe. He began his career at Steinmeyer Orgelbau in Oettingen as an apprentice from April 3, 1915 until 1919, and after that became an assistant at the factory.[23] According to E. Power

[22] Letter to author from Paul Steinmeyer, March 21, 2013.

[23] G. F. Steinmeyer, letter of recommendation, May 21, 1920, Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI.

Biggs, Steinmeyer was proud that Schlicker once worked for him.[24] From Steinmeyer he moved to Marcussen & Sohn in Apenrade, Denmark, working there from June 1, 1920 to July 24, 1922. Here he worked in assembly, tuning, and pipe finishing.[25] According to a 1925 letter of recommendation from Joseph Rinckenbach, Schlicker had already begun working at his company on July 1, 1922 and stayed until February 24, 1923.[26] He next worked for Zann and Company in Strasbourg from March 1, 1923 to March 31, 1924 as the technical director because he "was efficient in all branches of organbuilding." He left his position there because the company enlarged its piano business and stopped building organs.[27] His last position in Europe was at the Schwenkedel firm in Strasbourg from April 1, 1924 to February 24, 1925.[28]

With the exception of the details above from Marcussen, the letters of recommendation say very little about Schlicker's actual work. Zann calls him "noble and honest," and Rinckenbach calls him diligent and a good leader. Employees and clients would later recall these same qualities, and it is noteworthy that traits which would endear him to his employees and customers and contribute to his eventual success were present this early in his career. Schlicker also had

[24] E. Power Biggs to Schlicker, n.d., Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI, with a handwritten note "Copy of letter July 1954."

[25] J. Zachariassen, letter of recommendation, June 22, 1922, Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI.

[26] J. Rinckenbach letter of recommendation, February 17, 1925, Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI.

[27] "Herr Schlicker war in alle Zweige des Orgelbauer tüchtig." Letter of recommendation, March 31, 1924, Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI.

[28] Georges Schwenkedel letter of recommendation, February 14, 1925, Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI.

training in all the various aspects of organbuilding, and his early clients praised his extensive knowledge of the entire process.

Schlicker came to America to learn about theater organs. He first worked for the Artisan firm, a maker of calliopes and other automatic instruments. He then moved to the Wurlitzer firm in Tonawanda, New York, before moving to Erie, Pennsylvania, to work for the Tellers-Kent Organ Company. While working on a rebuild of a Hook and Hastings organ at St. Joseph's Cathedral in Buffalo, New York, he met James and Louis Rothenbueger, the two men with whom he would eventually form his own company. After doing more work in the area, he decided to stay and establish his own business in 1932.[29] He chose Buffalo because that was where most of his acquaintances were.[30]

The organs produced by the Tellers-Kent Organ Company provide a useful tool for gauging the environment in which Schlicker worked in the 1920s. Comparing the standard work of this company with the organs Schlicker eventually produced under his own name will demonstrate how different Schlicker's concept of organ design came to be. A catalogue from 1921 lists fourteen model schemes. Appendix A gives the stoplist for the largest, number 14.[31]

The first difference that separates this organ from the classic (and Schlicker's mature) style is the emphasis on 8' tone and the omission of stops in the higher ranges of the harmonic spectrum which develop a unified ensemble. In this,

---

[29] Snyder, 24.

[30] Ray Dearlove, "Backlog Means Nothing but Sweet Music for Schlicker Organ Co.," *Courier Express* (Buffalo), October 28, 1973.

[31] "Tellers Organ Company: Church Organ Builders," (Erie: Tellers-Kent Organ Company, 1921).

the largest scheme in the catalogue, nothing above 4', the first harmonic, appears. Sixteen of twenty-two stops in the manuals are at 8' pitch. An increase in sound would therefore require an increase at the fundamental and not a broadening and reinforcement of the harmonics of the fundamental as in the classical organ. This creates a sound which, to those who championed the organ reform movement, was fat and tubby, and prohibited the clarity needed for the performance of polyphony. Organs with this or a similar specification were therefore unacceptable to adherents of the Orgelbewegung.

Also noticeable is the lack of an independent Pedal division equal in power to and able to support the manuals. In fact, the Pedal division lacks any independent 8' stops at all. This lack of independent 8' tone requires the coupling of the manuals to the pedal. This does not allow the bass to be truly distinctive in the texture. Those who advocated a return to classical principles in order to facilitate the correct rendering of polyphonic music rejected this pattern because, without an independent bass line, the resulting sound caused muddiness and confusion in the music.

The first organ Schlicker built under his own name is useful in analyzing how Schlicker responded to the prevailing aesthetic while infusing it with his own developing style. Appendix B gives the stop list of the organ at First Presbyterian Church, Dunkirk, New York, as built in 1933. The organ was a rebuild of a Garrett House organ. Schlicker retained much of the pipework, and what he retained harkened back to a specification more likely to be found in the 1860s than in the 1930s.[32] Schlicker's choice to keep these stops demonstrated his preference for an

[32] For a specification of an 1864 Garrett House organ, see Orpha Ochse, *The History of the Organ in the United States* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1975), 280.

older design closer to the classic specifications of his mature period than for the more romantic specifications prevalent at the time.

Noticeable is the inclusion of more ranks such as the 2 2/3 Twelfth and 2' Fifteenth on the Great which reinforce the harmonic development of each manual. Fifteen of twenty-four stops in the manuals (including the Cornopean, which was only a preparation) are at 8' pitch. The organ is larger than the Tellers example, yet it contains fewer 8' stops. To balance these stops, Schlicker includes a 2 2/3' and two 2' stops in the manuals. The Swell chorus is not as developed as that on the Great. Independent 8', 4', and 2' stops are available, but the Geigen Prinzipal (principal), Fugara (string), and Piccolo (flute) are all from different families and the sounds do not coalesce into an ensemble as well as the Principal chorus on the Great. This combination also would not equal the intensity of the Great Principal chorus. It therefore falls short of classical organ design which requires distinct choruses equal in intensity. The specification does, however, allow for greater harmonic development and deemphasizes the fundamental in an ensemble. It therefore represents a step in the tonal direction which Schlicker would eventually travel.

The organ, though, still retains many characteristics of organs built by his contemporaries such as Tellers-Kent and Skinner. The Pedal is not as developed when compared to Schlicker's mature organs; only two ranks are unique to this division. The Echo Organ is present more for effect rather than as a contrasting yet equal division on par with the others, as is necessary in classic design. Furthermore, each rank contains an extra octave of pipes (with the exception of celestes and 2'

ranks), presupposing the use of supercouplers to enhance the ensemble. These supercouplers were considered necessary in the Romantic organ in order to add to the brilliance of the ensemble which contained few voices above 8' pitch.

Schlicker's second instrument, built for St. Francis Xavier Catholic Church in Buffalo, exhibits many of these same characteristics. The Great has an independent chorus of 8', 4', and Grave Mixture (2 2/3' and 2'), along with the 8' Stopped Diapason. The Swell, like that of First Presbyterian, has a unified stopped flute; this one is present at 16', 8', 2 2/3', and 2'. However, the 8' Violin Diapason and 4' Flute are also present, allowing a 16'-2' chorus with minimal unification. Again, the Pedal division is not as independent as in later organs, consisting of six stops with extensive borrowing. Thus again we have contrasting choruses in the manuals with a weaker Pedal division, a scheme in between those of Tellers-Kent and Schlicker's later instruments. He retained other characteristics of organ building at the time, such as heavy nicking and slide tuning[33].[34]

Reaction to his early work was extremely positive, and even at this stage of his career, Schlicker was using word of mouth and the recommendations of others to gain business. To win the contract for the organ at First Presbyterian, he pointed to his previous work as proof of his skill and included two letters of recommendation. One of these letters was written by Caspar Koch, the city organist of Pittsburgh from 1904 to 1954. Schlicker impressed Koch with his ingenuity in

[33] Slide tuning uses movable collars at the top of pipes which are raised or lowered to adjust the pitch.

[34] This organ still exists in its original location and condition at the Buffalo Religious Arts Center, Buffalo, NY. It is therefore the oldest example of Schlicker's work under his own name.

devising solutions to problems that arose in the installation. Koch attests in his letter that "you can not find a man better equipped and more thorough and honest in his methods than Mr. Schlicker."[35] The other letter, from J. H. Mettland, executive secretary of the Church of the Covenant, Erie, Pennsylvania, attests to Schlicker's "pleasing personality" and the respect he gained from the churches with which he worked.[36] Even for his first project, then, Schlicker relied on the recommendations of high-profile musicians and church officials.

Schlicker collected other letters of recommendation from clients during his time with Tellers-Kent. Herman Hahn wrote a glowing review of Schlicker's work. Important to note is the enthusiastic tone and how Hahn's enthusiasm helped sell another organ for Tellers-Kent:

> Received a letter today from my friend, Herm. Schlicker, advising me of his safe return from the Old Country, also of his branching out for himself in the field of Organ Building, repairing, tuning and voicing, for which he has my very best wishes.
>
> Have been Church Organist for 43 years, the last 32 years at Emmaus Luth. Church here. During this span of time I have, as recitalist, seen and played many an organ, good and bad, tracker and electric action. 2 years ago Oct. 6, we dedicated our new Tellers-Kent Organ. This organ contract went to Tellers-Kent, of which Superintendent, Herm. Schlicker, was the genius as to the lay-out, tuning, and voicing. I had the good fortune to notice his work on several recital tours, and made up my mind that if ever my congregation was to make a change, a Tellers-Kent Organ would be the one I would fight for, providing Mr. Schlicker was to do the planning. Well, we have that $12,000 organ now for 2 years and we are very proud of it, for it is hard to beat, never "sick," mute, or unable to speak. I have a baby brother, a fine organist at Frankenmuth, Mich., Saginaw Co.[37] He came down here to see what

[35] Caspar Koch to Norman Grampp, October 3, 1932, Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI.

[36] J. H. Mertland to "Whom it may concern," October 11, 1932, Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI.

[37] St. Lorenz Lutheran Church, Frankenmuth, MI. This organ was replaced by a Casavant designed by Paul Bunjes.

> I received (through the knowledge of) Mr. Schlicker. He went home, came back after a few wks with 3 cars full of music lovers, played and heard my organ, and after 4 wks the congregation ordered that organ for $12,000. And are they satisfied? I was up there for recital this spring, and the younger members told me how glad they were to have made that trip here with my brother, for who knows what they would have gotten if the contract would have gone to a different company.
>
> I have known Mr. Schlicker to [be an] honest and upright and man of his word, and hereby recommend him as an expert Organ builder, voicer, and tuner second to none.[38]

Even from the earliest stages of his career at Tellers-Kent, then, Schlicker was developing a reputation as an honest, thorough, and knowledgeable organ builder, and his work and personality helped Tellers-Kent gain contracts. Hahn purchased an organ from Tellers-Kent because he wanted and "would fight for" Schlicker's work, not necessarily because he liked the builder. He must have been able to hear a difference between Tellers-Kent organs on which Schlicker did not work and those on which he did. Hahn's comment "who knows what they would have gotten" also puts Schlicker, in his estimation, above the work of other builders whose work would likely be inconsistent and of lower quality in its workmanship and voicing. Schlicker's work was not only admirable; it created a real excitement in certain people. E. Power Biggs exhibited this same type of enthusiasm when he came across Schlicker's work twenty years later, and he, just like Hahn, helped convince others to buy Schlicker's organs. In fact, Biggs also called Schlicker a "genius" at voicing many times.[39] Schlickers's early work, though different from his mature

[38] Herman Hahn to Norman Grampp, October 4, 1932, Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI.

[39] e.g., Biggs to David Larson, May 22, 1952; Biggs to Harold Mueller, June 11, 1952; Biggs to Hubert V. Taylor, October 4, 1953, among others.

style, was still consistent with the products of his later years, and the positive reaction remained consistent as well.

Another early enthusiast of Schlicker's work was Howard E. Marsh. Marsh was a freshman at Fredonia College who helped with the construction of the organ and was the invited organist for the dedication ceremonies on October 30, 1933.[40] He introduced his teacher, William Gomph, and others to the instrument, and they in turn recommended Schlicker to their own churches and others considering a new organ.

Gomph's reaction was not only extremely positive, but it immediately led to his referral of Schlicker to other churches about to purchase organs:[41]

> I took my first lesson from Gomph today here at our church and I have some very good news for you. In the first place he thinks it is one of the best organs he has seen in a long time. He said the tone is superb and the workmanship excellent throughout. I can't begin to tell you in a letter all the praise he had for it so am anxious to see you. He says that anyone that can build organs as well as that certainly shouldn't be hiding their talents as he thinks you are since he had never heard of you before; also he says that you deserve to get more than your share of the work and he is going to do all he can to help you get it. He intends to come out and see you someday soon as I told him you were building another organ at present.
>
> He could hardly believe that you built the console and did all the assembling yourself. He says it is very rare to find one in your profession so adept in all lines of the work. He was especially pleased with the Echo organ as he says it not only serves its purpose as an echo but also does nicely as a choir organ blending so well with the rest of the organ. Any leads that he hears of he is going to let me know about so I can look them up. He says he is often asked to give his recommendations for organs and will be pleased to recommend you without reserve to any committee. Isn't that something?

---

[40] "Presbyterian Organ Recital Will Dedicate Added Tonal Resources," *Evening Observer*, Dunkirk-Fredonia, N. Y., October 10, 1982.

[41] Howard Marsh to Schlicker, May 23, 1934, Justin Matters's files, Hermosa, SD.

Gomph praised the blend of the organ, an important factor in Schlicker's concept of the relationships among the stops. He also admired the workmanship and Schlicker's thorough knowledge of all aspects of organbuilding, traits that had already been admired by Koch. Notable also was Gomph's belief that Schlicker was hiding himself, an indication that Schlicker was reluctant to advertise his own work.

Marsh's description of Gomph's reaction is also important because his tone conveys surprise and delight at the amount of enthusiasm Gomph displayed towards Schlicker's work. "I can't begin to tell you" and "Isn't that something" indicate that Marsh wasn't expecting and didn't think Schlicker expected the degree to which Gomph appreciated the organ. This surprise reinforced Marsh's own love for the instrument.

Gomph reacted to the sound of the organ at Dunkirk Presbyterian as if it were a revelation. Unfortunately this organ was renovated in the 1970s by the Schlicker firm, and consequently it now sounds very similar to other instruments built at that time. One may, however, assume that it sounded similar to the St. Francis Xavier organ since both were rebuilds of organs by the Garrett House Organ Company built in the typical nineteenth-century American style, and their stop lists after the rebuilds were similar. The voices on the latter organ are full and warm, yet clear. The strings are not as mellow as those found in later Schlicker organs, yet they are not as keen as those built by contemporary American companies. This is an influence of Schlicker's German heritage where the strings sound more like small-scaled Principals than an imitation of their orchestral counterparts. Sounds such as these, as well as Schlicker's design concept which

emphasizes the relationship of stops within the ensemble over their use as solo sounds, would have been new to many American organists in the 1930s. Gomph's reaction is remarkably similar to E. Power Biggs's reaction after he heard the organ at St. Paul's Cathedral in Buffalo, where he was astounded by the clarity and gentleness of the voicing and soon began recommending Schlicker's work to all who asked his opinion.[42]

This enthusiasm led directly to new contracts and further recommendations. One person to whom Marsh showed the organ was a Miss Sears from Endicott, New York. After Marsh demonstrated the organ and showed her the chambers, she was "very much enthused about the whole thing."[43] Her church, Union Presbyterian, Endicott, decided to buy a Schlicker organ. The response was so positive that it garnered a recommendation from a non-musician, demonstrating that Schlicker's work and personality combined to elicit praise from all types of people, not just musicians:

> Recently, Mr. H. L. Schlicker of the Herman L. Schlicker Organ Co., Buffalo, N. Y., was here tuning our organ at the Union Presbyterian Church. At that time he spoke to the writer in reference to an organ he was quoting on for you folks, asking that we tell you something about our experience with him.
>
> Mr. Schlicker put in for us a three manual organ about two years ago and we are very much pleased to say that everything worked out in a very satisfactory manner. At the time the organ was installed there was also involved the proposition of remodeling the Church to accommodate the new organ, etc. Mr. Schlicker worked with us very nicely in this connection.

[42] For example, E. Power Biggs to David Larson, May 22, 1952, E. Power Biggs Archives, Boston University, Boston, MA. Chapter 3 contains a full discussion of Biggs's reaction to and relationship with Schlicker.

[43] Marsh to Schlicker, n.d., Justin Matters's files, Hermosa, SD.

Our congregation is very well pleased with the results. Outside organists tell us that we have one of the best toned instruments in this section.

Mr. Schlicker kept his word and agreement with us to the letter and gave us a very satisfactory job. At the time the contract was placed with him we had previously looked up the situation and felt that we were safe in every way – the ultimate result proved this to be true. Mr. Schlicker not only gave us everything he agreed to give us but quite a lot more, and we feel entirely confident that we got a very much better job and, at considerably less money than had we placed the contract with some of the larger organ companies such as Skinner, Austin, etc. Mr. Schlicker is a conscientious worker and seems to know the organ construction game from start to finish. The writer has been President of the Board of Trustees of our Church for more than a quarter of a century and of all the things we have done during that period such as new lights, new heating system, redecorating, new slate roof, etc., this organ matter with Mr. Schlicker resulted in about the most satisfactory results of any of the jobs we have done for the Church.

We had the organ tuned to tones round and mellow and Mr. Schlicker showed great skill in fitting the tones to the particular acoustical properties of our building. This was quite an achievement in itself. How often you go into a Church (I have lots of times) and find the organ (good as it may be) entirely out of relation in volume and tone to the building. In the First Presbyterian Church here in Endicott, they have just about four times too much of an organ for their building and you can imagine what the results are. Mr. Schlicker is very skillful in this respect and you can rest assured that if he handles the job for you that he will fit the organ to the building and not just sell an organ and let you sink or swim.

We would be very much pleased to have you drive down here and hear our organ at any time. It has just been tuned after the summer holiday and if you will let me know a few days ahead of time, I can arrange to have the organist on hand when you are here and give you a good demonstration.

We cannot say too many good things about Mr. Schlicker, both as an artist and a mechanic and in the business details. Personally, I was very much gratified with the results because we not only pleased the organist (and you know what those old maid organists are) but practically everybody in the congregation. A state of unanimity of this kind cannot always be had in a Church organization – as you probably know. But this instance was certainly the exception that proved the rule. At first, I could not get used to having everybody so well satisfied with the organ, its tone, the rearrangement of the front of the church, etc., but now after two years, I am getting used to it.

> If there is anything further in the way of information that I can supply for you, please command me.[44]

As he did with Koch and Gomph, Schlicker impressed Furry with his thorough knowledge of all the aspects of organbuilding. He impressed them with more than just skill, though. Schlicker helped win them over with his own attitude toward his work. They recognized a work ethic that translated into service that exceeded their expectations. Koch noted his honesty. According to Furry, Schlicker "not only gave us everything he agreed to give us but quite a lot more," giving a value much greater for the cost than would have been possible with other builders. This matches the admiration Theophilus Twente, pastor of St. Peter's Church, Evangelical and Reformed, in North Tonawanda, expressed to Schlicker:

> I want to send you this unsolicited note of appreciation because you deserve it. Although our organ is an old instrument and our church comparatively small, you have given us "million dollar" service. Thank you ever so much. Whenever opportunity presents itself I shall be delighted to tell others of your fine work. [45]

The relationships Schlicker built with these churches through his work and personality led to business not only in other churches but within the same congregation. First United Methodist Church in Alabama hired Schlicker to rebuild their Kimball organ in 1956 because he had done so much for them when they had only enough money to barely maintain their instrument. If he was so good to them when they had no money, they felt should be good to him when they did.[46] This was later in his career, but it was a continuation of the kind of customer service he

---

[44] E. B. Furry to Nathan Wilson, September 29, 1937, Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI.

[45] Theophilus Twente to Schlicker, December 30, 1935, Stanton Peters's files.

[46] Donald Ingram, "Memoir: Herman Schlicker and the Schlicker Organ Company, in Particular from 1956-1963," *The Tracker*, October 2004, 15.

already exhibited at the beginning of his career. It also led to good treatment by his customers. First Presbyterian, Dunkirk, Schlicker's first job under his own name, paid him in full earlier than required under the contract because they saw him as reliable and knew he would fulfill his obligations.[47]

Furry's letter, like Marsh's letter, also expresses surprise at the reaction Schlicker's work elicited. Furry couldn't understand how no one in the congregation was complaining because he had never seen such a unified, positive response to any project. These were regular members, non-organists, who were hearing something special even though they might not have known what it was. Furry compares the organ to other projects and says there is no comparison. His recommendation is therefore a response not only to his own impression of Schlicker's work and personality, but also the reaction he saw that they elicited in others.

What did Schlicker himself think about his work? From two newspaper articles it is clear that Schlicker was sufficiently confident in his work to allow it to speak for itself. When asked about the quality of the organ at Dunkirk Presbyterian, Schlicker replied, "There it is. Try it. Listen to it."[48] He directed the attention away from himself and wanted his work to be the deciding factor in a listener's (and potential customer's) ears and minds. On the other hand, he never doubted his own ability as an organ builder. "Organ voicers, like geniuses, are born, not made, yet a

[47] M. D. Repest to Schlicker, October 30, 1933, Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI.

[48] "Presbyterians Will Dedicate New Organ in Program Tonight," *Dunkirk Evening Observer*, October 20, 1933.

voicer need not be a musician, according to Mr. Schlicker."[49] To say this publicly, Schlicker must have believed that his work could equal that of the best builders; otherwise it would be unfounded self-promotion by someone who felt it necessary to promote himself rather than allow the work to promote his business.

This lack of self-promotion had already been noted in Howard Marsh's May 23, 1934 letter. If Gomph remarked that Schlicker was hiding himself, Schlicker must not have spent much effort to promote his business himself. Throughout his career, Schlicker never concerned himself with large or detailed advertisements,[50] and this pattern of reticence to promote himself began at the very beginning of his career. Even at this early stage, he relied on the endorsements of friends and clients who loved his work to gain new business.

Schlicker continued working throughout the 1930s until the beginning of World War II in 1941. Despite the Depression, Schlicker was able to find enough business to keep the company open. He regarded 1937 as an excellent year because churches had delayed getting new organs for so long that they simply couldn't wait anymore.[51] This optimism, in the midst of economic adversity was a continuation of the positive attitude he had at the beginning of his career. According to his

[49] "Echoes a Major Problem in Church Installation." *The Buffalo Evening News*. I have multiple copies of this article, but I have been unable to determine its exact date. It says Schlicker founded the company six years previous, so it must have been around 1938.

[50] Chapter three compares Schlicker's advertisements in the major organ journals with those of his competitors.

[51] "Echoes a Major Problem in Church Installation." *The Buffalo Evening News*.

daughter, he found the Depression as good a time as any to establish a business because he had very little money to lose if it did not work out.[52]

From the beginning of his career with Steinmeyer through the early years of his own company in America, Schlicker established a reputation as a thorough and trustworthy organbuilder skilled in all aspects of organbuilding. His work elicited enthusiastic responses which he used to gain additional contracts and expand his business. His customers heard organs which emphasized balance and blend among the various stops in contrast to most other organs built at the time. The letters testify to his workmanship, his honesty, and the respect these qualities created. Even though Schlicker had not yet developed his mature style, the organs were different enough that they, along with his personality, caused others to recommend him and help his business to grow.

The advent of World War II brought a cessation of organ building around the country due to restrictions on materials such as metals and wood. To keep the business going, Schlicker produced machine gun crates and stereo cabinets. After the war, though, building resumed, and unlike 1932, Schlicker found himself in a much more favorable business environment. The post-war period saw a boom in organ construction. The first decade after World War II also saw the beginning of his collaboration with Robert Noehren. Their work together helped move Schlicker into the forefront of national organ building and put Schlicker on the path to greater success and collaborations with other high profile organists. The positive and enthusiastic responses of organists and institutions in the 1930s to his instruments

[52] Maria Schlicker Dinwoodie, interview with the author, Buffalo, New York, August 6, 2012.

and personality set a pattern which continued after the war and allowed his business to rapidly expand.

Chapter 3

The Importance of Prominent Organists to Schlicker's Success

"People like Paul Manz, E. Power Biggs – that genre of organists who thought so highly of that kind of music making – they did a lot of the selling for us." – Ken List[53]

When the restrictions of World War II ended and organ building could begin again in earnest, Schlicker had a reputation as a trustworthy regional builder whose organs had a special quality which excited those who heard them. Already he was using the recommendations and salesmanship of personal friends such as Howard Marsh to sell his instruments for him. Although he was able to earn contracts from churches as far away as Alabama, his sphere of influence was much more regional, concentrated in the New York and Pennsylvania areas with some work scattered around the periphery. In the forties and fifties, though, Schlicker established friendships with major figures in the organ world who engaged him in projects which brought him national attention. These friendships and the collaborations established him as a builder who, by returning to classical organ design principles, was ahead of and could set the trends for the rest of the organbuilding industry. These organists also assisted Schlicker by recommending him as a builder to churches and institutions seeking to purchase a new organ.

The first major organist with whom Schlicker collaborated after World War II was Robert Noehren. A native of Buffalo, Noehren served as an organist and choirmaster in various churches in New York and Pennsylvania before apprenticing with Walter Holtkamp in 1945. In 1946 he began teaching at Davidson College,

[53] Ken List, interview by author, Wooster, OH, July 28, 2012.

moving in 1949 to Ann Arbor to teach at the University of Michigan. He helped Schlicker gain national attention by collaborating on a number of organs and, most importantly, issuing recordings on these instruments which exposed larger audiences to Schlicker's organs.

In 1948 and 1949 Noehren took a series of trips to Europe to study the organs, and he was impressed by the difference in tone between the organs of Europe and those of America. He published three articles in *The Diapason* describing the organs and his impressions.[54] At this time only a handful of American organists had traveled to Europe and had much experience with European organs, and he used his knowledge to advertise himself as a performer with "an unusual and deep understanding of the instrument."[55] In these articles, he analyzes the dispositions of the organs, noting not only the specifications but how each stop relates to the others in its division. Especially important is his attention to the mixtures; he notes that in French, Dutch, and German Baroque organs, the mixtures are more important for intensity than they are for brilliance. Also important for his future work with Schlicker is Noehren's observation that the individual stops are softer and gentler than their American counterparts.[56] Noehren put these ideas to practical use when he designed organs which Schlicker built.

---

[54] "Poitiers Cathedral Has Famous Cliquot Organ Built in 1791," *The Diapason*, June 1949, 28-29; "Historic Schnitger Organs Are Visited; 1949 Summer Study," *The Diapason*, December 1949, 10, and "Principles Taught by Schnitger Work a Lesson for Today," January 1950, 10 (continuation of the previous article); "Famous Old Organs in Holland Disprove Popular Fallacies," *The Diapason*, March 1951, 8-9.

[55] Advertisement, *The Diapason*, October 1950, 25.

[56] Noehren, "Principles Taught," 10.

Noehren dedicates a large portion of the essays, especially the Schnitger article, to the relationship of each division to the others. He emphasizes the parity and completeness of each division, each of which, including the Pedal, possesses complete Principal and flute ensembles throughout the harmonic spectrum. This is especially important because coupling mechanisms between manuals are rare and so, unlike in the American classic scheme, a full *tutti* must be available in each division. This allows for balance as well as distinctiveness among the various ensembles. Noehren saw room for improvement in American organ building in light of these studies: "The American organ does not need to be a 'baroque' organ, but certain basic principles practiced in the time of Schnitger deserve the study of organ builders and organists."[57]

As noted in the previous chapter, Schlicker's early work hints at the classical European style. In his first organ at First Presbyterian, Dunkirk, he retained the upperwork on the Great and the Swell to create more complete choruses incorporating a larger portion of the harmonic spectrum than was common in organs built at that time. The choruses were not as complete as Noehren's examples, but they stood apart from most of his contemporaries' work. Noehren had the desire to fully express the principles of design behind classic European organs, and Schlicker had the experience of working directly on instruments such as these during his time in Europe. Schlicker thus already had the knowledge and the tools to introduce these ideas and sounds to American organ building; his work with Noehren gave him the opportunity to develop them and express them fully.

[57] Noehren, "Principles Taught," 10.

Their first collaboration that had a major impact on Schlicker's career was the organ at Kenmore Presbyterian, Buffalo. In this rebuilding project, Noehren himself scaled the new stops, designed the mixtures, and collaborated with Schlicker on the voicing. The stoplist, given in figure 3, is of a classic design with independent and distinctive choruses on each division.

GREAT		SWELL	
16'	Quintaton	8'	Principal
8'	Prinicpal	8'	Rohrfloete
8'	Hohlfloete	8'	Salicional
8'	Gemshorn	8'	Voix Celeste
4'	Octave	4'	Flute
2 2/3'	Quint	2'	Piccolo
2'	Octave	2'	Mixture (IV)
1'	Mixture (III-IV)	16'	Fagotto
		8'	Trumpet
POSITIV		8'	Vox Humana
8'	Viola		
8'	Unda Maris (II)	PEDAL	
8'	Gedeckt	16'	Principal
4'	Gemshorn	16'	Subbass
4'	Rohrfloete	16'	Gedeckt
2'	Principal	8'	Principal
1 1/3'	Quint	8'	Flute
1/2'	Mixture (III)	4'	Octave
8'	Clarinet	2'	Octave
		2'	Mixture (III)
		16'	Trombone
		8'	Trumpet
		2'	Cornet

Figure 3. Specification of the Schlicker Organ at Kenmore Presbyterian Church, Kenmore, New York, 1949. *Source: 16th and 17th Century Organ Music,* Allegro AL 36, 1950.

