Journal of Turkish Organology, September 2025
2(2), 93-110, e-ISSN: 3023-7890
turkorganolojidergisi.com

Genç Bilge yayıncılık
gencbilgeyayincilik.com

Research Article

A historical and organological analysis of early electronic musical instruments

Serkan Çolak[1]

Faculty of Music Sciences and Technologies, Ankara Music and Fine Arts University, Ankara, Türkiye

Article Info

Submitted: 3 August 2025
Accepted: 28 September 2025
Online: 30 September 2025

Keywords
Digital transformation
Electronic musical instruments
Magnetic tape
Organology
Synthesizer history

Abstract

This study aims to explore early electronic musical instruments developed between the late 19th century and the mid-1980s within the frameworks of both the history of technology and organology. The research examines six main developmental phases: from electromechanical systems to vacuum tube technologies; from magnetic tape-based studio practices to voltage-controlled modular synthesizers; and from the era of digital synthesis to the MIDI era. Employing a qualitative and historical-descriptive research design, the study is conducted through secondary sources drawn from the literature on the history of electronic music, sound technologies, and instrument design. Instruments such as the Telharmonium, Theremin, Ondes Martenot, Hammond organ, RCA Mark II, Moog and Buchla systems, as well as the Minimoog, Prophet-5, Synclavier, Fairlight CMI, and Yamaha DX7, are analyzed through case studies with regard to their technical features, performance interfaces, aesthetic approaches, and organological characteristics. The findings reveal that the historical development of electronic musical instruments is not merely a linear sequence of technical innovations, but rather reflects a profound transformation in the very concept of what constitutes a musical instrument. During the electromechanical era, the definition of the instrument expanded to encompass entire buildings and their transmission infrastructures. The vacuum tube era introduced novel possibilities for touchless performance and hybrid interface designs. In the era of magnetic tape-based studios, the instrument evolved into a spatial structure that extended across the entire studio environment. The emergence of voltage-controlled synthesizers and integrated systems reshaped the relationship between performer and instrument, emphasizing real-time, performative control. With the advent of digital synthesis and MIDI technology, the physicality of the instrument progressively gave way to software-based interfaces and digitally defined configurations. In conclusion, this study demonstrates that examining early electronic musical instruments through the lens of organology not only enriches discussions on instrument classification and the history of music technology but also offers a framework for reconceptualizing the term electronic instrument as a living, evolving, and dynamic organological category.

To cite this article:

Çolak, S. (2025). A historical and organological analysis of early electronic musical instruments. *Journal of Turkish Organology, 2*(2), 93-110. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17912094

Introduction

The emergence of electronic musical instruments occurred during a pivotal period at the intersection of music and technological history, beginning in the late 19th century. This period was shaped by a historical context in which the scientific and technological advancements accelerated by the Industrial Revolution had transformative effects on forms of artistic expression. Following the revolutionary outcomes of the use of electricity in communication devices such as the telegraph and telephone, the idea of producing, controlling, and transmitting sound by electronic means emerged as a new and experimental field of possibility that attracted the attention of inventors and avant-garde composers alike (Holmes, 2008, p. 18). These developments profoundly transformed the ways in which music was produced, performed,

[1] Lecturer Dr., Faculty of Music Sciences and Technologies, Ankara Music and Fine Arts University, Ankara, Türkiye. -mail: serkancolak@mgu.edu.tr ORCID: 0000-0001-5445-6378

and experienced. They not only enabled the creation of previously unheard sonic textures, but also brought the composer's control over sound materials to an unprecedented historical level. Furthermore, they redefined the concept of the "instrument," reshaping the boundaries of the term within the field of organology.

This study aims to examine the historical development of electronic musical instruments through an analytical approach that considers both their technical and aesthetic dimensions, within a chronological framework extending from early electromechanical devices to the onset of the digital revolution. In academic discourse, the term *electronic musical instrument* is defined as "a device in which periodic electric currents, selectively generated or controlled by a performer for the purpose of producing music, are converted into sound" (Miessner, 1936, p. 1429). This comprehensive definition encompasses significant technological and organological diversity, bringing together under a single overarching concept a wide range of systems—from those that amplify mechanical vibrations through electrical means to fully electronic circuits and digital data protocols.

Therefore, the study of electronic instruments involves not only tracing a narrative of technological advancement, but also following a continuous transformation in terms of the instrument's physical structure, performance interface, spatial configuration, and the performer–instrument relationship. This classification highlights the necessity, within the expanding scope of the discipline of organology, of examining instruments not only through their material and acoustic properties but also through their electrical and digital principles of operation.

The body structures of electronic instruments (e.g., large-scale mechanisms occupying entire buildings or portable synthesizer housings), their sound production mechanisms (electromechanical, vacuum tube, transistor-based, digital), performance interfaces (touchless control, keyboard, sequencers, performance control surfaces), and usage contexts (studio, stage, home studio, etc.) offer a unique and multilayered field of analysis from a contemporary organological perspective. Therefore, the historical development of electronic instruments should be understood not merely as a series of technical innovations, but as an organological process involving the transformation of musical aesthetics, performance practices, and the very concept of the instrument itself.

Accordingly, this study aims to systematically investigate the development of electronic musical instruments from Thaddeus Cahill's *Telharmonium*, noted for its centralized and large-scale architecture, to early vacuum tube-based instruments such as the *Theremin* and *Ondes Martenot*, followed by the magnetic tape-based approaches of *Musique Concrète* and *Elektronische Musik*. The scope then extends to the emergence of voltage-controlled modular synthesizers, the widespread adoption of integrated and polyphonic models such as the *Minimoog* and *Prophet-5*, and finally, the digital revolution characterized by FM synthesis, sampling technologies, and the establishment of the MIDI standard.

The central thesis of this study asserts that each of these historical phases corresponds to a gradual yet profound redefinition of the instrument in terms of its physical embodiment, performance interface, spatial configuration, and the performer–instrument relationship.

This chronological framework seeks to illuminate the technological evolution that begins with early experimental ventures into the use of electricity as a musical medium and culminates in the digital systems that form the foundation of contemporary music production. The initial steps of this trajectory were marked by electromechanical devices that embodied the concept of electrically produced music, yet faced various limitations in terms of practicality, portability, and sustainability. Over time, these early experiments were reinterpreted and refined both technically and aesthetically, enabling electronic musical instruments to become central components of contemporary musical culture. From an organological perspective, these instruments have significantly expanded the conceptual boundaries of what constitutes a musical instrument.

