

# **ІСТОРІЯ НАУКИ І ТЕХНІКИ**

**Видається з 2011 року**

**Том 15  
Випуск 2**

**DOI:10.32703/2415-7422-2025-15-2**

**Київ 2025**

УДК 929:93

*Рекомендовано до друку Вченою радою Національного транспортного університету  
(протокол №12 від 27 листопада 2025 р.)*

**Редакційна колегія:**

**Олег Стрелко**, доктор історичних наук, професор (головний редактор), Національний транспортний університет (Україна);

**Юлія Бердниченко**, кандидат історичних наук, доцент, (заст. гол. редактора), Національний транспортний університет (Україна);

**Чжан Байчунь**, доктор філософії, професор, Інститут історії природознавства Академії Наук Китаю (Китай);

**Даніеле Коцолі**, доктор філософії, професор, Університет Помпеу Фабра (Іспанія);

**Ганна Дефорж**, доктор історичних наук, професор, Центральноукраїнський державний університет імені Володимира Винниченка (Україна);

**Марина Гутник**, кандидат історичних наук, доцент, Національний технічний університет "Харківський політехнічний інститут" (Україна);

**Віра Гамалія**, доктор історичних наук, професор, Інститут досліджень науково-технічного потенціалу та історії науки імені Г. М. Доброва НАН України (Україна);

**Світлана Гурінчук**, кандидат історичних наук, доцент, Національний транспортний університет (Україна);

**Світлана Ісаєнко**, кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент, Національний транспортний університет (Україна);

**Георгій Касьянов**, доктор історичних наук, професор, Університет Марії Кюрі-Склодовської в Любліні (Польща);

**Славомир Лотиш**, доктор історичних наук, професор, Інститут історії науки Польської академії наук (Польща);

**Массімо Мораліо**, доктор філософії, старший науковий співробітник, Технічний університет Берліна (Німеччина);

**Пеетер Мююрсепп**, доктор філософії, професор, Талліннський технічний університет (Естонія);

**Лазат Нурсултанова**, доктор історичних наук, професор, Євразійський національний університет ім. Л. М. Гумільова (Казахстан);

**Олег Пилипчук**, доктор біологічних наук (спеціальність - історія науки й техніки), професор, Український центр досліджень з історії науки і техніки (Україна);

**Марія Рентетці**, доктор філософії, професор, Технічний університет Берліна (Німеччина);

**Сергій Рижов**, кандидат історичних наук, доцент, Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка (Україна);

**Зауреш Сактаганова**, доктор історичних наук, професор, Карагандинський державний університет ім. Е. А. Букетова (Казахстан);

**Галина Салата**, доктор історичних наук, доцент, Київський національний університет культури і мистецтв (Україна);

**Володимир Слабін**, кандидат педагогічних наук, науковий співробітник, Університет Орегону (США);

**Олена Сорочинська**, кандидат історичних наук, доцент, Національний транспортний університет (Україна);

**Вадим Степанчук**, доктор історичних наук, старший науковий співробітник, Інститут археології Національної академії наук України (Україна);

**Джоел Варгас Домінгуес**, доктор філософії, науковий співробітник, Національний автономний університет Мексики (Мексика);

**Михайло Відейко**, доктор історичних наук, старший науковий співробітник, Київський університет імені Бориса Грінченка (Україна);

**Чарльз Уайт**, доктор філософії, професор, Університет Спринг Арбор (США);

**Гудрун Вольфшмідт**, доктор історичних наук, професор, Гамбурзький університет (Німеччина).

**Історія науки і техніки / Гол. ред. О.Г. Стрелко. Київ: ДУІТ, 2025. Том 15. Вип. 2. 276 с.**

*Журнал розрахований на науковців, викладачів, студентів вищих навчальних закладів та усіх, хто цікавиться питаннями історії науки і техніки. Редакційна колегія не обов'язково поділяє позицію, висловлену авторами у статтях, та не несе відповідальності за достовірність наведених даних посилань. Журнал виходить двічі на рік англійською мовою.*

*Журнал включено до міжнародних наукометричних баз даних та електронних бібліотек: Scopus, Web of Science Core Collection (Emerging Sources Citation Index), DOAJ (Directory of Open Access Journals), European Reference Index for the Humanities and the Social Sciences (ERIH PLUS), MIAR (Information Matrix for the Analysis of Journals), Ulrichsweb (Ulrich's Periodicals Directory), German Union Catalogue of Serials (ZDB), Scilit, CNKI (China National Knowledge Infrastructure), BASE (Bielefeld Academic Search Engine), ROAD (Directory of Open Access scholarly Resources), OpenAIRE (Open Access Infrastructure for Research in Europe), Crossref, Worldcat, Наукова періодика України і Google Scholar.*

*Електронна версія журналу доступна на порталі Національної бібліотеки України імені В.І. Вернадського та на сайті журналу <https://hst-journal.com>.*

*Наказом Міністерства освіти і науки України № 735 від 29.06.2021 р.*

*журнал включено до категорії "А" Переліку наукових фахових видань України, в яких можуть публікуватися результати дисертаційних робіт в галузі історичних наук за спеціальністю В9 – "Історія та археологія".*

*Журнал "Історія науки і техніки" зареєстровано як суб'єкт у сфері друкованих медіа: рішення від 11.04.2024 р. №1166 Протокол №13 Національної ради України з питань телебачення і радіомовлення.*

© Видавництво ДУІТ, 2025

e-ISSN 2415-7430

p-ISSN 2415-7422

DOI:10.32703/2415-7422-2025-15-2-472-498

UDC 681.816.61:780.6(091): 930.85

**Olena Spolska**

Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University  
2, Maxyma Kryvonosa Street, Ternopil, Ukraine, 46027  
E-mail: [olenadovbush84@gmail.com](mailto:olenadovbush84@gmail.com)  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2397-2035>

**Mariia Kyreia**

Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University  
2, Maxyma Kryvonosa Street, Ternopil, Ukraine, 46027  
E-mail: [mariaganych@gmail.com](mailto:mariaganych@gmail.com)  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5872-9839>

**Nataliya Hryhoruk**

Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University  
2, Maxyma Kryvonosa Street, Ternopil, Ukraine, 46027  
E-mail: [n.hryhoruk@ukr.net](mailto:n.hryhoruk@ukr.net)  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7064-300X>

**Svitlana Saldan**

Ivan Franko National University of Lviv  
1, Universytetska Street, Lviv, Ukraine, 79000  
E-mail: [svitlana.saldan@gmail.com](mailto:svitlana.saldan@gmail.com)  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2877-9282>

**Igor Riabov**

Ukrainian National Tchaikovsky Academy of Music  
1-3/11, Arkhitekтора Horodetskoho Street, Kyiv, Ukraine, 01001  
E-mail: [riabovcontact@gmail.com](mailto:riabovcontact@gmail.com)  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7544-0807>

**Pneumatics, acoustics and digital sound: The organ in the history of science and technology**

***Abstract.** This article analyzes the historical development of the organ as a complex technological system whose evolution reflects successive transformations in scientific knowledge, materials, and engineering practices from antiquity to the digital*



age. The study employs a combined methodology of historical textual analysis, examination of archaeological and material evidence, and interpretation through the technological-systems approach, supported by modern acoustical and engineering research. The results demonstrate that each major stage in organ history corresponds to a distinct scientific and technological environment. The Hellenistic hydraulis reveals early applications of pneumatic and hydraulic regulation grounded in the mechanical theories of Ctesibius and described by Vitruvius, while Roman and Byzantine adaptations illustrate how metalworking, woodworking, and empirical acoustics shaped early organ design. The medieval period shows a shift toward large wooden structures, the refinement of tin-lead alloys, and the emergence of elaborate tracker mechanisms suited to the architectural acoustics of Romanesque and Gothic churches. Renaissance and early modern developments link organ building to the rise of mathematical acoustics, with theorists such as Zarlino and Mersenne providing conceptual explanations for pitch, scaling, and harmonic structure that informed workshop practice. During the Industrial Revolution, machine tools, standardized materials, and pneumatic assist devices enabled unprecedented increases in size, reliability, and mechanical complexity, while nineteenth-century acoustical science, particularly the work of Helmholtz, clarified the physical basis of pipe tone. Electrification in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries reshaped organ control systems, separating console and pipes, introducing electromagnetic actions, and integrating the organ into broader electromechanical networks. The second half of the twentieth century and the early twenty-first century reveal the growing influence of electronics, digital sampling, physical modeling, CNC manufacturing, and hybrid designs that combine traditional pipes with computational sound generation. Taken together, these findings show that the organ evolved not through the replacement of old technologies by new ones but through their continuous accumulation, reinterpretation, and integration within changing scientific paradigms. The article concludes that the organ's two-millennia history offers a distinctive case study for understanding long-term interactions between scientific knowledge, material innovation, and technological continuity.