Each division has a complete and distinct chorus. The Great is essentially a Principal chorus with two other 8' stops for color. The Positiv is a brighter chorus

based on a Principal of a higher pitch. The Swell has an 8', 4', 2' flute chorus as well as an almost complete Principal chorus; with the low-pitched Mixture, only the 4' Principal is missing. The Pedal division is very complete, including its own 2' and Mixture. Missing is a reed in the Great division. Noehren considered this necessary in the Schnitger chorus,[58] but it does not appear here. Over time, Schlicker became known as one of the only builders to put a major reed on the Great when others such as Harrison had abandoned them.[59] This organ thus does not represent Schlicker's mature style, but it is a major step forward when compared to his early work.

The Kenmore organ became famous through a series of recordings Noehren made for the Allegro label in the early 1950s. The record jackets include the following description of the organ:

> The organ used for these recordings was designed and built by Hermann Schlicker and the Schlicker Organ Company of Buffalo, N. Y. In this organ scales and voicing methods were used which were typical of the great north German organ builder, Arp Schnitger, whose organs Bach played and greatly admired. Since World War I there has been a great revival of interest in the organs of the 17th and 18th centuries and contemporary organ builders in Europe and America have built organs which reflect the old traditions.
>
> It is believed that the organ in the Kenmore Presbyterian Church in Buffalo is the first instrument in this country where certain voicing techniques which were common to the old builders have been used (beyond the field of experimentation). The intonation of this organ is not only very clear, but the speech of the pipes is notably incisive, and the tone is considerably milder than that of most contemporary organs.[60]

---

[58] Noehren, "Principles Taught by Schnitger Work a Lesson for Today," *The Diapason*, January 1950, 10

[59] Jonathon Ambrosino, "Lost Generation." *Choir and Organ*, May/June 2005, 57; Donald Ingram, "Memoir: Herman Schlicker and the Schlicker Organ Company, in Particular from 1956-1963," *The Tracker*, October 2004, 17.

[60] *16th and 17th Century Organ Music*, Allegro AL 36, 1950

Those looking for a revival of classic organ building in America, then, would have looked to this organ as a model, and they would recognize Schlicker as a builder in the forefront of the movement. Clarity and mildness of tone were characteristics that adherents of the organ reform movement advocated, and so Noehren's recordings promoted Schlicker's work as an example to be emulated. The records became even more popular after one of Noehren's discs, his recording of Bach's Trio Sonatas 2 and 5,[61] won the *Grand Prix du Disque* in 1953.

Noehren also made a series of recordings on another collaboration with Schlicker. In 1950, they rebuilt an 1893 Johnson organ at Grace Episcopal Church, Sandusky, Ohio. In addition to the stoplist, the record jackets contain the following description which highlights the voicing techniques used on the pipes:

> The organ of Grace Episcopal Church in Sandusky, Ohio was originally built in 1893 by the Johnson Organ Company. During 1950 the instrument was entirely rebuilt by the Schlicker Organ Company of Buffalo, N. Y. This work was done under the direction of Robert Noehren, who planned a new disposition and specified the scales and voicing details of the pipework. All the pipes are either new or have been completely rebuilt. The wind pressure is two and one-quarter inches. Of unique interest is the retention of the mechanical action which was a part of the old organ. It has been completely renewed. This action is similar in type to those used universally by organ builders for centuries, which in recent times have been replaced by electric action. With this action the player has a direct contact with the tone and is able to control the opening of the valves which admit wind into the pipes. Thus, it is possible to open the valves slowly and achieve a gentle attack of the tone, or to open the valves more quickly to produce a more sharp and precise attack.
>
> The voicing of the organ is quite unlike that of modern organs, and the listener is quick to realize that the quality of tone is different. This type of voicing was common to all organs during the golden age of organ building in the 17th and early 18th Centuries. It reflects the serious studies Robert Noehren has made of certain old organs in Holland and North Germany. It is his belief that organ

[61] *Johann Sebastian Bach: Trio Sonatas: No. 2 in C minor; No. 5 in C Major*, Allegro AL 66.

> building is very nearly a lost art, which depends not only on the musical taste of the organ builder, but also on many details such as the type and age of the pipe metal and its relative thickness, the wind-pressure in relation to the measurements of the pipes, or the type of wind-chest used. His studies have concentrated upon an attempt to consider more seriously the relation of organ building to the playing of organ music, and he believes the art of organ building must be closely related to musical taste.
>
> The organ of Grace Episcopal Church in Sandusky, Ohio, represents the first serious attempt in America to combine the use of mechanical action and certain traditional principles of voicing.[62]

An important voice included on this instrument was the Cymbal III, a very gently voiced Mixture that appears on the Great in addition to the Mixture II-IV which completed the Principal chorus on the Great. The former was designed as a color stop and was not meant to be used with the full ensemble. It was believed that this was the first appearance of a Cymbal mixture on an American organ in modern times.[63]

At this time the only new mechanical action organs in America came from very small, regional builders such as Otto Hoffman in Texas. The common practice when rebuilding an older instrument was to replace the action with either all-electric or electro-pneumatic action. This rebuild was seen as revolutionary because of the deliberate retention of the original action. The 1950s saw a revival of interest in the retention, restoration, and manufacture of mechanical action instruments, and so Schlicker and Noehren were very much ahead of their time when they decided not to change the mechanical action. Combined with the low pressures and voicing

[62] *Johann Sebastian Bach*, Allegro AL 116.

[63] *The Diapason*, November 1950, 12.

techniques, this again made Noehren and Schlicker stand out as progressive and spurred the interest of others in the organ reform movement.[64]

Noehren's belief that organbuilding was "very nearly a lost art" also elevated Schlicker's status in the eyes of those looking for a revival of classical organ building. Noehren's recordings endorsed Schlicker's work as an exception to this decay. Although the notes do not specifically endorse Schlicker as the correction to this deterioration, Noehren's choice to record on this instrument implies that Schlicker's work stood in the tradition of what he regarded as proper organbuilding. He therefore not only gave exposure to Schlicker but also set him as a model for other builders to follow.

Noehren's recordings again received good reviews. In addition to praising his playing, the New York Times drew attention to the instrument's "beautiful" tones which were "clear and penetrating" and "never cut stridently into the nerves." The reviewer also found the variety of voices "a surprise and delight."[65] Noehren used some of these quotes in his own advertisements,[66] and he also advertised himself as "designer of the organ, Grace Episcopal Church, Sandusky, Ohio."[67]

---

[64] Noehren's attitude on mechanical action changed throughout his career. In the 1950s he very much favored tracker action because it best allowed the performer to control the transient sounds at the beginning of pipe speech ("chiff") ("A Practical Study in the Voicing of Organ Pipes," *Organ Institute Quarterly*, Spring 1954) and convinced First Lutheran Church, Cleveland, to install a mechanical action organ by Rudolph von Beckerath, the first major installation of such an instrument in the United States in decades. When he began building organs for himself, though, he used all electric action, maintaining that "tracker action is a clumsy and unresponsive affair." [Robert Noehren, "My Life with the Organ," *An Organist's Reader: Essays* (Warren: Harmonie Park Press, 1999), 208].

[65] *The Diapason*, July 1951, 31.

[66] *The Diapason*, June 1952, 3.

[67] *The Diapason*, September 1951, 4.

Noehren's and Schlicker's successes were thus intertwined, and as one became more prominent, so did the other.

Schlicker and Noehren collaborated on three other organs: Davidson College; First Baptist, Flint, Michigan; and Trinity Episcopal, Buffalo. Unknown to Schlicker when he built it, the Davidson organ would play a major part in his rise to national prominence after E. Power Biggs gave a national broadcast from the organ on June 1, 1952.

E. Power Biggs's reaction to Schlicker's organs was immediate and revelatory. He first came in contact with Schlicker's work when he gave a recital on the newly rebuilt organ at St. Paul's Episcopal, Buffalo, in May 1952. He followed this recital with a national broadcast from the newly built organ at Davidson College.

By this time, Biggs was arguably the most well known and respected organist in the United States. His weekly broadcasts for CBS were carried by stations around the country, and by this time he had issued a number of popular recordings. His fame was such that he eventually received a star on the Hollywood Walk of Fame for his contributions to recording. In 1952 he already had a well-established relationship with G. Donald Harrison and the Aeolian-Skinner company. Most of Biggs's broadcasts were from the Germanic Museum at Harvard University (later renamed the Busch-Reisinger Museum) which housed an Aeolian-Skinner organ. This was an experimental instrument, built by Harrison during the Depression when he had little other business, and was a chance to experiment with voicing and design ideas that could be more progressive because it was not meant to

be sold. This gave Harrison the opportunity to move further away from a romantic sound and more towards his conception of a "classic" sound. Biggs, therefore, became associated through his broadcasts with this sound, and it no doubt influenced Biggs as he became an advocate of classically designed organs.

Biggs's reaction to Schlicker's organs led him to support Schlicker in two important ways: personal recommendations as well as Biggs's collaboration with Schlicker on three highly visible projects. As one of the most well known and respected organists of his time, Biggs often received inquiries asking for his recommendations concerning organbuilders. Biggs's direct influence on Schlicker's potential clients came through private endorsements of the builder's work. He sometimes mentioned Aeolian-Skinner and more often Holtkamp, but after his recital at St. Paul's, he always mentioned Schlicker.

An example of one such recommendation is a response to an inquiry by the faculty of the University of California at Berkeley. They desired an organ which had both visual and musical appeal and were considering Austin, Aeolian-Skinner, Holtkamp, and Möller as potential builders.[68] Biggs quickly suggests Schlicker as the best possible choice:

> If you would have a distinguished and notable instrument, I suggest that you restrict your choice only to Schlicker and Holtkamp. They are the builders who know what they are up to, and who have the necessary cultural and musical background together with the ability to carry it all out in terms of pipes, wind pressure and voicing.
>
> From your letter I believe you are already in contact with Walter Holtkamp of Cleveland, but perhaps I may add a word about Schlicker.
>
> The excellence of the organs built by Herman Schlicker, of the Schlicker Organ Company, 1530 Military Road, Buffalo, New

[68] Manfred Bukofzer, William Denny, and Joaquin Nin-Culmell to Biggs, November 20, 1953, Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI.

> York, places him, for me, far in the lead among American organ builders. Two notable recent installations are in St. Paul's Episcopal Cathedral of Buffalo, and at Davidson College, North Carolina.
>
> Schlicker's voicing has a wonderfully round and unforced quality, and this musical transparency carries right through the instrument in every degree of sonority. His instruments are quite a revelation of what is possible in refinement and elegance of voicing.
>
> The present catchword among builders is "an instrument on which all types of music may be played." In actual fact this usually turns out to be the tacking on of a Positiv to an ordinary organ, further clarified (allegedly) by the sheer force of one or two over loud mixtures. The result is an organ that changes character as one builds up the ensemble, and though the idea looks well on paper it doesn't work out musically.
>
> On the other hand, if you have an organ of homogeneous voicing throughout, as in either of the above Schlicker instruments, any organ music of any period will sound wonderfully well on it.[69]

Biggs valued Schlicker's organs because he heard a clarity and transparency in the sound. In the letter he draws attention to the blend and the unified ensemble created by Schlicker's voicing. The relationship of each voice in the organ to the others and their place in the larger ensembles was a characteristic of classic organ design noted by Noehren, and Biggs heard this cohesion in Schlicker's organs.

Like Gomph when he first heard Schlicker's organ at First Presbyterian in Dunkirk, Biggs viewed Schlicker's organs as a revelation. It is clear that Biggs had not heard anything like this before. In another letter, Biggs says he "was just bowled over by the wonderful transparency of the voicing."[70] If the clarity was such a shock, Biggs cannot have been expecting such a sound. This made his recommendation more than simply an endorsement of Schlicker's work; it set Schlicker apart from other builders as the only one who, in his opinion, had voiced

[69] Biggs to Manfred Bukofzer, William Denny, and Joaquin Nin-Culmell, November 30, 1953, Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI.

[70] Biggs to David Larson, May 22, 1952, E. Power Biggs Archives, Boston University, Boston, MA.

an organ with such pleasing results. According to Biggs, moreover, not only was Schlicker a "leader in the field,"[71] but Biggs more than often refers to Schlicker as a "genius."[72] Biggs sometimes intensifies this label with the adjectives "very great,"[73] "absolute,"[74] or "outstanding."[75]

Another way Biggs sets Schlicker apart from the rest of American organbuilders in his letter to the University of California-Berkeley faculty is by pairing him with Walter Holtkamp. Holtkamp by this time was well known and respected, and listeners knew that he built organs in line with the organ reform movement. Holtkamp was also considered one of the top builders in the country in both quality and cache; when Biggs mentions Schlicker in the same sentence, he wants the reader to understand that Schlicker's work deserved the same respect and admiration as Holtkamp's and that the buyer would receive an instrument equal in quality and just as progressive, if not more so. Biggs thus couples his own authority and respect with Holtkamp's reputation and transfers them to Schlicker.

In addition, Biggs compared Schlicker's work favorably with that of European builders. After playing instruments in Europe, he told William Vaughan that "with the sounds of these wonderful old and new organs in our ears we're very conscious of the shortcomings of the standard instruments [in America]. But

---

[71] Biggs to Robert G. Dayton, February 9, 1953, Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI.

[72] Biggs to Hubert V. Taylor, October 4, 1953, E. Power Biggs Archives, Boston University, MA.

[73] Biggs to David Larson, May 22, 1952, E. Power Biggs Archives, Boston University, Boston, MA.

[74] Biggs to Harold Mueller, June 11, 1952, Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI; Biggs to William S. Vaughan, August 10, 1954, E. Power Biggs Archives, Boston University, Boston, MA.

[75] Biggs to Harold Pavelis, May 5, 1955, E. Power Biggs Archives, Boston University, Boston, MA.

Schlicker incorporates this German and Dutch musical tradition with a dash of Yankee integrity."[76] In another recommendation, he included Schlicker alongside a list of European builders a church should consider, calling his work "the equal of the best in Europe."[77] Biggs's recommendations played a crucial role in Schlicker's success by not only introducing people to Schlicker's work but also by promoting his organs as the best a customer could buy.

Despite Biggs's association with Aeolian-Skinner through his broadcasts from the Germanic Museum organ, the letters of recommendation demonstrate a waning enthusiasm for that company's work, one which did not go unnoticed by other builders and organists. Biggs and Harrison had a personal falling out due to Biggs's dissatisfaction with an alteration Harrison made to the museum organ as well as the general upkeep of the Aeolian-Skinner at Boston Symphony Hall,[78] and Biggs consequently turned his attention and influence elsewhere. In 1952 an Aeolian-Skinner would have been satisfactory,[79] but by 1955 Biggs was actively discouraging buyers from considering Aeolian-Skinner.[80] Biggs's hostility to Harrison's work and promotion of Schlicker was public and seemed to some

[76] Biggs to William S. Vaughan, August 10, 1954, E. Power Biggs Archives, Boston University, Boston, MA.

[77] Biggs to Harold Pavelis, May 5, 1955, E. Power Biggs Archives, Boston University, Boston, MA.

[78] Barbara Owen, *E. Power Biggs, Concert Organist* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987), 100.

[79] Biggs to Robert Dayton, February 9, 1953, Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI.

[80] Biggs to Frank Fagerburg, October 31, 1955, E. Power Biggs Archives, Boston University, Boston, MA.

ungrateful.[81] The animosity between Biggs and Aeolian-Skinner became so deep that some were circulating rumors that Biggs began supporting Schlicker because Schlicker agreed to build the Cambridge Portativ for free:

> Herman has asked me to send you details of this Bodle incident. Briefly, Douglas Bodle has specifically stated to several people in Toronto that your recommendation of Schlicker cannot be taken seriously because Schlicker gave you a free organ. An indication of the probable source of this story lies in his further statement that you had asked Donald Harrison for a free organ and he had refused to give you one.
>
> When I was having a meeting to draw up the contract for this big Toronto job with the two church wardens, one of them said that Bodle had told him about your getting a free organ and when I denied it emphatically, the other warden, a lawyer, suggested that a letter should be sent from your solicitor to Douglas Bodle. Bodle is being very irresponsible, but if he were the only person concerned, it would hardly seem wise to pay any attention to the whole matter. Unfortunately, the source of these stories and a good deal more mischief too comes from Hans Vigeland here in Buffalo. He is the Aeolian-Skinner booster here and apparently is pretty thick with Joe Whiteford. There are wheels within wheels and no doubt Herman will explain the whole thing to you when he sees you next.
>
> Frankly, the whole business seems pretty childish and we have sold two organs in Toronto despite Bodle's efforts to discredit us.[82]

Biggs wrote his lawyer concerning the matter, and the rumors disappeared soon after. The letter, though, indicates how closely Schlicker and Biggs had become in some people's minds. In an effort to gain business for Aeolian-Skinner, Bodle tried to discredit Schlicker by discrediting Biggs. This tactic would work only if Biggs's endorsement of Schlicker was well known and Bodle saw Schlicker as a genuine threat to business because Schlicker had risen to prominence with the help of

---

[81] G. Donald Harrison to Henry Willis, May 29, 1956, in *The American Classic Organ: A History in Letters*, ed. Charles Callahan (Richmond: Organ Historical Society, 1990), 424; Emerson Richards to Henry Willis, July 12, 1956, *The American Classic Organ*, 435.

[82] Donald Corbett to Biggs, April 8, 1955, Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI.

Biggs's recommendations. As the letter above indicates, though, Schlicker's representatives sold two organs despite the attempted slander.

Biggs also commended Schlicker as a leader in organbuilding in his conversations with other organists. One such effort to promote Schlicker as a progressive builder using more modern technology to achieve the quality of sound found in classic organs involved the *tone-kanzelle.* Biggs had asked Schlicker what he thought about his thoughts on the use of expansion chambers in Pitman chests (a type of electro-pneumatic chest) as a means of approximating the effect of slider chests[83] on the speech of a pipe.[84] Schlicker responded by saying that he had been using expansion chambers for a while.[85] This reply delighted Biggs: "I'm enormously tickled to have the news that for some time you've been using this expansion chamber idea! I'll take great delight in mentioning this, casually, in classes this summer at Andover and at Pomona, California."[86]

This exchange was instigated by organists' reaction to an article by Lawrence Phelps in the *Organ Institute Quarterly*.[87] Phelps argued for the use of expansion chambers in chests rather than placing the pipes directly over the pouches in order to soften the blow of air across the languid of the pipe and allow the inertia of the air to be "overcome by gentle persuasion rather than by sudden

[83] A type of chest on which all pipes for each note on the keyboards or pedalboard are fed by the same channel of air. This is thought by some to produce a better blend of sound than separating the wind supply for each pipe as is in other forms of pipe organ actions.

[84] Biggs to Schlicker, June 3, 1953, Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI.

[85] Schlicker to Biggs, June 9, 1953, Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI.

[86] Biggs to Schlicker, June 11, 1953, Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI.

[87] Lawrence Phelps. "Effects of Wind Chest Design on the Speech of Organ Pipes." *Organ Institute Quarterly*, Winter 1953, 19-26; continued in Spring 1953, 38-43.

force."[88] This would allow for less nicking – none if possible. This led Phelps to advocate the use of the slider chest with its key channels. If those were not possible, modifications to the pitman chest would be desirable to allow a gentler introduction of air to the pipes.

As Schlicker told Biggs, he had already been using side-rail pouches to create this effect for sometime already. He referred to them as the "*tone-kanzelle*." Stanton Peters, explains the concept and shows that the idea was not original with Schlicker:

> That's been around for a long time. Pilcher used it. Murray Harris used it. Schuelke used it here in Milwaukee…From voicing on a slider chest, when you put it on an electro-pneumatic chest, either a unit or even a pitman chest, you know there's a difference in the sound. The pipe is not happy. It can make it slow because of the concussive attack of the wind. Frank Roosevelt is another one. They heard that. How can we get around that? Ah. Put the valves on the side so when it goes around the corner you eliminate the Bernoulli effect of the wind twirling because it's going around all those corners and it cushions it. So Schlicker coming up with that was not an epiphany of some sort. Obviously other people did it and did it for a reason. It's a lot more time consuming to make a chest like that. When you think of the rackboard, a toeboard, the pouchboard, you nail them all together, you drill the holes, and everybody lines up. No big deal. But when you put the pouches on the side rails, now you have to lay your rackboard and toeboard out separately and then your siderail and your pouchboard separately to get them all to connect. So it's a lot more work, a lot more drilling, but the results are subtle, but they're there. And I think a lot of the people like Biggs and all these other people maybe didn't know why, but they could hear it. [89]

[88] Phelps, Spring 1953, 42.

[89] Stanton Peters, interview by author, Milwaukee, WI, August 18, 2011. Peters worked for Schlicker and later was part-owner of the company in the period before its closure in 2002. "The Fred and Ella Reddel Memorial Organ at Valparaiso University," *The Diapason*, January 2002, 19, also notes how other builders built similar mechanisms.

Schlicker therefore did not invent the idea of an expansion chamber, but he recognized the advantages it offered to the speech of the pipes. As the idea gained in popularity, though, Schlicker began to include it in his advertisements along with other features such as variable scaling, no nicking, and the option of slider chests with either electro-pneumatic or tracker action.[90]

Eventually, Schlicker began building slider chests whenever possible. The justification for this move was the belief that "all the pipes which sound together in answer to a given key should have an acoustical, structural, and mechanical unity reflecting their aesthetic relationship."[91] In other words, all pipes activated by the pressing of a key should be in close physical relationship and feed off a common wind supply to promote good blend. As Manuel Rosales remarks, this became a selling point for the company and offered an edge because Schlicker could provide more organ in the same amount of space than could other builders:

> There was little competition. Of the builders on the scene, he was the only one consistently building slider chests. Casavant would do that begrudgingly. Schantz, Möller, Austin, never would have done that on their own. And the electro-pneumatic chests take up a lot of room, and they're not as efficient in use of space. So if somebody wanted a fifty rank organ, Austin would tell them only thirty, maybe Schantz told them thirty-five, but Schlicker could tell them sixty because the chests are so compact and very versatile. You could build them very deep or very broad or whatever you want, or you could double-deck them.[92]

Shop efficiency was also an advantage of moving to slider chests:

---

[90] The first appearance of this advertisement in *The Diapason* is on page 2 of the December 1961 issue.

[91] Packet included in 1971 promotional catalogue produced by the Schlicker Organ Company.

[92] Manuel Rosales, interview by author, Los Angeles, CA, June 28, 2012. Rosales worked for Schlicker in the 1960s and now works as an organbuilder.

> Once the guys got good at doing those, those were much less expensive to build than pitman chests. There are a lot fewer parts. The parts that there are are very simple. Have you ever seen the inside of a pitman chest? Lots of detail. We restored our shares of Skinners and Kimballs. We had to restore a Kimball that somebody had used duct tape everywhere on the pouchrails for every purpose, and you pulled it all off and all the gaskets came off and everything was just covered with this horrible residue of duct tape glue and we had to recreate all that pitman stuff, all the individual cells that the pitmans were in. Yikes, that was a lot of work. And I don't think it was any less work when they were making them the first time around. Maybe they were faster if they did it a lot. When Schlicker could eschew all that production and replace it with slider chests, I think it was a real glorious day for them because they could build more efficiently more compact chests and actually ones that work better musically. They still built unit chests because there was the inevitable need to have stops that were borrowed into the pedal, stops that played at more than one pitch, or whatever. Stops in a Swell box that played on the Great. So those still had the typical amount of leather in them, but once you have a slider chest, you don't have any leather to speak of.[93]

Slider chests therefore offered Schlicker a chance to market himself as a builder in the classic organ tradition while, at the same time, making organbuilding cheaper and more efficient.

The exchange between Biggs and Schlicker about chest action also highlights Biggs's enthusiasm to promote Schlicker as the progressive builder who was already doing what others were just beginning to discover. Biggs was eager to spread Schlicker's name and work, and he relished the thought that he could point this out to others as though it were a great revelation.

Biggs also provided important exposure for Schlicker through published articles. After his trip to Europe in 1954, Biggs wrote an article discussing his

[93] Ibid.

impressions of European organs.[94] In it he extols the virtues of the instruments he encountered and lists the salient features of the "classical" organ:

1. stops speaking at a variety of pitches of the harmonic spectrum;
2. voicing that allows multiple combination of stops within each division of the organ;
3. low wind pressure;
4. little to no nicking;
5. a slight chiff;
6. open placement.

He contrasts the European ideals with much of contemporary organ building, but he also says that the work of Holtkamp and Schlicker equals that of the best of Europe. The first page of the article also includes a picture of the Cambridge Portativ.

Biggs wrote a second article in 1956 for *The Diapason*[95] in which he argues that American organ building will never equal that of Europe until builders adopt classical voicing techniques throughout their instruments. Classic sounding specifications were not enough; organs should be placed high and in the open with slider chests, tracker action if possible, and have pipes with no nicking speaking on very low wind pressure. Although he says that Americans have a long way to go before they reach the consistently high quality of European organs, he identifies three organs in Boston that offered hope: the two new Holtkamp organs at the

[94] E. Power Biggs. "Classic vs. Romantic: European Organs Reveals Virtues of Classic Principles of Structure." *Musical America*, February 15, 1955, 16-17, 203.

[95] E. Power Biggs, "Basic Principles of Classic Organ Ensemble Defined," *The Diapason*, March 1956, 8, 36.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the Schlicker rebuild of the Old North Church organ. The project was not yet complete as Schlicker had just been awarded the contract, so Biggs's mention of it gave the project greater visibility and created more interest in Schlicker's work. By connecting Schlicker with classical organ building, Biggs made him more attractive to potential customers who share these ideals.

Biggs expressed these same ideas in a letter to Schlicker. Because he knew that Schlicker was already producing instruments similar to the European organs, he saw a great opportunity for Schlicker to market himself as a builder with European sensibilities:

> The very first thing I did, on returning the other day, was to start up the motor and try the Portativ! We were eager to hear how it would sound, with the sonorities of European organs still in our ears, and as we knew all along – it's second-to-none of them!
>
> How wonderful the best of the Dutch, Danish and German organs are. The trip, all the way from Southern Germany up to Norway, has been an eye opener for us. With the exception of Schlicker and Holtkamp (!) I don't believe American organ builders know anything about the real art of voicing and building. It may make you chuckle to hear that Steinmeyer is very proud of the fact that you were once with him, but I suspect that you learned most of the secrets of your art a little further north than this.
>
> Anyway, I gave about forty concerts and broadcasts, and in addition we visited many other instruments, both old and new. You're absolutely right in saying that it's the voicing, and the type of voicing, that counts. Tracker touch may help, but that alone is not the secret. Some of the tracker actions were so stiff as to be almost unplayable (some of the new ones, too) but others were very easy and excellent. But the response and sensitiveness of your electro-pneumatic action is extremely close to trackers, while we didn't come across any non-tracker action in Europe that was really satisfactory.
>
> Your pal Flentrop is the nearest to you, we thought, while Marcussen and Frobenius are well intentioned but sometimes over loud. No doubt one has to learn to use different instruments in different ways, but what a wonderfully exciting quality they all have.

> The problem now is to make the United States organ public aware of some of this, particularly as it relates to Schlicker organs! However, I have a few ideas and will sort them out.
>
> By the way, Lewis Elmer, President of the AGO, came through Cambridge just a day or two ago, and came out to hear the Portativ. He seemed genuinely impressed.[96]

Biggs here draws attention to the importance he attached to advertising in order to convince customers that if they wanted an organ with classically voiced stops, Schlicker would be the best builder. It also draws attention to Schlicker's general lack of an emphasis on traditional print advertisement.

In the two main trade journals of the day, *The Diapason* and *The American Organist*, builders could advertise their products in two ways. The first was by announcing an upcoming or recent installation. These announcements usually included a stop list, any interesting details about the organ, and perhaps a mention of the consultant or recitalist who dedicated the organ. Notices of almost all instruments three manuals or larger appeared this way. Like the other builders of this time, Schlicker frequently included information about his organs this way. The accompanying descriptions, though, are very vague and give little information about the organs. Typical descriptions mention no nicking and low wind pressures. Descriptors such as these connect Schlicker to the organ reform movement, but they do not set him apart because, as these ideas became popular, any builder who wanted to appear progressive used terms such as low cutups, low pressure, open toes, and no nicking.[97] The descriptions also do not explain why those techniques

[96] Biggs to Schlicker, n.d., Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI, with a handwritten note "Copy of letter July 1954."

[97] Stanton Peters, interview by author, Milwaukee, WI, August 18, 2011.

are important or what they do for the organ. They mean something only to those who already know what effect they have on the sound and so would be attractive only to those already looking for that style.