In this context, the study seeks to answer the following research question: *How did the design of electronic musical instruments between 1876 and 1985 transform the instrument in terms of body, interface, spatiality, and the performer–instrument relationship?*

This study aims not merely to summarize the frameworks of prominent scholars such as Holmes and Jenkins—frequently referenced in the literature on the history of electronic music—but to engage in a critical dialogue with them from an organological perspective. While Holmes primarily interprets the period in question as a succession of

technological innovations, this study repositions the same chronological trajectory as an organological re-reading that explores how the concept of the "instrument" was transformed in terms of its physical body, performance interface, spatial configuration, and the performer–instrument relationship.
Similarly, Jenkins's approach, which focuses on the role of synthesizers in popular music culture, is here reconsidered not only in terms of the sonic ideals associated with popular music but also in relation to how these instruments have expanded the very notion of the instrument family. In doing so, this study places electronic musical instruments at the intersection of music technology and organology, establishing them as a focal point for interdisciplinary inquiry.

Within this framework, the central claim of the study is that the historical development of electronic musical instruments should not be read merely as a linear sequence of technical innovations, but rather as an ongoing organological negotiation that continually redefines the ontological boundaries of the instrument. Departing from the technology-centric narratives offered by authors such as Holmes and Jenkins, this article foregrounds organological categories—such as body, interface, spatiality, and the performer–instrument relationship—to reinterpret the evolution from the architectural scale of the *Telharmonium*, through the "expanded instrument" paradigm of the studio era, to the shift toward data protocols marked by the advent of MIDI and digital synthesis.

Thus, the study seeks to move beyond a linear narrative of progress, and instead conceptualizes the history of electronic instruments as a multilayered process of organological transformation—one that is continuously reconstructed along the axes of embodiment, space, and control.

Methodology

This study is structured as a historical-descriptive research that investigates the historical development of early electronic musical instruments and the reflections of this process on musical aesthetics, performance practices, organological classification, and the history of technology. The primary data sources of the study consist of secondary literature produced in the fields of electronic music history, sound technologies, instrument design, and contemporary organology. In particular, Holmes's comprehensive study on the history of electronic music (Holmes, 2008), Jenkins's work examining the relationship between synthesizer culture and popular music (Jenkins, 2007), and various compilations containing technical documentation on early instruments are used as main reference sources. This approach aligns with the historical-descriptive research design and document analysis method defined within the scope of qualitative research in the social sciences (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2021).

Within the scope of this research, the development of electronic musical instruments is analyzed along two axes: chronological and thematic. The chronological axis is structured around six main periods spanning from the late 19th century to the mid-1980s:

- The Electromechanical Era (1876–1930)
- The Vacuum Tube Revolution (1920–1940)
- The Age of Magnetic Tape and Studio Production (1940–1960)
- The Voltage Control Paradigm and Modular Synthesizers (1960s)
- Integrated Synthesizers and Mass Dissemination (1970s)
- The Digital Revolution and New Synthesis Paradigms (1975–1985).

This historical framework not only outlines key technological turning points but also aims to reveal the impact of these transitions on musical aesthetics, performance practices, and instrument design from an organological perspective.

The thematic axis is structured around three main focal points:

Technological Paradigm: The transition from electromechanical systems to vacuum tube technologies, followed by voltage control and digital synthesis; the transformation of sound production mechanisms.

Performance Interface and Musician–Instrument Relationship: The influence of touchless control mechanisms, keyboard-based structures, sequencers, and performance-oriented control surfaces on instrumental performance and perception.

Aesthetic Orientation and Musical Context: The philosophical distinctions between *Musique Concrète* and *Elektronische Musik*, interactions with popular music, the shift from studio-centered production to stage-centered performance, and the reflections of these transformations on debates within organological classification.

In this context, each period is examined through a case study approach, focusing on prominent instruments. Devices such as the Telharmonium, Theremin, Ondes Martenot, Hammond Organ, RCA Mark II, Moog and Buchla systems, as well as the Minimoog, Prophet-5, Synclavier, Fairlight CMI, and Yamaha DX7 are analyzed through a descriptive approach in terms of their technical features, performance interfaces, usage contexts, and organological positioning. Each case study explores the specific transformations indicated in the dimensions of instrument body, interface, spatiality, and performer–instrument relationship (Holmes, 2008; Jenkins, 2007). In addition, primary sources such as manufacturer catalogs, patent documents, and period-specific magazine articles related particularly to instruments like the Minimoog, Prophet-5, and Yamaha DX7 have been reviewed and evaluated to clarify the historical context concerning their technical specifications and intended user profiles.

This study does not rely on quantitative data sets and does not employ statistical analysis; instead, it utilizes qualitative content analysis and historical interpretation methods. Within this framework, intertextual comparisons are used to identify commonalities and divergences across different periods, highlighting the reciprocal interaction between technological innovations and organological discussions related to musical aesthetics, performance practices, and instrument design. Moreover, themes such as the philosophical differences between the *Musique Concrète* and *Elektronische Musik* schools, the ways in which voltage-controlled modular systems transformed the roles of composers and performers, and how the production–performance dichotomy was redefined with the digital revolution are discussed based on existing literature (Holmes, 2008, pp. 35, 56, 154, 227, 265, 325; Jenkins, 2007, pp. 50, 65, 73–75). This methodological approach enables the historical development of electronic musical instruments to be understood not merely as a sequence of technical innovations, but as a multilayered process encompassing transformations in musical thought, aesthetic perception, performance practices, and criteria for organological classification—thus offering an analytical framework aligned with the principles of qualitative historical research (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2021).

The study is structured around six main periods within this analytical framework. It begins by examining the progression from electromechanical eras to early electronic instruments based on vacuum tube technology. This is followed by a discussion of the age of magnetic tape and studio production, voltage-controlled modular systems, and integrated analog synthesizers within an organological context. In the final section, the transformation shaped by digital synthesis, sampling, and the MIDI standard is evaluated in terms of both the technical foundations of modern music production and the emerging forms of the instrument concept intertwined with digital protocols.

Results

In this section, the findings obtained in accordance with the method detailed in the previous section are organized and presented along the axis of the historical periodization adopted in the study. Each period is examined through its prominent instruments; the technological characteristics, aesthetic positioning and cultural contexts of these instruments, as well as the implications they bear in terms of organological classification, are analysed together. In this way, the historical development of electronic musical instruments is articulated from a holistic perspective, with particular attention to the period-specific turning points and to how these ruptures are reflected in instrument design and musical practices.