**Keywords:** history of technology; history of keyboard musical instruments; organ; history of music; history of art

## Introduction.

Among the musical instruments that accompanied the development of Western and Middle Eastern cultures, the pipe organ occupies a distinctive position as one of the earliest and most durable examples of complex mechanical engineering applied to artistic ends. From the Hellenistic hydraulis of the third century BCE to contemporary hybrid and digital instruments, the organ has continually adapted to new materials, new scientific knowledge, and new technological environments. Its long history is not only a history of musical practice but also a record of changing understandings of

pneumatics, acoustics, mechanical control, metallurgy, electricity, and digital signal processing. Because of this unique technological depth, the organ offers an unusually rich lens through which to view broader transformations in science and engineering across more than two millennia.

Despite this potential, historical writing on the organ has been shaped by disciplinary boundaries that tend to separate music history, craft practice, acoustics, and technological change. Standard reference works (such as the *Grove* article on the organ (Owen, Williams, & Bicknell, 2021) or the overview chapter in *The Cambridge Companion to the Organ* (Thistlethwaite, 1999) provide reliable chronological and stylistic syntheses, but they generally treat scientific and technological developments as peripheral rather than central to the narrative. Regional and cultural studies, including Snyder's *The Organ as a Mirror of Its Time* (2002), demonstrate how individual instruments reflect their social and artistic contexts, yet they focus on specific centuries and limited geographies. Technical treatises from the nineteenth century, such as Hopkins and Rimbault (1877), document industrial-era workshop practices but do not relate them to earlier scientific traditions or later technological revolutions. Meanwhile, acoustical studies and STS-oriented research (Science & Technology Studies) address sound production and socio-technical identity but offer only partial historical coverage.

Taken together, these works illuminate many aspects of organ history, yet they leave several important problems insufficiently addressed. First, no existing study traces in a single, continuous narrative how developments in scientific knowledge (ranging from ancient pneumatics and early modern acoustics to nineteenth-century materials science and late-twentieth-century digital engineering) systematically reshaped organ design. Second, the historiography often isolates historical periods rather than examining how earlier technological logics constrained or informed later innovations. Third, although the organ is frequently described metaphorically as a “mirror of its time,” previous literature rarely analyzes it explicitly as a technological system whose subsystems (wind production, action mechanisms, pipe acoustics, electrical control, digital sound generation) evolved in response to specific scientific and industrial contexts. Finally, the most recent transformations of the organ (CNC fabrication, hybrid digital-pipe architectures, and computational sound modeling) are seldom integrated into long-duration historical accounts, leaving a conceptual gap between pre-industrial traditions and contemporary engineering practice.

Addressing these unresolved problems requires a methodological approach capable of integrating textual sources, material evidence, scientific analysis, and the technological-systems perspective. This article adopts such an approach, combining historical reconstruction with insights from acoustics, engineering, and material science to situate organ building within the broader evolution of scientific and technological knowledge.



The purpose of this article is to provide the first comprehensive, long-term historical analysis of the organ as a technological system, demonstrating how changes in scientific understanding, material technologies, and engineering practices shaped the instrument's evolution from the Hellenistic period to the digital age.

### **Methodology.**

In light of the diverse historiographical traditions surrounding the organ (ranging from encyclopaedic surveys to regional case studies, technical treatises, acoustical analyses, and STS-oriented interpretations), this article adopts a methodological approach designed to integrate these fragmented perspectives into a coherent, long-duration technological history. The study proceeds from the premise that the organ is neither solely a musical instrument nor solely a cultural object, but a technological system whose components, materials, and operational principles evolved in step with broader scientific and engineering developments.

To reconstruct this evolution, the article employs historical textual analysis combined with material and archaeological evidence. Primary sources such as Vitruvius, Hero of Alexandria, Theophilus Presbyter, Marin Mersenne, and Hermann von Helmholtz are used not only for the technical information they contain, but also for the scientific assumptions and conceptual frameworks they document. These texts are interpreted alongside surviving instruments, documented reconstructions, and detailed organological surveys, allowing the study to align written evidence with material practice across different periods.

The analysis is further guided by the technological-systems approach familiar from the history of technology (Strelko, Pylypchuk, Berdnychenko, Hurinchuk, Gamaliia, & Sorochnytska, 2019; Pylypchuk, O. Ya., Strelko, & Pylypchuk, O. O., 2021; Vaniuha, Zharkova, Markovych, Pryidun, & Drevnitskyi, 2022). This framework makes it possible to treat the organ's subsystems (wind production, mechanical and pneumatic actions, pipe acoustics, control interfaces, and later electrical and digital components), as interdependent elements that respond to changes in available materials, manufacturing tools, and scientific understanding. This perspective complements, rather than duplicates, the historiographical literature: whereas previous studies have typically emphasized stylistic schools, regional traditions, performance practice, or acoustical measurement, the present study uses those same sources to trace long-term patterns in the organ's technological architecture.

Modern acoustical, engineering, and materials-science research is incorporated selectively to clarify why certain empirical solutions persisted or how specific design choices affected mechanical or acoustic outcomes. These scientific perspectives are not retroactively imposed on earlier builders; rather, they help articulate the underlying physical principles that shaped historical workshop practice and explain transitions that textual sources sometimes describe only indirectly.

Finally, the study follows a chronological comparative method, linking each historical stage to the scientific and technological environment in which organ building operated. This structure allows the analysis to highlight both discontinuities, such as the introduction of electrification or digital signal processing, and deeper continuities in the organ's technological logic. In this way, the methodology complements the historiographical review by offering a unified analytical lens through which disparate strands of scholarship can be connected and reinterpreted.

### **Historiography of the Problem.**

The history of the organ has been described many times, but mostly within musicological or organological frameworks rather than as a long-term history of a technological system. The most widely used point of entry remains the article “Organ” in *Grove Music Online*, which offers a compressed but authoritative narrative from antiquity to the twentieth century, structured around periods, regional schools, and major builders (Owen, Williams, & Bicknell, 2021). This overview is invaluable for chronology, terminology, and basic typology, yet it treats scientific and technological contexts largely as background. Pneumatics, acoustics, metallurgy, and later electronics are mentioned in passing or under specialized subheadings, but they are not framed as drivers of technological change in their own right. The present study builds on this canon by taking many of the same chronological milestones and reinterpreting them explicitly through the lenses of the history of science and technology.

A similar role is played by Nicholas Thistlethwaite's chapter “Origins and development of the organ” in *The Cambridge Companion to the Organ* (1999). Thistlethwaite offers a compact survey from the hydraulis to the modern concert and church organ, with particular attention to action types, case design, and liturgical or musical functions. His narrative is exemplary as a clear organological synthesis and has shaped how students and practitioners understand the broad arc of organ history. Yet, like the *Grove* entry, it stops short of treating the organ as a technological system in the sense used in science and technology studies. Machine tools, industrial materials, electrification, and digital electronics appear as contextual elements rather than as interconnected subsystems whose evolution can be traced in parallel with developments in acoustics, materials science, and control engineering. The present article retains Thistlethwaite's chronological scaffolding but reorients it toward these technological dimensions.

Kerala Snyder's edited volume *The Organ as a Mirror of Its Time: North European Reflections, 1610–2000* moves closer to the perspective adopted here, though on a different scale (Snyder, 2002). The essays in that collection show how specific North European organs reflect confessional, political, and cultural histories, and several contributions explicitly link technical features to patronage, liturgical reform, and changing musical aesthetics. Snyder's own introductory essay formulates the idea of the organ as a “*mirror*” of its time, a metaphor that has been influential in



later work. At the same time, the volume is geographically and temporally bounded: it concentrates on the period from the early seventeenth century to the late twentieth century and focuses on Northern Europe. The central aim is to understand how individual instruments embody particular local or regional histories, not to reconstruct a continuous, two-thousand-year trajectory from the hydraulis to digital hybrids. The present study is indebted to Snyder's conceptual framing but extends it backwards into antiquity and forwards into the digital age, and it shifts the emphasis from cultural microhistory to the long-term coevolution of organ design and scientific–technical knowledge.

Older nineteenth-century treatises, especially Edward Hopkins and Edward Rimbault's *The Organ, Its History and Construction*, represent another important layer of historiography (Hopkins & Rimbault, 1877). Hopkins and Rimbault combined what they called a “new history of the organ” with detailed descriptions of construction methods, specifications, and workshop practice as understood in Victorian Britain. Their work is not a modern secondary study in the contemporary sense but a primary source for how organ builders and organists in the industrial era perceived the past and justified current practices. It documents late nineteenth-century attitudes to pneumatics, wind systems, tonal ideals, and factory production at the moment when organ building was deeply entangled with steam-powered machine tools and expanding transport networks. In the present article, such treatises are used less as historiographical models and more as empirical witnesses to the industrial phase of organ technology, to be reinterpreted in light of later acoustical and materials-science research.