The other means of advertisement in the journals was to actually buy advertising space. If the size and detail of the advertisements are an indication of how much importance Schlicker attached to them, most of the time he did not make them a priority. Schlicker's first advertisement in *The Diapason* appeared in the January 1950 issue. The advertisement is about 4 ½ x 2 inches out of an available 13 x 9 inch space and reads

SCHLICKER ORGAN
Schlicker Organ Co., Inc.
1530 Military Rd. Buffalo, New York.[98]

No information about the style of instruments or past installations appears. The advertisement is not hidden, but no specifics or details appear which may attract a customer.

Many other builders advertising in the same issue used a more aggressive approach. Aeolian-Skinner took out a full-page ad on page 5 saying that quality instruments need no selling. Wicks (p. 7) also used a full page. Mars (p. 8) and Conn (p. 27) each used 2/3 of a page. Möller (p. 11), Hammond (p. 14), Allen (p. 21), and Schantz (p. 23) used half a page for their advertisements. Estey (p. 7), Austin (p. 7), Gothic Music Company (p. 10), La Marche Brothers (p. 11), Reuter (p. 15), and Casavant (p. 26) all used quarter-page ads. All of these advertisements address their customers in some way. If Schlicker was trying to compete with his advertisement, his ad did not demonstrate his intention. Aeolian-Skinner could say

[98] *The Diapason*, January 1950, 29.

it was not selling itself even as it was because the company had an established reputation, and the intent of the ad was to reinforce the image of a quality, high-class builder. Schlicker's nondescript ad could not mean the same thing because, at this point in his career, he had no national reputation upon which he could rely.

Schlicker used this same advertisement throughout 1950. A point of comparison is the advertising strategy by the Standaart Organ Company of Suffolk, Virginia, a relatively new company in America; its owner, Adrian Standaart, was originally from Holland. Many of the advertisements are a full page, and the June 1950 issue contains a two page ad on pages 22 and 23. The text calls Standaart "America's most progressive organ company" and features endorsements by numerous organists. Schlicker was also a European organ builder whose organs were viewed by many as progressive and became associated with famous organists who endorsed his products, but he never took out advertising like this. The largest advertisement he ran in *The Diapason* was a full page that featured the organ at Valparaiso in the January 1960 issue.[99] The only items on the page, though, are a picture of the organ, the name of the chapel and university, and the name and address of the company. The most detail about the organ appears in Paul Bunjes's article about the organ in the same issue,[100] but this did not have originate from the Schlicker company.

[99] *The Diapason*, January 1960, 5.

[100] Ibid, 27.

Throughout the 1950s, Schlicker did occasionally replace his advertisement with a picture of a recent installation and its location.[101] These, however, still lacked text about its style or how it was received which might pique a customer's interest. The most descriptive texts appear in advertisements that discuss the practical nature and adjustable design of the company's unit organs (smaller organs which contain a small number of ranks playing at multiple pitch levels).[102]

In the 1960s Schlicker's advertisements do list a few features of his organs such as low wind pressures, no nicking, slider chests or electro-pneumatic chests with the *tone-kanzelle*.[103] Still, though, no explanation is given as to why these are important. In contrast, other companies ran advertisements similar to one run by the Wicks Organ Company.[104] The ad contains pictures of four pipes, two with closed toes and heavy nicking, and two with open toes and no nicking. The three accompanying paragraphs explain the difference in tone produced by the traditional and early twentieth-century voicing. A sentence in the picture reads, "In modern Wicks organs, traditional voicing helps promote a clear, cohesive ensemble." This allows the customer to know what to expect from a Wicks, something Schlicker did not attempt in his advertisements.

This lack of emphasis on print advertisements meant that Schlicker had to develop business by some other means. As demonstrated in chapter two, he used the enthusiasm of his earliest clients and their recommendations to find new business.

---

[101] e.g. St. Paul's Cathedral, Buffalo, in *The Diapason*, October 1953, 22; St. Paul Lutheran, Dolton, Illinois in *The Diapason*, November 1958, 33.

[102] *The Diapason*, February 1954, 5; *The Diapason*, October 1966, 2.

[103] *The Diapason*, December 1961, 2.

[104] *The Diapason*, May 1964, 28.

As he became more well known, he attracted people like Noehren and Biggs who had a wider influence and could sell his work for him.

Biggs's letter on page 53, though, indicates that he was interested not only in referring Schlicker to potential customers, which he was already doing. He apparently was considering a more organized advertising campaign. In the E. Power Biggs archives at Boston University, there is found an untitled and undated group of sheets of paper of various sizes containing ideas for such an advertisement, perhaps in booklet form. It is reproduced as Appendix C.

This outline for an advertisement contains more detail than anything Schlicker ever produced. Unlike advertisements which mention voicing techniques, the outline actually explains why a customer should want the techniques used on an organ and how Schlicker's product would help them make music. It also details why Biggs found Schlicker's organs so attractive: their subtlety, their clarity, and their tonal cohesion. This is the sound he associated with the classic organs of Europe, and this is why he was so anxious to convince others to purchase Schlicker's products.

The second important effect of Biggs's enthusiasm for Schlicker's work was Schlicker's involvement in three unique and highly publicized projects: the construction of the Cambridge Portativ, Biggs's transportable organ; the rebuilding of the Old North Church in Boston; and the replication of Benjamin Franklin's Glass Armonica. These projects gave Schlicker national exposure not only in the organ world, but in the larger American musical and historical circles as well. Schlicker became involved in these projects at Biggs's request, and Biggs played a

major role in organizing the projects and their publicity. The unique nature of these projects and the high level of publicity surrounding them acted as a catalyst to Schlicker's rise as a national figure.

The Cambridge Portativ was a portable unit organ Biggs commissioned Schlicker to build in 1952. Biggs visited Schlicker's shop when he was in Buffalo for the recital at St. Paul's Episcopal. He saw a unit organ in production and was greatly intrigued, asking when it would be finished so that he could hear it.[105] Biggs visited again in August of that year, and the next week wrote a letter outlining the specifications for an organ they had discussed during the visit. This letter serves as an example of the dialogue the two men had about the design of the Portativ:

> Apologies for the delay in this promised letter, but I thought we'd take a few days to think of any additional items that should be included in the little organ.
>
> Everything seems fine, however, as we left it, and I believe it was as follows: -
>
> ["16' Ped" penciled in on carbon copy]
>
> 16' Rankett
> 8' Gedeckt
> 8' Quintadena (also playable at 4'
> 4' Principal
> 2 2/3 Nazard
> 2' Rohrflote
> Mixture (II Rk)
> Zimbel (II Rk)
>
> ["+ K" penciled in on carbon copy]
>
> On the whole, I'd be just as happy if all the stops are straight, with no unification except for the Quintadena at 4', and of course duplexed on each manual. What do you think of this? And I suppose you'd make them all duplexed again on the pedal?
>
> Also, do you prefer cone tuning or the sliders? I suppose the sliders might be easier for me to tune, but on the other hand the pipes would probably stay better in tune if coned. Here I believe I'll have to rely on your choice and judgment.

[105] Biggs to Schlicker, May 3, 1952, Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI.

> By the way, will you remember to make the organ – both chest and the console – as moveable as possible?
>
> I'd like to take the instrument to other places for occasional concerts and broadcasts, possible with flute, oboe, etc., so perhaps you'd keep this use in mind rather than think of it only as a practice organ permanently housed in the little room here.
>
> Another reason for making the instrument as readily transportable as possible is that I'd like to record on it, and for this would probably have to take it to New York.
>
> I'd like very much to do some recording at Buffalo, but the problems of persuading a large firm such as Columbia to move all their crew and equipment so far are considerable! As soon as there's a Schlicker organ in New York or Boston all will be easy, but meanwhile this little instrument may serve very well for certain things.
>
> The sooner such an instrument could be finished the more useful it would be to me, so here's hoping you can fit it in between the other work you have on hand! Do you have any idea when it might be ready?
>
> Enclosed is a check for $750.00 as a first payment, and I'd be glad to have any contract or agreement you want to make on this matter.
>
> Peggy and I both enjoyed the visit so much last week, and we look forward to seeing you here in Boston this month. Be sure to let us know as far again as possible when you're coming.[106]

From the very beginning of the project, then, Biggs was very much involved in the concept and design of the instrument. Through March of 1953, Schlicker and Biggs continued to write each other to work out the details of specification and construction of the Portativ. Schlicker responded to the above letter with assurances that it would be compact and easily portable as Biggs requested. He suggested cone tuning[107] the Mixtures and Zimbel and using slide tuning on the other ranks.[108] In

[106] Biggs to Schlicker, September 2, 1952. Carbon copy in E. Power Biggs Archives, Boston University, Boston, MA. Original in Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI. The back of the letter contains drawings for the layout of the organ.

[107] Cone tuning adjust the shape of the top of the pipe in order to adjust pitch.

[108] Schlicker to Biggs, September 25, 1952, E. Power Biggs Archives, Boston University, Boston, MA.

this letter Schlicker also mentions figuring the scales for the instrument. A pipe's scale is the relationship between its diameter and its length. Regular scaling has uniform scale reduction ratios as the pitch goes higher; e.g., 17th halving in which the diameter halves every seventeen notes. Variable scaling is the use of different halving rations throughout the compass of a single stop in order to adjust to the acoustics of the room and balance out the relative strengths of low, middle, and high pitches; e.g., C1-G32 using a 17th halving ratio, G#33-C49 using a 15th halving ratio, and C#50-C61 using a 13th halving ratio. Schlicker used variable scaling on all of his organs. This contributed to the balance and clarity which Biggs found so appealing in Schlicker's instruments because it allowed all the stops to be heard clearly in all ranges. In contrast to other builders such as Möller and Austin who used the halving ratio throughout the entire compass of a stop, Schlicker used variable scaling on all of his instruments, even small organs such as the Portativ. Schlicker asked whether he should scale the organ for a larger room or the room in which it would sit in Biggs's house.[109] Biggs replied that the use as a concert instrument and for recording and broadcasting was more important than its use as a practice instrument, but he still wanted Schlicker to voice the organ gently: "quality rather than quantity is the idea, and I picture the instrument as having a certain beautiful softness of effect, rather than volume. I'll confidently leave this matter entirely to your judgment!"[110]

[109] Schlicker to Biggs, December 5, 1952, E. Power Biggs Archives, Boston University, Boston, MA.

[110] Biggs to Schlicker, December 12, 1952, Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI.

The letters also reveal Biggs's excitement as he waited for the organ's completion. He often referred to it as "the organ,"[111] the emphasis on the definite article demonstrating the singular importance he attached to the instrument. Biggs also repeatedly asked what progress it was making and when it would be ready even before construction had begun.[112] He wanted it as soon as possible because he saw the numerous ways it could be used for concerts and recordings: "It may be a little organ, but I have big plans for it!"[113]

As the instrument progressed, Biggs began mentioning the organ to others, trying to ferment anticipation for its unveiling. In contrast to Schlicker, Biggs actively sought venues which might give large exposure to the Portativ. He wrote to Oliver Daniel at CBS Radio, praising the organ and its maker: "This chap Schlicker is an absolute genius at voicing and the whole project, I think, is going to make a little history."[114] Biggs also laid the groundwork for a concert at the Library of Congress, suggesting to the chief of the music division that it would make a good story.[115] Moreover, he began talking with a publicity agent in New York who thought that the idea of a traveling organ made a "first class story."[116] Schlicker was not completely inactive; he did suggest to Biggs a concert at the University of

[111] e.g., Biggs to Schlicker, November 7, 1952, Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI.

[112] Ibid; also Biggs to Schlicker, September 2, 1952, Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI.

[113] Biggs to Schlicker, January 7, 1953, Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI.

[114] Biggs to Oliver Daniels, August 24, 1953, E. Power Biggs Archives, Boston University, Boston, MA.

[115] Biggs to Edward N. Waters, August 26, 1953, Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI.

[116] Biggs to Schlicker, September 7, 1953, Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI.

Buffalo that coming December.[117] For the most part, though, Schlicker remained content to let Biggs do the promotion for him as Biggs's celebrity allowed him to promote Schlicker on a scale unavailable to Schlicker himself.

By November Biggs was referring to the Portativ as "the organ of the century."[118] In this same letter he suggests the possibility of a broadcast from Buffalo on the new instrument. Biggs recognized all the publicity from such a broadcast, noting that "It makes a wonderful story from so many angles." He sent notices about the broadcast to the two major magazines read by organists in America, *The Diapason*[119] and *The American Organist*,[120] in an attempt to create as much interest as possible.[121] The CBS press release concerning the broadcast called Schlicker "a leading American organ builder who has used classic principles of design and sonority in an ultra-modern instrument."[122] National publicity like this was a windfall for the company and was possible only through the influence and efforts of Biggs. The reference to classic design principles, furthermore, gave Schlicker credibility among American organists who were rapidly embracing the ideas of the organ reform movement with its insistence on the return to these principles for future organbuilding.

---

[117] Reed Jerome to Biggs, September 21, 1953, E. Power Biggs Archives, Boston University, Boston, MA.

[118] Biggs to Oliver Daniels, November 2, 1953, E. Power Biggs Archives, Boston University, Boston, MA.

[119] *The Diapason*, December 1953, 2.

[120] *The American Organist*, December 1953, 422.

[121] Biggs to Schlicker, November 12, 1953, E. Power Biggs Archives, Boston University, Boston, MA.

[122] "He Can Take It with Him," November 18, 1953 press release from CBS Radio, Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI.

Biggs made his weekly Sunday morning broadcast from the Portativ on December 6 and played the concert on December 8. An article about the Portativ appeared in the *Christian Science Monitor* the day before the broadcast. The article discusses the size of the instrument and how it was transported, calling it useful for halls where no organ was possible before, setting up Schlicker's organs as reasonable options for institutions which might have considered purchasing an electronic instrument or no organ at all. Biggs used the article as a direct means to promote Schlicker's work:

> But this well-known organist hastens to give entire credit for the actual instrument to Herman Schlicker of Buffalo, who is working the final touches after 18 months' work.
>
> Originally from Germany, Mr. Schlicker is "an absolute genius in voicing the organ," according to Mr. Biggs. "He is possibly the leading man in the country today in voicing and has developed early organ forms. I was very much impressed with the organs he built. It is his sense of voicing, his artistic background, his persistence to carry it through" that convinced Mr. Biggs that Mr. Schlicker was the craftsman he wanted.[123]

The large circulation of the newspaper ensured that Schlicker's name and work would be known around the country as a builder endorsed by the leading advocate for a return to classic principles. Moreover, if an organ was good enough for Biggs, one of the recognized leaders in his field, it would be good enough for the regular organist. Biggs's fame radiated off Schlicker and made him a bright light in the organbuilding world. This enabled Schlicker to move outside his status as a regional builder and establish his national reputation without prominent advertisements.

[123] Don Stirling Raymond, "Biggs Unveils Portable Organ," *The Christian Science Monitor*, December 5, 1953, 9.

The Buffalo broadcast and concert were very well received, with almost all of the attention focused on the organ. The review in the *Buffalo Evening News* notes that the instrument and not Biggs was the center of attention, praising its clarity and flexibility due to the voicing and unenclosed pipes.[124] The broadcast also resulted in letters asking about the organ,[125] and so the public responded to Schlicker's promotion of the organ.

Despite the success of the organ, Schlicker and Biggs still viewed it as a work in progress. Biggs left a detailed list of adjustments he desired Schlicker to make. The most common request concerning a stop was to soften it. Biggs wanted the Principal and Mixture to be softer and of smaller scale, and he also wanted the Rohrfloete to be softer. He asked that the Cymbel on the Positiv be "as soft as possible…just a rustle."[126] These requests correspond to the sound that Biggs first heard in Schlicker's organs and praised to others: the gentle and transparent voicing. Schlicker agreed to these requests and built a new Principal and a new Mixture.[127] The sound of the Portativ, an instrument Biggs used to showcase Schlicker's talents, thus owed a great deal to Biggs's reactions and input.

As the concert at the Library of Congress approached, Biggs continued to exploit all possible opportunities for publicity:

> Very many thanks indeed for the excellent pen-pencil-cufflinks-tie clip-set! And here's just a line to mention that I'll arrive in Buffalo next Wednesday morning, with all cuffs linked, tie clipped, and pen

[124] Theodolinda C. Boris, "Specially-Built Organ Merits Applause in Biggs' Recital," *The Buffalo Evening News*, December 9, 1953.

[125] Reed Jerome to Biggs, December 16, 1953, Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI.

[126] "The Cambridge Organ Specification," December 8, 1953, Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI.

[127] Schlicker Organ Co., Inc. to Biggs, December 28, 1953, Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI.

> and pencil in each hand. I'll go right to the Statler, and will stay until early Thursday morning.
>
> I hope this day will be convenient for you, and if you are to be away – could you wire or phone me collect at once?
>
> All news then, except for one item. I've heard that the Associated Press is very interested in the organ, but the story was not nationally used at the time of the Buffalo concert because they want to include a picture of the organ in the trailer. Thus the Washington concert (of March 5th) is our chance, and we need to provide the opportunity for pictures of the organ 1)leaving Cambridge, 2)arriving Washington (with the Capitol in the background!) 3)on the stage in the Library of Congress. If all this can be done on schedule there's every indication that the whole project will receive considerable publicity.
>
> Incidentally, the Monitor story was an independent venture, and they want to do another in connection with the March event, with additional pictures!
>
> I've suggested to Dr. Spivacke, at the Library of Congress, that you be interviewed on the FM Network during the intermission of the concert, and I hope this will go through.[128]

Biggs still saw the Portativ as an excellent chance to gain publicity for Schlicker. No doubt he recognized that the publicity would help his career as well. The suggestion of an interview on the radio, though, would benefit Schlicker far more than it would promote Biggs himself because the interview would direct the attention to the organ and its builder and away from the performance.

Biggs told Schlicker of the positive reactions to the instrument he was already receiving and encouraged Schlicker to take advantage of the publicity that the upcoming concert would generate:

> Everywhere I've been this past month people have been extremely interested in the Portatives and they seem absolutely fascinated by the pictures. In addition to the two prospects in Berkeley, I hope you'll hear sooner or later from the Pacific Lutheran College in Tacoma, Washington, and from Boise Junior College in Boise, Idaho.
>
> Incidentally, Boise has a new "classic" Austin, which is quite good. Yet here, as elsewhere, one feels that they are jumping on the

[128] Biggs to Schlicker, January 4, 1954, Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI.

> band wagon, yet they don't really know what they are up to. It made me think that you – in order to appropriate the leading position in the parade – should adopt some phrase in your advertising as:
>
> "For distinctive and finished voicing by Schlicker!
>
> I think it's very evident that you could sell the Portatives like hot cakes if you made up a brochure with photographs and sent it to all colleges and schools of music in the country. The brochure could also include a picture of Davidson (for example) so that it would not interfere with getting larger contracts, but in fact would lead to them. You probably already have a school and college directory – if not I'll give you the publisher's name.[129]

He points to the interest generated by the broadcast and urges Schlicker to capitalize on it. His survey of the current landscape of American organbuilding led him to believe that Schlicker could easily position himself as a leader if he took advantage of the situation by stressing his natural background in the classic style.

The audience and critics in Washington received the Cambridge Portativ just as well as those in Buffalo. Biggs provided a note about the organ in which he states that by using low wind pressure and small-scaled pipes with unnicked mouths, Schlicker had "developed anew for today the natural beauty and clear tonal quality of the 18th century organ."[130] Biggs thus promoted Schlicker as a leader or the organ reform movement, referring to this type of voicing as the "natural" way pipes should be voiced.

A critic present at the concert picked up on these ideas and related how they produced a sound which seemed new to him:

> It was an instrument obviously to the taste of the large audience present, and it was certainly to my taste too. You could hear all the music going on. Scales were crisp and clear, and apparently every stop had the rare characteristic of being well-defined throughout its whole register. The actual

[129] Biggs to Schlicker, February 1, 1954. Original in Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI. Carbon copy in E. Power Biggs Archives, Boston University, Boston, MA.

[130] Program, "A Concert of Chamber Music for Organ and Strings," March 5, 1954, 8:30.

> sounds, of course, were varied, but all stops had a marvelous almost touchable quality. Mr. Biggs referred to this initial accent as "chiff," – a word new to me, but a good one.
>
> The heart of the program was three of Mozart's church sonatas, really miniature organ concertos. They were played with a brilliance and intimacy it would be hard to surpass. The liveliness and the rhythmic capabilities of the new organ were a delight. The organist seemed a part of the proceedings, not like a player in a large church who presses the keys and after a lapse of time listens to a reflection of the music he has made.
>
> The Mozart pieces were accompanied by two fiddles and a cello, a group that seemed much too thin for the music. Each part could well have been doubled or tripled. The Haydn and Handel accompaniments, to which a viola was added, suffered from the same feeling of sparsity.
>
> Mr. Biggs played the Piston Partita on the Library organ. As the work was commissioned by the Coolidge Foundation, it is probable that it was written with this organ in mind. Nevertheless, although as a solo instrument the Library organ is acceptable, the ensemble with the viola and fiddle was very poor – the two strings were making music on stage while the hollow and muffled sound of the organ seemed to be coming from the green room, rather like the ghost of Hamlet's father on strike.
>
> The deft and busy Hindemith Sonata showed that Mr. Biggs' little instrument is just as effective with modern music as with that of the 18th century.[131]

He draws attention to the clarity and brilliance of the voicing. He also contrasts the sound of an organ in chambers with the Portativ which stood in the open and speaks freely into the room. Prior to the portion included above, he mentioned two new organs in Washington by Aeolian-Skinner that, along with the Schlicker, provide "clear, bright, well-defined tones and balanced and distinct stops" in contrast to the "agglutinated noise of the 19th and early 20th century organs." He therefore placed the Portativ in the center of the classical organ revival.

This review also served Schlicker by providing the material for one of the most detailed advertisements Schlicker ever produced. The May 1954 issue of *The*

[131] Day Thorpe, "Rare Tones from New Organ Give Recital Classic Quality," *The Evening Star* (Washington, D. C.), March 6, 1954.

Diapason[132] had a half-page advertisement labeled "Schlicker Organs for Distinctive and Finished Voicing." Included with the quotes are three pictures: the trailer containing the organ, the organ in the midst of assembly, and the musicians ready to perform. The phrase "distinctive and finished voicing" came from Biggs himself, demonstrating the influence Biggs had on the promotion of the company.[133] The amount of detail in this advertisement is much greater than in almost every other printed advertisement Schlicker used. After this issue Schlicker reverted back to his normal printed advertisements, demonstrating his lack of interest in pursuing this opportunity further.

After the Library of Congress concert, Biggs took his organ on the road for a number of notable appearances which kept the organ in the public eye and continued to spread Schlicker's name. In August 1954 Biggs took the organ to Toronto for a concert for the annual convention of the Canadian College of Organists which was broadcast on CBC Wednesday Night, providing some publicity in the Canadian market[134] as well as receiving a very favorable review in the American press. *The Diapason* remarked how the instrument "showed how excellently a properly-voiced instrument can interchange comments with a harpsichord, a sort of 'tinkle against blow' in perfect balance."[135] The next day

[132] *The Diapason*, May 1954, 4.

[133] Biggs to Schlicker, February 1, 1954, Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI.

[134] "E. Power Biggs: A Widely-Known Organist Develops a New Instrument for Use on Tours," *CBC Times*, August 20, 1954, 1.

[135] "Canadian Organists Hold Big Convention," *The Diapason,* October 1954, 12.

Biggs gave a special demonstration of the organ, playing through the individual stops and showing how it could be used for leading hymns as well.

The next summer Biggs took the organ to Reading, Pennsylvania, for the regional convention of the American Guild of Organists. The organ made its television debut in December 1955 when Biggs played a concert with the McGill Chamber Orchestra on CBC-TV's "Concert Hour," an appearance Biggs considered "invaluable."[136] A picture of the broadcast appeared in *The American Organist*.[137] Audiences in the United States saw the Portativ in February 1956 when Biggs included it in his appearance on the "Omnibus" program. Biggs gave a lecture on the history of the organ from the hydraulus to the present and used the Portativ to demonstrate the different families of organ tone.[138]

Biggs and his Portativ thus played a large role in securing Schlicker national and international attention. This attention had the direct effect of gaining new business, including organs similar to Biggs's, as demonstrated in a letter to Biggs from Gerhard Cartford:

> Enclosed is the specification for the St. Paul version of the Cambridge Portative. I feel that I owe you some thanks for it. In the first place, it was your recommendation, at the Methuen session in 1953, that put me on the Schlicker trail. In the second place, I spent part of this past summer at the plant in Buffalo, and while there had the privilege of playing your organ while it was in the shop for some adjustments, and with this aid readied our own specification.
>
> This organ started out fairly small, but grew, like Topsy, when we discovered some extra funds. The portative idea appealed to us because we are in a temporary situation. Our use for it being a

[136] Biggs to Donald Corbett, November 28, 1955. Original in Stanton Peters's files.

[137] *The American Organist*, April 1956, 121.

[138] Owen 105.

> congregational one, it is bigger in tonal design and makeup. However, in most other respects it will be almost identical to yours.
>
> I have a private suspicion that it will make musical history out here, because there is hardly one good organ in either Minneapolis or St. Paul. Incidentally, I am currently employed as the organist of the seminary[139] here.
>
> May I extend a cordial invitation to you to stop in and give the "Midwest portative" a "whirl" when you are in these parts, that is, after April 1956, which is the approximate delivery date.[140]

Biggs's promotion of Schlicker, both verbally and through the Portativ, thus had the concrete result of the sale of another instrument for Schlicker. In his letter, Cartford sees the potential of his organ creating even more sales for Schlicker as people heard the sound and recognized its quality in contrast to the instruments then available. Even Schlicker's small instruments such as the Portativ, and even smaller practice organs, stood out from those of his contemporaries because of their clear voicing and classical design.

Schlicker's concept of a small organ, even one such as the Portativ with multiple borrowings and unifications from a limited number of ranks, is an extension of his general concept of the organ. Figure 4 gives the specification of the Cambridge Portativ.

[139] Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul, Minnesota.

[140] Gerhard Cartford to Biggs, September 30, 1955, E. Power Biggs Archives, Boston University, Boston, MA.

GREAT		POSITIV		PEDAL	
Gedeckt	8'	Gedeckt	8'	Untersatz	16'
Quintadena	8'	Quintadena	8'	Gross Gedeckt	8'
Octave	4'	Rohrfloete	4'	Gedeckt	8'
Rohrfloete	4'	Rohrfloete	2'	Octave	4'
Nasat	2 2/3'	Quintadena	2'	Bourdon	4'
Principal	2'	Larigot	1 1/3'	Quintadena	4'
Rohrfloete	2'	Siffloete	1'	Rohrfloete	2'
Mixture	III	Cymbal	II	Nasat	1 1/3'
Krummhorn	8'			Mixture	II
				Ranket	16'

All stops are taken from the following ranks:

Untersatz	16'
Gedeckt	8'
Quintadena	8'
Octave	4'
Rohrfloete	4'
Nasat	2 2/3'
Mixture	III
Cymbal	II
Ranket	16'
Krummhorn	8'

Figure 4. Specification of the Cambridge Portativ, Schlicker Organ Company, 1953. *Source:* Barbara Owen, *E. Power Biggs: Concert Organist* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987), 215.

Schlicker believed that each manual should contain a chorus of independent voices which should be voiced according to their place within this scheme. This means that each voice in an 8', 4', 2', and Mixture chorus on each division would be drawn from a different rank rather than one rank playing at multiple pitch levels. Also, each division was designed so that, when registering a chorus on both manuals, the choruses would be distinct because the ranks would be playing at different pitch levels. For example, on the Portativ, one could make a chorus on the Great consisting of the 8' Gedeckt, 4' Octave, 2' Rohrfloete, and Mixture; the chorus on the

Positiv could consist of the 8' Quintadena, 4' Rohrfloete, 2' Principal, and Cymbal. Even though the same ranks play on both manuals (with the exception of the Mixture and Cymbal, which were completely separate), they sound at different pitch levels. As a result, each chorus will sound distinct and is not simply duplicate or sound different only in terms of dynamics. Schlicker incorporated this idea into all of his unit organs, and in the larger ones the manuals are even more distinct. One of the largest unit organs built by the company was an eleven-register, seventeen-rank, two-manual and pedal instrument built for Trinity Episcopal Church in New Rochelle, New York. Each manual has twelve stops, and the only rank available at the same pitch level on both manuals is the 1 3/5 Terz.[141]

Schlicker believed strongly that the basis of even the smallest organs must be a straight chorus. He made it a point to include this information in publicity or advertisements about his unit organs.[142] In fact, the advertisement in the October 1966 issue of *The Diapason* contains the most text of any advertisement which appeared in that magazine. Schlicker must have considered the concept important if he decided to break his pattern of general, nondescript advertisements with something so detailed about the design of a six-rank organ. The advertisement, though, appears in only one issue and was not part of a concerted effort to sell the instruments through print advertising. Like the advertisement featuring the Cambridge Portativ discussed above, it stands out because it is different from Schlicker's general practice.