The Discovery of Electricity in Music and Early Instrument Experiments (1876–1930)

The late 19th and early 20th centuries mark a period during which the first experimental applications demonstrating the potential of electricity as a musical medium and creative agent emerged. This period also represents a stage in which the tension between technological idealism and the practical and technical limitations of the era became increasingly evident. Early devices—often described as "electromechanical giants"—were developed around visionary concepts such as transmitting music through telephone lines, ideas that were remarkably forward-looking within their historical context (Holmes, 2008, p. 12; Collins et al., 2013). However, the extremely large physical scale, high costs, and various technical shortcomings of these systems signaled that the future of electronic sound production would likely depend on decentralized, smaller-scale, and more accessible systems. These early examples made it clear that electricity could serve not only as an auxiliary medium for amplifying acoustic instruments but also as a creative component capable of generating sound from scratch.

The origins of this period lie in experimental work conducted in parallel with the development of telephone technology. In 1876, Elisha Gray demonstrated that the frequency—and thus the pitch—of a sound could be controlled using a self-vibrating electromagnetic circuit, a discovery that led him to develop the *Musical Telegraph*, an instrument whose primary function resembled that of a monophonic oscillator. In this device, the vibration of steel reeds was maintained by electromagnets, and the resulting electrical signal was transmitted over telephone lines. Gray later incorporated a simple loudspeaker system featuring a diaphragm vibrating within a magnetic field to increase audibility, thereby creating a closed structure in which electrical oscillations were directly converted into audible sound. Although the *Musical Telegraph* was originally conceived more as a technological invention than as a musical instrument, it is widely regarded as one of the earliest concrete examples demonstrating that electric current could be transformed directly into musical sound (Holmes, 2008, pp. 8–10). From an organological perspective, the device represents an early prototype that radically redefined the instrument's body, sound-generation mechanism, and performance modality, marking a distinctive threshold that foreshadowed the later trajectory of electronic instrument design.

When this initial period is evaluated as a whole, it becomes evident that the instrument's physical body expanded into large-scale industrial mechanisms, its sound production shifted toward electromagnetic circuitry, and its spatial dimension was extended through the concept of "remote listening" via telephone lines. Yet the cumbersome structure and limited sonic capabilities of these systems underscored the need for more compact, flexible, and directly controllable solutions to unlock the musical potential of electricity. This recognition laid the groundwork for a transition from such large-scale experiments to more abstract electronic designs based on vacuum tubes, as exemplified by Thaddeus Cahill's *Telharmonium*. The experimental nature of these early electromechanical systems represents not merely a technical step, but an organological rupture in which the conceptual boundaries of what constitutes a musical instrument were actively questioned (Collins et al., 2013).

Thaddeus Cahill's Telharmonium: An Early Electromechanical Sound Machine

The first large-scale and most ambitious attempt at electronic sound production materialized with the *Telharmonium*, developed by Thaddeus Cahill. Considering the technological and infrastructural vision behind it, as well as its physical scale and cost, the *Telharmonium* stands out as a remarkable project for its time. Weighing approximately 200 tons and measuring 18 meters in length, this colossal apparatus resembled an industrial generator more than a traditional musical instrument. With a construction cost of around $200,000—equivalent to several million dollars today—it was one of the most expensive technological investments of its era. Installed in New York's *Telharmonic Hall*, the system occupied nearly an entire floor of the building for over two decades, and could only be transported using a specially designed setup involving 30 railway cars (Holmes, 2008, p. 12).

This massive physical scale reveals that Cahill's ambition was not simply to invent a new musical instrument, but to establish a centralized music distribution system capable of delivering performances to subscribers via telephone lines. From an organological perspective, this indicates that the *Telharmonium* should be conceptualized not merely as a sound-producing object, but as a comprehensive musical technology system designed together with its own distribution infrastructure.

The *Telharmonium* was based on a sound generation system involving electromechanical tone wheels—an early and large-scale implementation of the principle of additive synthesis (Holmes, 2008, p. 13). Signals derived from tone wheels generating fundamental sine waves were combined to create more complex timbres rich in harmonic content. This approach would later inspire Laurens Hammond's *Hammond Organ*, which achieved significant commercial success. The *drawbar* system in the *Hammond Organ* can be seen as a more compact, cost-effective, and performer-accessible version of the additive synthesis model first realized in the *Telharmonium*. In this sense, the *Telharmonium* represents a foundational link in the organological lineage of subsequent electromechanical organs.

However, the *Telharmonium* had notable limitations, both musical and technical. Cahill's forward-looking keyboard design—featuring 36 notes per octave—posed significant challenges for performers accustomed to the 12-tone equal-tempered system. This unusual layout made consistent practice and repertoire development difficult. On a technical level, transmitting music over telephone lines led to several problems related to signal strength and fidelity. Each additional subscriber diminished the overall volume, and bass frequencies in particular suffered from distortion described as “growling,” which negatively impacted the listening experience. These issues were among the main reasons why the *Telharmonium* failed to achieve commercial viability (Holmes, 2008, pp. 14–15).

Despite these shortcomings, the *Telharmonium* made a significant contribution to the history of music and technology by materializing the concept of electronic sound production in a functioning system. With an instrument body large enough to fill an entire building, performance space became an integral part of the instrument itself. While the interface was operated via a keyboard, the sound was transmitted across telephone lines to distant locations. This created a unique example in which the body, space, and distribution network merged into a single “instrument system” from an organological standpoint.

The limitations of the *Telharmonium* underscored the need for smaller, more localized instruments focused on the performer’s direct interaction. This recognition paved the way—both theoretically and practically—for a transition toward more compact designs, such as the *Hammond Organ*, shifting the focus of electronic instrument design from centralized infrastructure to individual performance contexts.

Overall, this period represents a stage in which, although electronic sound production had not yet become economically or practically sustainable, the instrument–space–infrastructure relationship was opened to radical organological reconsideration. Devices like the *Telharmonium* conceptualized the instrument not as a self-contained body, but as an integrated technical-economic system involving tone generators, telephone lines, and listening spaces. In contrast to later compact and performer-centered instruments, the *Telharmonium* exemplified a centralized, infrastructure-dependent model. Consequently, these electromechanical giants served not merely as technical "failures," but as initial paradigms to be transformed—paradigms from which future designers learned what to avoid and how to innovate in terms of scale, energy requirements, and distribution logic.

This early organological legacy made visible the tension between centralization and decentralization, magnitude and portability, institutional infrastructure and individual expression. This tension would resurface in various forms throughout subsequent phases of electronic music history (Collins et al., 2013; Holmes, 2008, pp. 15–18).

Electromechanical giants like the *Musical Telegraph* and the *Telharmonium* demonstrated the feasibility of using electricity for musical sound generation. However, their massive scale, infrastructural demands, and limited timbral flexibility prevented them from becoming part of everyday musical practice. This tension increasingly highlighted the need for solutions offering more compact circuitry, portable bodies, and richer sonic possibilities—ultimately preparing the ground for the next phase marked by vacuum tube technology and abstract electronic circuit design.