More recent scholarship has begun to connect organ history directly to scientific analysis. Albrecht Schneider's chapter “*Aspects of Sound Structure in Historic Organs of Europe*” in the volume *Sonic Design* sketches the development of European organs from Roman times to the Baroque specifically to provide context for detailed spectral analyses of historic instruments (Schneider, 2024). Schneider's organological survey is concise but important because it explicitly links historical design choices to measurable acoustic outcomes. Nevertheless, his primary goal is to characterize sound structure in a defined historical window, not to follow the instrument's technological evolution into the eras of electrification, electronics, and digital signal processing. The present study takes inspiration from this combination of historical outline and acoustic detail, while extending the narrative into the twentieth and twenty-first centuries and broadening the focus from sound structure alone to include materials, mechanisms, and control systems.

A complementary, more localized approach can be seen in the article by Karol Czajka-Gieldon and Krystyna Kirschke on the organs of St. Mary Magdalene's Church in Wrocław (Czajka-Gieldon & Kirschke, 2025). Their study traces a sequence of instruments from the Middle Ages to the present in a single building, analyzing changes in case design, architectural integration, liturgical function, and technical solutions.

This microhistory demonstrates how organ building is embedded in specific architectural, institutional, and urban contexts, and it includes careful documentation of successive reconstructions and restorations. While the scope is intentionally narrow, the article models how to connect technical history, acoustic environment, and cultural practice in one concrete site. The present work follows this logic of contextualization but at a much larger temporal and geographic scale, and with stronger emphasis on linkages to parallel developments in science and engineering.

Two further strands of research, emerging from science and technology studies, are especially relevant for the conceptual framing of this article. Peter Peters's and Darryl Cressman's study "*A sounding monument: How a new organ became old*" examines how a late twentieth-century replica of a fifteenth-century organ in Amsterdam gradually acquired the status of a historic monument (Peters & Cressman, 2016). Peters and Cressman treat the instrument as a socio-technical object whose "newness" and "oldness" are negotiated through performance practice, institutional discourse, and restoration choices. Here, the focus is less on mechanical or acoustical detail and more on how organ technology becomes entangled with questions of authenticity, heritage, and identity. Karin Bijsterveld and Peter Peters, in their article "*Composing Claims on Musical Instrument Development: A Science and Technology Studies' Contribution*," take an even more abstract step back (Bijsterveld & Peters, 2010). They analyze how makers, historians, and users tell "development stories" about instruments (organs among them), showing that narratives of progress, decline, or revival are themselves constructed and contested. Musical instruments are treated as "black boxes" and "boundary objects" that sit between scientific knowledge, craft practice, and cultural meaning.

These STS-oriented studies do not provide a comprehensive chronological history of the organ, but they sharpen the questions that a technologically informed historiography should ask. They suggest that any account of organ development must consider not only technical innovations but also the narratives that surround them, the ways in which builders and users claim novelty or continuity, and the institutional settings that shape which technologies become dominant. The present article follows this insight by combining long-term historical reconstruction with attention to how different ages understood and justified their own organ technologies.

Taken together, the existing literature offers rich but fragmented coverage. Encyclopedic and companion-volume surveys outline the main chronological and stylistic stages; nineteenth-century treatises document contemporary industrial practices; case studies and regional histories illuminate specific instruments and contexts; acoustical research relates historical designs to measurable sound structures; and STS-inflected work interrogates the narratives and heritage regimes around organs. What remains largely missing is a single, integrated account that traces the organ from the Hellenistic hydraulis to contemporary hybrid and digital instruments while consistently relating changes in design to parallel developments in pneumatics,

acoustics, materials science, electrotechnics, and digital engineering. It is this gap that the present article seeks to address, by treating the organ explicitly as a long-lived technological system whose components and meanings have coevolved with broader scientific and technological transformations.

### **Antiquity. The *Hydraulis* and Early Pneumatic Engineering.**

The story begins in Alexandria, a city known for its concentration of engineers and natural philosophers. Ctesibius, whose work survives primarily through references in Hero of Alexandria and Vitruvius, developed several devices based on the behavior of air and water under pressure (Dessi, 2020; Filson, 2025; Morgan, 2022). The *hydraulis* appears to have been one such invention. Although modern reconstructions must rely on limited archaeological evidence (such as the fragments from Dion and Aquincum) and literary descriptions, scholars generally agree that the instrument used a water-regulated chest to maintain stable air pressure before distributing that air to metal pipes.

Vitruvius's account describes the mechanism in enough detail to demonstrate that its creator understood the importance of constant pressure for controlling sound (Nikolic, 2011; Dessi, 2020). Water served as a natural regulator: fluctuations in airflow from manual pumps were absorbed by the water level in the chamber, ensuring that the pipes received a steady supply. This principle, while conceptually simple, required a careful balance of materials and geometry. Bronze pipes had to be cast or hammered to precise dimensions, and the valves that admitted air needed tight tolerances to avoid leaks.

The existence of such an instrument in the third century BCE indicates that Hellenistic artisans had achieved a high degree of competence in small-scale metalworking and hydraulic control systems. Their ability to manufacture pipes with smooth internal surfaces and predictable acoustical behavior suggests that techniques such as hammering, annealing, and the shaping of thin-walled cylinders were already quite advanced. Historians of ancient technology, including Andrew Barker (1989) and Stefan Hagel (2009), have noted that the *hydraulis* marks one of the earliest documented applications of scientific theory to a practical acoustic device.

The Roman period brought modifications rather than conceptual breakthroughs. By the second century CE, the *hydraulis* had been transformed into a largely pneumatic instrument, operated by foot-powered bellows rather than a hydraulic regulator. The well-preserved organ discovered at Aquincum in 1931, now in the Budapest Museum of Aquincum, reveals the integration of wooden components, leather bellows, and metal pipes arranged in a compact chest (Erdmann, 2023; Filson, 2025). The instrument also indicates a degree of standardization: pipes are grouped by scale, and their construction suggests established workshop practices.

At public events across the empire (amphitheater games, banquets, and military ceremonies), the organ became a symbol of mechanical ingenuity. The Roman

fascination with automata and hydraulic devices provided a cultural environment that encouraged such engineering feats. Writers such as Claudian, Ammianus Marcellinus, and later medieval chroniclers mention organs as marvels of craftsmanship, implying that their technological complexity was widely recognized (Bittermann, 1929; Huysmans, 2015).

Yet the organ's history after late antiquity is more a story of transmission than innovation. Some knowledge persisted in the Byzantine Empire, where organs were used in court ceremonies. The famous organ sent by Emperor Constantine V to the Frankish ruler Pippin III in 757, mentioned by the chronicler Theophanes, suggests that the technology gradually moved westward, but the mechanics described in later sources differ significantly from their ancient predecessors (Apel, 1948; Filson, 2025). What survived was not a continuous technical lineage but a general idea, – an instrument powered by air, capable of producing sustained tones through pipes.

### **The Middle Ages. Wood, Metal, and the Rebirth of Large Mechanical Instruments.**

The revival of organ building in medieval Europe should be understood in relation to developments in craft technologies rather than the rediscovery of ancient engineering texts. Early medieval references, such as the organ built for the church of Winchester in the tenth century (recorded in Wulfstan's *Narratio Metrica*), describe instruments of striking size and power (Lapidge, 1972; Quirk, 1957). These organs relied almost entirely on wood for their structure, with metal used mainly for the resonant parts. The bellows were operated by teams of assistants, highlighting the instrument's dependence on human energy as a mechanical resource.

Medieval woodworking underwent important changes between the ninth and thirteenth centuries. The increasing availability of well-seasoned timber, improvements in hand tools, and advances in joinery techniques allowed for more stable and airtight windchests. Glue production (made from animal collagen), became more reliable, enabling builders to construct large composite structures that could withstand variable humidity and pressure. These workshops were often located in monasteries or cathedral precincts, where access to skilled labor and specialized tools was relatively consistent.

The parallel evolution of metalworking also played a decisive role. The alloy of tin and lead used for organ pipes became increasingly standardized by the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Treatises such as Theophilus Presbyter's *De Diversis Artibus* (early twelfth century) describe methods for casting sheets of metal, forming them into cylindrical shapes, and soldering the seams, – a process strikingly similar to what organ builders continued to use for centuries (Adámková, 2021). The ability to control the alloy ratio influenced both durability and sound quality: higher tin content produced a brighter tone, whereas lead offered ease of shaping. This interplay of acoustics and

metallurgy demonstrates how the organ served as a testing ground for material properties long before modern materials science formalized such studies.