---

[141] "Schlicker Builds Unit Organ for New Rochelle Church." *The Diapason*, April 1, 1971, p. 10.

[142] *The American Organist*, July 1958, 261, in a discussion of the auditorium organ for Concordia Senior College, Ft. Wayne; advertisement in *The Diapason*, October 1966, 2.

The concept of a straight chorus on a unit organ set Schlicker apart from many other contemporary builders. Other companies also produced two-manual unit organs, but these would contain multiple ranks based on 8' pitch. Even Biggs had this concept in mind for a three-rank practice organ. When he decided to sell his Portativ, he considered buying another organ from Schlicker, and he suggested the following:

> What would you think of making an instrument just as tiny as possible. With perhaps a very prompt speaking Gedeckt 8' and a Quintadena 8' (much like the present one) with two manuals: –
>
> Man 2 – Q. 8', also Q. 4', Q. 2' and Ged. 2' [handwritten: (or = Q8 Ged 4' 2')]
>
> Man 1 – Ged. 8', also Q 4', Q. 2' (possibly Ged. 4'?) [handwritten: (or = Ged 8 Q 4' 2')]
>
> Ped – Q. 8', Ged. 8', Q. 4' (other pitches?)[143]

Schlicker replied with an alternative scheme:

> We would like to have your reaction to the following specification:
>
Manual -	8'	Gedeckt	56 notes
	4'	Quintadena	56 notes
	2'	Weitprincipal	56 notes
Manual II -	8'	Quintadena	56 notes
	4'	Gedeckt	56 notes
	2'	Quintadena	56 notes
	1'	Principal	56 notes
Pedal -	8'	Gedeckt	30 notes
	4'	Quintadena	30 notes
	4'	Gedeckt	30 notes
	2'	Weitprincipal	30 notes

[143] E. Power Biggs to Herman Schlicker, March 21, 1961. Original in Stanton Peters's files.

> The pipes would be: 8' Gedeckt – 56 pipes, 4' Quintadena – 56 pipes and 2' Weitprincipal – 56 pipes. We would prefer having an independent 2' voice to having two independent 8' voices.[144]

Schlicker insisted on some version of a chorus rather than multiple 8' ranks. He persuaded Biggs, who admitted, "No doubt you are quite right not to wish to make an organ of a couple of 8' ranks. Your idea is much better."[145] This allowed for more proper scaling and a balanced result.[146] This concept of a balanced, clear chorus rather than a more random selection of different colors placed Schlicker clearly within the ideas of the organ reform movement and explains why individuals such as Cartford and Biggs would have heard something unique in Schlicker's organs, even his small ones, that they did not hear anywhere else.

The most prominent use of the Portativ was Biggs's concert at the 1956 national convention of the American Guild of Organists in New York City. The convention program committee invited Biggs to bring his organ with the opportunity to talk about it.[147] Biggs naturally saw the immense opportunities for press and advertisement this presented, stating his opinions to Schlicker in the following:

> The enclosed letter from Searle Wright and the New York A.G.O. is just fine! And I hope you will agree that we certainly must do it!
>
> In fact, I suggest we plan to go down aiming to steal the whole Convention show. Somewhat along these lines – I'll reply to Searle Wright saying we'll do it, quoting him whatever figure you would set as transportation costs (this would be direct between the

[144] Herman Schlicker to E. Power Biggs, April 3, 1961. Carbon copy in Stanton Peters's files.

[145] Biggs to Schlicker, May 28, 1961. Original in Stanton Peters's files.

[146] Donald Ingram, "Memoir: Herman Schlicker and the Schlicker Organ Company in Particular from 1956-1963," *The Tracker*, Fall 2004, 17.

[147] Searle Wright to E. Power Biggs, July 7, 1955. Original in Stanton Peters's files.

> A.G.O. and you,) and adding to Searle Wright that we would much like a few instruments available, a quartet perhaps.
>
> Then you could take a page in the Convention booklet, making the most of your Boston contract (we'll expect Paul Revere's Church to be in the bag long before this) and emphasizing that you build small (such as the Cambridge portative) medium (listing several, such as Atlanta[148]) and large instruments (such as Trinity[149] etc.)
>
> Did you know that Ralph Waldo Emerson once wrote that "if a man builds a better church organ the world will make a beaten path to his door." This was a variant on his better mousetrap saying! I like the thought of people hacking their way through the heavily nicked underbrush towards Buffalo from all points of the compass, and here's an idea for that Convention advertisement!
>
> Also – you could make the most of the opportunity with advertising booklets and records to hand out.
>
> So – I wonder if you'll plan to take it down, and what figure you'd like me to tell Searle Wright? [150]

Biggs speaks as though he were Schlicker's press agent, urging Schlicker to advertise in the convention booklet and to produce his own materials. He even suggests ideas for the advertising himself. Biggs found great delight in "aiming to steal the whole show." He had the driving enthusiasm that put Schlicker's name and organs in the public eye with the expressed intention of selling more organs. In spite of Biggs's insistence, though, Schlicker did not take out an extensive advertisement in the convention booklet. Schlicker took out a quarter-page ad that contained a picture of the organ with the caption "The Cambridge Portativ" and the name "Schlicker" underneath.[151]

---

[148] Protestant Radio Center (Chapel Studio), 1954.

[149] Trinity Episcopal Church, Buffalo, New York, installed 1954.

[150] Biggs to Schlicker, July 14, 1955, Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI.

[151] *Program for the National Convention of the American Guild of Organists 60th Anniversary*. New York City: New York City Chapter of the American Guild of Organists, 1956.

The concert at Hunter College Auditorium on June 28, 1956 received international notice.[152] More importantly, however, it gave many organists from around the country their first opportunity to hear a Schlicker organ in person. One such organist was Clarence Mader, who after the convention went to Buffalo to tour the factory. [153] Soon afterwards his church purchased a Schlicker organ, and he was instrumental in Schlicker's success in southern California.[154]

Schlicker became involved in the rebuild of the organ at the Old North Church in Boston mostly because of Biggs. Biggs acted as a consultant on the project, and he used his influence and inside knowledge of the church and the project to get Schlicker the contract, feeding Schlicker information to give him an advantage over the competition:

> Please keep this letter quite confidential, but I thought it would be a good idea to tell you what I know about the old North Church.
>
> Mr. Peck is a very pleasant chap, and I think you will enjoy meeting him. The church, of course, is world famous, and is also quite good in acoustics – at least so Mr. Peck says. It has a stone floor.
>
> It would be very worth while if you could fly to Boston and have a discussion with Mr. Peck just as soon as he can set a time. The sooner the better, I'm sure, since once this thing becomes known the competition will start hopping! So call him up, if you haven't already done so, and try to see him. We wish that we could be here, but unfortunately we leave for Iceland on Monday and will be away until June 18th, and you should not wait this long.
>
> I believe Mr. Peck will have a gift available of from $20,000 to $25,000 – though out of this he wishes to establish a maintenance fund for the organ, which is a very practical idea. Don't tell him I told you these figures, but they may give you a figure to estimate around.

---

[152] Laurence Swinyard, "American Guild of Organists: National Convention), *The Musical Times*, September 1956, 478-479.

[153] Donald Ingram, interview by author, Latham, NY, August 6, 2011.

[154] Mader's impact on Schlicker's career is discussed in detail beginning on page 84.

> I believe Gammons[155] will be quite all right, and not troublesome. And on my part I intend to keep out of things as much as possible. My one thought at the moment is that Mr. Peck needs to meet you just as soon as possible, so that you can pin it down and forestall competition![156]

Biggs clearly wanted the church to choose Schlicker for the rebuilding job. He gave him confidential information about funding so that Schlicker could present a proposal with which the church would be immediately comfortable. Biggs envisioned other builders vying for the contract, but he wanted to make Charles Peck, the rector, see Schlicker as the obvious choice for the job.

Biggs also wrote to Charles Peck to convince him that Schlicker was able to provide the best work at the best price:

> Many thanks for the organ schemes, and please excuse a little delay in returning them.
>
> Organ costs and quotations nowadays by the larger companies average about $1200-1250 per stop. So a probable figure on either scheme if made by one of several large companies, would be about $30,000 to $32,000.
>
> This seems an awful lot! But though Mr. Schlicker's figure is well below this, I imagine the problem still is to bring together the costs as quoted and the amount actually available for purchase.
>
> Perhaps it's worth mentioning again that Schlicker represents a rather unusual – one may almost say – unique! – combination of rare skill and lower costs. He is an artist craftsman in the best tradition, and I believe one can in these circumstances be perfectly frank with him – since it is certain he wants to do a fine job, and it is also certain that no money is being wasted in large-company overhead and advertising.
>
> Therefore I'd suggest that the difference be adjusted either by finding the additional wherewithal (which of course is the ideal way) or by telling Schlicker frankly what is available and asking him if he can trim the scheme accordingly.
>
> Of course certain costs are inevitable – that of the console for example. And if a purchase figure is reduced by, say, one-sixth I

[155] Edward Gammons, organist at Groton School 1941-74, who also served as a consultant on the Old North project.

[156] Biggs to Schlicker, June 4, 1955, E. Power Biggs Archives, Boston University, Boston, MA.

> suppose a little more than one-sixth of the pipes must be eliminated, since one cannot very well chop off one-sixth of the console!
>
> So – if, by good luck – a slightly larger figure is possible my vote would be to accept one or the other of these schemes. One or two substitutions might be a good idea, but this is probably better discussed at a meeting.
>
> As for a new organ versus reconditioning the old – I would trust Schlicker completely either way. Having now heard the organ, I do admit that he'll have to be a wizard to revoice some of the stops! But he's a chap who can work miracles.
>
> On the other hand, if on consideration he feels that an entirely new instrument is preferable, then I would certainly believe him, and you could be assured of having an organ of rare and distinctive tone. This question is perhaps also better discussed at a meeting.[157]

Biggs assures Peck that whether Schlicker advised a rebuild or a completely new instrument, he would provide the finest instrument available at a lower cost than any of his competitors. He calls Schlicker "a chap who can work miracles," a comment reminiscent of his other recommendations of Schlicker as a genius. He also sets Schlicker above the competition by implying that other builders charge too much because they spend too much on overhead and advertisements. Furthermore, Biggs says that Schlicker could trim costs if the need arose, a flexibility which Biggs implies other builders did not have. However, Biggs had already supplied Schlicker with an approximate budget. If Schlicker could offer an acceptable plan within the determined budget, this would give him an edge over his competitors and make him the obvious choice for the job. Biggs's behind-the-scenes maneuvering was therefore a key factor in Schlicker's success at gaining the contract.

Schlicker rebuilt and enlarged the Johnston organ, creating a hybrid between the old and the new. The mechanical action and the original 1759 casework were

[157] Biggs to Charles Peck, October 24, 1955, E. Power Biggs Archives, Boston University, Boston, MA.

retained. The Swell, which originally extended down only to Tenor C except for one register, was extended to a compass of fifty-six notes. The Pedal division, which originally included only a 16' Open Diapason, was greatly expanded and connected by electro-pneumatic action, as was the Quintaton which played on all three divisions. Schlicker also added electro-pneumatic stop action and a combination action.

The most significant changes Schlicker made to the organ were the tonal alterations which brought them more in line with his own and Biggs's classic ideals. All flue pipes received new languids to remove any nicking. The specification reflects Schlicker's idea of a full chorus on each manual. The Great has a 3-rank mixture and a 3-rank Cymbel. The Pedal has a 16-8-4-2 chorus topped with a 3-rank mixture and supplemented with 16' and 4' reeds. The reeds in the Pedal and all the upperwork were additions made by Schlicker.[158] These alterations reflect Biggs's ideas of the classic organ and enabled him to promote it as a model for future projects.

The historic nature of the church guaranteed that the rebuild received a great deal of publicity. The large write-up in the chapter news section of *The Diapason* has a picture of Schlicker with Biggs at the organ, but except for mentioning the "good organ design," says nothing about the actual sound of the organ.[159] Biggs did some radio broadcasts from the church which gave the organ more national publicity. However, the organ did not sustain the interest that the Portativ had. It

[158] *The American Organist*, October 1959, 348.

[159] "Boston Chapter Sponsors E. Power Biggs in Recital at the Old North Church," *The Diapason*, July 1958, 11.

did, however, help Schlicker's reputation by associating his name with a high profile, historical project. This gave him credibility among the growing number of organists who wished to preserve and restore historical instruments.

The other high profile project on which Biggs and Schlicker collaborated was the replication of Benjamin Franklin's Glass Armonica. Franklin's instrument consisted of glass bowls of different sizes that, when placed on a spindle and pressed with a wet finger while being spun, produced pitches. A handful of eighteenth-century composers, including Mozart, wrote for the instrument.[160] With the assistance of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Biggs sought to reproduce such an instrument and commissioned Schlicker in October 1955 to build a cabinet and keyboard mechanism. He realized the amount of experimentation it would take, but he also saw the value of the exposure it would create: "This all needs a certain amount of thought and inventiveness but I think you're the one chap who could do it! The instrument is going to receive a lot of national publicity, and you would be given full credit."[161] In November of that year, Biggs suggested that Schlicker help with the tuning of the glasses and again noted that "the publicity possibilities of this instrument are endless, and I hope a lot will come of it during the Mozart year of 1956."[162]

As work progressed on the project, problems soon arose. The bowls produced by Corning were thicker than Franklin's originals and therefore more

[160] "Adagio in C Major for Glass Harmonica," K. 356

[161] Biggs to Schlicker, October 15, 1955, Stanton Peters's files.

[162] Biggs to Schlicker, November 13, 1955, Stanton Peters's files.

difficult to sound. It turned out that the smaller glasses needed to be rotated faster than larger glasses, thus complicating the mechanism. Finding the right material to use in place of fingers was also difficult. Dry rubber and wet pigskin produced the best, but not very satisfactory, results. In addition, some of the hand-blown glasses broke, requiring their last-minute replacement and increasing the cost of the project.[163] With the instrument's premiere scheduled for April 11, 1956, Biggs became nervous about the readiness of the instrument and its effects on publicity:

> I'm so sorry that today's snowstorm – our third in eight days – prevented all air travel and that it wasn't possible to come to Buffalo after all.
>
> It's too bad that we have to cancel the "press preview" set for March 30th, particularly with LIFE coming to make pictures of the occasion.
>
> Yet obviously you had better keep the instrument in Buffalo until the arrival of the four or five replacement bowls, which Mr. McClellan promised over the phone, by Friday, March 30th. No doubt you are in touch with Mr. McClellan directly about this?
>
> However, can you finish up the case and all remaining work ahead of this date, so that nothing then remains except to substitute the bowls?
>
> The absolute deadline for the arrival of the instrument here in Boston in the Academy's opinion is: –
>
> Tuesday, April 3rd.
>
> Not until it is safely here can we send out announcements to the press of another "preview."
>
> The concert, as you know is Wednesday, April 11th. And we would like to record the instrument on Monday or Tuesday, April 9th or 10th.
>
> There is also the Philharmonic broadcast of April 8th, on which James Fassett would like to talk about the Academy's Mozart-Franklin celebration and the instrument. Although it's hardly possible to play anything at all with E flat, E natural, G and B broken, I'd like to come to Buffalo next
>
> Wednesday, March 28th
>
> to see it and to record a few sounds for this broadcast. Would the shop be quiet at 5:30 or 6:00 p.m.?

[163] Owen, 108.

> As you can see, we're right at the deadline, and as far as a fair chance for me to learn how to play the instrument – we're way past it! If we can have the instrument here by noon of April 3rd, it may still be useful. If not the concert will have to take place without it, and our work will have come to nothing, for the anniversary occasion will have passed.
>
> By the way, Corning did suggest on the phone yesterday to Mr. Burhoe that the bowls would always tend to break if they were played too loudly. No doubt, as you suggested, we should have some sort of check in the key mechanism which would prevent more than a soft pressure.
>
> Here's hoping we can pull this out! – since Corning are evidently producing a rabbit out of a hat for us. This is absolutely the last lap and it's now or never.[164]

This letter demonstrates how Biggs was the driving force behind the project. He coordinated the construction and the performance details. Biggs also put great emphasis on the publicity. He frets over the lost chances for public exposure of the armonica if it was not completed in time. Even if the instrument did eventually work, Biggs would consider their work a failure if it were not ready in time for the concert because they would have missed the chance for the greatest publicity. Biggs therefore not only helped Schlicker gain the high profile work, but he showed great concern that the project received as much exposure as possible.

The concert, which also included six instrumentalists and a tenor, went on as scheduled, though Biggs played some of the pieces originally written for the armonica on the Portativ. The reaction was less than enthusiastic. The review in *The American Organist* notes the squeaks and harmonics produced by the contact of rubber with the glass, as well as the unevenness of volume and clumsiness of the mechanism.[165]

---

[164] Biggs to Schlicker, March 24, 1956, Stanton Peter's files, Milwaukee, WI.

[165] "Frankliniana," *The American Organist*, October 1956, 320, 322.

Although this last project was not as successful as the other two, it demonstrates Biggs's faith in Schlicker as an innovator and his desire to include him in highly public events. All three projects made Schlicker part of the national conversation about the future of organbuilding, and they established him as a progressive and innovative organbuilder who drew upon classical principles. Biggs's stature as one of the most respected organists of his time allowed Schlicker to use their association as a means to establish his own reputation as a first-class builder in the classical tradition.

After these three projects, Biggs and Schlicker did not collaborate on any other large projects. However, Biggs continued to offer public[166] and private[167] praise of Schlicker's work. He also suggested Schlicker to organizations who needed organs for concerts.[168] When the opportunity came to replace the Aeolian-Skinner at the Busch-Reisinger Museum, though, Biggs chose Flentrop, a Dutch builder of mechanical action organs. Despite this cooling off of their professional relationship, the two remained good friends until Schlicker's death in 1974.

It is highly unlikely that Biggs would have involved Schlicker in these major products and continued to endorse his work if the two had not also developed a warm personal relationship in conjunction with their professional collaborations. The letters at the beginning of 1952 are more formal in tone, but they soon warm up and include jokes and well wishes from their spouses. Biggs even offered Schlicker

---

[166] "Biggs Has Praise for Chapel, Organ at Senior College," *Ft. Wayne Journal-Gazette*, January 15, 1959.

[167] Biggs to Schlicker, November 28, 1959, Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI.

[168] Biggs to Ralph L. Miller, December 6, 1960, Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI.

a standing invitation for Thanksgiving.[169] Schlicker's tone is always more formal than Biggs's, and he continued to address each letter "Dear Mr. Biggs," even after Biggs had switched to "Dear Herman." This is a reflection of Schlicker's personality rather than any personal feelings towards Biggs, for he insisted that his employees address clients formally.[170]

By cultivating friendships such as this one with Biggs, Schlicker gained valuable exposure in the American musical world. His lack of follow-through on many of Biggs's suggestions for print advertising demonstrated that he preferred his reputation to grow by word-of-mouth rather than by a comprehensive advertising scheme. His willingness to work on such varied and unusual projects as the Portativ and the glass armonica demonstrated Schlicker's openness to innovation and new ideas. These also made him more intriguing and appealing to organists. Without friendships such as this one with Biggs, Schlicker might not have had a number of opportunities which enabled him to enter the public's eye on a national level.

By the middle of the 1950s, Schlicker's work with Noehren and Biggs had created favorable reputation for Schlicker as a builder who based his work on classical principles. To break into the western market, especially the southern California area, the influence of Clarence Mader was crucial. Mader was the organist at Immanuel Presbyterian and at Occidental College, and his purchase and

[169] Biggs to Schlicker, November 7, 1952, E. Power Biggs Archives, Boston University, Boston, MA.

[170] Ken List, interview by author, Wooster, OH, July 28, 2012.

endorsement of Schlicker organs led to a number of important installations and major publicity for Schlicker.

Clarence Mader saw a deep connection between the organ and the Christian heritage and identity. According to Mader, the organ lost its uniqueness when it sought to imitate the orchestra, and he saw that as an encroachment of the secular into the sacred world of the church. He openly criticized especially what he saw as the influence of the cinema organ with its "new sounds" which worked perfectly for film scoring but also created a desire for the same style of music in the church.[171] He saw salvation from this decline partly in the return by organ builders to classical designs: "We need to be told again that the pipe organ is the traditional instrument of the Christian church, that it alone provides the impersonal grandeur and mystical overtones to the worshiper's contemplation of the personality of God."[172]

As Mader sought to correct the decadence he saw in church organs of his time, he looked to the classic organs of Europe and saw hope in contemporary builders such as Schlicker whose work emulated those instruments:

> The characteristic sound was bright and cheerful, sweet and light, the ensemble brilliant, but never very loud or overpowering. The thundering, pew-shaking organ on the late 19th or early 20th century was unknown in that earlier period, and is not the kind of organ we want for our Westminster Chapel. We want organ tone that will cheer and elevate by its purity and refinement, inspire by its perfect balance and unity.[173]

---

[171] Richard Mathison, "Bright Future Seen for Church Organs," *Los Angeles Times*, August 3, 1958, Clarence Mader Collection, 37, Performing Arts Special Collections, University of Caifornia, Los Angeles.

[172] Ibid.

[173] Clarence Mader, "We Plan an Organ, Part V: Design for Tonal Beauty," *Immanuel Messenger*, April 5, 1957, Clarence Mader Collection, 37, Performing Arts Special Collections, University of Caifornia, Los Angeles.

Mader thus saw a clear connection between the tonal characteristics of the classical organ and the religious experience of the listener. Although he never states it directly, he equates a purity and clarity of tone with a purity and clarity of faith. This faith would not be colored by what he saw as sentimentality or cheap entertainment. He already saw hope in the abandonment of Victorian choral literature[174] and hoped that the renaissance in organ building as typified by Schlicker would allow the organ to fulfill what he saw as its true role in Christian worship:

> Long before Westminster Chapel seemed a real possibility, I held the hope that some day Immanuel might house an organ of singular beauty for the interpretation of the classical literature for the organ, a fitting instrument for the music that came from the disciplined hearts of great composers who found in the church the source of their greatest inspiration. Such an organ would not be muffled and dull, or saccharine, but rather clear, sparkling and chaste. It would not be an instrument of entertainment, but a vehicle of that dimension in depth where the aspiring heart reaches out toward God.
>
> In the deathless music of Bach, with which Ladd Thomas concludes his program tonight, we may feel the presence of the living faith that built these walls, and now leads our hearts through the on-going dream to new revelations of the truth which lies in beauty. We pray that the music of this organ may serve its spiritual end by stirring the timid, strengthening the weak, and quickening our souls in the joyous light of Christian worship.[175]

Mader's emphasis on the pure and objective and his rejection of the sweet and subjective in religion and its music is parallel to the neoclassic reaction to the romanticism prevalent in music at the beginning of the twentieth century.

---

[174] Mathison, "Bright Future Seen for Church Organs."

[175] Clarence Mader, "Clyde Shoemaker Jr. Memorial Organ Dedication – 6/19/60: The Realization of a Dream," handwritten manuscript, Clarence Mader Collection, 37, Performing Arts Special Collections, University of Caifornia, Los Angeles.

Composers inspired by true religious feeling were "disciplined," and he defines their sound as pure and brilliant. This mirrors neoclassicism's return to abstract forms and deemphasis of color in favor of more neutral tones. According to Mader, an organ worthy of use in true worship, then, must also submit to these tonal ideals.

Why did Mader select Schlicker to build an organ that fulfilled these ideals? He acknowledged that other organists played a crucial role in bringing Schlicker's work to national attention: "The sudden prominence given Mr. Schlicker's work came after the 'discovery' by several important American organists, that here in our own country was a man building organs in the tradition of Europe's master builders, a product so long considered unavailable to American churches."[176]

Important to Mader was the authenticity he saw in Schlicker's work. Unlike other builders who might have been viewed as cashing in on the organ reform movement and building "classical" organs for profit rather than principle, Schlicker' training in Europe gave him, according to Mader, an authenticity and natural authority in the field which could not be matched:

> With my hopes fixed on that star I surveyed the field for an organ builder who, I believed, could attain our ideal. This proved to be somewhat easier than one might expect, for, out of the many builders, only a few could qualify on the basis of training an experience in the classic traditions as practiced in Northern Europe for several centuries. Mr. Schlicker seemed to be preeminently fitted for the job. Not only had he had this training, but also an active part in the restoration of famous organs of Bach's day. Now, after 35 years in America, his work is esteemed everywhere, and some of the most significant organs of our time are coming from his factory.[177]

---

[176] Clarence Mader, "We Plan an Organ, Part IX: Herman Schlicker, Organ Builder," *Immanuel Messenger*, May 31, 1957, Clarence Mader Collection, 37, Performing Arts Special Collections, University of Caifornia, Los Angeles.

[177] Mader, "Clyde Shoemaker Jr. Memorial Organ Dedication."

As for the tone of the organ, Mader used the same vocabulary to describe Schlicker's organs as he did to describe the ideal religious organ: "purity and brilliance, and yet sweetness of tone."[178] The Schlicker organ and the Schlicker sound thus played a crucial role in Mader's quest to reclaim the organ for the Church and allow it to fulfill its role as a spiritual communicator. Mader was aware of the significance attached to the Westminster Chapel organ in this endeavor and hoped that it would lead to an improvement in the larger world of the organ and church music.

The finished organ was recognized as a success by both its owners and the wider public. At the dedication the church noted its suitability for a variety of uses (leading congregational singing, accompanying choirs and soloists, and faithfully interpreting organ literature). It also expressed confidence that the "organ tone will cheer and elevate the listener by its purity and refinement, and will inspire the listener by its perfect balance and unity."[179] Again, the emphasis is on purity and balance, which Mader believes would allow the listener to be lifted beyond himself, whether simply on a music level or a spiritual level.

Mader's influence is seen in the number of organs Schlicker installed in California after Immanuel Presbyterian. Before the Immanuel organ was installed in 1958, his only organ in the area was in the residence of William S. Martin in Bel

---

[178] Clarence Mader, "We Plan an Organ, Part X: Herman Schlicker, Organ Builder (continued)," *Immanuel Messenger*, June 14, 1957, Clarence Mader Collection, 37, Performing Arts Special Collections, University of Caifornia, Los Angeles.

[179] "Service of Dedication, June 19, 1960" for the Clyde Shoemaker Jr. Memorial Organ, Westminster Chapel, Clarence Mader Collection, 37, Performing Arts Special Collections, University of Caifornia, Los Angeles.

Air. By the end of the next decade he signed contracts for over twenty-five new instruments. Some of these were small unit organs for practice at universities, but they also included some major contracts. Mader himself was consultant for a number of these, including: the three-manual organ for Herrick Chapel, Occidental College; All Saints' Church, Pasadena; and the organ at First Congregational Church, Los Angeles; and St. Mark's Episcopal, Glendale. The All Saints' organ was completed just in time for the 1962 national convention of the American Guild of Organists and attracted significant attention, due not only to its design but also because Anton Heiller, the famed Austrian organist, made his American debut on this instrument at the convention.[180]

The organ at First Congregational Church was the largest installation in Schlicker's entire career, consisting of 219 ranks. It consisted of the 1931 Skinner organ in the chancel and a new organ in the rear gallery. In addition, Schlicker built an Italian Continuo organ. All three were controlled from two duplicate four-manual consoles, one at each end of the sanctuary. The Skinner was left untouched, for the most part, except for twenty-eight new ranks which filled out the principal and flute choruses and made the pedal more independent.[181] Schlicker thus showed respect for the older organ while still making it conform to his concept of organ design with complete choruses on each division. An instrument of this size is always considered a landmark, and without Mader's help, Schlicker most likely would have had a much more difficult time getting the contract.

---

[180] *The Diapason*, October 1962, 17.

[181] *The Diapason*, June 1965, 1.

During the 1950s Schlicker also formed close relationships with prominent Lutheran organists, especially Paul Bunjes and Paul Manz, who acted as consultants for churches preparing to purchase organs. The identification of Schlicker's organs with a particular "Lutheran" sound is discussed fully in chapter four. Apart from this sound quality, though, the relationships he formed with these men played a large part in bringing Schlicker's work to national attention through installations in important universities and churches. Moreover, because Schlicker and Bunjes often worked together, the two became linked in many organists' minds. Bunjes was known for his dissertation[182] which analyzed the descriptions and drawings of organs and organ pipes by Michael Praetorius and tried to apply these ideas to modern organ construction. It is important to distinguish the ideas of the two men to see how they may have influenced each other and how they remained distinct. An analysis of their writings and the organs on which they worked together shows that the two shared many ideas, but Schlicker remained independent and did not always incorporate Bunjes's ideas in his organs. Schlicker knew that Bunjes's influence upon Lutheran musicians and churches could generate business. While he tolerated some of Bunjes's ideas about voicing and design, Schlicker strove to maintain control so that the overall sound of the organ remained distinctly Schlicker's.

It is difficult to determine exactly when Bunjes and Schlicker first began working together. It was soon after the beginning of the 1950s because Schlicker provided practice instruments for Concordia College, River Forest's new music

[182] Published as *The Praetorius Organ* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1966).

facility in 1953. The 1950s and 60s produced a number of collaborations, including Concordia Senior College, Ft. Wayne (1958), Valparaiso University (1959) and St. Luke's Lutheran, Chicago (1963), as well as a number of smaller projects. The latter two are especially important because Bunjes wrote his own commentary on the designs of the organ.[183] The commentary on the St. Luke organ is more general and gives his overall principles on organ design, and these provide a useful comparison with Schlicker's own ideas.