While the *Telharmonium* was technologically advanced, it proved economically and practically unsustainable. It thus served as a kind of “negative blueprint” for later designs. The *Hammond Organ*, with its portable body, lower cost, and user-friendly interface, can be understood as a systematic response to the limitations of Cahill’s project. In this regard, the *Telharmonium’s* commercial “failure” became a key threshold, revealing how success criteria in organological terms—such as scale, accessibility, and usage context—were being redefined. It indirectly shaped the trajectory of later electromechanical instrument design by exposing the conditions under which new instruments could be viable, performative, and musically relevant.

The Emergence of Abstract Electronic Sound and New Performance Interfaces (1920–1940)

The widespread adoption of vacuum tube technology in the 1920s marked a significant paradigm shift in electronic instrument design—from bulky, mechanically driven systems based on direct physical vibration to more abstract, flexible, and relatively compact electronic circuits. This transformation not only made instruments more functional in terms of size, portability, and installation but also expanded the range of producible sounds, increased timbral diversity, and enabled the emergence of novel performance interfaces that redefined musician–instrument interaction.

Vacuum tube-based circuits facilitated the exploration of new sound production techniques—such as the heterodyning oscillator principle—that were unfeasible with prior acoustic or electromechanical constructions. As a result, continuous pitch transitions, touchless control, and timbral expressions unfamiliar to traditional musical practices of the time became part of the musical vocabulary (Holmes, 2008, p. 19; Battier, 2020). From an organological perspective, this period represents a critical threshold in which the physical relationship between instrument and performer was fundamentally redefined, prompting a reconsideration of concepts such as contact, corporeality, motion, and control.

Within this framework, instruments such as the *Theremin* and *Ondes Martenot* exemplify a loosening of the distinction between the instrument's body and its interface. They introduced performance paradigms in which physical contact was replaced by body–field interactions or hybrid configurations. While the *Telharmonium* had merged the instrument's physical body with its distribution system into a single industrial structure, instruments of this period demonstrated a trend toward miniaturization, with an increasing emphasis on the visibility and intimacy of the performer's bodily engagement (Schnell & Battier, 2002). This shift forms a conceptual bridge to the later reconceptualization of the studio environment as an "expanded instrument."

The Theremin: Touchless Performance, Electronic Timbre, and Body–Field Interaction

The most iconic and innovative instrument of this period was the *Theremin*, developed in 1920 by Russian inventor Leon Theremin (Lev Termen). Distinguished by its radical departure from all previous musical instruments in terms of both working principle and performance interface, the *Theremin* is considered a major turning point in the history of electronic music. It operates through the combination of two high-frequency radio oscillators via the heterodyning method. One oscillator remains fixed, while the other is connected to a vertical antenna. The distance of the performer's hand from this antenna modulates the variable oscillator's frequency via capacitive body effect, and the frequency difference between the two oscillators produces an audible signal that determines pitch. A second, loop-shaped horizontal antenna controls amplitude in a similar fashion, allowing the performer to manipulate both pitch and volume simultaneously using hand gestures—entirely without physical contact.

This resulted in a completely unprecedented performance technique in music history (Holmes, 2008, p. 19; Jenkins, 2007, p. 48; Battier, 2020). The *Theremin's* unique interface generated a strikingly visual performance aesthetic while enabling continuous pitch transitions and microtonal expressions—musical gestures for which no direct analogue existed in the conventional music language of the time. From an organological standpoint, the *Theremin* occupies a singular position in that it redefines the concept of the "instrument" from a handheld or touch-based object to one defined by the body's interaction with an electromagnetic field (Schnell & Battier, 2002).

Following its invention, the *Theremin* gained significant cultural visibility. When exhibited at the Moscow Industrial Fair in 1920, it reportedly captured the attention of Vladimir Lenin, who not only tried the instrument himself but also ordered hundreds to be produced and toured across the Soviet Union. After Theremin emigrated to the United States in 1927, the instrument was manufactured commercially in the 1930s. During the 1940s and 1950s, it became a characteristic sonic element in science fiction and suspense films—particularly associated with Alfred Hitchcock's *Spellbound* (1945) (Holmes, 2008, p. 23). In popular music, the *Theremin's* most recognizable appearance is in The Beach Boys' 1966 hit *Good Vibrations*.

Nonetheless, despite its innovative design, the *Theremin* was often perceived primarily as a device for generating effects. This perception limited its recognition as a "serious" concert instrument at the institutional level. Organologically, this is significant: the radical nature of the *Theremin's* operation and performance paradigm makes it difficult to categorize within traditional instrument families. While the instrument's body was reduced to a small cabinet and two antennas, its true "instrumentality" was embodied in the performer's interaction with the surrounding electromagnetic field. In this sense, the *Theremin* became a pioneering example of electronic instruments that emphasize corporeal gesture and performative visibility.

Particularly in the science fiction films of the 1940s and 1950s, the *Theremin's* sound came to signify the alien, the uncanny, and the otherworldly—establishing the instrument not only as a technological innovation, but also as a sonic icon evoking specific affective and imaginative dimensions within popular culture (Holmes, 2008, pp. 23–25; Battier, 2020).

The Ondes Martenot and Other Innovations: Hybrid Interfaces, Electromechanical Organs, and Early Experiments in Synthesis

As an alternative to the touchless performance paradigm introduced by the *Theremin*, French cellist and radio telegraphist Maurice Martenot developed a different approach. With his 1928 invention, the *Ondes Martenot*, Martenot sought to create an electronic instrument more familiar to orchestral musicians, in contrast to the *Theremin's* unconventional and alienating interface. In early models of the instrument, pitch was controlled via a string attached to a ring worn on the finger, which was moved horizontally. Later versions incorporated a traditional keyboard, thereby offering a hybrid interface that allowed for both continuous pitch glides, similar to the *Theremin*, and discrete pitch control akin to keyboard instruments (Holmes, 2008, p. 24; Gil Noé, 2015). From an organological perspective, this hybrid structure served as an aesthetic and practical "bridge," facilitating the integration of electronic instruments into traditional orchestral contexts.

Another significant instrument developed during this period, which quickly gained widespread use, was the *Hammond Organ*. Inheriting the technological legacy of the *Telharmonium*, the *Hammond Organ* incorporated the principle of additive synthesis and an electromechanical tonewheel system into a more compact and cost-effective body—making it suitable for use in homes, churches, and concert venues. The contrast between the *Telharmonium* and the *Hammond Organ* clearly demonstrates the evolution of electronic instrument design from centralized, large-scale systems to portable formats appropriate for everyday musical practice. Although both instruments relied on similar sound-generation principles, the *Hammond Organ* allowed for more flexible and performer-friendly control of timbral components through its "drawbar" system (Holmes, 2008, pp. 26–27).