Wind supply systems also evolved significantly. While ancient organs used water or simple pumps, medieval organs relied on multiple wedge bellows, each lifted by hand or foot. The design of these bellows reflects a growing understanding of pressure dynamics. Builders learned to match the size and number of bellows to the air requirements of different ranks of pipes. Surviving examples from later centuries, such as those in the Arp Schnitger school, show the continuity of this approach (Crandall & Bush, 2013). Although the principles were empirical, they nonetheless required careful measurement, predictable materials, and long-term familiarity with pneumatic behavior.

Architecture shaped the organ just as much as technology did. The transition from Romanesque to Gothic building styles, with their soaring vaults and expansive interiors, changed the acoustical environment in which organs were heard. Longer reverberation times and increased volume encouraged the development of larger pipe scales and more prominent façade pipes. Modern acoustic studies, such as those by Leo Beranek, have shown that the medieval cathedral offered an unusually supportive acoustic for sustained tones, making the organ a natural complement to monastic chant and ecclesiastical ritual (Beranek, 1960, 1992, 2004).

By the thirteenth century, the organ had become one of the most complex mechanical devices in Europe. The action that connected keys to valves (typically a system of levers, trackers, and pallets), required fine tolerances and coordinated movement. Although far simpler than the actions of later centuries, these early mechanisms nonetheless reflect a sophisticated understanding of mechanical advantage and motion transfer. In many respects, the medieval organ stood alongside astronomical clocks as one of the period's most advanced engineered artifacts.

The instrument's cultural significance also grew. Chronicles, such as those by Orderic Vitalis and Richer of Reims, describe organs as both musical and technological marvels (Chibnall, 1997; Reilly, 2013). Their inclusion in major churches symbolized institutional power, while their construction offered opportunities to develop and preserve specialized craft knowledge. Even without a continuous transmission of ancient engineering treatises, Europe had recreated a form of large-scale mechanical instrument that rivaled the complexity of its Roman predecessors.

### **Renaissance and Early Modern Transformations. Precision, Acoustics, and Expanding Mechanical Ambitions.**

The Renaissance brought a new intellectual climate that shaped the development of organ building in profound ways. Unlike the medieval period, where the transmission of technical knowledge relied primarily on workshop practice and monastic craft, the Renaissance saw the emergence of a more self-conscious engagement with mathematical proportion, mechanical design, and acoustical theory.



These influences did not replace the empirical traditions of organ builders, but they reshaped the direction of experimentation and offered new frameworks for understanding the instrument's possibilities.

One of the most significant changes was the refinement of the key action. Earlier medieval organs often had short key levers with long pallets beneath them, requiring considerable physical effort (Hopkins & Rimbault, 1877; Maurette, 2018). During the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, builders developed more sophisticated tracker mechanisms capable of transmitting motion over greater distances. Surviving instruments from builders such as Lorenzo da Prato (Bologna, Italy) and the workshop of Conrad Schott in Germany show an increasing attention to balanced movement, reduced friction, and predictable mechanical response (Davies, 2019; Milner, 2000). These improvements reflected broader changes in mechanical engineering. The same period witnessed advances in clockmaking, automata, and precision metal tools, creating an environment in which mechanically complex devices could flourish.

Renaissance acoustical theory also influenced organ design. Gioseffo Zarlino's *Le institutioni harmoniche* (1558) systematized musical intervals and tuning systems in a way that had direct implications for pipe scaling and temperament (Callegari, Lisboa, Gregório, dos Reis, & Martins, 2023; Da Col, 2017). Although Zarlino did not write specifically for organ builders, his ideas circulated widely among musicians and theorists, shaping expectations about consonance and the mathematical basis of harmony. Marin Mersenne's *Harmonie Universelle* (1636–1637) provided an even more explicit scientific treatment of pipe acoustics (Callegari, Lisboa, Gregório, dos Reis, & Martins, 2023; Fabbri, 2007). Mersenne discussed the relationship between pipe length and pitch, the influence of diameter on tone, and the behavior of vibrating air columns. His observations, derived from experiments with organ pipes, helped formalize principles that builders had long understood intuitively. The exchange between scientific treatises and artisanal practice during this period demonstrates the increasingly porous boundaries between craft knowledge and early modern science.

Materials also changed. While tin–lead alloys remained dominant for pipe production, improvements in refining and casting techniques allowed for more consistent sheets of metal. Larger façade pipes, wider scalings, and greater tonal variety emerged in part because builders could rely on predictable mechanical properties. Woodworking likewise benefited from more accurate saws, planes, and drills, producing smoother surfaces and more reliable joints. These tools were sometimes adapted from techniques introduced through military engineering manuals, shipbuilding, and architectural carpentry, – fields that also required geometric accuracy and standardized measurement.

The cultural context of the Renaissance supported this technical complexity. Courts, cathedrals, and civic governments commissioned instruments not only for liturgical purposes but also as expressions of prestige and technological sophistication. Descriptions of court organs in the Duchy of Burgundy, at the Habsburg courts, and in



Italian city-states reveal a fascination with devices that combined mechanical ingenuity with symbolic power (Owen, Williams, & Bicknell, 2021; Snyder, 2002). The organ became a marker of technological modernity, much like elaborate astronomical clocks or hydraulic automata. Its decorative façades often hid intricate inner workings, blending art and engineering in a single architectural object.

By the early seventeenth century, the organ had reached a degree of mechanical and acoustical refinement that set the stage for the great regional schools of the Baroque era. Builders such as Esaias Compenius, Arp Schnitger, and the Silbermann family produced instruments that reflected both local musical traditions and a shared understanding of mechanical design (Povilionis & Povilionienė, 2023). Their work cannot be separated from the broader scientific currents of the time, especially the rise of mathematical acoustics, the dissemination of printed engineering manuals, and the growing use of standardized measurement systems (Milner, 2000; Thistlethwaite, 1999). The organ builder's workshop had become a site where craft, mathematics, and emerging scientific theory met with unusual intensity.

### **The Industrial Revolution and the Mechanization of Organ Building.**

The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries brought transformations to the organ that paralleled major technological shifts in industrial society. No previous era had altered the materials, labor practices, and mechanical systems of organ building so radically. The Industrial Revolution introduced new metals, new production techniques, and new sources of power that reshaped both the scale and the internal logic of the instrument.

One of the most consequential changes was the introduction of machine tools. Precision lathes, drills, and milling machines made it possible to fabricate components with tolerances far beyond what earlier workshops could achieve. This precision influenced several aspects of organ building. Pipe-making, for instance, benefited from more accurate rolling mills that produced uniform sheets of metal. Conical and cylindrical pipes could be formed with predictable dimensions, and voicing practices became more standardized. Steel production, which expanded dramatically in the nineteenth century, enabled builders to incorporate metal frames and supports capable of bearing the weight of increasingly large instruments. The iron-framed organs built in the factories of E. F. Walcker & Co in Ludwigsburg are perhaps the clearest examples of this industrial turn (Huntington, 2006; Thistlethwaite, 1999). Their monumental instrument for Ulm Minster (1856) illustrates how the vocabulary of industrial materials infiltrated ecclesiastical architecture.

The organ also changed through advances in pneumatic systems. The need to operate large instruments with multiple manuals and stops strained the limits of purely mechanical actions. Builders such as Charles Spackman Barker introduced pneumatic lever systems in the 1830s and 1840s, which used bellows-like mechanisms to lighten the touch and expand the possibilities for complex registrations (Casson, 1905; Owen, Williams, & Bicknell, 2021). Barker's lever was documented by contemporaries and

discussed in engineering journals, indicating that its significance extended beyond organ building into the broader development of pneumatic assist mechanisms (Owen, 2002; Thistlethwaite, 2018). The use of pneumatics corresponded to the rise of pressure-based technologies in industry, including steam engines, gas lighting, and compressed-air tools. The organ thus participated in a wider exploration of energy transfer and mechanical advantage in an age when engineers were increasingly attentive to efficiency and responsiveness.

The development of new materials also played a role. Industrial-scale production of leather, felt, and adhesives created more uniform and durable components. Metal alloys could be specified with greater precision thanks to metallurgical research, such as that conducted by Henry Clifton Sorby and others who investigated crystal structure and material properties in the mid-nineteenth century (Kimberley, 1979; Louthan Jr., 2007). Although organ builders did not always engage directly with scientific publications, their material choices benefited from this new knowledge. Metal fatigue, corrosion resistance, and acoustic behavior became more predictable as alloys and treatments improved.

Transport networks (especially railways) had unexpected consequences for organ building as well. Factories capable of producing large components could ship them across Europe or even to the Americas. This contributed to a growth in export-oriented firms such as Cavaillé-Coll in France, Walcker in Germany, and Elliot & Hill in England (Owen, 2002; Thistlethwaite, 2018). Their instruments spread not only musical styles but also standardized engineering practices. The organ was no longer a purely local artifact created within a single workshop; it became part of an international industrial economy.