The overarching concept of Bunjes's design is the *Werkprinzip*. Although this is a twentieth-century term, it describes the type of design in which each division contains an ensemble distinct from those on the other divisions, similar to principles outlined by Praetorius. Bunjes conceives of each division which "contrast and complete" each other. To encourage the blend of sound, the entire organ should be encased. The chorus of each division is of supreme importance, and stops should be useful within each divisional chorus as well as the full ensemble. Any specific color stops are "appendages."[184] The most important means of differentiation of these choruses is the Principal base of each: the lowest pitched Principal in each ensemble should be on a different level of the harmonic spectrum. An earlier essay by Bunjes elaborates on this idea. According to him, the Great should be based on an 8' pitch, with the full complement of 4', 2 2/3', 2', and a Mixture, and this chorus should not be duplicated on other manuals both for economical reasons and because

[183] Paul Bunjes, "The St. Luke Organ: A Reflection of Modern Trends in Organ Design." *A Guide to the Evangelical Church of St. Luke*, 1965, 26-31; Paul Bunjes, "Define Principles of Valparaiso Organ Design," *The Diapason*, January 1960, 27.

[184] Bunjes, "The St. Luke Organ," 27.

it could not then contrast with the original chorus on the Great. Similar to Harrison, Bunjes conceived of the Swell as the home of the reed chorus which could be added to the Great to complete the sound of the full organ. Although a Principal stop may be present at one or more pitch levels on the Swell, Bunjes regards the reeds are the backbone of the chorus and argues that the Swell mixture should be voiced as a completion of the reed chorus and not the Principal work.[185] As for the Positive or Choir division, Bunjes makes it the home of the petite ensemble based on a 4' Principal because he considers it redundant to duplicate a chorus with an 8' basis, and he maintains that this was the practice of the best classical builders.[186] Bunjes's concept of an organ is therefore much closer to the American Classic concept of G. Donald Harrison discussed in Chapter 1 than to Noehren's concept based on his study of European organs.

How did Schlicker's organs fit with this concept, especially when he worked with Bunjes? Schlicker, like Bunjes, maintained that each division should contain its own complete chorus. This concern has already been demonstrated with the discussion of Schlicker's unit organs. Unlike Bunjes, however, he did not insist that this differentiation should necessarily be based on the lowest Principal stop in each chorus. In one of the only times he systematically discussed his own tonal philosophy, Schlicker states, "Each division should have clearly defined pitch lines, different from the other divisions on the organ, determined by the Principal chorus of the division, and the composition of the mixtures." Later in the letter, though, he

[185] Paul Bunjes, "Problems in Church Organ Construction." In *The Musical Heritage of the Church, Vol. III,* ed. Theodore Hoelty-Nickel (Valparaiso: Valparaiso University, 1947), 132.

[186] Ibid, 130.

indicates that "The principal chorus does not always need to be present at all pitches, depending on the size, location and purpose of the installation."[187] This seems to indicate that Schlicker considered the differentiations between divisions more a matter of voicing rather than actual speaking pitch; otherwise, exceptions for smaller organs would not need to be made. Indeed Schlicker's theoretical design for a three-manual instrument included in his letter to Biggs includes an 8' and 4' Principal on every manual.

In practice, Schlicker alternated between a strict differentiation based on pitch and one based more on voicing with duplication of the lowest Principal voices among the manuals. Small to medium organs followed the concept of different pitch levels for the Principal bases. The organ at St. Luke's Lutheran, Chicago, a collaboration between Bunjes and Schlicker, is an example. The disposition of Principal bases follows this scheme precisely: 16' in the Pedal, 8' in the Great, 4' in the Swell, and 2' in the Positiv. This became standard in Schlicker's organs of similar size. The Church of the Ascension, Chicago; St. Michael's Cathedral, Boise; Kenmore Methodist, Kenmore, New York; Concordia Senior College, Ft. Wayne (also a collaboration with Bunjes) all follow this pattern. On the Valparaiso organ, Bunjes's and Schlicker's largest collaboration, this design principle is amplified: 32' Grossuntersatz in the Pedal (according to Bunjes this stands in the place of the 32' Principal[188]), 16' on the Great, 8' on the Swell, 4' Principal on the Positiv, and 2' on

[187] Schlicker to Biggs, March 6, 1957, Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI, reproduced as Appendix D. The other source is an undated address to the American Guild of Organists, reproduced as Appendix E.

[188] Bunjes, "Define Principles," 27.

the Brustwerk. Thus, the addition of an extra manual allowed the lowering of the Principal base of each manual without sacrificing a strict adherence to Bunjes's concept of the *Werkprinzip*. The inclusion of a 16' Principal on the Great, though, is a contradiction of Bunjes's own dislike of open 16' Diapason tone in the manuals. He considers it too extravagant because it greatly increased the cost of the organ and because it would require a 32' Principal in the Pedal.[189]

Schlicker's designs apart from Bunjes show more of an appreciation of 16' Principal tone in the manuals. The gallery organ at Grace Church, New York, included a 16' Principal on the Great, 8' on the Swell, and 4' on the Positive, and 32' pitch in the Pedal. The organ in the Walter B. Ford Auditorium at Ithaca College also follows this pattern. A strict interpretation of the *Werkprinzip* is thus followed, but the pitch base is lowered despite being a three-manual instrument. The organ at Trinity Episcopal, Buffalo, is somewhat exceptional: the Great and Swell are based on 16' and 8' Principals, respectively, but the Rückpositiv is based on a 2' Principal, with no Principal on the Choir. He skips the 4' pitch entirely as the Principal base of a division.

When it came to distinguishing the Principal-pitch bases of the divisions of an organ, Schlicker was less dogmatic than Bunjes about making the distinction based on pitch. Schlicker certainly adopted that concept enough that in organs such as St. Luke's and other organs of similar size, it became a predictable pattern. However, it is clear that when space and resources allowed, he favored at least a 4' Principal on each manual in order to provide a stronger foundational tone.

---

[189] Mark Kirchenberg, "The Organ Designs of Paul G. Bunjes: the Development of His Basic Principles." (Master's thesis: Concordia College River Forest, 1980), 98.

Evansville Lutheran Church of Our Redeemer, Evansville, Indiana; St. Olaf College; Texas Lutheran College, Seguin, Texas; and Occidental College are just some that did not base a division on the 2' Principal. First Methodist in Anniston, Alabama has 8' Principals on the Great and the Swell but no Principal on the Choir. The Church of the Holy Trinity, Toronto, and St. Peter's Episcopal, Albany, both included 8' Principals on all three manuals. The Great division of chancel organ at the Cathedral of the Incarnation in New York City is based on a 16' Principal, and the Swell and the Positiv are each based on a 4' Principal. On the gallery organ at First Congregational, Los Angeles, the four manuals are based on 16', 8', 8', and 4'. Schlicker thus remained closer to his stated ideal design for a three-manual organ but exhibited flexibility in design rather than dogmatically adhering to a concept.

The inclusion of lower-pitched Principal bases in multiple manuals as the size of an organ increases is closer to historical German Baroque practice than the 20th-century concept of *Werkprinzip* to which Bunjes adhered. In his 1946 essay, Bunjes cites historical examples for his concept, but they are all small to medium organs. The larger an organ became, though, the less this remained the case. The large organ in the west end of the Marienkirche in Lübeck, Germany, had three manuals with Principal bases of 16', 8' and 8' and 32' in the Pedal, as did the Johanniskirche organ in Lüneburg. The organ at the Katharinenkirche in Hamburg was the same, except that it had a fourth manual which also had an 8' Principal. Some organs such as St. Blasien in Mühlhausen did follow the 8', 4', 2' concept in the manuals, but even smaller organs such as the Scholosskirche in Weimar (two manuals) and "Totentanz" organ in the Marienkirche, Lübeck (three manuals) had

more than one 8' Principal in the manuals. Historical builders adapted their specifications for each project. Although Schlicker did not include 8' Principal tone as often as these historical, classical builders, Schlicker's flexibility with the *Werkprinzip* was closer to historical practice than Bunjes's concept was.

Related to the subject of the *Werkprinzip* is the 16' tone found in the manual divisions. As mentioned above, Bunjes rejected open 16' Diapason tone as too wasteful of resources and also rejected 16' covered tone because Quintadenas[190] lacked enough fundamental to blend and more moderately scaled pipes such as Gedeckts[191] lack pitch definition.[192] To remedy this he developed the Konisch Gedackt, a conical covered pipe "constructed at wider-than-normal scale, with a one-to-two taper ratio. Its physical length is related to its pitch length as three to four."[193] While Schlicker was not averse to including this in collaborations with Bunjes,[194] he usually used either 16' open tone or, more commonly, 16' fully covered tone such as a Quintadena, Gedeckt, or Pommer.[195] Most installations with two 16' voices in the manuals included one closed and one open, allowing for gravity in tone on both manuals while still keeping the choruses distinct. Schlicker's own stated preference for 16' tone to be rich in overtones,[196] hence the reliance on

[190] A Quintadena is a fully covered stop in which the twelfth is prominent.

[191] A Gedeckt is a medium-scaled stopped flute.

[192] Ibid., 98.

[193] Ibid., 99

[194] St. John Lutheran Church, Merill, Wisconsin.

[195] A variety of Quintaton.

[196] Appendix B.

Quintadenas and Pommers which place less emphasis on the fundamental than wide-scaled Bourdons.[197]

One stop which Bunjes claimed to have revived from his studies of Praetorius was the 8' Flachfloete. He describes it as a stop of moderate scale with a comparatively wide mouth, very low cutup, and a slight degree of conicity. The tone is described as somewhat shallow and not nearly as pompous as that of the wide-scaled, open conical pipes such as the Gemshorn or Spitzfloete.[198] Bunjes included this on the Schlicker organ built for the gymnasium at Concordia College, River Forest, in 1958.[199] However, Bunjes actually discovered neither the name nor the stop. Other builders had been using the term since the seventeenth century, and contemporary builders used the term as well on their organs.[200] The name "flachfloete" covers a number of flute stops of various constructions which can differ widely in tone although they are usually metal, tapered, and have a wide mouth. When Schlicker included the stop on other organs with which Bunjes had no connection such as St. Paul's Chapel, Trinity Parish, New York, he used a general concept and not something peculiar to Bunjes. Schlicker therefore relied on his own knowledge and not information Bunjes gave him.

Bunjes's influence as a consultant was his most important connection with Schlicker. As a faculty member at one of the main centers for training church workers in the Lutheran Church – Missouri Synod, he possessed an authority in the

---

[197] A Bourdon is stopped flute of large scale.

[198] Bunjes, *The Praetorius Organ*, 637.

[199] Kirchenberg, 93.

[200] e.g., Trinity Lutheran Church, Worcester, Massachusetts, Noack organ, 1969.

eyes of churches throughout the nation and was often hired to assist with the purchase of a new organ. He never told clients that Schlicker must be the builder, as the selection of other builders by some churches demonstrates, but his recommendation would have carried great weight in the final decision. The two men worked together from the early 1950s through the early 1970s, but not exclusively. Bunjes also worked with Schantz and Zimmer, so Bunjes did not ensure contracts for Schlicker, but he no doubt pointed many committees in his direction.

Over the years, many of Bunjes's conclusions about the Praetorius organ and what it meant for twentieth-century organ building have been questioned. This has led to the discarding of some of the more "quirky" elements of his organs such as his special stops and redesigning the specifications.[201] Bunjes's work and thoughts about his work with Schlicker from former employees are mixed. Ken List, who joined the company and later became assistant to Schlicker until 1974, remembers that Bunjes gave Schlicker a lot of business, and so Schlicker allowed him some latitude in their design yet tried to reign in his ideas so that they still sounded like Schlicker organs.

> The one man I never understood who supported Schlicker very strongly but not exclusively was Paul Bunjes, but Bunjes designed his own specifications, and everybody I have worked with felt Schlicker, who wound up having to build those organs, hated them because of his weirdness. His ideal organ was somehow designed by Praetorius, but it didn't sound that way. Well, you've seen the specs, you know what I mean. And many times the organs had only one 8' reed in the pedal, and that was the Chalumeau. Who would have a 4' celeste in the swell with nothing to pair it with…and you couldn't talk him out of those things…

[201] The Dobson rebuild of the Valparaiso organ offers an example of such adjustments: "The Fred and Ella Reddel Memorial Organ at Valparaiso University," *The Diapason*, January 2002, 18-20.

> I think Schlicker built more Bunjeses than anybody else – and people of course said "How can he have any integrity if he built them?" Well, the truth is you couldn't turn down business, and I will say that Schlicker and some of his underlings spent a lot of time trying to argue out of those specifications.[202]

List points to the amount of business brought to Schlicker as a primary reason for their large number of collaborations. As a professor at a college of the Lutheran Church – Missouri Synod, Bunjes had an authority which many respected, and he was often hired as a consultant by congregations purchasing a new organ. Although Schlicker did not agree with all of Bunjes's ideas, he valued the business Bunjes gave him and worked as much as he could to build organs according to Bunjes's specifications that still matched his own ideas and concepts.

Manuel Rosales remembers the efforts he and other voicers in the company made in order to make some of Bunjes's ideas work on a Schlicker organ:

> He would design an organ to be built with a collection of sounds that had very little to do with each other. One of his favorite was a Konisch [Röhr]Gedeckt that started out as a Quintadena, became a Gedeckt, turned into a Rohrflöte, and in the treble turned into a Blockflöte. Yikes. Do you know what a voicing nightmare that is? How do you rationalize all these sounds? You do your best. And then he was the one who specified the scales, not probably having [even] picked up a voicing knife and voiced them himself. But Schlicker gave him that power because he gave him a lot of business. And the customers knew what they were getting, and what they wanted was a Bunjes organ with all its quirky stuff. So we had our names for those stops. We called them the "milk cans." "Have you voiced the milk can yet?" You would just have fun with a cutup knife on those things because the inherent sound is so enharmonic, these enharmonic effects that are so unpleasing to the ear so you keep cutting up and cutting up till you finally find a sound you can tolerate. That wasn't what was on the sheet either. So, to summarize, I think he was a very bright man, he had a lot of great ideas, but he didn't change with the times. He still thought his ideas were good long after I think most people were bored with them. I also

[202] Ken List, interview by author, Wooster, OH, July 28, 2012.

> participated in a small organ that he designed for Eastman, and I had friends that went to Eastman and they didn't like the organ. They just thought it was ridiculous. I don't think it's there anymore. But did you ever hear Valparaiso before it was changed? I think it was a wonderful organ. It had a lot of interesting ideas, but in an acoustic of that magnitude, you can have lots of ideas that work. They don't work in a dead room in a little Lutheran church in Green Bay, Wisconsin.[203]

Rosales recognizes that Bunjes had a number of good ideas, but he lacked the experience and ability to put them in practice and judge whether or not they worked. Like Ken List, Rosales points to the amount of business Bunjes gave to Schlicker as the reason Schlicker allowed him so much input on the organs. This economic reason explains why Schlicker collaborated with Bunjes so often even though they had different ideas about tonal design. Bunjes also worked with other builders such as Schantz, Casavant, and Zimmer; the two men maintained separate spheres although they often intersected.

Despite the idiosyncratic stoplists and pipework that some of Bunjes's organs had, Bunjes's work with Schlicker made the latter popular in Lutheran circles, and Schlicker gained a lot of business through this association. Although the two worked closely together, Schlicker tried to allow Bunjes some freedom with the designs while trying to keep him within the bounds of his own principles of design so that the organ would still be representative of the Schlicker sound.

Another Lutheran with whom Schlicker established a deep personal and professional relationship was Paul Manz. Manz spent the whole of his career in church music, having attending Concordia Teachers College, River Forest, Illinois,

[203] Manuel Rosales, interview by author, Los Angeles, CA, June 28, 2012.

one of the primary training grounds for Lutheran teachers. After teaching a few years in Wisconsin, Manz accepted a post at Mt. Olive Lutheran, Minneapolis in 1946. This was the longest position he held and, in conjunction with his work at Concordia College, St. Paul, was where he developed a national reputation as an organist, especially as an improviser. Manz had Schlicker organs installed at both these institutions and in doing so gave Schlicker and his work prominent exposure through church services, recitals, hymn festivals, and recordings.

When Manz arrived at Mt. Olive, the organ available was a 1931 Welte-Tripp, dominated by 8' stops with a large amount of unification, far away from the classical designs of Schlicker and the organ reform movement.[204] The instrument was expanded in the early 1950s in order to get rid of the unification, but by the next decade Manz felt it needed serious attention. A report by a committee, of which Manz was a member, detailed improvements needed to improve the music program in general and identified the organ's deficiencies in particular: poor placement, high wind pressures, heavy nicking of pipes, poor metal composition of pipes, dead notes, and inaccessibility to make repairs. Of particular interest is the comparison between the organ in question and classical organs. The introduction of the section concerning the organ clearly sets the tone of the ensuing criticisms:

> The present organ was built at a time some thirty-five years ago when American organ builders, forsaking the fine organ building tradition inherited from Europe, turned to a new and temporarily more exciting sound created by the theater organ industry promoted by Kimball of Chicago and Würlitzer [*sic*] of New York. While our present organ was not labeled as a theater organ when it was built, its

[204] Scott Hyslop, *The Journey Was Chosen*. (St. Louis: MorningStar Music Publishers, 2007), 30.

> conception and manifestation was strictly that of the theater instrument. A casual investigation will confirm this statement.[205]

The entire concept of the present organ is called into question, and the phrase "temporarily more exciting sound" contrasted with the "fine organ building tradition inherited from Europe" implies that the only real solution to the organ's deficiencies is a return to the European tradition and the purchase of a new organ. The succeeding criticisms compare traditional low wind pressures which "give gentle sounds which are never forced" to the current pressures (four to seven inches), "almost twice as high as it should be." The "round, sonorous tone" of pipes with few or no nicks is contrasted with stronger, louder sounds produced by heavy nicking, high cutups, and high wind pressures. The extensive use of lead in the Diapason chorus is seen as deficient when compared with the "fine, beautiful tones" produced by pipes of zinc, tin, and copper.[206]

Although the derogatory label "theater organ" is used by Manz to ensure the removal of the Welte-Tripp organ, the only true similarity between an actual theatre pipe organ was the scaling of and tone color from the pipework. Although most pipe organs built in the early twentieth century, including those built for theaters, had generously scaled, heavily nicked, and heavily winded pipework, there existed only three differences between an average church organ and theatre organ: the horseshoe console design synonymous with the "mighty Wurlitzer"; extensive

---

[205] Untitled and undated report, 4. The committee, consisting of Norman Priebe, Robert Kiercks, Leland Bauck, Harry Mueller, Pastors Mueller and Schrodel, and Paul Manz, was appointed after a congregational meeting in October 1960. Other issues discussed in the report are lighting, heating, and ventilation in the balcony; space for the choirs, and the dry acoustic in the church. Copy in Justin Matters's files.

[206] Ibid, 5.

unification of each rank; and the inclusion of traps, percussions, and other sound effects. The report uses the term "theater organ" in order to strengthen the argument that the Welte-Tripp should be discarded.

The report presents a number of options to remedy the situation and does not specifically endorse one over the other. However, the details presented and the contrast between the Welte-Tripp and the classic style of building clearly point to the desire to replace the instrument with one more in line with the organ reform movement. This was probably the influence of Manz. In 1955 and 1956 Manz spent a year in Europe on a Fulbright scholarship, studying with Flor Peeters in Belgium and Helmut Walcha in Germany. During this year Manz had the opportunity to hear both classical instruments and organs which emerged from the Orgelbewegung. Like Noehren, he carried these sound ideals and ideologies back with him and used them as guides when selecting builders for new organs at Mt. Olive and Concordia St. Paul.

Mt. Olive considered three builders for the new organ: Casavant, Holtkamp, and Schlicker. Manz first became acquainted with Schlicker's work through the instruments at Concordia Senior College, Ft. Wayne, St. Olaf College, and the Evangelical Lutheran Church of St. Luke, Chicago. Manz considered the combination of the Ft. Wayne organ with the outstanding architecture and acoustic of the chapel, and they created a special fondness for the instrument in his heart.[207] Manz himself dedicated the St. Luke organ in 1963. Manz wanted a Schlicker organ after he came in contact with notable instruments. He therefore is an example of

[207] Hyslop, 50.

how Schlicker's ability to gain key contracts in prominent churches and institutions led to large exposure and further contracts.

As Manz's national reputation grew, Schlicker's reputation grew as well. The specific association of Schlicker's organs with the "Lutheran sound" through Manz's organ music is discussed in detail in the next chapter. Here, it is important to note how that influence spread. In the 1970s Manz made a series of recordings on the organ at Mt. Olive which were distributed by Concordia Publishing House, the publishing arm of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod.[208] These recordings were very well received and sold well, enabling a large audience to hear a Schlicker organ played by a well known composer writing specifically for that instrument. As a professor of music at Concordia St. Paul, Manz also played a crucial part in securing a contract with Schlicker for the organ at the college's new Buetow Music Center. The organ was completed in 1974, shortly before Schlicker's death in December of that year, and was featured in the 1975 Region VI convention of the American Guild of Organists.

Schlicker and Manz also developed a close friendship. Manz had Schlicker build a two-manual, nine rank organ for his home[209] and had Schlicker personally sign the organ. Manz dedicated his setting of the tune OLD HUNDREDTH (most commonly known as the Long-Meter Doxology) to Schlicker. After Schlicker's death, his widow, Alice, personally invited Manz to play the funeral at Holy Trinity Lutheran in North Tonawanda, Schlicker's congregation. In an interview with Scott Hyslop, Manz reflected on his impression of Schlicker:

---

[208] The recordings and all of Manz's music are now sold by MorningStar Music Publishers, St. Louis.

[209] The organ is now located at Duquesne University in Pittsburgh.

> Herman Schlicker was a prince of a man whose only ambition was to make the current organ he was planning the best one he ever built. He was German and trained in Europe. He tolerated no shoddy workmanship and was constantly checking instruments as they went through the process of building, voicing, shipping and installation. His staff of professionals feared his criticisms, but adored his talents.[210]

Manz's admiration for the quality of Schlicker's work and the respect he gave his customers is very similar to the reaction of Schlicker's very first customers as seen in chapter two. Schlicker carried these traits throughout his career, and they helped forge personal relationships which led to a sense of loyalty between organists and the organ builder, a loyalty which enabled him to sustain and grow his business.

Schlicker's association with these men gave him credibility in the eyes of other musicians This allowed him to create a "brand" for his company and give himself legitimacy by pointing to the number of high profile churches and universities who bought his organs on the recommendation of his friends. R. E. Coleberd compares it to automobile manufacturers who became "trophy builders": makers of products that acted as status symbols and strengthened their purchasers' social status.[211] He traces a series of organbuilders through American history who, at various periods, established their reputations as upscale builders. In the early twentieth century, at the height of the Romantic organ, Skinner was the preferred builder of choice. As the organ reform movement began in reaction to the Romantic sound, Aeolian-Skinner and Holtkamp sold instruments to institutions who wanted to portray themselves as up-to-date with the latest musical styles. In the 1950s and

---

[210] Hyslop, 50.

[211] R. E. Coleberd, "Trophy Builders and Their Instruments: A Chapter on the Economics of Pipe Organ Building." *The Diapason*, August 1996, 11-13.

60s, Schlicker established himself as a preferred builder because he had received the endorsements of leading organ celebrities. Without these endorsements, and given his own lack of interest in the then accepted traditional means of advertising, Schlicker would likely have remained a recognized and respected builder, but one without a prominent national presence.

Chapter 4

Schlicker and the Lutheran Sound

Schlicker has received little devoted attention in the study of American organ building. When he is mentioned, though, authors often note his popularity among Lutherans.[212] Schlicker, however, never marketed himself as a Lutheran organbuilder. As discussed in the previous chapter, his advertisements contained little text and occasionally a picture of a recent installation. Some of these pictures happened to be of organs at Lutheran churches or colleges, but other instruments built for other denominations were pictured as well. Furthermore, these advertisements never mentioned why the churches chose him to build their organs. The largest advertisement with a picture features the Fred and Ella Reddel Memorial Organ at Valparaiso University in the same issue with Bunjes's description of the organ. This is a full-page ad, but it says nothing about the organ; the text gives only the name of the organ, its location, and the name and address of the Schlicker company.[213]

Schlicker grew in prominence in the organ building world at a time of transition in Lutheran music. Lutherans were beginning, for theological reasons and aided by the early music revival, to reexamine their musical heritage dating back to the Reformation. At the same time, they were producing new music which was influenced by the organ reform movement and neoclassicism. This created an

---

[212] R. E. Coleberd, "Trophy Builders and Their Instruments: A Chapter on the Economics of Pipe Organ Building." *The Diapason*, August 1996, 12 ; Jonathan Ambrosino, "Lost Generation." *Choir and Organ*, May/June 2005, 58; Lawrence Phelps, "A Short History of the Organ Revival." *Church Music*, 67:1, (repr. St. Louis: Concordia, 1967), 17.

[213] *The Diapason*, January 1, 1960, 5.

environment eager for instruments that differed from the Romantic organs Lutherans were accustomed to hearing and using in their churches in the first half of the twentieth century. Schlicker's sound came to be associated with the "Lutheran sound" because theologians and musicians such as Walter Buszin began identifying the Lutheran organ sound with the classical organ sound. Because Schlicker was already building organs in this style, they turned to him to produce instruments for their colleges and churches. As Lutheran composers began writing music for these instruments, the Schlicker sound became synonymous with the sound of Lutheran music.

One of the most prominent voices calling for Lutherans to return to their musical heritage was Walter Buszin. An ordained pastor in the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, Buszin spent most of his career teaching music and liturgics at colleges and seminaries within the Synod, most importantly Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, from 1947 to 1966. His musical and theological education at Northwestern University, Concordia Seminary, and Union Theological Seminary allowed Buszin to study the music of the early Lutheran Church, a topic not well explored in the 1930s and 1940s. His master's thesis at Union, *Johann Walther – The Father of Lutheran Church Music* and his master of sacred theology thesis from Concordia, *The Golden Age of Church Music*, indicate the direction in which he was moving.

Buszin believed in an intimate connection between theology and music within the church, and he connected the Lutheran orthodoxy of the 16th and 17th centuries with the music produced by its composers. This Golden Age produced

composers such as Johann Walter, Heinrich Scheidemann, and Heinrich Schütz, with J. S. Bach as the last representative of true Lutheran music. When theology began to decline, so did the church's music:

> In the late 17th and the early 18th century, theology became in large part an expression of *pia desideria*, of pious desires, while church music became an expression of emotional effusion and effeminacy. Services of worship became nothing more than *collegia pietatis;* and virile *cantus firmus* type of church music, until then a symbol of the church, was dropped, and sweet music, with pleasant texts took its place. Sugar-coated harmonies replaced virile unisons, and counterpoint polyphony, when used, became as thick and muddy as the theology of those years.[214]

This connection between theology and church music, that theology is doxology, led him to reject Romanticism and subjectivism as inappropriate for the church:

> Doxologies are directed Godward; they are objective and Trinitarian in content and expression. These two important factors close the doors of doxological theology and church music to sentimentality, sensuousness, vainglory, and to striving for effects. People do not sentimentalize about the Holy Trinity.[215]

For Buszin, then, objective, clear proclamation of doctrine was the prime consideration for determining the appropriateness of music for the church. One of the reasons for his rejection of most music after Bach (excepting his own time) for liturgical use was that it was written not for the liturgy but rather for the concert hall.[216] This led to his excitement with and encouragement of the Baroque music revival. He considered this the Golden Age of Lutheran music, and he kept in touch

---

[214] Walter E. Buszin, "Theology and Church Music as Bearers and Interpreters of the *Verbum Dei*" in *Music for the Church: the Life and Work of Walter Buszin*, ed. Daniel Zager (Ft. Wayne: Concordia Theological Seminary Press, 2003), 213.

[215] Ibid, 222-223

[216] Walter Buszin, "Cultural Values of Church Music and Liturgical Worship." In *The Musical Heritage of the Church, Vol. VI*, ed. Theodore Hoelty-Nickel (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House), 65.

with both American and German scholarship in organbuilding and music. He insisted that musicological study and its theological implications go hand in hand and considered the Baroque revival useless without an evaluation of its religious context and setting.[217] In the same way, he championed Bach and his predecessors as distinctly Lutheran, and he derided the French manner of playing Bach as the merely aesthetic approach.[218] "A purely aesthetic approach will never succeed in enabling truly Christian music and art to reach their final goal."[219] At the same time, he was embarrassed that other churches were ahead of the LC-MS in seeing the value of 17th- and 18th-century music.[220]

This idea that Romantic music was unsuitable for Lutherans was unique neither to Buszin nor the LC-MS. Charles Anders, professor of church music at St. Olaf College, connected modern Biblical scholarship to contemporary composition:

> Just as Biblical theology seeks to comprehend and communicate the meaning of Scriptural revelation with maximum literalness and clarity, the sensitive composers of today's church music have eschewed the tonal pleasantries of the 19th century to provide settings which will proclaim the Biblical text with truth and power.[221]

Though addressing only the contemporary church music scene, this attitude echoes the conviction that music must be objective and clear, avoiding sentimentality, in order to be useful for true proclamation.