Given the *Telharmonium's* approximately 200-ton structure and its requirement for industrial-scale infrastructure, the portable body and commercial success of the *Hammond Organ* highlight how two instruments based on the same synthesis principle can occupy radically different positions in terms of body architecture, performance context, and practical application. While the *Telharmonium* represented a centralized, broadcast-oriented "system instrument," the *Hammond Organ* became a widely used instrument addressing individual performers and local communities.

Other notable instruments from this period include the *Trautonium*, developed by Dr. Freidrich Trautwein and later extensively used by composer Paul Hindemith and virtuoso Oskar Sala. Similarly, the *Coupleaux–Givelet Organ* was conceived as an electronic replacement for pipe organs, though it failed to compete commercially with the *Hammond Organ*. Meanwhile, the *Novachord*—which supported polyphony up to 72 notes—was significant for incorporating early examples of functions like envelope control, which would later become standard in modern synthesizers (Holmes, 2008, p. 28; Collins et al., 2013). From an organological perspective, these instruments exemplify the need to reconceptualize the notion of the instrument family not only through acoustic parameters but also through the architecture of electronic circuits and the nature of control interfaces.

In general, the vacuum tube era substantially expanded the sonic palette of electronic music and provided composers with expressive possibilities previously unattainable. However, most instruments from this era were designed primarily for live performance, often monophonic, and tailored toward immediate, real-time interaction. This created a growing tension with the emerging compositional need to record, manipulate, layer, and reconstruct sound over time. That tension laid the groundwork for magnetic tape-based studio production, shifting the concept of the instrument from a singular body toward the broader system of recording and editing equipment—the foundation of the "studio instrument" model.

The instruments developed during the vacuum tube era demonstrated how flexible the relationship between instrument body and performance interface could become. In the *Theremin*, the instrument transformed into an "invisible" interface by positioning the performer's body within an electromagnetic field; the *Ondes Martenot*, through its hybrid design, offered a transitional solution that embedded electronic timbres into traditional orchestral practice. The *Hammond Organ*, in turn, redefined the industrial-scale body of the *Telharmonium* in a compact form suitable for personal and communal use. This period thus reveals a continuity ranging from radically experimental interfaces to hybrid solutions approximating conventional instrument families—showing how the concept of the instrument was both expanded and rescaled according to different usage contexts.

Despite these innovations, the dominant instruments of this period remained primarily monophonic, live-performance-oriented, and designed for real-time interaction. They proved insufficient for addressing composers' growing need to record, edit, fragment, and recompose sound in multilayered structures. This demand directly catalyzed the emergence of magnetic tape technology and a studio-centered mode of production (Holmes, 2008, pp. 28–30; Collins et al., 2013; Schnell & Battier, 2002).

Instruments such as the *Theremin*, *Ondes Martenot*, and *Hammond Organ* brought electronic timbre into both the concert hall and popular music culture. Through touchless performance, hybrid interfaces, and electromechanical organ structures, they fundamentally redefined the instrument–body–space relationship. However, their design emphasis on monophonic, real-time performance could not meet the emerging demands for recording, fragmentation, reorganization, and multi-layered sonic construction. This limitation became one of the key drivers behind the shift toward the magnetic tape era, in which sound itself came to be treated as an autonomous "object" and the studio environment was reconceptualized as an expanded instrument in its own right.

The Studio Era: Magnetic Tape, the Sound Object, and Early Programmable Synthesizer Prototypes (1940–1960)

The widespread adoption of magnetic tape following World War II brought about a fundamental transformation in the ontological status of music. During this period, music was no longer conceived solely as a transient, real-time performance, but rather as a tangible *sound object*—something that could be cut, spliced, reversed, slowed down, accelerated, and restructured in multilayered ways. Although invented in 1928, magnetic tape technology did not gain widespread use outside of Germany until after 1945 (Holmes, 2008, p. 35; Terrio, 2005). This technology redefined the figure of the composer—not merely as someone who writes scores, but as a "sound sculptor" who works directly with recorded material and shapes sound as a plastic medium.

This paradigm shift laid the foundation for the emergence of specialized studio environments in cities such as Paris and Cologne, where two distinct philosophical approaches to electronic music took form: *Musique Concrète* and *Elektronische Musik*. From an organological standpoint, this period witnessed a redefinition of the concept of the "instrument"—no longer restricted to a single physical object, but rather understood as an *expanded instrument system* encompassing the entirety of the studio environment (Schnell & Battier, 2002; Battier, 2020).

The *Musique Concrète* approach, centered in Paris, was developed by French radio engineer and composer Pierre Schaeffer. In this tradition, environmental and acoustic sounds—such as train noise, doors, and human voices—were used as primary musical materials. Schaeffer aimed to construct abstract compositions by detaching these "sound objects" from their original contexts and manipulating them through techniques such as cutting, looping, reversing, and speed variation. This practice gave rise to a new musical thought process focused not on the source of sound, but on its perceptual and auditory characteristics (Holmes, 2008, pp. 56–58; Terrio, 2005).

In contrast, the *Elektronische Musik* movement based in Cologne—led by composers such as Herbert Eimert and Karlheinz Stockhausen under the auspices of West German Radio (WDR)—adopted purely electronically generated sine waves as their point of departure. In this approach, core musical parameters such as pitch, duration, timbre, and intensity were organized systematically according to serial principles. The resulting compositions embodied a highly abstract, rational, and mathematically structured aesthetic (Holmes, 2008, p. 56; Terrio, 2005).

The opposition between these two approaches formed the core of early aesthetic debates in electronic music. On one side stood a concrete orientation grounded in the manipulation of found and recorded sounds; on the other, an abstract orientation based on the serial organization of entirely synthetic tones. From an organological perspective, *Musique Concrète* redefined the instrument as a system composed of recording and editing devices, whereas *Elektronische Musik* conceptualized the instrument as a modular structure comprising oscillators, filters, and other studio-based electronics.

In this way, the concept of the instrument expanded beyond physical objects to include the technological infrastructure of the studio itself, reshaping the relationship between tool, medium, and instrument (Schnell & Battier, 2002; Battier, 2020).

During this era, the instrument extended beyond a singular body to encompass the entire studio space, while the figure of the performer merged with that of the composer, technician, and editor. However, this model posed significant limitations—high cost, institutional dependency, and restricted real-time performance capabilities—making it difficult for electronic music to reach a broader community of performers. These constraints, in turn, gave rise to major programmable synthesizer projects such as the *RCA Mark II* and *Siemens Studio* systems. At the same time, they helped pave the way for the next generation of performance-oriented, voltage-controlled synthesizer designs.