Scientific research also deepened during this period. Hermann von Helmholtz's *Die Lehre von den Tonempfindungen als Physiologische Grundlage für die Theorie der Musik* (1863) offered the most comprehensive explanation to date of how pipes and resonators produced sound. Helmholtz's work influenced generations of acousticians and engineers, and his experimental use of resonators inspired organ builders seeking to understand tonal brightness, harmonic content, and pipe scaling (Fletcher & Thwaites, 1983). While builders continued to rely heavily on empirical voicing methods, the theoretical framework provided by acoustical science offered new ways to rationalize and systematize tonal design.

By the late nineteenth century, the organ had absorbed many of the defining features of industrial modernity. It incorporated mass-produced parts, used new energy sources, relied on pneumatic and mechanical amplification systems, and often required engineering expertise to design and install. Organs of this period could be enormous, incorporating thousands of pipes, miles of tubing, and increasingly complex control systems. Exhibitions such as the Paris Exposition of 1889 showcased organs alongside other engineering marvels, reinforcing their status as technological achievements as much as musical ones (Fauser, 2017).

Yet these developments also prompted debates about authenticity and craftsmanship. Some musicians and builders lamented the industrialization of the organ, arguing that the refinement and subtlety of earlier instruments risked being lost. This tension between mass production and artisanal tradition foreshadowed similar debates in many other fields, from architecture to instrument making, as industrialization transformed older craft practices.

### **Electrification and the Redefinition of Control Systems.**

The final decades of the nineteenth century and the early twentieth century introduced another set of transformative technologies: electricity, electromagnets, and eventually early electronics. These innovations did not merely supplement existing mechanisms; they redefined the basic logic of how organs were controlled and expanded the conceptual distance between the console and the pipes.

The earliest experiments with electricity in organ actions appeared in the 1860s and 1870s. Builders such as Charles Spackman Barker and later Robert Hope-Jones explored ways to use electromagnets to operate valves (Ramsbottom, C. E., & Ramsbottom, A. J., 1989; McKirdy, 1990; Owen, 2002). Electrical actions eliminated the limitations imposed by mechanical tracker lengths. While older organs required the console to be close to the windchests, electrical connections made it possible to place the console almost anywhere. This opened new architectural possibilities and allowed for much larger instruments without corresponding increases in physical key resistance.

Hope-Jones, working in England and later the United States, became one of the most influential figures in this transition (Miller, 1913). His patents detailed systems that used electric relays, combination pistons, stop controls, and unit-chest designs that separated each pipe from its traditional rank structure. Although many of Hope-Jones's musical ideas were controversial, his engineering contributions were undeniable. His relay systems anticipated later developments in telegraph switching and electrical logic, and they illustrate how organ building began to intersect with fields that would eventually form the basis of computing and automatic control.

The introduction of electric blowers was equally significant. Before this change, large organs required teams of calcants (bellows pumpers). With the advent of compact electric motors, wind supply became far more stable and predictable. Builders could design higher-pressure systems, expanding the tonal range and power of the instrument. Reliable electric blowers also made it feasible to install organs in concert halls, theaters, and public institutions that lacked the traditional staffing of a cathedral.

Electrification coincided with new materials that were becoming increasingly common in manufacturing. Early plastics such as Bakelite appeared in the early twentieth century and were soon used for stop knobs, key coverings, and small insulating components. Advances in wire production, coil winding, and electromagnetic design (technologies also driven by the telephone and telegraph

industries), directly influenced organ actions. Although these developments may appear minor compared to the monumental changes of the industrial period, they altered the organ's internal dynamics and its relationship to the built environment.

By the 1920s and 1930s, the organ had entered a new conceptual era. It was no longer solely a mechanical or pneumatic device but a hybrid machine incorporating electrical, electromagnetic, and mechanical subsystems. In some cases, such as the theater organs built by Wurlitzer, the instrument became part of a larger technological entertainment system, integrated with cinema projectors, lighting controls, and electro-acoustic effects (Landon, 1973). The organ now belonged to a world shaped by electromechanical communication, amplified sound, and industrial entertainment.

The emergence of early electric organs, such as the Hammond Model A (1935), further complicated the picture (Popular Mechanics, 1936). Although not pipe organs, these instruments appropriated many of the organ's traditional forms (multiple manuals, pedalboards, drawbars) and used them to control entirely new sound-generation technologies. Laurens Hammond's tonewheel generator drew on principles of electromechanical induction and owes as much to contemporary engineering research as to organ-building traditions. While the Hammond did not replace the pipe organ, it demonstrated that new scientific knowledge could create electronic analogues of traditional acoustic phenomena.

Throughout this period, organ builders continued to negotiate the tension between technological innovation and musical identity. The electrification of control systems expanded creative possibilities, yet it also raised questions about the nature of the instrument itself. Was an organ with no mechanical connection between the player and the pipes still the same instrument? Debates of this kind reflect broader cultural anxieties about automation and mediation in the early twentieth century, – anxieties that were felt not only in music but in industry, labor, and communication technologies.

### **Electronics, Digital Technologies, and New Acoustical Paradigms (1930–2000).**

By the mid-twentieth century, the worlds of acoustics, electronics, and digital computation were expanding rapidly, and organ builders found themselves navigating a landscape far removed from the craft traditions of earlier centuries. The trajectory from electropneumatic organs to fully electronic and later digital instruments was neither linear nor uniform; yet taken together, these developments reveal how deeply the organ has always been shaped by contemporary scientific knowledge.

The earliest major shift occurred with the invention of electromechanical tone generation. Laurens Hammond's first instruments, introduced in 1935, famously used rotating tonewheels and electromagnetic pickups to create stable waveforms. Although designed primarily as economically accessible alternatives to pipe organs, Hammond's machines became influential for reasons that went beyond cost or portability (Flynn, 1954; Werner & Abel, 2016). They demonstrated that the distinctive features of organ

sound (steady-state tones, harmonic structures, and responsive control interfaces) could be produced through entirely different means.

This period also saw important advances in the scientific study of organ acoustics. Acousticians such as W. J. M. Rankine, later followed by Arthur Benade and others, examined the behavior of air columns in pipes using increasingly sophisticated experimental and theoretical tools (Marsden, 2013). Benade's *Fundamentals of Musical Acoustics* (1976) synthesized many decades of research, offering explanations of harmonic structure, pipe scaling, and resonator acoustics that previous generations of builders could only have approached empirically. Although much of this research addressed the physics of wind instruments more broadly, organ builders drew upon it, especially those working in large firms in Germany, the United States, and Japan. The renewed interest in historically informed performance in the latter half of the twentieth century (coupled with a revival of mechanical tracker actions), reflected not a rejection of science but a desire to apply new knowledge to historically grounded construction methods.

Parallel to these developments, postwar electronics opened new possibilities for sound generation. Companies such as Baldwin, Conn, and later Allen Organ Company experimented with vacuum tubes, oscillators, and frequency divider circuits (Rossing, 1975). These instruments (sometimes labeled "electronic organs"), occupied an ambiguous space between pipe organs and fully digital synthesizers. They often used loudspeakers to project sound, which immediately distinguished their acoustic presence from that of classical pipes, but they retained interfaces reminiscent of traditional organs. Technical literature from the 1950s and 1960s reveals how engineers adapted technologies from radio, radar, and early computing to create stable oscillators and efficient amplifier circuits. For example, Allen's 1971 introduction of the first commercial digital organ, based on digital sampling and microprocessor control, relied on innovations in semiconductor fabrication and digital memory that had emerged only a few years earlier (Riley, 2006).

Digital sampling represented a conceptual turning point. By recording real pipe tones and replaying them through digital circuitry, builders could imitate traditional acoustics with a degree of realism that analog oscillators never achieved. Although early systems required substantial compromises (limited memory, short loops, and a lack of dynamic nuance), they demonstrated the potential of computational approaches to organ design.

The material environment of the late twentieth century also influenced organ construction. The availability of advanced plastics, composite materials, and new adhesives changed workshop practices. PVC and ABS pipes appeared in educational and experimental instruments, valued for their stability and low cost. Carbon-fiber reinforcements were occasionally used in structural elements to reduce weight while maintaining rigidity. CNC (computer numerical control) tools increasingly found their way into organ workshops, enabling precise cutting of wood, metal, and plastic



components. These machines, adapted from the manufacturing sector, allowed builders to standardize parts with unprecedented accuracy. The contrast with earlier centuries is striking: where Renaissance builders relied on hand tools and eighteenth-century builders on simple machine tools, late twentieth-century builders could draw on the same digital design and fabrication methods used in aerospace and automotive industries.

Through these developments, the organ remained connected to the technological ethos of each era. In the mid-twentieth century it intersected with electromechanical engineering; by the 1970s it absorbed techniques from digital computation; by the 1990s it incorporated advanced materials and numerical modeling. Yet despite these transformations, the instrument retained its historical identity, preserving a continuity that bridged craft traditions and scientific innovation.