---

[217] Kirby L. Koriath, *Music for the Church: The Life and Work of Walter E. Buszin* (Ft. Wayne: Concordia Theological Seminary Press, 2003), 27.

[218] Ibid, 44.

[219] Buszin, "Theology and Church Music as Bearers of the *Verbum Dei,"* 220.

[220] Ibid, 26.

[221] Charles R. Anders, "Church Music and the Ecumenical Scene." In *The Musical Heritage of the Church, Vol. VII,* ed. Theodore Hoelty-Nickel (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House), 35.

These ideas about church music naturally led Buszin to make pronouncements about organs and their music, especially as used in Lutheran churches. Buszin himself was an organist, having studied with Wilhelm Middelschulte and Clarence Dickinson, and early in his career gave public recitals. This not only gave him actual exposure to organs and organ music of his day, but also some authority to speak on such matters.

One characteristic of Lutheran liturgical music which Buszin repeatedly points to is its objectivity. Buszin connects the ability to clearly hear a chorale melody with the objective proclamation he found so important. For this reason he considered Buxtehude's chorale preludes to be less than successful because, as opposed to Pachelbel and others who left the cantus unadorned and free from subjective interpretation, Buxtehude "revealed a too independent spirit which thereby doomed many of these compositions."[222] By way of contrast, Buszin regarded Michael Praetorius's chorale fantasy on *Ein feste Burg* as the "greatest extant organ work based on this hymn. The fantasy is indeed as monumental as the chorale itself and in a most effective manner is expressive of the spirit and character of the chorale, which is its *cantus firmus.*"[223] This fantasy is in the style of a chorale motet; each line of the melody is treated as a point of imitation, allowing the cantus to be in the forefront of the texture at all times.

---

[222] Walter Buszin, "Dietrich Buxtehude (1637-1707): On the Tercentenary of His Birth." *The Musical Quarterly* 23 (October 1937), 481; as quoted in Koriath, 47.

[223] Walter Buszin, "Organ Music for the Liturgical Service." *Music for the Church: The Life and Work of Walter Buszin, with Essays by Walter Buszin*, ed. Daniel Zager (Ft. Wayne: Concordia Theological Seminary Press, 2003), 158.

This push for objectivity led Buszin to reject the Romantic, expressive organs of the 19th and 20th centuries. After detailing the intrusion of secular elements into even Lutheran organ music, Buszin observes:

> Together with these developments soon came another change: the organ became an expressive instrument and thus prepared the way for the *vox humana,* the *Unda Maris,* the tibia, the Chinese bells, and the *pleno organo con tremolo.* While calling attention to the early development of the expressive organ, Curt Sachs rightly says: "From the viewpoint of a pure organ, these expressive devices inaugurated an era of degeneration."[224]

According to Buszin, an overemphasis on expression ruined the true character of the organ. Objectivity in organbuilding, characterized by pure organ tone, matched the objectivity Buszin found necessary in true Lutheran theology; expressivity and subjectivity were, to Buszin, signs of degenerate organbuilding and a degenerate theology. Organbuilding and theology were not two complementary ideas. Rather, each was integral to the true expression of the other.

Buszin also recognized the need to train organists to adjust to this style of organbuilding. He thought it impossible for a liturgically-minded pastor to work with

> an organist who believes in perpetuating the old-time movie organ tradition and who derives great pleasure from extracting tears and unbalancing emotions through the use of what Ernest M. Skinner has provocatively called the "nox vomica." There is no instrument on which you can bluff your way through and impress people with so little musicianship and sensuous deception as on the theatrical and the romantic type of organ with all its gadgets, swell pedals, tremolos, and who knows what else.[225]

[224] Buszin, "Organ Music for the Liturgical Service," 163.

[225] Buszin, "Organ Music for the Liturgical Service" (MS), 23-24, as quoted in Koriath, 45.

Buszin saw the romantic organ and the style of playing associated with the instrument as dangerous to the theological health of the people. It undermined the objectivity that a pastor might impress upon his congregation. By calling it a "sensuous deception," he attaches a trace of evil to the style, making it directly opposed to godly Lutheran worship.

For his part, Buszin became a vocal supporter of the organ reform movement because he saw a clear connection between the subjectivity and sentimentalism he was trying to purge from the church and the romantic organ most suited towards this music:

> I invite you to draw your own conclusions as to what kind of organ culture has its roots in the Victorian romantic organ. Look at the compositions that were written for it, and look at the organists who are imbued with its spirit and impressed by its weaknesses, and you will soon discover the type of church-music culture they represent… If you will but look at the church art you find in most churches, you will soon discover that it is very much in keeping with the romantic type of organ. The same may be said, of course, of nineteenth-century hymnody and choral music and of all the theatrical *Effekthascherei* which has found its way into much worship life of our day. We still have much of this, and the majority of our organists still prefer a four-manual organ to one that has only three; they still prefer having the entire organ enclosed and under expression, and they still desire as many mechanical devices as possible. Try to tell them that a three-manual organ is altogether sufficient, that at most only the swell should be under expression, and that too many mechanical devices endanger the real artistic quality of music and mechanize its performance, and you will be looked upon either with a blank stare or as an outdated simpleton.[226]

Just as he was working to rid theology and worship of sentimentality, he saw the need to rid churches of organs which, through their emphasis on expression, reinforced this sentimentality. Buszin approached the problem from both sides:

[226] Buszin, "Cultural Values of Church Music and Liturgical Worship," 70-71.

theologians and musicians must be trained to appreciate objective Lutheran music, and churches must possess organs which, through their clarity and objectivity, match this theology. Both must be in place for progress to be made.

These ideas eventually led Buszin to support the work of Walter Holtkamp. In addition to this objective nature of the classical organs which Holtkamp produced, Buszin also recognized and valued an authenticity in his work:

> Taking into serious consideration the great difference which exists between the orchestral and romantic type of organ and the classical organ, how, we ask, is it possible for a builder who for decades has built enclosed organs with a sensuous and sentimental type of organ tone and which may be played *multa con expressione* suddenly qualify himself of building classical organs? This is impossible…There is a certain amount of lack of artistic and commercial integrity involved in much of the movement. If classical organs are built, the should be built out of conviction and with a thorough understanding of all that is involved and not merely to make more money or keep up with the times…Mr. Holtkamp has built classical organs for many years. He has done this out of conviction, as may be seen from the fact that he built them despite the fact that he was for a number of years America's only builder of classical organs. For this reason the nature and character of his excellent work are by no means unknown in Europe. When his praises are sung by men like Albert Schweitzer, Christhard Mahrenholz, and Wilibald Gurlitt, the very men who initiated the classical-organ movement in Europe, then we ought most certainly give serious though not only to what he has done, but also to what he stands for.[227]

The starkness of Holtkamp's aesthetic appealed to Buszin because it matched his requirement that organs should be limited in their use of expression. Buszin appreciated the fact that Holtkamp was not adapting to a new trend in organbuilding; he developed his ideas before they became popular among American

[227] Ibid, 70.

organists and was a leader in the field, not a follower. This authenticity matched the objective authenticity Buszin desired in Lutheran theology and worship.

In 1953 Holtkamp installed an organ in the chapel of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, where Buszin was seminary organist, replacing an organ built by Wangerin in the 1920s. The new organ was given credit for improving the singing of the students.[228] For Buszin, this would have been the ultimate test of its usefulness since it would have united music with theology in order to strengthen it. Buszin's description of the organ in *The Lutheran Witness,* the official magazine of the Missouri Synod, notes that it is smaller than the previous organ, but it produces more sound because is installed along the wall, not in chambers, with many of the pipes in the open rather than enclosed. Buszin also drew attention to the straight specification with no borrowing or sharing of ranks among the divisions:

> Its tone is distinctive of an organ; it does not seek to imitate an orchestra. Its tone is firm, clear, and virile. It has no tremolo; only the Swell is under expression. After presenting his recital, Professor Fleischer remarked: "This organ is indeed ideal for worship purposes."[229]

This organ, then, represented the ideals of the organ reform movement: open placement of the pipework, independent divisions based on principal tone, and few expressive effects. Buszin therefore linked the production of true and healthy Lutheran music to the type of organ this movement produced.

This emphasis on clarity and purity was not unique to Buszin and other Lutherans. Buszin used language remarkably similar to Clarence Mader when describing the true sound of sacred music and the tonal characteristics of the organs

---

[228] "New Holtkamp Organ Opened in Seminary," *The Diapason*, June 1953, 6.

[229] Walter E. Buszin, "The New Seminary Organ" *The Lutheran Witness,* May 26, 1953, 5.

used in Christian worship. The two shared an ideal for which music must strive, but Buszin took it one step further and identified it with the sound which the Lutheran church once had and so claimed it for Lutherans as their own rightful heritage. He appropriated a sound ideal of the larger Christian culture around him as particular and distinctive of his own Lutheran heritage. No difference existed for him between an authentic Christian sound and an authentic Lutheran sound. This not only gave Lutherans a head start and set their music as a model for other Christians to follow, but it also created disdain for those Lutherans who did not embrace their heritage when others outside Lutheranism such as Mader began adopting the sound as their own.

According to Buszin, then, music that is authentically Lutheran has a clear, non-romantic sound, and the recovery of this aesthetic in contemporary Lutheran churches required the presence of organs which produced this masculine, objective, clear sound. This meant a rejection of the "romantic" organ with its possibilities of sentimentalism and individualism. Buszin believed that polyphonic music, by its very nature with its multiple independent lines, is more objective than homophonic music with a solo melody which draws attention to itself and its own expression. A Lutheran organ, then, was one on which polyphonic music was best rendered and whose tonal makeup was dictated by its ensemble rather than its individual colors.

This emphasis on the ensemble of an organ rather than its solo effects places the Lutheran organ squarely within the sphere of the classical organ. The scheme of the Holtkamp organ Buszin had installed, given in figure 5, illustrates this emphasis.

GREAT		POSITIV	
Quintadena	16′	Singende Gedeckt	8'
Principal	8′	Rohrflöte	4'
Chimney Flute	8′	Octava	2'
Octave	4′	Larigot	1 1/3'
Doublette	2′	Cymbal	III
Mixture	IV	Cromorne	8'
Trumpet	8′		
		PEDAL	
SWELL		Subbass	16'
Copula	8′	Quintadena (Gt.)	16'
Dulciane	8′	Violon	8'
Gemshorn	4′	Flauto Dolce	8'
Nazard	2-2/3′	Choralbass	4'
Nachthorn	2′	Mixture	III
Terzian	II	Posaune	16'

Figure 5. Specification of the 1953 Holtkamp organ at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis. *Source:* Organ Historical Society, "Organ Historical Pipe Organ Database," http://database.organsociety.org/SingleOrganDetails.php?OrganID=37897, (accessed March 30, 2013).

Each division is almost exclusively a straight chorus with almost no multiple stops at the same pitch. Each voice on the Great, with the exception of the Chimney Flute and the Trumpet, have a definite function as part of the Principal chorus. The other two manuals have choruses based on 4' and 2' Prinicpals (the Gemshorn on the Swell stands in place of the Principal, a practice Schlicker occasionally followed as well.)

Figure 6 gives the specification of an organ Schlicker installed at Grace Lutheran Church, Albert Lea, Minnesota, of very similar design to the Holtkamp organ at Concordia Seminary.

GREAT		RÜCKPOSITIV	
Quintadena	16'	Holzgedeckt	8'
Principal	8'	Rohrfloete	4'
Spillfloete	8'	Italian Principal	2'
Octave	4'	Quint	1 1/3'
Waldfloete	2'	Scharf III	2/3'
Mixture V	1 1/3'	Krummhorn	8'
Trompeta Real	8'	Tremolo	
Chimes			
		PEDAL	
SWELL		Principal (ext.)	16'
Rohrfloete	8'	Subbass	16'
Principal	4'	Flachfloete	8'
Koppelfloete	4'	Choralbass	4'
Nasat	2 2/3'	Rauschpfeife III	2 2/3'
Nachthorn	2'	Fagott	16'
Terz	1 3/5'	Cornet	4'
Principal Mixture V	1'		
Schalmei	8'		
Tremolo			

Figure 6. Specification of the 1971 Schlicker organ at Grace Lutheran Church, Albert Lea, Minnesota. *Source: The Diapason*, August 1971, 15.

As on the Holtkamp, each voice has a definite place within an ensemble that encompasses a large portion of the harmonic spectrum. Although individual voices or combinations thereof can be used as solo voices, that role is secondary to their function within their own divisions. If Buszin thought Hotlkamp's concept was the ideal church organ, and Schlicker designed his organs in the same manner, it is not surprising that Schlicker became a popular builder for Lutheran churches and schools.

Noteworthy also is the organ repertoire chosen for the dedicatory service and recital. Pachelbel, J. S. Bach, Walther, and Praetorius all came from what Buszin called the "Golden Age." The only exceptions to this era on the programs

were Ludwig Lenel (1914-2002), a German organist and composer teaching at Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pennsylvania; and the Toccata in D Minor and Fugue in D Major from the *Zwölf Stücke,* Op. 59 by Max Reger. Lenel wrote in a neoclassic, imitative style, and so the aesthetic of his music matches that of the organ and the Lutheran ideal.[230] Reger's music, with its typically thick textures, extreme contrasts, and the requirement of a large organ able to convey emotional turbulence for the long duration of much of his music, at first seems somewhat out of place on the program and out of touch with the organ and its purposes. The Toccata and Fugue, however, are much shorter than his masterworks such as the Symphonic Fantasy and Fugue, Op. 57, or his large chorale fantasies. The textures are, for the most part, thinner and more transparent than the larger works. The music calls for dynamic and registration changes, but they differ from those in his symphonic works. Where the larger fantasies require rapid shifts in color that do not always correspond with the overall structure of the music, the dynamic and registration changes in the Toccata and Fugue are less rapid and correspond with larger ideas such as a sudden change in texture or entry of the fugal subject. The color is therefore subservient to the form, bringing it closer to the neoclassic aesthetic more in line with the more restrained and objective use of registration for which organs such as this were designed.

Buszin also saw a clear connection between the classical organ and the music written for it. When comparing the organs of Gottfried Silbermann to romantic organs, Buszin labeled the Silbermann's tones "not only beautiful, but also

[230] *The Parish Organist,* Heinrich Fleischer, ed. (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1953) contains four of his chorale preludes. See a discussion of the collection below.

masculine, firm, crystal-clear, and distinct" in opposition to the "soggy and spongy, muffled, sentimental, resultant, and synthetic" tones of the romantic organ. The clarity of the older instruments made them

> ideal for the liturgical type of service of the Lutheran Church and of other churches. A large percentage of the music written for this type of organ was composed by the great Lutheran masters of the 17th and 18th centuries. Music based on the Lutheran chorale is produced to the best advantage at this type of organ, whose pedal tones are as firm and clear as those of the manuals.[231]

The necessity of a "firm and clear" Pedal division on an organ meant to play Lutheran chorale preludes relates to the style of these preludes. As mentioned above, Buszin viewed polyphony as the most appropriate texture for Lutheran music due to its objectivity. Polyphonic textures require the bass to be heard as an independent melodic line and not simply as a harmonic bass. This requires a pedal division that matches the manuals in intensity and harmonic development. Furthermore, many chorale preludes require a solo voice in the feet which sounds in the treble register. This necessitates the inclusion of 4' and 2' stops which will sound one or two octaves higher, respectively, than written. Organs which lack stops at these pitches, as did most American organs of the early twentieth century, cannot play this music which Buszin considered vital to Lutheran worship. Organs such as Schlicker's which almost always included these registers therefore filled a real need for Lutheran musicians.

Buszin's appropriation of current trends to create and define a "Lutheran" sound thus extended beyond the field of church music but into a larger musical context. The Baroque music revival provided Buszin an opportunity to make the

[231] Walter E. Buszin, "The Organ in the Church." In *Christian Worship: Reprints from the American Lutheran Magazine*, ed. Paul John Thielo (New York: American Lutheran Publicity Bureau), 55.

music of 17th- and 18th-century Lutheran masters better known. He himself edited a volume of organ music from this period and acknowledged the greater interest in this music even outside Lutheran circles:

> The music world today is making wide use of the chorale preludes written by the Lutheran masters of the 17th and 18th centuries. We are convinced that this is not merely a passing fad, but rather an indication of the rapid rise of musical standards in America and a recognition of the superiority of this music for worship purposes. From a purely musical point of view one may rightfully refer to the chorale preludes of the Lutheran masters as tone poems in miniature; from a liturgical and ecclesiastical point of view, however, they are more than tone poems, for their real purpose, as intended by their composers, was to incite people to worship and to create an atmosphere or worship in services of worship.[232]

Buszin thus viewed the Baroque revival as key in the recovery of the Lutheran heritage and was hopeful that the large interest in this repertoire in general would fuel a revival of it within Lutheranism.

Although Buszin did not actively support Schlicker, he was important to the success of builders such as Schlicker because, through his work at the seminary and writings and presentations throughout the country, he created an attitude and expectation of what organ music should sound like and, especially for the pastors he helped train, what sort of organ should be purchased for their church if they want "true" Lutheran music. His students would be looking for clear, distinct tones produced by an organ with proper placement and independent divisions. They would know that organs which best played the music of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries would be the best organ for their congregations. Schlicker's design principles ideally reflected Buszin's philosophy of organs for worship

[232] Walter E. Buszin, ed. *Chorale Preludes by Masters of the XVII and XVIII Centuries* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1948), Foreward.

because their voicing was clear and transparent, each division had an independent chorus, and the independent pedal divisions allowed the performance of polyphonic music which Buszin believed formed the backbone of Western music. When pastors and musicians trained by Buszin recognized these features in Schlicker's organs, they viewed him as the ideal Lutheran builder.

Buszin was not the only influential American Lutheran who advocated the return to classic organ design as necessary for the proper practice of Lutheran music. In a manual that covers various topics of Lutheran worship, Carl Halter, then chair of the department of music at Concordia Teachers College River Forest, one of the Missouri Synod's colleges, addresses the proper type of organ and its role in the Lutheran service. Parallels with Buszin's thoughts are very clear. He calls the chorale preludes produced by the Church of the Reformation after 1500 "the core of all organ music" and the organs that were produced when these were written "tonally the finest organs ever built."[233] Two of the primary functions he lists for the church organ are the support of congregational singing and the use of solo music which "serves to emphasize the message of the service."[234] Thus, Buszin's emphasis was on the chorale and the function of music to communicate theology, both in hymnody and music based on these hymns.

Also like Buszin, Halter rejects the Romantic organ as adequate for these purposes. He regards the inclusion of stops imitative of orchestral instruments as a decline in organ design which produced ensembles that were "muddy and

[233] Carl Halter, *The Practice of Sacred Music* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1955), 23.

[234] Ibid, 25.

indecisive. The tone soon palled upon the ear, and musical people in droves fled the excruciating tonal experience."[235] Furthermore, he sounds very much like Buszin when he decries the romantic emphasis on expressiveness because it focuses attention on the organist and his feelings about the music rather than the music itself, fostering an individualism that "leads to confusion and decay." Thus, romantic devices and stops such as celestes and tremulants "have their legitimate (but limited) uses," but "their emphasis is unfair to both worship and to the organ itself." By contrast, the best of the organs influenced by the organ revival "have a clear, bright, easily produced tone and at the same time a full-throated ensemble of authentic organ grandeur."[236]

Although Halter did not endorse any specific builder (though he does refer to the recent, well built organs as "American classic," a term usually associated with Aeolian-Skinner), he clearly places himself among those who regard the organ influenced by the Orgelbewegung as that most appropriate for Lutheran use. The Lutherans using this manual as a guide would be led to builders who emphasized clarity necessary for polyphonic music and the support of congregational singing. Because these were two emphases which Schlicker placed on his organs, he would have been a natural candidate as a builder for congregations seeking to purchase an organ.

The combination of "clear, bright, easily produced tone" and that yet provides a "full-throated ensemble" which Halter describes was noted in a review

[235] Ibid, 24.

[236] Ibid, 24.

of a Schlicker organ and gives an idea of how organists wanted their instruments to sound:

> When you want to undergird the fundamental, instead of drawing a 32 open diapason (which is not here) you draw the 16' Fagotto with about 4 times the results. When an organist is not used to this type of instrument, he is inclined to draw the light 16' Quint and Bourdon and get the impression that the organ does not have much pedal. But as the wealth of upper work is added, it seems to cause the 16' and 8' stops to bloom and develop into enough weight to support the entire organ, but retaining the fast, articulate quality for which this type of organ is famous.[237]

Musicians such as Halter looking for this fullness without heaviness recognized it in Schlicker's work and therefore turned to him when they needed organs for their churches.

A manual published by the American Lutheran Church, while less polemical than Buszin and Halter, has many of the same ideas. In particular, *A Prelude to the Purchase of a Church Organ* advocates lower wind pressures and exposed pipework as beneficial not only in new organs, but also the refurbishing of older instruments.[238] These fit with the trends of the organ revival, and Schlicker's advertisements often draw attention to the use of low pressures. Notable also is the selection of instruments pictured throughout the manual. Of the eight organs, three are Schlicker instruments, the others representing the Möller, Casavant, and Schantz companies. The authors thus identified Schlicker's organs as consistent with the ideal sound suitable for Lutheran worship, and his predominance in the manual indicates the regard Lutherans held for his instruments.

---

[237] Eugene Clay, "The New Schlicker Organ in Immanuel's Westminster Chapel." *Worship and Arts*, December-January, 1960-1961, 14, Clarence Mader Collection, 37, Performing Arts Special Collections, University of Caifornia, Los Angeles.

[238] *A Prelude to the Purchase of a Church Organ* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1964), 35.

The revival of Baroque organ music occurring in the larger musical scene found its expression in the Lutheran church in the publication of practical volumes of music for service use. *The Parish Organist* series, published by Concordia Publishing House in 1954, is one of the most prominent products of this time. Originally four volumes and gradually expanded over the years, it contains hundreds of chorale preludes and short free pieces of easy to moderate difficulty, many without obbligato pedal, meant for the average parish organist with only a modicum of training. Of the one hundred hymn preludes and twenty free pieces in the original four volumes, fifty-six belong to the eighteenth century or before, and sixty-three to the twentieth century. The only nineteenth-century composition is Brahms's setting of "Schmücke dich," a setting similar in style to those in Bach's *Orgelbüchlein* with a clear and unadorned cantus over the counterpoint. Though not addressed in the publication itself, the implicit message is that music of the intervening period is not as suited or useful for the true Lutheran service.

Also noteworthy is the attitude toward contemporary composition. Sixty of the hymn preludes by twenty-four composers were specially commissioned for the collection.[239] This indicates that this was a living tradition, built on the works of the past masters but still producing compositions of musical and liturgical worth in the present in a contemporary idiom, influenced by neoclassicism. The Holtkamp installed at the St. Louis seminary was the instrumental equivalent: based on classical designs and principles, but using modern technology such as electric key action and combination pistons. Lutherans were not looking for historical

[239] Heinrich Fleischer, preface to *The Parish Organist: One Hundred Twenty Chorale Preludes, Voluntaries, and Postludes, by Older Masters and Contemporary Composers* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1953).

reproductions for their churches. Like the music produced at the time, organs suitable for Lutheran worship melded classic and contemporary principles into an instrument that upheld a heritage yet still remained a product of the twentieth century with its technological innovations.

The ideal organ for Lutherans, then, was one which supported congregational singing and could best play the music of the Lutheran masters of the past. The clearest enunciation of these principles is "The Church Organ: A Guide to Its Selection."[240] In this publication, the authors list three important features of organs:

1. The *Werk* principal: each manual is a complete organ in and of itself with a full and distinctive chorus.
2. The Pedal division should be complete by itself with minimal borrowing.
3. The organ should have beauty, clarity, and blend.[241]

After stating that organ music and organ building reached their climax in the early 18th century, an ideal being rediscovered and approached again, the authors make a clear connection between the literature and congregational singing, the two most important things in a Lutheran organ:

> The tonal resources required to play organ music, especially the masterworks of the 17th and 18th centuries, are essentially the same as those required to lead the singing of a congregation. This point, which might seem obvious when thinking of a church and an organ

[240] Philip Gehring and Donald Ingram. "The Church Music: A Guide to Its Selection" Second Edition. The Lutheran Society for Worship, Music, and the Arts, 1973. Of note to this project is that Donald Ingram is not Lutheran but had served as sales manager for the Schlicker Organ Company from 1956 to 1963.

[241] Ibid, p. 5

> of some size, is less obvious but true nevertheless of the smallest churches and organs as well. When very little money is available and the sanctuary is very small, a one-manual, pedalless organ of three ranks of pipes can fulfill both needs with distinction: its bright tone will both lead and support the roomful of singers, and its modest three ranks will be all that is necessary to perform a considerable amount of organ music, both early and modern.
>
> Of course, no small organ can render *all* organ music effectively. Since Lutheran church music is so deeply rooted in the chorale and the Scheidt-Buxtehude-Bach tradition of organ music, it is natural to expect an organ designed along German Baroque lines to fulfill its liturgical function in a Lutheran church. If we must choose between the chorale prelude literature for which this sort of organ is ideal, and the Franck-Widor-Dupré organ music for which the French Romantic organ is best suited, we would be better off with the former. Without completely excluding any period or style of organ music, it is best to let that type of organ music that will be used most dictate the tonal design of the organ.[242]

Lutherans thus consciously connected the German Baroque-inspired organ of the Orgelbewegung to the proper execution of Lutheran church music. Because the congregational chorale is the core of Lutheran music, music which is based on this chorale is the most important type to be played on the organ within the service. This music should clearly and objectively state the tune so that the worshiper can make the connection between the music and the text of the original chorale.[243] The organs which best do this are the ones which are modeled on those for which the pieces were written. Excepting contemporary composers, the vast majority of this music was written in Germany from about 1600 to shortly after the death of Bach in 1750. Therefore, an organ designed in the North German Baroque style of this period is the essential organ for proper, objective Lutheran worship. As a

---

[242] Ibid, 7-8.

[243] Paul Rosel, "The Organ in Worship with Emphasis on the Chorale Prelude," *The Musical Heritage of the Church* (Valparaiso: Valparaiso University, 1946), 121.

consequence, builders who worked in this style would be favored by these churches.

The connection between an organ ideally suited for polyphony and one ideally suited for congregational singing was reinforced by how Lutheran musicians of the time thought that hymns should be sung. In the period just preceding the publication of *Lutheran Book of Worship* (1978) and *Lutheran Worship* (1982), two major Lutheran hymnals of the time, an emphasis grew on unison singing of hymns by the congregation instead of the four-part singing common in many congregations in the first half of the twentieth century. This was a response to Dietrich Bonhoeffer's assertion that singing in unison is a physical manifestation of the unity of the Church.[244] As a consequence, many of the harmonizations published in these hymnals reflect a keyboard idiom rather than a vocal idiom in order to purposefully discourage part singing. Organists such as Paul Manz also began to improvise their own harmonizations. Church publishing houses such as Augsburg and Concordia published collections of these in order to encourage this trend and to provide variety to the hymn singing. Paul Bunjes published such a set though Concordia Publishing House, and their "distinctive idiom and technique of the organ using a somewhat polyphonic texture" were considered to be "ideal for accompanying congregational singing."[245] Congregations thus needed organs capable of playing polyphony clearly while still carrying the melody for them to follow. As Schlicker's work became known for its clarity and brilliance, they were seen as ideal in this regard.

---

[244] Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Life Together*, trans. John W. Doberstein (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1954), 57-59.

[245] Edward W. Klammer, preface to Paul Bunjes, *New Organ Accompaniments for Hymns* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1976).

The first instrument Schlicker built for a Lutheran church that received national attention was the organ at St. Mark Lutheran Church, Fremont, Ohio. On this project Schlicker collaborated with the theologian and musicologist Christhard Mahrenholz, one of the leading figures of the Orgelbewegung in Germany. Marenholz drew up the specifications and the pipe scales. The organ was dedicated at and featured throughout a church music conference sponsored by the Synod of Ohio of the United Lutheran Church in America. A review in *The Diapason* praised the organ as ideal for worship: "In this organ every voice contributes to the ensemble; on it the entire organ literature is playable, save the few compositions that actually require more than two manuals. For leading congregational singing it is described as ideal, as it is also for use with the choir and with other instruments."[246] As an organ based on ensemble rather than individual colors, able to play appropriate literature, and helpful in leading congregational singing, it therefore fit the ideal organ for Lutheran worship. Lutheran musicians who heard the organ at the conference or read about it in *The Diapason* would therefore recognize Schlicker as a builder of organs well suited for their churches.