RCA Mark II, Siemens System and Programmable Synthesizers

One of the most notable developments of the studio era was the emergence of large-scale synthesizer prototypes that combined sound generation, various forms of sound transformation, and sequencing functions within a single system. Typically funded by universities or large institutions, these systems were produced in limited quantities and often used only in specialized studios at certain centers. One of the most striking examples in this context is the RCA Mark II Synthesizer, installed in 1957 at the Columbia-Princeton Electronic Music Center with support from the Rockefeller Foundation.

Known as "Victor," this system occupied an entire room and consisted of thousands of vacuum tubes in an extremely complex structure. Its most distinctive feature was its programmability via punched paper tape. Composers encoded parameters such as pitch, duration, timbre, and envelope for each note onto the tape using a binary coding system, thereby enabling composers — especially serialists like Milton Babbitt — to design intricate and precise structures that would have been practically impossible for human performers to execute. Organologically, the RCA Mark II can be regarded as an example in which the performer is largely excluded from the system and the composer assumes the role of "programmer," representing a radical reorganization of the performer–instrument relationship.

However, the RCA Mark II had significant practical limitations: its range of timbres remained relatively limited, and the programming process was laborious and non-intuitive. Moreover, in its early years, sound recording was done on media older than magnetic tape, which reduced the system's flexibility and narrowed its field of application.

A similar approach was developed at the end of the 1950s within the Siemens Studio for Electronic Music in Munich. In the Siemens system, compositions were programmed via rolls of four parallel punched tape strips. These strips controlled the four fundamental parameters of sound: pitch (octave and note), volume (graded scale), duration, and timbre (filter settings). The system directed sound sources such as sine-wave and square-wave generators via this programmable structure.

Although both the RCA and Siemens systems aimed — at a theoretical level — to provide composers with complete control over sound, their non-intuitive interfaces, highly indirect and time-consuming composition processes, and unsuitability for real-time performance limited their usage to a small circle of specialists. This situation clearly revealed that electronic music should not remain solely a studio-based, tape-focused production activity, but should also be developed as a practice grounded in immediate performance, performative interaction, and direct musician–instrument relationships.

From an organological perspective, these systems transformed the instrument's body into a room-sized machine assembly, while the performance interface shifted to punched tape programming panels and control consoles. Yet, relegating bodily gestures and real-time responsiveness to the background emphasized — in contrast — the need for a "return to performance," a need that would later find expression in voltage-controlled synthesizers. In this sense, intermediary solutions such as the Electronic Sackbut proposed a novel response by shrinking the instrument's body and making its interface responsive.

Electronic Sackbut: Pioneer of Voltage Control and Performance-Oriented Interface

Contrary to the large-scale, extremely laborious studio systems, the Electronic Sackbut — developed beginning in 1945 by the Canadian inventor Hugh Le Caine — represents an astoundingly forward-looking approach to future synthesizer design. Considered one of the earliest prototype examples of voltage-controlled synthesizers in music history, this instrument occupies a special position because it early on materialized the idea of performance-based instantaneous control in electronic music.

The Electronic Sackbut featured a mechanism sensitive to the pressure applied to the keys. This allowed the performer to modulate the timbre and other sound parameters in real-time by varying the pressure on the keys, providing highly sensitive and simultaneous control. The control was achieved by routing the voltage signal generated by the keyboard to the sound-producing oscillators and sound-shaping circuits. This structure can thus be considered both an early form of the voltage-control principle and a performance-oriented interface enabling the real-time control of multiple parameters. Indeed, the conceptual foundations of the modular synthesizers developed in the 1960s by Robert Moog and Don Buchla bear clear traces of this approach pioneered by the Electronic Sackbut.

From an organological standpoint, this example reduced the instrument's body to a compact, physically accessible console placed before an individual performer and redefined the performance interface via pressure sensitivity and continuous parameter modulation. In doing so, it created a critical bridge between the programmable but "static" machine aesthetics of the studio era and the performance-centered modular systems of the 1960s. As such, it offered a technological and aesthetic precedent for the future identity of the electronic instrument under the voltage-controlled paradigm.

The studio era redefined the concept of the instrument not as a discrete object, but as an expanded studio instrument comprising tape recording systems, mixing consoles, large-scale programmable synthesizers, and embedded electronic infrastructure within spatial environments. RCA Mark II and the Siemens system, through their structures that excluded the performer and positioned the composer as the "programmer" of the system, created a radical rupture in the performer–instrument relationship. In contrast, examples like the Electronic Sackbut opened an alternative path: through voltage control and performance-oriented interfaces, they reunited electronic sound with embodied performance practices. These opposing orientations reveal that the development of electronic instruments was not determined solely by technical possibilities, but also by aesthetic choices regarding the distribution of composer–performer roles.

Magnetic tape technologies and early studio-synthesis systems provided unprecedented levels of control and abstraction over sound, expanding the aesthetic horizons of electronic music through the schools of Musique Concrète and Elektronische Musik. However, the high cost, complex programming processes, and lack of real-time performance capability of large-scale prototypes such as RCA Mark II and Siemens system posed a limitation: they confined electronic music to a narrow expert circle. This limitation spurred a search for smaller-scale, flexible voltage-controlled systems in which both composer and performer could directly and intuitively control parameters during performance — a search that laid the groundwork for the emergence of modular synthesizers in the 1960s.

The Rise of Voltage-Controlled Synthesis: From Modular Systems to the Commercial Synthesizer Identity (1960s)

The 1960s represent a critical period marking the transition of electronic music from its "invention age" to its "instrument age." During this era, as voltage-controlled systems became standardized, modular architectures emerged, in which electronic sound-producing modules could be connected independently yet flexibly. Thus, the synthesizer came to be positioned not merely as a technology producing new sounds, but as a musical instrument that directly expands the creative expressive capacity of composers and performers. This technical transformation shifted the production of electronic music away from the institutional studio monopoly towards individual musicians; it laid the foundation for the rapid proliferation of electronic sounds across a broad spectrum—from academically centered experimental work to popular music and commercial production practices (Pinch & Trocco, 2002; Menoche, 2005; Horn et al., 2022).