### **Hybrid Organs, CNC Manufacturing, and the Contemporary Technological Landscape (2000–2025).**

The early twenty-first century has been characterized by a fusion of mechanical, electrical, and digital technologies that would have been difficult to imagine even a few decades earlier. Organ building today exists in a hybrid space shaped simultaneously by historical scholarship, material science, computer engineering, and digital acoustics. This synthesis has led to new ideas about authenticity, sustainability, and technological heritage.

One of the most visible trends in recent decades has been the rise of hybrid organs, those that combine traditional pipe ranks with digital extensions or substitutes (Czajka-Giełdon & Kirschke, 2025). This phenomenon reflects practical, economic, and technological factors. The ability to reproduce certain timbres digitally allows institutions with limited budgets or space to expand the tonal palette of their instruments. High-quality digital stops, based on multichannel sampling or physical modeling, complement real pipes without requiring additional windchests or structural reinforcements. Companies such as *Allen*, *Rodgers*, and *Hauptwerk*-based manufacturers have pushed this integration further, providing systems in which digital and pipe components are regulated from a unified console. Scholarly commentary in journals such as *The Diapason* and *Organists' Review* has highlighted the practical challenges of maintaining historical tonal ideals while incorporating contemporary digital tools.

Parallel to this hybridization, CNC machining has reshaped workshop practices. The precision of CNC routers allows builders to produce windchests, keyboards, pallets, and structural components with repeatable accuracy. While the artistic aspects of voicing and tonal finishing remain largely manual, the foundational work of cutting and shaping parts increasingly relies on automated systems. This development mirrors broader trends in the crafts, where digital fabrication supports (but does not replace) human expertise. For example, modern reconstructions of historical instruments, such



as the North German organs inspired by Schnitger, benefit from CNC-milled racks and templates that ensure structural fidelity (Crandall & Bush, 2013; Schneider, 2024; Thistlethwaite, 1999). At the same time, the delicate process of scaling, cutting, and finishing metal pipes still depends primarily on the hands and ears of skilled artisans.

Material science continues to influence construction choices. Concerns about environmental sustainability have shifted attention toward responsibly sourced timber and alternatives to tropical hardwoods traditionally used for keyboards and structural frames. Modern adhesives and sealants, based on polymer chemistry, offer stability and resistance to humidity that earlier glues could not provide. Metal pipe alloys remain largely tin-lead based, but some builders have experimented with alternative compositions to achieve specific tonal effects or improved durability. Research on corrosion-resistant materials, discussed in publications such as *Materials and Corrosion*, has found occasional application in organ maintenance and restoration, particularly for instruments exposed to fluctuating climate conditions.

The acoustic design of performance spaces has also changed. Whereas medieval and early modern organs were built for reverberant stone churches, many contemporary instruments are installed in concert halls, universities, and multipurpose venues. Acousticians and builders collaborate to model how sound will propagate in spaces with variable acoustic treatments. Digital simulation tools, adapted from architectural acoustics, help visualize reflections, diffusion, and reverberation times before construction begins. These methods, derived from the same scientific tradition that began with nineteenth-century acoustical research, represent an extension of the iterative relationship between organ building and acoustical science.

The digital revolution has further transformed interfaces and control systems. Modern combination actions are essentially computer-controlled memory systems that allow organists to preset registrations across thousands of levels. MIDI (Musical Instrument Digital Interface) integration enables organs to communicate with other electronic instruments, sequencers, and recording systems. Some builders experiment with gestural interfaces or touchscreen controls, though these remain secondary to traditional keyboards and stop controls for most performers. The debate between mechanical authenticity and technological innovation continues, but the presence of digital systems is now widely accepted as part of the practical toolkit of contemporary organs.

In parallel, digital-only organs (software-based systems using sampled or modeled sound) have grown increasingly sophisticated. Hauptwerk and other platforms allow for high-resolution sampling of historic organs, providing musicians with access to instruments that may be geographically distant or fragile (Czajka-Giełdon & Kirschke, 2025; Schneider, 2024). These systems raise new questions about preservation and authenticity. They function as a kind of digital organological record, preserving not only the repertoire but also the acoustic identity of instruments that may not be permanently accessible.

Taken together, these developments demonstrate that contemporary organ building is a fundamentally interdisciplinary practice. It intersects with digital engineering, architectural acoustics, materials science, conservation studies, and performance traditions. The organ remains a living, evolving instrument precisely because it adapts to the scientific and technological ecosystems within which it is built.

## **Discussion.**

### **The Organ as a Mirror of Scientific and Technological Change.**

Across more than two millennia, the organ has repeatedly absorbed, adapted, and repurposed scientific and technological innovations. This resilience raises broader questions about how technological systems evolve over long periods (Casson, 1905; Thistlethwaite, 1999). Unlike many artifacts whose relevance faded with shifts in scientific thinking, the organ retained its identity even as its internal mechanisms changed dramatically (Hopkins & Rimbault, 1877; Snyder, 2002). The hydraulis of Ctesibius, with its hydraulic regulator and bronze pipes, shares little mechanically with a twenty-first-century hybrid organ equipped with digital sampling and CNC-milled components. Yet the conceptual core (the controlled excitation of air to create sustained tone) provides continuity.

This continuity, however, can obscure the ways in which the organ has served as a site of scientific experimentation. In antiquity, it embodied Hellenistic knowledge of pneumatics and hydraulics; in the Middle Ages, it reflected advances in woodworking, metallurgy, and architectural acoustics; in the Renaissance, it became entangled with mathematical theories of harmony and mechanical precision; during the Industrial Revolution, it absorbed machine-tool practices, new materials, and pneumatic amplification; in the twentieth century, it intersected with electricity, electronics, and digital computation. Each phase of its development illustrates how scientific knowledge and material technologies enter into dialogue with existing cultural forms.

The organ also reveals how technological change is shaped by both scientific theory and hands-on experimentation. Builders often learned through a combination of inherited technique and iterative modification. Scientific treatises, when they appeared, offered explanations or new conceptual frameworks rather than direct construction manuals. For example, the acoustical principles described by Mersenne and later by Helmholtz did not dictate pipe construction, but they helped rationalize practices already familiar to voicers and builders. Conversely, empirical knowledge occasionally preceded scientific understanding, as in the long-standing workshop awareness of how pipe scale and cut-up height influence tone, – phenomena that received rigorous explanation only with the rise of acoustical science (Fabbri, 2007; Miller, 1913; Owen, Williams, & Bicknell, 2021).

Another important theme is the relationship between the organ and its architectural setting. Because organs are often built for specific spaces, their design inevitably reflects the intersection of acoustics, engineering, and spatial planning. This

interplay became particularly visible in the Gothic cathedral, the nineteenth-century concert hall, and the modern multipurpose venue. In each case, the organ served as a technological response to a particular acoustic and architectural environment (Huntington, 2006; Landon, 1973; Quirk, 1957).

Finally, the organ provides a clear example of how mechanization and digitization do not simply replace earlier technologies but layer upon them. Mechanical tracker actions coexist today with electropneumatic and digital controls. Hand-voiced metal pipes coexist with digitally modeled stops. CNC fabrication coexists with traditional planing and hand carving. The organ thus represents a technological system that grows through accumulation rather than substitution. It does not discard older forms but redistributes them within new frameworks.

### **Conclusions.**

The organ's two-millennia evolution demonstrates how a single class of artifact can continually absorb and reinterpret advances in scientific knowledge, materials, and engineering while retaining a recognizable structural identity. From the hydraulic regulators of the Hellenistic hydraulis to the electrically driven, digitally assisted instruments of the present, each major transformation in organ design coincided with shifts in wider technological paradigms. Pneumatics, acoustics, metallurgy, machine tooling, electrification, and digital computation entered organ building not as isolated innovations but as part of broader scientific cultures that shaped how builders understood air, motion, resonance, energy, and information.

Reconstructing this process shows that the organ did not evolve through simple replacement of older solutions with newer ones. Instead, its history is characterized by accumulation and reconfiguration: mechanical tracker actions coexist with electropneumatic and digital controls; empirically voiced metal pipes function alongside digitally sampled or physically modelled sounds; and handcrafted components now sit within assemblies shaped by CNC manufacturing and contemporary materials science. This layered structure reflects the persistence of deeply rooted craft traditions as well as the instrument's readiness to accommodate new scientific and technological frameworks.

The analysis also clarifies several conceptual gaps in previous scholarship. Earlier studies have documented individual periods, regional schools, or specific instruments, yet they rarely examined the organ in a continuous, long-duration narrative that links developments across antiquity, the medieval and early modern worlds, the industrial era, and the digital present. Likewise, while organology, acoustics, and STS research have each highlighted particular dimensions of the instrument, few works have treated the organ explicitly as a technological system whose subsystems co-evolve with scientific advances in pneumatics, acoustics, materials science, control engineering, and computation. By synthesizing these perspectives, the present article seeks to

demonstrate that the organ's history is inseparable from the history of science and technology itself.