Although Schlicker himself never advertised his organs as ideal to Lutheran worship, he articulated many of the concerns about organ design which were important to Lutheran musicians. In one of the rare instances in which Schlicker details his thoughts on organbuilding,[247] he discusses the differences between Classic instruments and Romantic instruments. After a brief historical introduction,

---

[246] Richard T. Gore, "Week of Dedication Opens New Schlicker Organ in Fremont, O." *The Diapason*, December 1953, 20.

[247] Attributed to Herman L. Schlicker, "The Organ—Yesterday and Today," n.d., Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI. See Appendix E.

he states that the Classic instrument is the best suited for both liturgical and non-liturgical uses because it can play music from all periods and lists ten key differences between the two styles of organs, five of which are directly applicable to requirements of an organ appropriate for Lutheran worship according to figures such as Buszin and Halter.[248] The first is the inclusion of full choruses through mixtures on all manuals. The second is a complete Pedal division whose size and harmonic development balances the manuals. Numbers three, five, and six concern details of pipe construction and voicing which cause a better blend of sound among the stops (stops differing in tone rather than power, wider scaled string stops, and gently voiced mixtures). The ability of the stops to blend well and not function merely as solo voices leads to a more cohesive ensemble. Schlicker's concept of a classic organ therefore matches the Lutheran concept of a proper church organ. For Schlicker, then, the organ designed among classic lines is the ideal church instrument. Although he never says it directly in the address, it can be assumed that he is referring to the type of organs he himself was building, and therefore his organs were the ideal instruments for churches.

Furthermore, there is a reciprocal relationship between the organs which Lutherans were buying and the music written for Lutheran use. As noted in the first chapter, the neoclassical movement created an aesthetic in which objective music played on more neutral tones as opposed to a more subjective interpretation which favored a greater use of color as an essential part of the performance. The music written by Lutherans for service use reflects these trends, and this creates a positive feedback loop between the music and the organs. The style of the music leads to a

[248] See Appendix E for all ten characteristics.

demand for organs which most faithfully render these pieces; the organs in turn inspire more music which creates a greater demand for these organs. Chapter 1 includes a discussion of the influence of neoclassicism on Hugo Distler and his organ music and organs. In America, this same type of interplay between composers and the organ occurred between Lutheran musicians such as Paul Manz and Jan Bender and Schlicker. At the same time, the music also reflects many of the ideals of Lutheran music as expressed by Buszin and others.

One of the most important examples of this phenomenon is the music of Paul Manz. Manz's personal relationship with Schlicker is discussed in the previous chapter. His music, though, especially the preludes contained in his numerous volumes of *Ten Chorale Improvisations* published by Concordia Publishing House, is also intimately connected with the sound of the Schlicker organ. Most notable are the registration indications for his hymn preludes. At times, he calls for general registrations such as "Small Plenum" ("All Praise to Thee, Eternal God," Set III) or "Flutes 8', 4'" ("Lord Jesus Christ, Be Present Now," Set II). Many other times, though, the registrations represent the stops and ensembles available on Schlicker organs. First, he very often calls for gapped registrations in which certain pitches of the harmonic series are omitted, e.g. "Flutes 8', 4', 1 3/5'" and "Flutes 8', 4', 1'." This creates a bright, transparent, and present sound, the kind of sound favored by Buszin as opposed to a heavier, more sentimental sound produced by layered 8' colors. Furthermore, the manual indications for the registrations in pieces published after 1966, the year the Schlicker organ was installed at Mt. Olive, correspond to the layout and nomenclature present on Manz's organ there. The Cornet V ("Savior

of the Nations Come, Set III) or the individual mutations (2 2/3' and 1 3/5') are always called for on the Swell, the division on which Schlicker almost always included the Cornet. When Manz calls for the 1 1/3', it is always on the Positive. If Schlicker included only one 16' foundation stop on the manuals, it was on the Great; if Manz calls for a 16' flute ("O God Thou Faithful God," Set III), it is on the Great. By Set IV Manz's stop indications became even more specific, not specifying merely "Flute" at a pitch level, but giving the exact stop name. "God the Father, Be Our Stay" calls for a 16' Pommer and 8' Spitzfloete on the Great, exactly matching the stops at Mt. Olive.

Also extremely important is the large and independent Pedal division Manz's music expects. Melodies are often soloed out in the pedal on 4' or 2' stops which more Romantic organs, with their small pedal divisions which relied on coupling and borrowing stops from the manuals due to the lack of stops above 8', would not have had. Furthermore, Manz indicates a 2' Block Floete in "Lord Jesus Christ, Be Present Now" from Set III. Not only does this assume a complete and independent pedal division, a hallmark of the Schlicker organ, but it also matches the nomenclature of the 2' flute stop on the Mt. Olive organ. Manz also often indicates 32'-4' choruses of foundations, reeds, and mixtures in the pedal. Schlicker himself indicated that a well designed organ included reed and mixture choruses on all divisions, including the pedal.[249] Thus, Paul Manz's organ music needs to be played on organs which followed Schlicker's design in order to sound as the composer intended. Manz traveled extensively around the country to lead hymn

[249] Schlicker to E. Power Biggs, March 6, 1957, Stanton Peters's files, Milwaukee, WI. See Appendix C.

festivals, and even if the organ he had available was not a Schlicker, he try to approximate those sounds the best he could. Those who heard him play thus connected those sounds with his music and Lutheran music in general.

The form and function of Manz's preludes are also directly related to the expectations of leaders such as Buszin. Most importantly, the tune is clearly heard, not hidden within the texture and usually in a straightforward manner with very little adornment. Buszin and Halter maintained that a chorale melody communicates a text and its inherent theology, and the best way to do this is to not let it be obscured. Manz's music fulfills this expectation. At the beginning of each collection Manz indicates that these pieces, while they may serve as voluntaries during the service, were developed in conjunction with the singing of the hymns, and some may even replace certain stanzas, communicating the text in an even more direct manner. The musical forms Manz chooses allow this use. Although a prelude may indicate a general mood or *affekt* of a hymn, objectivity is key. Vorimitation and the use of ritornellos are the two standard formal techniques Manz uses in almost all of his preludes. Absent are extended fantasias which aim to express the chorale rather than present it. Registration changes are rare. Thus, he avoids sentimentality and is clear and firm in his presentation, the hallmarks of true Lutheran music according to the theologians and musicians of the time. Because Manz's music fits the Lutheran ideal and was inspired by and composed for Schlicker organs, the sound of the Schlicker organ became identified with the Lutheran sound.

A contemporary of Manz's whose music also represents this trend was Jan Bender. Although he never became identified with Schlicker as Manz did, his music shares many of the same characteristics, though with some distinct differences. Most of his chorale preludes,[250] like Manz's, have a presentation of the tune preceded by counterpoint that is derived from the chorale itself. Bender's use of vorimitation is not as strict and regular as Manz's, and the sections between the official statements of each line of the chorale are more extended and free. Bender's harmonic language is also closer to that of contemporary Europeans than Manz's. Bender studied with Hugo Distler, and one of the trademarks of his style is the preponderance of quartal harmonies. Manz often used these harmonies as well, but not as extensively and often as part of a more extended tertian harmony. With Bender, though, the 4ths dominate the texture. This is very similar to the harmonic style of Distler as well as contemporaries such as Ernst Pepping and Hermann Schroeder. Bender also incorporates the *cantus firmus* differently than Manz. After vorimitation or a ritornello, Manz usually places the melody in the uppermost voice or in another voice on a solo sound. Bender sometimes does this, but he often places the melody within the texture without differentiating it by dynamic or timbre. An example of this style is the beginning of his prelude on "Praise to the Lord, the Almighty".[251]

This style is important because it represented the direction in which Lutheran music was moving in the 1960s and 70s. By extension, the organs which

[250] The occasional extended pieces such as his "Fantasy on *Mit Freuden Zart*" are exceptions.

[251] Jan Bender, *Festival Preludes on Six Chorales*, Op. 26 (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1963), 5. Interestingly, the cover of this volume is a picture of Schlicker's instrument at Concordia Senior College in Ft. Wayne.

best rendered this music would become connected to and identified with the "Lutheran" sound. As with Manz's music, a large, independent pedal division is required because Bender not only often puts the melody in the pedal but also because it is an equal part in the counterpoint. Furthermore, open sonorities such as fourths and fifths are clearer and more incisive when played on stops and combinations of stops that are rich in harmonic development; if too much fundamental is present, especially in contrapuntal textures, the transparency of the sound is lost. The sound of fourths and fifths is also more austere and less susceptible to sentimentality, and this would have hastened its approval. Schlicker's instruments contained pedal divisions equal to the manuals, and a large and extended portion of the harmonic spectrum was included in the stops which, according to E. Power Biggs, had a "wonderful transparency."[252] His organs, therefore, were ideal for this music and easily became associated with it and the Lutherans producing it.

Schlicker thus found in the Lutheran church a public that was trying to establish its musical identity and needed a sound it could call its own. Men like Walter Buszin were exhorting Lutherans to reclaim their heritage of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and, in conjunction with this, provide instruments on which this music could be best performed. They saw in the Orgelbewegung a chance to make this happen and obtain this sound, and in Schlicker they found a builder able to provide the colors and clarity they needed. As composers became

[252] E. Power Biggs to David Larson, May 22, 1952, E. Power Biggs Archive, Boston University, Boston, MA.

acquainted with these instruments, the music they produced in turn required organs of the same type.

Schlicker never marketed himself as the "Lutheran builder," but his instruments and their sound became very associated with the denomination. Many mentions of Schlicker in various articles[253] note his popularity within Lutheran circles. Certainly, the promotion of his work by Manz, Bunjes, and other Lutherans whom Lutheran churches and universities enlisted as consultants helped. Schlicker installed organs at Concordia Teachers College, River Forest; Concordia College, Seward; Concordia Senior College, Ft. Wayne; Valparaiso University; Concordia College, Ann Arbor; St. Olaf College; Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul; and Concordia College, St. Paul, to name some of the major institutions. As students left these schools and worked as musicians elsewhere, it was natural that, when searching for a new organ, they would return to the sound with which they were familiar. For example, Donald Rotermund, formerly the director of music at Zion Lutheran Church in Dallas, oversaw the installation of a Schlicker organ during his tenure there. He noted the clarity of the Schlicker practice instruments at Concordia River Forest as well of his favorable impressions of the instruments at Valparaiso and Concordia Senior College as one of the reasons he approached Schlicker for the project.[254]

---

[253] R. E. Coleberd, "Trophy Builders and Their Instruments: A Chapter on the Economics of Pipe Organ Building." *The Diapason*, August 1996, 12 ; Jonathan Ambrosino, "Lost Generation." *Choir and Organ*, May/June 2005, 58; Lawrence Phelps, "A Short History of the Organ Revival." *Church Music*, 67:1, (repr. St. Louis: Concordia, 1967), 17.

[254] Donald Rotermund, interview by author, Richardson, TX, June 22, 2012.

Ken List recalls the installation of the organ at Schlicker's own church, First Trinity Lutheran in Tonawanda.

> I was sitting there – Paul Manz played the organ in recital – and there was somebody from Buffalo, who was sitting with his friends behind us, not knowing that we were the Schlicker forces, "Oh, god, you didn't tell me this was going to be another Schlicker. Why do these Lutheran churches all have to have…why do they all seem to think Schlicker is god?" I turned around and said, "Maybe he is."[255]

Humorous as the story is, it demonstrates how powerful and pervasive the intersection of theology and music was and how closely Schlicker and Lutherans were related in many people's minds. Schlicker did not deliberately push his sound as the "Lutheran" sound; many other denominations bought his organs as well. Circumstances happened to be favorable in that a theological need (a firm, clear sound to proclaim firm, clear doctrine) matched musical and intellectual movements (the Orgelbewegung and neoclassicism), and Schlicker built organs that fit into all these currents. This made him popular with Lutheran institutions and created a firm connection between the Schlicker organ and the Lutheran sound.

[255] Ken List, interview by author, Wooster, OH, July 28, 2012.

Conclusion

Herman Schlicker was fortunate as an organbuilder because he emerged after World War II when the American organ world was in transition. Organists in the 1940s and 1950s reacted to the Orgelbewegung and the early music revival. At the same time, Lutherans became more aware and appreciative of their own musical heritage. These movements converged to create a demand for organs built in the classic style which, with their brilliance and clarity of ensemble, stood in contrast to the Romantic organ of the previous generation. Schlicker took advantage of this market for a new type of organ by collaborating with well respected organists such as Robert Noehren, E. Power Biggs, and Paul Manz. Their recommendations and the publicity they generated enabled Schlicker to become a key figure in American organbuilding without relying on a traditional advertising campaign. Using the training he had received in Europe, Schlicker was able to sell his product to a market already willing to buy.

The pattern of using personal friendships and recommendations to further his reputation continued after Schlicker's death on December 4, 1974. In contrast to G. Donald Harrison and Walter Holtkamp, whose deaths merited front-page coverage in *The Diapason,* Schlicker received only a few paragraphs in the obituary section.[256] Those who knew him and admired his work, though, saw him as a much more important figure than this treatment suggested. Benjamin Hadley, Schlicker's sales representative in the Midwest in the 1960s, saw Schlicker as a key contributor to the organ reform movement:

[256] *The Diapason*, February 1975, 8.

> I think you know Herman's place in history, but you are probably too close to realize the impact and extent of it. As the last of the three great pioneers in the classic revival in America, his passing marks the end of an era. Now, of course, the movement is so accepted that the earlier controversy seems so vague and distant. You probably remember just how real it was! In my mind, at least, Herman's contribution was the greatest of the three, and the results of his pioneering efforts will be appreciated – knowingly or unknowingly – well into the distant future.[257]

Hadley connects Schlicker with Harrison and Holtkamp, referring to "the three," and remarks that Schlicker's ideas became so standard that it is easy to forget how radical they were at the time.

Richard Peek, organist at Covenant Presbyterian Church in Charlotte, North Carolina, where the Schlicker firm was installing an organ when Schlicker died in December of 1974, also remarked on Schlicker's impact on American organbuilding:

> Let us think first on his work as an organ builder. It can be said without a doubt of contradiction that he was one of our major builders in America. From the day he opened his shop in the early thirties until his death this past Thursday, he consistently moved American organ building toward higher ideals and concepts of organ building. His concept of the classic organ which might be modified to play the music of other periods was quite different from the prevailing concept of other builders who attempted to add a few classic stops to the Romantic organ in order to play classic music, and his concepts resulted in an instrument of great integrity as well as flexibility. His complete pedal divisions in particular were in great contrast to many romantic instruments of his day, and did much to modify their pale and weak pedal divisions. He was the first American builder to build his own slider chests, and these, along with his unnicked pipework, low wind pressures, and open toe voicing, kept him in the forefront of American builders.
>
> As a person he was conscientious and hardworking, and he expected his employees to be the same. At the same time he was a warm and kind man, taking a personal interest in his employees and friends, and in their families as well. As one of his employees

[257] Ben Hadley to Alice Schlicker, December 10, 1974, in the possession of Elizabeth French.

> remarked to us last evening, he possessed the gift of making acquaintances friends.
>
> Here at Covenant Church we first made his acquaintance through the rebuilding of our beautiful chapel organ some 12 years ago. This association, which was pleasant and productive, led most recently to his choice as the builder of the Nebel Memorial Organ which is at the moment being installed in the balcony of our Church. We feel fortunate for his wisdom and guidance in this latter project which God ordained to be a last memorial to him as a builder and artist. Again, I am sure our friends here from other churches in our area could speak with equal conviction about their association with Mr. Schlicker.
>
> At Montreat there is small plaque commemorating her builder which reads, "If you would see his monument look around you." With regard to Hermann Schlicker we may say with Christ, "To he who has ears, let him hear."[258]

Peek points to the positive effect Schlicker had on his contemporaries, pushing them towards higher concepts and ideals of organbuilding. He regards Schlicker, who used classical building principles and techniques, as someone whom builders began to emulate. Both Hadley and Peek, therefore, saw Schlicker as a major figure even though, because he did not actively court publicity, others did not.

As musicians today seek a balance between classic and romantic organ sounds, the instruments must be seen within their own historical and musical context so that those inheriting these organs can make informed decisions when they must make decisions concerning an organ's restoration, alteration, or replacement. Today, almost forty years after his death in 1974, Schlicker's instruments have reached an age where rebuilding or replacement is common. They are also old enough that organists and historians can begin to look back at them objectively and try to determine what their future should be. The decision rests on how valuable the organs are in their eyes, both musically and historically. The 2004 and 2012

[258] Richard Peek, typewritten copy in the possession of Elizabeth French.

conventions of the Organ Historical Society featured Schlicker organs in their itineraries, demonstrating their increased importance in the minds of organists. Some major installations such as St. Luke's Lutheran in Chicago remain unaltered. Some like Valparaiso have been modified by other builders. Others, such as Grace Church in New York, have been completely replaced. At the moment, opinion seems divided as to the necessity of retaining his instruments. It is hoped that this document will at least spur research and discussion about a builder who was so significant in his time but whose influence has been largely neglected today.

Schlicker's organs deserve to be preserved and studied both for their inherent musical quality and their rightful place in American musical history. As Biggs and Mader noted, Schlicker's organs have an authenticity in their sound. He was not trying to produce a certain type of organ in response to a perceived market demand. The fact that the market desired the type of organ that Schlicker wanted to build was a fortunate coincidence for Schlicker. Some such as Noehren may have encouraged him to adhere more closely classical principles than he was when they first encountered his work, but even from the beginning of his career his organs stood apart from those of his contemporaries because he relied on his own training and experience to guide him toward the transparency of sound which others found so attractive in his organs. Schlicker built organs the way he believed they should be built. Schlicker's professional success came about because he was the right builder at the right time surrounded by the right people.

While recognizing the importance and value of Schlicker's organs, it is important not to regard them as period pieces which cannot be altered. Schlicker

himself made changes to his own instruments, even to the Kenmore Presbyterian organ which Noehren made famous through his recordings. Aesthetic preferences have shifted away from the view commonly held in Schlicker's day that romantic music and the organs of that period have nothing musical of value to offer. Today, as we seek a balance between the classical organ and its romantic counterparts, most organs, if they are to serve the practical purposes of service playing and general teaching and concert needs, must be able to accommodate a wide variety of styles. If alterations are made, they should be done in a way that recognizes contemporary needs and yet respects Schlicker's aesthetic. Schlicker's ideal organ specifications (Appendix D) can serve as a guide. Filling out the stoplists by adding Principals of lower pitch on the manuals is one possibility which stays true to Schlicker's style while adding more gravity to the sound. Strengthening the 8' reed on the Swell, usually weaker than it's 16' and 4' counterparts in the division, is another possibility.

Organists who deplore the destruction of early twentieth-century organs that occurred at the hands of the organ reform movement should not be just as quick to reject Schlicker's instruments that came from that movement. They need to be judged according to the criteria they were meant to fulfill. No builder's work, no matter how skilled he might have been, is flawless, and Schlicker's organs are not immaculate and untouchable. However, as an expression of the musical ideas of their day, they represent the sound desired in the 1950s and 1960s, an important period of American cultural history that must be understood in order to properly appreciate our own. Before they are altered or replaced, though, organists and builders must recognize why they were built and the aesthetic they represent. Only

then can useful changes be made and can this generation avoid building instruments just as idiosyncratic as they accuse those of the organ reform movement to be. The musical judgments of Noehren, Biggs, Mader, and the many other organists who heard Schlicker's organs cannot be dismissed as a mere fad. If they saw something unique and worthy of praise in Schlicker's sound, we should pay heed and try to understand and appreciate it, as well. Only when we recognize the value of what has come before us can we judge our own work and chart a meaningful path for American organbuilding into the future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ambrosino, Jonathan. "Lost Generation," *Choir and Organ*, May/June 2005, 56-59.

Ambrosino, Jonathan. "Present Imperfect: An Overview of 20th-c. American Organbuilding." *The Tracker*, Summer 1998, 22-36.

Anders, Charles R. "Church Music and the Ecumenical Scene." In *The Musical Heritage of the Church, Vol. VII,* ed. Theodore Hoelty-Nickel, 35-40. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1970.

A.P.O.B.A. *American Organ Building 1976*. Cleveland: Pipe Organ Publishers, 1976.

Barnes, William Harrison. *The Contemproary American Organ: It's Evolution, Design and Construction.* Glen Rock: J. Fischer & Bro., 1959.

Barnes, William Harrison, and Edward B. Gammons. *Two Centuries of American OrganBuilding.* Glen Rock: J. Fischer & Bro., 1970.

Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. *Life Together*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1954.

Bunjes, Paul G. "Perceptible Trends in the Conceptual Theory of the Modern Organ." In *Festschrift Theodore Hoelty-Nickel*, edited by Newman W. Powell, 101-109. Valparaiso: Valparaiso University, 1977.

Bunjes, Paul. "Problems in Church Organ Construction." In *The Musical Heritage of the Church, Vol. III,* ed. Theodore Hoelty-Nickel, 124-145. Valparaiso: Valparaiso University, 1947.

Bunjes, Paul J. "The St. Luke Organ: A Reflection of Modern Trends in Organ Design." *A Guide to the Evangelical Church of St. Luke*, 1965, 26-31.

Buszin, Walter E. "Cultural values of Church Music and Liturgical Worship." In *The Musical Heritage of the Church, Vol. IV,* edited by Theodore Hoelty-Nickel, 64-76. Valparaiso: Valparaiso University, 1954.

Buszin, Walter E. "The Organ in the Church." In *Christian Worship: Reprints from The American Lutheran Magazine.* Edited by Paul John Thielo, 52-57. New York: American Lutheran Publicity Bureau, n.d [article was originally printed December 1954].

Buszin, Walter E. "Organ Music for the Liturgical Service," In *Essays from the Second Institute of Liturgical Studies*, 28-56. Valparaiso: Valparaiso University, 1950.

Ferguson, John. *Walter Holtkamp: American Organ Builder*. Kent: The Kent State University Press, 1979.

Gehring, Philip and Donald Ingram. *The Church Organ: A Guide to Its Selection.* 2nd edition. The Lutheran Society for Worship, Music, and the Arts, 1973.

Gotsch, Herbert M. *A Study of the Orgelbewegung and the Organ Music of Two of Its Contemporaries.* DMA document, Northwestern University, 1965.

Haskell, Harry. *The Early Music Revival: A History.* London: Thame and Hudson, Ltd., 1988.

Hoelty-Nickel, Theodore. "Church Music Reform." In *The Musical Heritage of the Church, Vol. IV*, edited by Theodore Hoelty-Nickel, 8-11. Valparaiso: Valparaiso University, 1954.

Hyslop, Scott. *The Journey Was Chosen*. St. Louis: MorningStar Publishers, 2007.

Ingram, Donald. "Memoir: Herman Schlicker and the Schlicker Organ Company, in Particular from 1956-1963." *The Tracker*, October 2004, 14-18.

Kirchenberg, Mark. R. "The Organ Designs of Paul G. Bunjes: the Development of His Basic Prinicpals." Master's thesis: Concordia College River Forest, 1980.

Koriath, Kirby L. *Music for the Church: The Life and Work of Walter Buszin.* Ft. Wayne: Concordia Theological Seminary Press, 2003.

Messing, Scott. *Neoclassicism in Music from the Genesis of the Concept through the Schoenberg/Stravinsky Polemic*. Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 1988, rep. 2007.

Noehren, Robert. *An Organist's Reader: Essays*. Warren: Harmonie Park Press, 1998.

Ochse, Orpha. *The History of the Organ in the United States.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1975.

Owen, Barbara. *E. Power Biggs: Concert Organist*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987.

Pape, Uwe, ed. *Organs in America, Vol. 1*. Berlin: Pape Verlag, 1982.

Pape, Uwe, ed. *The Tracker Organ Revival in America*. Berlin: Pape Verlag, 1977.

Phelps, Lawrence I. "A Short History of the Organ Revival." St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1967.

Robinson, Joseph E. "Apprenticing with Herman Schlicker," *The Diapason*, February 2012, 20-22.

Rosenwald, Hans. "Changes in the Approach to Bach." In *The Musical Heritage of the Church, Vol.* 2, edited by Theodore Hoelty-Nickel, 39-55 Valparaiso: Valparaiso University, 1946.

Schweitzer, Albert. "Organ Building and Organ Playing in France and Germany"; "Epilogue, the Present Status of Organ Building." Trans. William D. Turner from *Deutsche und französische Orgelbaukunst und Orgelkunst 1906; Nachwort über den gegenwärtigen Stand der Frag des Orgelbaues 1927*. Braintree: The Organ Literature Foundation, 1984.

Snyder, David. "Buffalo Church Organ Builders." *Western New York Heritage*, Winter 2007, 18-27.

Snyder, David. *Organo Buffalo: Western New York's Notable Church and Concert Pipe Organs.* 2003.

Snyder, James Rawlings. "Twentieth-Century Hymnody in the United States." In *Addresses at the International Hymnological Conference, September 10-11, 1961, New York City*, 28-41. The Hymn Society of America, 1962.

Sumner, William Leslie. *The Organ: Its Evolution, Principles of Construction and Use*. 3rd ed. New York: Philosophical Library, 1962.

Wallmann, James L. "The Organ in the Twentieth Century." In *Twentieth-Century Organ Music*, edited by Christopher S. Anderson, 10-42. New York: Routledge, 2012.

Whitney, Craig R. *All the Stops: The Glorious Pipe Organ and Its American Masters.* New York: PublicAffairs, 2003.

Williams, Peter, and Barbara Owen. *The New Grove Organ*. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1988.

Appendix A

Specification of a Model Tellers-Kent Organ, 1921[259]

	GREAT	
8'	Open Diapason	73 pipes
8'	Second Diapason (or Gemshorn)	73 pipes
8'	Violoncello (or Viola da Gamba)	73 pipes
8'	Doppel Floete	73 pipes
4'	Octave	73 pipes
4'	Wald Floete	73 pipes
8'	Tuba	73 pipes
	SWELL	
16'	Bourdon (or Gedeckt)	73 pipes
8'	Open Diapason	73 pipes
8'	Salicional	73 pipes
8'	Vox Celeste (speaking 73 notes)	61 pipes
8'	Aeoline	73 pipes
8'	Stopped Diapason	73 pipes
4'	Harmonic Flute	73 pipes
4'	Violina	73 pipes
8'	Oboe	73 pipes
	CHOIR	
8'	English Diapason	73 pipes
8'	Viole d'Amour	73 pipes
8'	Dulciana	73 pipes
8'	Concert Flute	73 pipes
4'	Flute d'Amour	73 pipes
8'	Clarinet	73 pipes
	PEDAL	
16'	Open Diapason	32 pipes
16'	Bourdon	32 pipes
16'	Lieblich Gedacht	32 notes
8'	Violoncello	32 notes
8'	Dolce Flute	32 notes

[259] "Tellers Organ Company: Church Organ Builders," (Erie: Tellers-Kent Organ Company, 1921).

COUPLERS

Great to Pedal	Choir to Great 16'
Swell to Pedal	Choir to Great 4'
Choir to Pedal	Great to Great 16'
Swell to Great	Great to Great 4'
Choir to Great	Swell to Swell 16'
Swell to Choir	Swell to Swell 4'
Swell to Great 16'	Choir to Choir 16'
Swell to Great 4'	Choir to Choir 4'

Appendix B

Specification of the 1933 Schlicker organ at First Presbyterian Church, Dunkirk, New York[260]

GREAT

8'	Open Diapason	73 pipes, old (16 top pipes new)
8'	Gamba	73 pipes, new
8'	Melodia	73 pipes, old (16 top pipes new)
8'	Dulciana	73 pipes, old (low octave and 15 top pipes new)
4'	Octave	73 pipes, old (15 top pipes new)
4'	Flute Harmonic	73 pipes, new
2 2/3'	Twelfth	61 pipes, old (3 top pipes new)
2'	Fifteenth	61 pipes, old (3 top pipes new)
8'	Tuba	73 pipes, new
	Chimes	20 notes, from Echo
	Harp	Tablet only
	Tremolo	

SWELL

16'	Bourdon	97 pipes, old (39 top pipes new)
8'	Geigen Prinzipal	73 pipes, old (low octave and 15 top pipes new)
8'	Stopped Diapason	73 notes, from 16' Bourdon
8'	Salicional	73 pipes, old (low octave and 15 top pipes new)
8'	Vox Celeste	61 pipes, new
4'	Fugara	73 pipes, old (15 top pipes new)
4'	Flute	73 notes, from 16' Bourdon
2'	Piccolo	61 pipes, old (3 top pipes new)
8'	Cornopean	Tablet and Chest only
8'	Oboe	73 pipes, old (15 top pipes new)
	Chimes	20 notes, from Echo
	Tremolo	

ECHO

8'	Gedeckt	73 pipes, old (15 top pipes new)
8'	Aeoline	73 pipes, old (low octave and 15 top pipes new)
8'	Vox Angelica Cel.	61 pipes, new
4'	Flute D'Amour	73 pipes, old (15 top pipes new)

[260] Herman Schlicker, "Specification of an Organ prepared for the First Presbyterian Church, Dunkirk, N.Y." May 12, 1933; attached to contract between Schlicker and First Presbyterian Church. Copy in Justin Matters's files, Hermosa, SD.