Moog and Buchla: Two Aesthetic Lines from Keyboard-Centered Design to Experimental Interfaces

In the mid-1960s, the synthesizers developed in two different regions of the United States by Robert Moog (East Coast) and Donald Buchla (West Coast) represented not only a technical but also an aesthetic and organological divergence in the design of voltage-controlled electronic musical instruments. This divergence manifested across many levels—from control interfaces and timbral possibilities to target user profiles and musical contexts. Robert Moog adopted the piano keyboard as the primary control interface in his synthesizer designs, aiming for rapid adoption by traditional musicians educated in Western musical canon. This choice facilitated the alignment of Moog synthesizers with tonal music language and laid the groundwork for their quick popularity in genres such as rock, jazz, and pop. In contrast, Donald Buchla deliberately rejected the traditional keyboard interface's tonal and formal constraints, positioning electronic music as a fundamentally experimental domain. Control units such as touch plates, random voltage generators, and sequencers stood out in Buchla's systems, guiding the performer toward a more open-ended sound organization, independent from conventional pitch structures (Holmes, 2008, p. 221; Pinch & Trocco, 2002; White, 2022).

This bifurcation of approaches is directly reflected in the sonic output produced by the synthesizers. Moog systems typically relied on subtractive synthesis, shaping harmonically rich waveforms through filtering—especially using Moog's characteristic ladder low-pass filter—to yield the warm, full-bodied, and rounded timbres that became their hallmark. Conversely, Buchla synthesizers prioritized techniques such as wave-shaping and frequency modulation, aiming to produce more metallic, sharp, and complex sonic textures. Buchla's design philosophy was less about imitating traditional instrument timbres than about creating previously unheard soundscapes; thus, the electronic instrument was positioned not as a carrier of existing musical language, but as a tool for generating a new sonic language altogether (Horn et al., 2022; White, 2022).

From an organological perspective, the Moog–Buchla divergence illustrates how decisively the instrument's interface design and aesthetic positioning can shape its identity. With their keyboard-based interfaces, Moog synthesizers integrated the electronic instrument into existing instrumental families; by contrast, Buchla systems defined the instrument as a new body–machine interaction space. Consequently, the 1960s became a dual-directional organological expansion period, in which electronic instruments could simultaneously integrate into the conventional instrument family or radically diverge from it (Pinch & Trocco, 2002; Menoche, 2005; White, 2022; Horn et al., 2022).

***Switched-On Bach*: The Legitimation of the Moog Synthesizer and Its Positioning in Popular Music**

The real turning point in bringing the Moog synthesizer out of academic and institutional studio circles and before a broad listening audience came with the release of Switched-On Bach by Wendy Carlos in 1968. In the album, works by Johann Sebastian Bach were re-performed solely using the Moog modular synthesizer, employing multichannel recording and meticulous editing processes; this resulted in an interpretative approach that challenged the instrument's boundaries in terms of articulation, dynamics, and timbral variety. Achieving unexpected commercial success, *Switched-On Bach* rose high on the classical music charts and repositioned the synthesizer as a "serious" musical instrument capable of carrying a historical repertoire — rather than merely an experimental or effect-oriented device (Jenkins, 2007, p. 50; Holmes, 2008, p. 218; Pinch & Trocco, 2002).

Following this rupture, Moog synthesizers quickly gained prevalence in the realm of popular music. As leading figures of the time such as The Beatles and Mick Jagger began using the Moog in studio recordings and stage productions, electronic timbres became a permanent component of rock and pop's sonic world. In this way, the synthesizer shed its identity as a device confined to closed studio environments and acquired an established instrument status both on stage and in the studio; this contributed to the blurring — and in some aesthetic contexts, the dissolution — of boundaries between electronic music and popular music (Pinch & Trocco, 2002; Menoche, 2005).

From an organological perspective, this process can be read as a phase during which the legitimacy domain of the electronic instrument expanded. With the same body and timbre architecture, the Moog gained a hybrid identity as an instrument capable of carrying both Bach interpretations and popular music repertoire — thus transforming the electronic instrument into a flexible "family member" that can traverse different layers of musical culture.

The significance of *Switched-On Bach* is not limited to legitimizing the Moog as a "serious" music instrument. The fact that Wendy Carlos (then known as Walter Carlos) later became publicly visible as a trans woman intersects with gender and visibility debates frequently highlighted in electronic music history. The synthesis technologies — on one hand frequently identified with male-dominated, high-tech studio environments and on the other hand associated with identity and expressive freedom through figures such as Carlos — transform electronic instruments into tools that carry cultural and social meanings beyond their technical function. This context calls for an organological analysis that extends beyond body and interface design to include the relationship between the instrument and the social position of its performer (Pinch & Trocco, 2002).

Moreover, the historical importance of *Switched-On Bach* should not be regarded as limited to timbral and performative innovations. The fact that Wendy Carlos publicly came out as a trans artist in the following years suggests that the synthesizer could function not only as a tool offering new sound possibilities, but also as an expressive domain enabling a rethinking of gender identity, body, and technology. The relatively "bodiless" and abstract interfaces of electronic instruments create a space with potential to challenge traditional gender roles shaped around conventional instrument performance; this calls for the socio-cultural dimension of organological analysis to be taken into account. From this perspective, *Switched-On Bach* can be viewed not only as the legitimation of the Moog synthesizer but also as one of the early heralds of new possibilities opened by electronic technologies in the realms of identity and representation.

An Alternative from Europe: EMS VCS3 and the Birth of a Portable Synthesizer Aesthetic

Around the same period, Europe witnessed noteworthy developments that directly shaped the design of electronic instruments. In 1969, the British firm Electronic Music Studios (EMS) released the VCS3 — conceived as a more compact, portable, and affordable alternative compared to the large modular systems of Robert Moog or Don Buchla. Instead of the patch cables commonly used in Moog systems, the VCS3 employed a "pin matrix" — a patch panel resembling a chessboard — where users could insert small pins to connect oscillators, filters, amplifiers, and modulators. Although it had a fixed physical housing, this design preserved much of the routing flexibility and sound-design capabilities characteristic of modular synthesizers. Because of its relatively small size and portable body, the VCS3 offered clear advantages for stage use. Its distinctive timbre, featuring the slightly "rough" texture produced by analog waveforms filtered through its circuitry, along with its innovative control interface, led to widespread adoption — particularly in Europe's progressive rock and electronic music scenes. Bands such as Pink Floyd and Tangerine Dream used the VCS3 both in live performances and studio recordings, helping the instrument become one of the defining icons of Europe-centric electronic sound aesthetics. These developments signified a shift: the instrument's body was liberated from the studio walls and settled into portable enclosures; the musical space itself moved from the fixed studio to the stage, tour, and mobile environments. By the end of the 1960s, the timbral diversity, control flexibility, and creative possibilities offered by voltage-controlled modular synthesizers were clearly demonstrated. Yet the large physical size, complex patching, and high cost of modular systems still limited their user base. Consequently, there emerged a clear demand for solutions that offered portability, standardization, and ease of use — and in response, the 1970s witnessed the rise of integrated synthesizers that combined oscillators, filters, and envelope generators within a single housing.