Understanding the organ in this way not only enriches the historiography of the instrument but also provides a model for studying other long-lived technological artifacts whose development spans multiple scientific revolutions. Future research might extend this approach by examining regional technological traditions in greater depth, comparing organ building with parallel developments in other acoustic or electromechanical systems, or analyzing how digital modelling and fabrication are reshaping contemporary concepts of authenticity and historical continuity. Viewed across its full historical arc, the organ stands as a uniquely instructive case of technological persistence, adaptation, and innovation, – an artifact in which scientific thought and material practice have been intertwined for more than two thousand years.

### **Funding.**

This research received no external funding.

### **Conflicts of interest.**

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## **References**

- Adámková, I. (2021). The Sense of Sight in the Prologues of Theophilus Presbyter's *De diversis artibus*. *Convivium*, 8(1), 132–141. <https://doi.org/10.1484/J.CONVI.5.126198>
- Apel, W. (1948). Early history of the organ. *Speculum*, 23(2), 191–216. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2852952>
- Barker, A. (Ed.). (1989). *Greek musical writings: The musician and his art* (Vol. 1). Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Benade, A. H. (1976). *Fundamentals of musical acoustics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Beranek, L. L. (1960). Audience and seat absorption in large halls. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 32(6), 661–670. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.1908175>
- Beranek, L. L. (1992). Concert hall acoustics – 1992. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 92(1), 1–39. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.404283>
- Beranek, L. L. (2004). Music and acoustics. In *Concert Halls and Opera Houses: Music, Acoustics, and Architecture* (pp. 1–18). New York: Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-21636-2\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-21636-2_1)
- Bijsterveld, K. T., & Peters, P. F. (2010). Composing claims on musical instrument development: A science and technology studies' contribution.

- Interdisciplinary Science Reviews*, 35(2), 106–121.  
<https://doi.org/10.1179/030801810X12723585301039>
- Bittermann, H. R. (1929). The Organ in the Early Middle Ages. *Speculum*, 4(4), 390–410. Retrieved from <https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/pdf/10.2307/2847071>
- Callegari, P. A., Lisboa, C. A. V., Gregório, A. R. F., dos Reis, I. M., & Martins, M. E. G. (2023). O repertório musical presente em Le istituzioni harmoniche (1558) de Gioseffo Zarlino: catalogação e experimentação prática com um conjunto de flautas doces. In *XXXIII Congresso da ANPPOM* (pp. 1–14). Retrieved from [https://anppom.org.br/anais/anaiscongresso\\_anppom\\_2023/papers/1719/public/1719-7622-1-PB.pdf](https://anppom.org.br/anais/anaiscongresso_anppom_2023/papers/1719/public/1719-7622-1-PB.pdf) [in Portuguese].
- Casson, T. (1905). Development of the Resources of the Organ. *Proceedings of the Musical Association*, 32, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrma/32.1.1>
- Chibnall, M. (1997). A twelfth-century view of the historical church: Orderic Vitalis. *Studies in Church History*, 33, 115–134. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0424208400013218>
- Crandall, B. J., & Bush, D. D. E. (2013). The Organ Reform Movement – A Revitalization of the 17th Century North German Organ. *Journal of Undergraduate Research*, 2013(1), 2309. Retrieved from <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/jur/vol2013/iss1/2309>
- Czajka-Gieldon, K., & Kirschke, K. (2025). History and overview of the unique architecture of pipe organs in St. Mary Magdalene's Church in Wrocław (Poland) from the Middle Ages to the present day. *Arts*, 14(5), 121. <https://doi.org/10.3390/arts14050121>
- Da Col, P. (2017). The Tradition and Science: The Istitutioni harmoniche of Gioseffo Zarlino. In *Musical Theory in the Renaissance* (pp. 373–393). London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315090689-11>
- Davies, S. (2019). Kirchen Cron or Baalsfeldzeichen? The Organ as a Sign of Confessional Identity, 1560–1660. In D. J. Burn, G. McDonald, J. Verheyden, & P. De Mey (Eds.), *Music and Theology in the European Reformations* (pp. 307–340). Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols. <https://doi.org/10.1484/M.EM-EB.5.116307>
- Dessi, P. (2020). Music, Power, and Propaganda in Julio-Claudian Imperial Rome (27 BC–68 AD). In T. A. C. Lynch, E. Rocconi (Eds.), *A Companion to Ancient Greek and Roman Music* (pp. 435–446). Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119275510.ch31>
- Erdmann, E. (2023). Life under Roman rule – In parts of present-day Hungary. *Hungarian Educational Research Journal*, 13(4), 531–542. <https://doi.org/10.1556/063.2023.00153>
- Fabbri, N. (2007). Genesis of Mersenne's Harmonie Universelle: The Manuscript Livre de la nature des sons. *Nuncius*, 22(2), 287–308. <https://doi.org/10.1163/182539107X00554>



- Fausser, A. (2017). World Fair–World Music: Musical Politics in 1889 Paris. In *Nineteenth-Century Music* (pp. 203–247). London: Routledge. Retrieved from <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781315090504-23/>
- Filson, L. V. (2025). Medieval Mechanical Marvels. In *Renaissance Automata of the Villa Pratolino: Magic, Mechanics, and Medici Ambition* (pp. 199–248). Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-86993-8\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-86993-8_4)
- Fletcher, N. H., & Thwaites, S. (1983). The Physics of Organ Pipes. *Scientific American*, 248(1), 94–103. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24968811>
- Flynn, T. G. (1954). Electronic organs. *Students' Quarterly Journal*, 25(98), 113–118. <https://doi.org/10.1049/sqj.1954.0094>
- Hagel, S. (2009). *Ancient Greek music: A new technical history*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Helmholtz, H. (1863). *Die Lehre von den Tonempfindungen als Physiologische Grundlage für die Theorie der Musik*. Braunschweig: Friedrich Vieweg und Sohn [in German].
- Hopkins, E. J., & Rimbault, E. F. (1877). *The Organ: its history and construction*. London: Robert Cocks and Co.
- Huntington, S. L. (2006). Boston's Great (est) Organ. *The Tracker-Journal of the Organ Historical Society*, 50(3-4), 72–95. Retrieved from <https://organhistoricalsociety.org/downloads/tracker/public/old/2006-50-34.pdf>
- Huysmans, J. K. (2015). *Against the Grain: (À rebours)*. Berlin: BoD–Books on Demand.
- Kimberley, M. M. (1979). Origin of oolitic iron formations. *Journal of Sedimentary Research*, 49(1), 111–131. <https://doi.org/10.1306/212F76D0-2B24-11D7-8648000102C1865D>
- Landon, J. W. (1973). Long Live the Mighty Wurlitzer. *Journal of Popular Film*, 2(1), 3–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00472719.1973.10661675>
- Lapidge, M. (1972). Three Latin poems from Æthelwold's school at Winchester. *Anglo-Saxon England*, 1, 85–137. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675100000090>
- Louthan Jr., M. R. (2007). Traditional Metallurgy, Nanotechnologies, and Structural Materials: A Sorby Award Lecture. *Journal of Failure Analysis and Prevention*, 7(4), 229–238. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11668-007-9055-z>
- Marsden, B. (2013). Ranking rankine: Wjm rankine (1820–1872) and the making of ‘engineering science’ revisited. *History of science*, 51(4), 434–456. <https://doi.org/10.1177/007327531305100403>
- Maurette, P. (2018). The Organ of Organs: Vesalius and the Wonders of the Human Hand. *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 48(1), 105–124. <https://doi.org/10.1215/10829636-4280873>
- McKirdy, A. (1990). The Engineering of the Organ. *Transactions of the Newcomen Society*, 62(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1179/tns.1990.001>
- Mersenne, M. (1636–1637). *Harmonie Universelle*. Paris: Sebastien Cramoisy.