8'	Vox Humana	73 pipes, old (15 top pipes new)
	Chimes	20 tubes, new
	Harp	Tablet only
	Tremolo	

PEDAL

16'	Open Diapason	32 notes, old (12 low pipes new; from second C on from #1)
16'	Sub-base	44 pipes, old (17 top pipes new)
16'	Gedeckt	32 notes, from Swell 16' Bourdon
10 2/3'	Quint	32 notes, from Swell 16' Bourdon
8'	Bourdon	32 notes, from 16' Sub-base
8'	Flute Dolce	32 notes, from Swell 16' Bourdon
8'	Cello	32 pipes, old

COUPLERS

Great to Pedal	Echo to Pedal
Great to Great 4'	Echo to Great
Great to Great 16'	Echo to Great 4'
Swell to Pedal	Echo to Great 16'
Swell to Great	Swell to Echo
Swell to Great 4'	Swell to Echo 4'
Swell to Great 16'	Swell to Echo 16'
Swell to Swell 4'	Echo to Echo 4'
Swell to Swell 16'	Echo to Echo 16'

Appendix C

E. Power Biggs's Sketch for a Potential Schlicker Advertisement

E. Power Biggs made the following notes for a potential advertisement for Schlicker. The manuscript is undated and is found in the E. Power Biggs Archives at Boston University. Schlicker never produced any advertising material that used these ideas. It does, however, give the clearest description of what Biggs saw in Schlicker's organs and why he thought the public should buy them.

The lines represent the page breaks in the manuscript.

For distinctive and finished voicing

Schlicker Organs

Schlicker organ company. 1530 Mil. Rd

A modern American organ in the classic manner for Church, College, Concert Hall

Schlicker organs are a new-old approach to organ design and building

Schlicker organs incorporate the best of the old and add only the best of the new

Schlicker organs are built for music

The materials that go into the making of a Schlicker organ are the finest:

Oak for the
Silver for the
Pipe metals with high tin
Pipe woods
Consoles
etc…

The tonal principles on which a Schlicker organ is designed and built are the valued principles of several hundred years of organ building.

The first European organs have a musical authenticity, perfect either for church or concert use.

This authenticity derives from the voicing techniques employed by the early artist builders.

These same voicing techniques form the basis of Schlicker organ design.

The Schlicker organ is an instrument for modern America.

The Schlicker organ incorporates the best of the old and only the best of the new

---

Specification…and Voicing

A specification is no more than a blueprint…a sketch of invention. By itself, a specification (that is, the list of stops) guarantees little.

It's the voicing of the stops that will give distinction to the finished instrument

In Schlicker organs, the specification is determined according to the size and musical needs of a church, concert hall, or college, and voicing matches the specification.

A Schlicker is an organ in the classic manner VOICED in the classic manner

Classic voicing is the manner of scaling, cutting, and voicing pipes employed by the great organ builders of history.

It is the "natural" technique of voicing which gave outstanding musical distinction to 17th and 18th century organs

It is an old method as up-to-date today as in Bach's day.

Under the hands of an artist-builder, an organ voiced in this manner has a round fullness of tone, rich and brilliant, yet never strident nor overloud, a charming accent gained from the un-nicked pipes, an instantaneous and subtle response to the performing techniques of the player. Leading churches and concert organists of

America and of Europe have found in Schlicker organs the medium for their highest artistry.

(Conventional mass-production methods with heavily nicked pipes cannot produce this sound. A classic specification carried out with conventional "romantic" voicing results in unsatisfactory hard and shrill tone)

A Schlicker is an organ in the classic manner VOICED in the classic manner

Schlicker organs are subtle in their voicing. Like their prototypes of earlier days, they avoid stridency

Schlicker organs have an identity of tone carried right through the art. The Positiv, for example, is an integral part of the larger tonal scheme and is not an "afterthought." The various divisions are matched in character and are not disparate.

In Schlicker organs all stops are designed and scaled for the building where the organ is to be and they are voiced and finished in the building. (Here is the painstaking approach of the artist-builder of history.

Schlicker organs pursue an ideal based on the tradition of centuries.

Schlicker organs are built for today and for the future. An organ built on correct tonal principles is never outmoded need never be "redesigned" tonally. Many great [?] of history are as perfect musical mediums today as when they were built, some 200 years ago.

Schlicker organs are a new-world approach to organ design and building.

Schlicker organs are equally and eminently suited for church, college, concert hall

---

Schlicker has built many large church and college instruments as well as smaller church organs.

Schlicker has also pioneered in creating Portativs of from 3-12 stops, for practice, church, and concert hall.

Anticipating some questions:

Is this voicing appropriate for services of the Church?

The history of 500 years of organ building answers this question! The finest instruments of the centuries in the great cathedrals and in small Parish Churches have been voiced in this way. And today, these voicing techniques afford renewed [?] and musical excellence to church music for congregation and choir accompaniment as well as soloists.

But isn't this sort of organ more exacting to play?

No – and yes! It responds to the player in an entirely new and musical way. It sets forth music clearly, it is sensitive to every nuance of phrasing. It is an [?] that is a musical joy to the advanced player, to the part-time organist, and even to a beginning. For there is a vast organ literature – quite easy to play – that is only effective on such voicing.

Can I play "romantic" music on a "classic" organ?

Just play it! You'll be surprised! For all music of [?] takes on new life played on a Schlicker. On an instrument of "natural" voicing, and of a suitable size,

classic works stand forth in new clarity, romantic music takes on unaccustomed strength, and modern music sounds at its best.

But if I have the right specification, will not this guarantee an organ's excellence?

No, unfortunately not. Specifications are merely words on paper unless the pipes are scaled and voiced correctly.

A personal note about the founder of the company:

Born in Germany, Herman Schlicker has been a citizen of the United States for many years. In Europe, Mr. Schlicker received a thorough training with leading European organ firms, and first-hand experience in restoring many of the historic instruments of Germany, Scandinavia, and Holland.

The Schlicker Organ Company of Buffalo has been in business for over 20 years. The ideal of the entire company is to build fine modern instruments for America and for today, on the experience and foundations gained from study of fine organ building of the centuries.

Appendix D

Letter from Herman Schlicker to E. Power Biggs, March 6, 1957[261]

Dear Mr. Biggs:

Thank you for your recent letter. I am extremely sorry to have taken so long in making a reply to the letter, but I have been out of town in California, the Midwest, and Florida and North Carolina. The organ at Holy Trinity, Toronto was opened a week ago tonight by Catherine Palmer, the church organist, and she did a fine job before the 500 people who were in the congregation. I am leaving tomorrow morning to begin the finishing work on the Dayton organ, and after that, is the other large three manual we are currently installing at Anniston, Alabama.

Recent contracts include several organs similar to the one we built for you. Among them are: Rollins College (the Gleasons); Orlando, Fla. (a residence); Bel Air, Calif. (a residence) and the Methodist Student Center at Duke University. We sincerely appreciate your recommendation of our work at Duke, as well as at many other places throughout the country. We are receiving letters continuously from people who have talked to you.

We trust that the following information will be a help to you in the preparation of your article.

In general, I feel that an organ should be based on the foundation of the North German Baroque instrument. The organ should have variable scaling of the pipes, especially in the flutes. There should be a complete principal and flute chorus on all divisions, with reeds and mixtures balanced throughout the organ. Each

[261] Carbon copy in Stanton Peter's files.

division should have clearly defined pitch line, different from the other divisions on the organ, determined by the principal chorus [of?] the division, and the composition of the mixtures. Voicing of the Swell division should not differ from that of the other divisions, so that when all are coupled together, each division has its logical place in the ensemble. There should not be merely a battery of reeds on the Swell; rather, reed and mixture choruses should be present on all divisions, and should not be duplications of each other.

On smaller instruments, the principal chorus does not always need to be present at all pitches, depending on the size, location and purpose of the installation. Then, if an 8' and/or 4' Principal is omitted, flutes would be substituted at places where the principal pitches are omitted.

Expression becomes increasingly less important, except to control dynamic levels on plateaus, rather than crescendos and diminuendos, as the voicing techniques develop, and the ensembles, speech and tone improve in the organs.

It is difficult to develop a single specification for an ideal organ. Many things must be taken into consideration, far removed from even financial considerations. A four or five voice organ is often ideal in an acoustically good setting. On the other hand, in an acoustically bad situation, an organ of tremendous size, with proper voicing and a good specification, may not result in an ideal instrument. On a larger organ, there should be four divisions, if an instrument is to be capable of having all organ literature (worthy of performance) performed on it. These divisions would be: Great, Positiv, Oberwerk (Swell) and a complete Pedal.

We are enclosing a specification of such an instrument. The selection of the reeds would be governed by the room where the organ was to be installed.

We really don't know which is the best organ which we have built thus far. They all seem right when we are listening to them. Certainly Trinity, Buffalo; St. Benedict's Davidson; and now Holy Trinity, Toronto; rank at the very top of the list. We are also enclosing our brochure, and a program of the Toronto recital, as well as the following pictures of some of our best installations: 1) Trinity, Buffalo; 2) St. Benedicts, Eggertsville; 3) Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul – as installed in Albright Art Gallery, Buffalo; 4) Davis Memorial Chapel, The Baptist Hospital, Winston-Salem, N.C. These instruments, along with St. Paul's Cathedral here, are all successful installations, we feel, and the Winston-Salem organ is extremely successful as an example of a small organ in an acoustically excellent situation.

We are going to remove the Old North Church organ to Buffalo very soon, and at the same time install the organ in the Cambridge Chapel of the Latter Day Saints. This organ is nearly completed here at the factory.

I hope to be seeing you again before too long.

With all good wishes to Peggy and you,

Sincerely,

Schlicker Organ Co, Inc.

Herman L. Schlicker
President

HLS:mh
enc.

SPECIFICATON OF A THREE MANUAL AND PEDAL PIPE ORGAN

GREAT ORGAN

1.	16'	Quintadena	61 pipes
2.	8'	Principal	61 pipes
3.	8'	Gemshorn	61 pipes
4.	8'	Holzfloete	61 pipes
5.	4'	Octave	61 pipes
6.	4'	Spitzfloete	61 pipes
7.	2 2/3'	Quint	61 pipes
8.	2'	Octave	61 pipes
9.	2'	Waldfloete	61 pipes
10.	V-VII	Mixture	390 pipes
11.	16'	Dulzian	61 pipes
12.	8'	Trumpet	61 pipes

POSITIV ORGAN

13.	8'	Principal	61 pipes
14.	8'	Quintadena	61 pipes
15.	4'	Octave	61 pipes
16.	4'	Rohrfloete	61 pipes
17.	2'	Principal	61 pipes
18.	2'	Nachthorn	61 pipes
19.	II	Terzian	110 pipes
20.	1 1/3'	Larigot	61 pipes
21.	1'	Siffloete	61 pipes
22.	IV-V	Scharf	293 pipes
23.	III	Cymbel	183 pipes
24.	16'	Ranket	61 pipes
25.	8'	Krummhorn	61 pipes
26.		Tremolo	

SWELL ORGAN

27.	8'	Principal	61 pipes
28.	8'	Gedeckt	61 pipes
29.	8'	Viola	61 pipes
30.	8'	Viola Celeste	49 pipes
31.	4'	Principal	61 pipes
32.	4'	Traversfloete	61 pipes
33.	2 2/3'	Nasat	61 pipes
34.	2'	Schwegel	61 pipes
35.	1 3/5'	Tierce	61 pipes
36.	IV-V	Mixture	293 pipes

37.	16'	Contra Fagott	61 pipes
38.	8'	Schalmey	61 pipes
39.	4'	Clarion	61 pipes
40.		Tremolo	

PEDAL ORGAN

41.	32'	Untersatz (ext. No. 43)	12 pipes
42.	16'	Principal	32 pipes
43.	16'	Bourdon	32 pipes
44.	16'	Quintadena (from No.1)	
45.	8'	Principal	32 pipes
46.	8'	Flute	32 pipes
47.	4'	Choralbass	32 pipes
48.	4'	Spitzfloete	32 pipes
49.	2'	Hohlfloete	32 pipes
50.	IV	Mixture	128 pipes
51.	32'	Ranket (ext. No. 24) or	
	32'	Contra Fagott (ext. No. 37)	12 pipes
52.	16'	Posaune	32 pipes
53.	8'	Trumpet	32 pipes
54.	4'	Clarion	32 pipes
55.	2'	Cornet	32 pipes

Appendix E

"The Organ – Today and Yesterday"

by Herman L. Schlicker[262]

It is indeed a pleasure to be invited to speak to you about organs. Since the American Guild of Organists is an organization dedicated primarily to advance the cause of good church music, it seems most appropriate to note that the present trend of organ building goes hand in hand with your expressed aims. Both movements depend, for their success, upon revival of the Church's great musical heritage.

At the outset I want to say that the word "Baroque" will be used quite often. It is not a word we like but one which has come into use to denote a certain type of organ. So that we may understand each other, I use the word. At the same time knowing that it is a misnomer for the organ which bears its name.

In order to better demonstrate certain principles of organ design, construction and placement, it seems advisable to briefly review the various periods of organ history.

Before 1400 there existed only the Gothic Organ constructed mostly of diapason tones and for which very little literature was written. The Renaissance organ took its place during the 15th and 16th century and became the forerunner of the baroque organ of the 16th and 17th century. For reasons of clarity, the Organ of the Romantic period which follows, should be divided into three classifications: the

[262] Typed copy, undated, in Stanton Peters's files. I have been unable to determine when and where this address was given. The direct authorship by Schlicker, whose name is typed on the manuscript, is assumed but cannot be authoritatively verified.

early Romantic of the 17th [*sic*] century, the "High" Romantic of the 19th and 20th centuries, and the Orchestral and unit or Theatre Style Organ of the 20th century.

Today, when speaking of Romantic Organs, we are inclined to think only in terms of organs built in the late 19th century and early 20th century because these are the instruments with which organists and laymen of today are most familiar. Actually, the transition from the Baroque to the early Romantic was already noticeable in the organs built by the famous Gottfried Silbermann during the middle of the 18th century. For, in some of his instruments, he omitted the Rückpositiv and some of the very wide scaled flutes. In the pedal, he left out the 2' stops and high pitched mixtures. Even the famous organ built for the Abtei Kirche in Weingarten by Joseph Gabler during the years 1737-50 is an early Romantic instrument even though some may wish to consider it "baroque." Careful study of its pipe work will reveal its lack of conformity to the purely Baroque Organ.

Looking back we find that some of the most important inventions to improve the organ tonally were made during the 15th and 16th and 17th centuries. During the 19th and 20th centuries most inventions were of mechanical nature; such as the Barker Lever, pneumatic action, electro-pneumatic action, all electric action, combination action and many more. But with all these inventions, tonally the organ declined steadily and we have plenty of examples. It seems the Organ Builders expended most of their efforts on mechanical improvements and left the pipes and their voicing a secondary matter.

Today we are witnessing a gradual return to the type of organ built in Europe during the late 16th and 17th centuries that is, the Baroque Period in history. Also to

the organ of the middle of the 18th Century, the early Romantic. That is to say, not a pure Baroque nor pure romantic but a really musical instrument, which the Baroque organs certainly were. This movement, started in Germany approximately 30 years ago and known as the "Orgel Bewegung," exerted considerable influence on the European continent. However, at least 10 or 15 years elapsed before its effect was felt here in America and only very recently in England.

There are several reasons for this fact. At first, a definite prejudice existed among organists (and still to some extent), against the so-called purely Baroque design. Even those who did accept it, allowed, at first, only the inclusion of certain mutations and mixtures added to an otherwise Romantic Instrument. Even though Baroque nomenclature was used for these stops, the scaling and voicing of the pipes was done mostly in the Romantic style. The results were often loud and shrill in contrast to the true 16th and 17th century organ, a brilliant but mild instrument. A good ensemble and tonal blend failed to result.

To designate the difference between the extremely Romantic and Orchestral organ and this new type of "straight" Church instrument, the term "Classical" was applied. Realizing the faults and inadequacies of these early so-called "Classical" or "Neo-Baroque" instruments, many leading Organists, Teachers, and Builders took it upon themselves to study and explore at first hand the reasons for the superiority of the tonal ensemble of the Baroque and early Romantic period. This involved travel in Europe and much investigation. As a result, we now have a much better understanding of these early organs.

Unfortunately, though the term “Baroque” is often applied to many present day instruments, actually, except in rare instances, few “Baroque” organs are being built today. But we, who are convinced of the superiority of the Baroque style organ are seeking organs whose ensemble is created entirely along Baroque lines to which may be added, if desired, certain usable colors and effects developed by the romanticists. Let us call this the Classical organ, if you wish; but let us not confuse this new instrument with the early so-called “Classical” instrument previously mentioned.

These same organists, teachers, and builders, with cooperation of many leading Universities and colleges, are at present exerting a strong and effective influence for the acceptance of this type of Church instrument. They and their students are convinced of its musical superiority; that on it can be performed not only music composed for such an organ, but romantic and modern music as well; that it is the ideal instrument for music of both the Liturgical and non-Liturgical church and blends extremely well with all instrumental and solo instruments and ensembles.

Perhaps it would be well at this point, to make a brief comparison between this Classical Organ of today and Romantic Organ of a few years back with which, I am sure, we are all familiar.

1. The Classical Organ has a well-balanced appointment of stops of all pitches, including mixtures, on all manuals, whereas the Romantic Organ is overloaded with stops of 8' pitch, has a few 4' stops, 2' stops only in the

larger instruments and then but one or two. Mixtures are usually entirely missing.

2. The Pedal division of the Classical Organ is very complete; almost all pitches from 16' to 2' stops including mixtures being present in even smaller installations. No borrowing from the manual is done. The Pedal section, as a result, is large and definite enough to carry the Full organ. On the other hand, the Romantic Pedal with its usually heavy 16' disposition and only occasionally 8 and 4 foot stops cannot uphold the full organ satisfactorily. 2' stops and mixtures are always missing. Normally, approximately 60 to 80 percent of the Pedal stops are borrowed from the manuals.
3. The Classical Organ has in general more tone color, more stops which mix well to make up a large variety of solo color in combination. The Romantic Organ, due to its large number of 8' stops has a certain sameness in tone color among the various ranks; their contrast being mostly dependent upon loudness or power.
4. Very wide-scaled stops of the Nachthorn and Blockfloete type, clear high mixtures, reeds like Krummhorn, Rankett, Regale and Dulzian are entirely absent in the romantic organ. Seldom are found wide-scaled mutations such as Nasat, Rauschpfeife, Sesquialtera and stops of high pitch 2' – 1 1/3' and 1'.
5. The strings of the classical organ are also wide-scaled with low cut mouths. (Of course these strings are not strings as we know or think of them today.) These stops then mix and carry well. The strings on the Romantic organ are

very small scales with narrow, high cut mouths. The result is a thin, keen tone which does not carry or mix well.

6. Mixtures in the Classical Organ are composed of many ranks of small scaled Principal type pipes; scaled according to the division they are in. Repeating frequently and of good blending quality, due to its traditional baroque voicing, giving a clear brilliant color to the full ensemble throughout the entire range of each keyboard. By comparison, the mixtures of the romantic organ, when any are present, have only a few ranks of pipes with few or no repetitions due to the type of voicing used. They rarely blend well with other stops or even the full organ. This may account for the omission of mixtures during the high romantic period. The art of designing and finishing good mixtures apparently became lost or was thought unnecessary with the advent of large scaled more power stops of 8 foot pitch, keen strings and 4 foot couplers.
7. 16' manual stops for a classical organ are selected from those rich in overtones such as Principal, Quintadena, Trumpet, and Dulzian. 16' stops in a Romantic organ are of the heavy voiced 16' Double open, 16' Bourdon and Gedeckt type.
8. One never finds a Rückpositiv in a romantic organ.
9. A most important “MUST” of the Classical Organ is that each manual should have about the same intensity of tone. But the tone colors should contrast. In the Romantic Organ the manuals have intensity of Piano, Mezzo forte and Forte, respectively.

10. The wind pressure of the classical organ should be between 2" and 3" and on small chamber music organs and practice organs 1 ½" and 2". The wind pressure of a present day Romantic Organ varies from 4" to 8" with even much higher pressures being employed for reeds and solo sections.

When a new organ is contemplated for a church a number of matters must be taken into consideration.

Of prime importance is the location and placement of the instrument. This should definitely be decided upon before a final stop specification is drawn up. The ideal placement is out in the open and not in organ chambers. A balcony is the ideal location although many congregations oppose this arrangement because the "like to see the choir." In those cases where this plan has been followed it has proven most satisfactory to all concerned. If no other space is available, and the organ must be placed in chambers, then the front side of the chambers should be open. Very often it is possible to build a shelf or overhand outside of the chamber on which the Great and Positiv divisions can be placed with all pipes showing.

Division of an organ with one half on either side of a church or chancel is a practice which should be done away with. All divisions should be placed together if at all possible. It is far better to have a small organ well placed than a large organ spread all over the church in several chambers and behind walls.

The stop specification should not be just a piece of paper with a lot of names of stops written upon it! It should be the result of much study of the individual needs of the particular church for which it is planned. Although the seating capacity of the

church must be considered, it must not be the only criteria on which the size of the organ is based. Only after careful survey of the acoustics of the building and the placement of the organ have been decided upon, can the proper stops be selected and most important, the proper scaling of these pipes. The term "custom built" heard so very often in the organ trade should apply not only to the fitting of the organ into the space provided for it, but also to the pipework. The pipes should be scaled especially for each instrument and building before the term "custom built" bears any weight.

A "straight" organ without any unifications is always to be preferred, not alone from the standpoint of being tonally superior. It is mechanically much simpler and therefore gives years of trouble-free satisfactory service. Of course I would personally recommend specifications of classical design.

For very small organs consisting of only 2 or 4 ranks of pipes, of which one can be a mixture, the unit system may possibly be permissible and where the cost of a "straight" organ would be prohibitive. Such an organ can and should be designed without couplers so that no additional electric relays or contacts are necessary besides the electrical contacts underneath the keys of the console. Such an organ of simple construction, providing it has the proper selection of stops, serves well in a small church, chapel, or as a practice organ.

As to the pipe chests, there are several systems in use today. The most prevalent are the electro-pneumatic, the all-electric and the slider chest of the tracker action era. Of the three systems, the electro-pneumatic chest is the most used. Of this later type, there are several variations of which the Pitman Chest and the

individual ventil chest are the most common. For our purposes, we find the Pitman Chest most satisfactory, for these reasons. If properly constructed, a great many stop channels can be operated from one primary because the pitman acts as a secondary valve for each chest pouch underneath the pipes. Putting stops on and off is also quiet which cannot be said for the ventil type chest. The all-electric chest is possibly useful in the construction of small unified organs. But for "straight" organs the Pitman Chest is much superior. The slider chest is still the best from a musical standpoint. This chest certainly helps the tone and speech of the pipes. The so-called Tone Chamber is doing all it is credited for. Sometimes we think we should go [to] the slider chest even if electric action is used because Tracker Action will never become universally used again. At present we are using a Pitman Chest with somewhat of a tone chamber which is quite like the slider chest. It has a valve carefully calculated to get the proper force with which to attach the speech of the pipe. We have used it on several organs and it has proved to us that the proper chest is 50% of a successfully voiced organ. By proper chests I don't mean the mechanics alone. As I pointed out before, the force with which the pipe is attached has much to do with the type of tone it produces. In this era when we strive to build classic organs and where the proper type of voicing is used, the proper chest is of utmost importance. However, not any type of voicing on a good chest will prove successful.

In the Classic organ we have to depart from the type of voicing and scaling used generally. The cut of the mouth should be lower and have few, if any, nicks in the block or languid. The stops should not vary much in power and intensity but in

color. For example, an 8' Principal should be mild so that it could be used even as a flute and is not merely the loudest stop on the manual.

The final voicing of any particular organ must be done in the church. By voicing in the church we do not mean merely adjusting the pipes louder or softer at the toe; this is often the case and the job is only partly done. But really adjust the windway, adjust the blocks and languids properly and select the right size foot-hole. These operations cannot be accomplished when the pipe is sent from the factory heavily nicked. A heavily nicked pipe can only be made louder or softer and nothing done for the color. All of this voicing is a great deal of work but it certainly does pay in the effectiveness of the organ.

Now a few hints for a really good organ.

The windtrunks to all chests in any type of organ should be oversize to guarantee a steady tone. Winkers will not be necessary then and they really aren't very effective anyway.

This large windtrunk is really more effective than an extra large air reservoir.

When certain sections of the organ are under expression, the louvre frames or tone openings should be so large that when the louvers are open, one is not at all conscious of the section being enclosed.

The console should be so placed that the organist can hear the entire organ well and not be too far from the instrument. As to the type of console; for smaller organs the console can be of the tilt tablet type. This allows the use of a less expensive direct mechanical combination action. When the organ is so large that

two rows of stop tablets reach past the width of the keyboards, the stop-knob console is preferable. The combination action should then be of the remote control type. The modern console no longer requires air for the operation of couplers switches. For the past 20 years the Schlicker Organs have been equipped with all-electric switches with complete success. The console should be as simple as possible with all unnecessary gadgets omitted.

Appendix F

IRB Authorization for Interviews

The University of Oklahoma

OFFICE OF HUMAN RESEARCH PARTICIPANT PROTECTION - IRB

IRB Number: 13506
Approval Date: August 03, 2011

August 03, 2011

Joel Sproat
Music
500 W. Boyd Street, CMC
Norman, OK 73019

RE: The Work of Herman Schlicker

Dear Mr. Sproat:

On behalf of the Institutional Review Board (IRB), I have reviewed and granted expedited approval of the above-referenced research study. This study meets the criteria for expedited approval category 6, 7. It is my judgment as Chairperson of the IRB that the rights and welfare of individuals who may be asked to participate in this study will be respected; that the proposed research, including the process of obtaining informed consent, will be conducted in a manner consistent with the requirements of 45 CFR 46 as amended; and that the research involves no more than minimal risk to participants.

This letter documents approval to conduct the research as described:

Consent form - Subject Dated: August 02, 2011 Publication
IRB Application Dated: August 02, 2011
Protocol Dated: August 02, 2011
Other Dated: August 02, 2011 Recruitment letter
Other Dated: August 02, 2011 Recruitment phone script
Other Dated: August 02, 2011 Recruitment email
Other Dated: August 02, 2011 Recruitment script
Consent form - Subject Dated: July 26, 2011
Survey Instrument Dated: June 25, 2011

As principal investigator of this protocol, it is your responsibility to make sure that this study is conducted as approved. Any modifications to the protocol or consent form, initiated by you or by the sponsor, will require prior approval, which you may request by completing a protocol modification form. All study records, including copies of signed consent forms, must be retained for three (3) years after termination of the study.

The approval granted expires on August 02, 2012. Should you wish to maintain this protocol in an active status beyond that date, you will need to provide the IRB with an IRB Application for Continuing Review (Progress Report) summarizing study results to date. The IRB will request an IRB Application for Continuing Review from you approximately two months before the anniversary date of your current approval.

If you have questions about these procedures, or need any additional assistance from the IRB, please call the IRB office at (405) 325-8110 or send an email to irb@ou.edu.

Cordially,

E. Laurette Taylor

E. Laurette Taylor, Ph.D.
Chair, Institutional Review Board

1816 West Lindsey, Suite 150 Norman, Oklahoma 73069 PHONE: (405) 325-8110

Ltr_Prot_Fappv_Exp

The UNIVERSITY of OKLAHOMA

Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects

Approval of Continuing Review – Expedited Review – AP0

Date: July 19, 2012 **IRB#:** 0785

Principal Investigator: Joel C Sproat

Approval Date: 07/19/2012
Expiration Date: 07/18/2013

Expedited Categories: 6, 7 – Collection of voice, video, and digital data; Low risk behavioral research

Study Title: The Work of Herman Schlicker

Based on the information submitted, your study is currently: Active, open to enrollment. On behalf the Institutional Review Board (IRB), I have reviewed and approved your continuing review application. To view the documents approved for this submission, open this study from the *My Studies* option, go to *Submission History*, go to *Completed Submissions* tab and then click the *Details* icon.

As principal investigator of this research study, you are responsible to:

- Conduct the research study in a manner consistent with the requirements of the IRB and federal regulations 45 CFR 46.
- Obtain informed consent and research privacy authorization using the currently approved, stamped forms and retain all original, signed forms, if applicable.
- Request approval from the IRB prior to implementing any/all modifications.
- Promptly report to the IRB any harm experienced by a participant that is both unanticipated and related per IRB policy.
- Maintain accurate and complete study records for evaluation by the HRPP Quality Improvement Program and, if applicable, inspection by regulatory agencies and/or the study sponsor.
- Promptly submit continuing review documents to the IRB upon notification approximately 60 days prior to the expiration date indicated above.
- Submit a final closure report at the completion of the project.

You will receive notification approximately 60 days prior to the expiration date noted above. You are responsible for submitting continuing review documents in a timely fashion in order to maintain continued IRB approval. If you have questions about this notification or using iRIS, contact the IRB @ 405-325-8110 or irb@ou.edu.

Cordially,

Lara Mayeux

Lara Mayeux, Ph.D.

Vice Chair, Institutional Review Board