- Miller, G. L. (1913). *The Recent Revolution in Organ Building: Being an Account of Modern Developments*. New York: Charles Francis Press. Retrieved from <https://ia801602.us.archive.org/8/items/recentrevolution00mill/recentrevolution00mill.pdf>
- Milner, S. J. (2000). Organ culture and organ contracts in renaissance Pistoia. *Recercare*, 12, 77–94. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41701334>
- Morgan, H. (2022). Nero's Experiments with the Water-Organ. *The Classical Quarterly*, 72(1), 285–302. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838822000362>
- Nikolic, M. (2011). An investigation of Vitruvius' technical vocabulary relating to water conduits and pipelines in de arch. 8.6.6–9: vis spiritus and colluviaria (Re)examined. *Mnemosyne*, 64(3), 424–446. <https://doi.org/10.1163/156852511X505060>
- Owen, B. (2002). Technology and the Organ in the Nineteenth Century. In K. J. Snyder (Ed.), *The Organ as a Mirror of Its Time: North European Reflections, 1610–2000* (pp. 213–229). Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195144154.003.0016>
- Owen, B., Williams, P., & Bicknell, S. (2021, January 20). Organ. *Grove Music Online*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.article.44010>
- Peters, P., & Cressman, D. (2016). A sounding monument: how a new organ became old. *Sound Studies*, 2(1), 21–35. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20551940.2016.1214445>
- Popular Mechanics. (1936, April). Electric Pipeless Organ Has Millions of Tones. *Popular Mechanics* (April), 569–571. Retrieved from [https://books.google.com.ua/books?id=INsDAAAAMBAJ&q=Popular+Science+1936+plane+%22Popular+Mechanics%22&pg=PA569&redir\\_esc=y#v=snippet&q=Popular%20Science%201936%20plane%20%22Popular%20Mechanics%22&f=false](https://books.google.com.ua/books?id=INsDAAAAMBAJ&q=Popular+Science+1936+plane+%22Popular+Mechanics%22&pg=PA569&redir_esc=y#v=snippet&q=Popular%20Science%201936%20plane%20%22Popular%20Mechanics%22&f=false)
- Povilionis, G., & Povilionienė, R. (2023). In Search of an Appropriate Name: Consolidation of the Vox Humana Designation. In *Vox Humana Craftsmanship: Origins, Intersections and Influence on Lithuanian Pipe Organ Building* (Vol. 23, pp. 3–21). Cham: Springer International Publishing. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-10290-5\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-10290-5_1)
- Pylypchuk, O. Ya., Strelko, O. H., & Pylypchuk, O. O. (2021). Academician V. I. Vernadsky about the originality of life in Space (To the 100th anniversary of his work “The Beginning and Eternity of Life”). *Space Science and Technology*, 27(2), 85–92. <https://doi.org/10.15407/knit2021.02.085>
- Quirk, R. N. (1957). Winchester Cathedral in the tenth century. *Archaeological Journal*, 114(1), 28–68. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00665983.1957.10854117>
- Ramsbottom, C. E., & Ramsbottom, A. J. (1989). Development of the electric organ and the significance of the contributions of Robert Hope-Jones, MIEE. *IEE Proceedings A (Physical Science, Measurement and Instrumentation)*, 136(6), 321–329. <https://doi.org/10.1049/ip-a-2.1989.0060>

- Reilly, D. J. (2013). The Bible as Bellwether: Manuscript Bibles in the Context of Spiritual, Liturgical and Educational Reform, 1000–1200. In E. Poleg, & L. Light, (Eds.), *Form and Function in the Late Medieval Bible* (pp. 9–29). Leiden: Brill. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004248892\\_003](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004248892_003)
- Riley, C. (2006). *The Modern Organ Guide*. Maitland: Xulon press.
- Rossing, T. D. (1975). Resource letter MA-1: Musical acoustics. *American Journal of Physics*, 43(11), 944–953. <https://doi.org/10.1119/1.10018>
- Schneider, A. (2024). Aspects of sound structure in historic organs of Europe. In A. R. Jensenius (Ed.), *Sonic Design. SSD 2022. Current Research in Systematic Musicology* (Vol. 12, pp. 225–258). Cham: Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-57892-2\\_13](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-57892-2_13)
- Snyder, K. J. (Ed.) (2002). *The Organ as a Mirror of Its Time: North European Reflections, 1610–2000*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195144154.001.0001>
- Strelko, O., Pylypchuk, O., Berdnychenko, Yu., Hurinchuk, S., Gamaliia, V., & Sorochnytska, O. (2019). Historical milestones of electrotechnical equipment creation for active experiments in the near-earth space by Ukrainian scientists. In *Proceeding's 2019 IEEE 2nd Ukraine Conference on Electrical and Computer Engineering, UKRCON 2019* (pp. 1229–1234). Lviv, Ukraine: IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/UKRCON.2019.8879983>
- Thistlethwaite, N. (1999). Origins and development of the organ. In N. Thistlethwaite & G. Webber (Eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Organ* (pp. 1–17). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CCOL9780521573092.002>
- Thistlethwaite, N. (2018). The English organ—an overview. In I. Quinn (Ed.), *Studies in English Organ Music* (pp. 5–55). London: Routledge. Retrieved from <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781315163857-2/>
- Vaniuha, L., Zharkova, I., Markovych, M., Pryidun, S., & Drevnitskyi, Y. (2022). Analysis of prerequisites and conditions for the foundation of an aircraft engine enterprise in Ukraine. *History of Science and Technology*, 12(1), 169–185. <https://doi.org/10.32703/2415-7422-2022-12-1-169-185>
- Werner, K. J., & Abel, J. S. (2016). Modal Processor Effects Inspired by Hammond Tonewheel Organs. *Applied Sciences*, 6(7), 185. <https://doi.org/10.3390/app6070185>

**Олена Спольська**

Тернопільський національний педагогічний університет імені Володимира Гнатюка, Україна

## **Марія Кирея**

Тернопільський національний педагогічний університет імені Володимира Гнатюка, Україна

## **Наталія Григорук**

Тернопільський національний педагогічний університет імені Володимира Гнатюка, Україна

## **Світлана Салдан**

Львівський національний університет імені Івана Франка, Україна

## **Ігор Рябов**

Національна музична академія України імені П.І. Чайковського, Україна

### **Пневматика, акустика та цифровий звук: Орган в історії науки і техніки**

***Анотація.** У статті проаналізовано історичний розвиток органа як складної технологічної системи, розвиток якої відображає послідовні зміни в наукових знаннях, матеріалах та інженерних практиках від античності до цифрової доби. У дослідженні використовується комбінована методологія історичного текстового аналізу, вивчення археологічних та матеріальних свідочств, а також інтерпретації за допомогою технологічно-системного підходу, підкріпленого сучасними акустичними та інженерними дослідженнями. Результати показують, що кожен основний етап в історії органу відповідає певному науково-технічному середовищу. Елліністичний «гідравліс» розкриває раннє застосування пневматичного та гідравлічного регулювання, заснованого на механічних теоріях Ктесібія та описаного Вітрувієм, у той час як римські та візантійські адаптації ілюструють, як металообробка, деревообробка та емпірична акустика сформували ранній дизайн органу. У середньовічний період спостерігається перехід до великих дерев'яних конструкцій, удосконалення сплавів олова та свинцю та поява складних механізмів стеження, адаптованих до архітектурної акустики романських та готичних соборів. Епоха Відродження та ранній Новий час пов'язують створення органів з розвитком математичної акустики. Такі теоретики, як Царліно та Мерсенн, запропонували концептуальні пояснення висоти звуку, масштабування та гармонійної структури, які вплинули на практику роботи у майстернях. Під час промислової революції верстати, стандартизовані матеріали та пневматичні допоміжні пристрої сприяли безпрецедентному збільшенню розмірів, надійності та складності механізмів, тоді як акустична наука XIX століття, зокрема роботи Гельмгольца, прояснила фізичну основу звуку труби. Електрифікація кінця XIX і XX століть перетворила системи управління*

органом, розділивши пульт управління та труби, ввівши електромагнітні механізми та інтегрувавши орган у ширші електромеханічні мережі. Друга половина XX століття та початок XXI століття демонструють зростаючий вплив електроніки, цифрового семплювання, фізичного моделювання, виробництва на станках з ЧПУ та появу гібридних конструкцій органів, що поєднують традиційні труби з обчислювальною генерацією звуку. У сукупності ці результати показують, що орган розвивався не шляхом заміни старих технологій новими, а шляхом їхнього постійного накопичення, переосмислення та інтеграції в рамках змінних наукових парадигм. У статті робиться висновок про те, що двохтисячолітня історія органу є унікальним прикладом для розуміння довгострокової взаємодії наукових знань, інновацій у галузі матеріалів та технологічної спадкоємності.

**Ключові слова:** історія техніки; історія клавішних музичних інструментів; орган; історія музики; історія мистецтва

*Received 15.05.2025*

*Received in revised form 11.11.2025*

*Accepted 17.11.2025*

**Olena Spolska, Mariia Kyreia, Nataliya Hryhoruk, Svitlana Saldan, Igor Riabov**

Pneumatics, acoustics and digital sound: The organ in the history of science and technology ..... 472

**Oleh Strelko, Nadiia Ryzheva, Svitlana Hurinchuk, Yuliia Berdnychenko**

The history of the emergence, development and improvement of high-speed railways: Technical, socio-economic and cultural aspects ..... 499

**Liudmyla Vaniuha, Mariya Markovych, Myroslava Tsyhanyk, Vasyl Baraniuk, Yuliia Nebesna**

Silent cinema as a technological system: Infrastructure, innovation, and institutionalization (1890–1930) ..... 531