Moog, Buchla, and EMS — with instruments such as VCS3 — collectively demonstrated the timbral potential and control flexibility of voltage-controlled synthesis, helping the synthesizer become an indispensable tool for both experimental music and popular music alike. However, the large modular systems' physical bulk, complicated patch structures, and lack of portability created a need — especially for live performance contexts — for more compact, standardized, and quickly deployable instruments. This need drove the development and widespread adoption of integrated synthesizers throughout the 1970s.

Integrated Synthesizers: The Massification of Synthesized Sound (1970s)

The 1970s mark a period in which the synthesizer was redefined—as both a technical architecture and a musical entity—as a "fully-fledged instrument." During this phase, technology shifted away from large-scale studio systems toward portable, relatively low-maintenance, all-in-one solutions; modular configurations gave way to compact synthesizers integrating oscillators, filters, envelopes, and keyboard control within a single housing. This transformation made electronic sound production accessible to a broader community of musicians—no longer confined to a narrow circle of specialists—with the rise of polyphony. Consequently, the synthesizer evolved into a core instrument that influenced not only experimental sound aesthetics but also the harmonic textures and arrangement practices of popular music.

The Icon of Portable Analog Synthesis: Minimoog

The most critical threshold marking the beginning of this era was the release of the Minimoog by Moog Music in 1970. The Minimoog combined the fundamental components of modular systems—three oscillators, a low-pass filter, and two envelope generators—into a single wooden-bodied keyboard instrument, with pre-wired architecture. This design gave rise to an intuitive, patch-cable–free synthesizer type, highly suited for both stage and studio use. Organologically, the Minimoog represents a turning point by transforming the "system" logic of modular synthesis into a discrete, portable "instrument" identity.

The characteristic "Moog bass" and "lead" sounds quickly became predominant in the timbral palette of genres such as progressive rock, funk, and jazz-fusion. Musicians like Rick Wakeman of the band Yes helped elevate the instrument's symbolic status by using multiple Minimoogs on stage. This success reinforced the industry-wide tendency to regard synthesizers not simply as studio-based experimental devices but as portable, integrated, performance-oriented musical instruments.

Integrated Synthesizers: The Diversification of Designs and Growing Competition

The commercial and aesthetic success achieved by Minimoog opened the door for many manufacturers to enter the synthesizer market during the 1970s — leading to greater technological variety, new design approaches, and production of synthesizers at more accessible price points. In this process, the company ARP Instruments emerged as one of Moog's strongest competitors: models like ARP 2600 and ARP Odyssey stood out with more stable oscillator designs and distinctive timbral characters.

From the mid-1970s onward, Japanese firms such as Korg and Roland also joined the global synthesizer producers. Roland, with products like System 700 and System 100, targeted professional studio users, while Korg's MS-series synthesizers aimed at a broader and semi-professional musician base.

These developments led not only to diversification in circuit design and technical capacity but also to significant variation in instrument aesthetics, user-interfaces, and performance practices. As a result, the synthesizer became part of a broad instrument family embodying different design philosophies and use-contexts.

The competition between Moog and ARP in the 1970s shows that expectations for an "ideal instrument" were shaped not only by technical and timbral parameters, but also by considerations such as stability, stage reliability, user interface, and pricing. While Moog's characteristic filter-driven timbres attracted certain preferences, ARP's stable tuning and modulation possibilities associated that brand with different performance and production practices. Thus, from an organological perspective, defining a "successful instrument" in that era must take into account not only musical aesthetics, but also industrial, economic, and usage-contextual criteria.

The Emergence of Polyphony and Programmable Memory

In the second half of the 1970s, the most significant breaking point in synthesizer technology was the adoption of polyphony. Until that time, synthesizers had largely been designed as monophonic instruments, allowing only a single note to be played at a time. With the development of polyphonic synthesizers, it became possible to play multiple notes simultaneously, thereby enabling chord production, the creation of harmonic textures, and the construction of multi-layered harmonic structures directly on the synthesizer. This transformation elevated the synthesizer from being merely a "lead" instrument carrying melodic lines to a harmonically functional and central instrument.

In this context, one of the most important instruments was the Prophet-5, released by Sequential Circuits in 1978. In addition to offering five-voice polyphony, the Prophet-5 attracted attention with its programmable memory feature, which was highly innovative for its time. Musicians could store sounds they designed in the instrument's memory and, especially during stage performances, quickly recall them with a single keypress. This feature eliminated the need to reconfigure the panel before each track, making performance more practical and rendering the synthesizer a highly reliable instrument for professional stage use.

From an organological perspective, the 1970s are characterized by a standardization of instrument bodies into compact, portable, industrial housings; and by a stabilization of interfaces around keyboards and panel-based knobs/switches. Features such as polyphony and memory positioned these instruments, in both their harmonic functionality and live-practice usability, alongside orchestral instruments — thus granting the electronic instrument a "core instrument" status, indispensable in both studio and stage contexts.

However, at this point, the instability of analog circuits, production costs, and the limited number of timbral algorithms fostered interest in microprocessor-based digital solutions with parameter structures that could be precisely defined and reliably reproduced. This interest accelerated the transition to the digital era in the 1980s, centered around frequency modulation synthesis, sampling techniques, and the MIDI standard — making possible an evolution of the instrument from physical circuits to digital algorithms and communication protocols.

Integrated synthesizers such as the Minimoog, instruments by ARP, and the Prophet-5 democratized analog synthesis for both studio and stage use; with polyphony and programmable memory, they transformed the synthesizer into one of the central instruments of popular music. Nonetheless, challenges such as tuning instability, limitations in sound storage capacity, and difficulties in reliably reproducing complex timbres led to increasing interest in digital, microprocessor-based synthesizer systems — a shift that paved the way, through FM synthesis, sampling, and MIDI, for the synthesis of instruments no longer limited to analog hardware but based on digital algorithms and protocols.

Digital Sound, New Synthesis Paradigms, and Inter-Instrument Communication (1975–1985)

By the late 1970s, the prevailing model of analog synthesis reached its peak, only to enter a fundamental transformation with the integration of microprocessors into musical instruments. In this new era, sound began to be shaped not via voltage-controlled analog circuits, but through digital signals generated by mathematical algorithms and numerical data. In doing so, electronic sound production was moved into a wholly new technological paradigm — one that replaced continuous electrical oscillations at the circuit level with processes based on digital sampling and computation

Techniques such as frequency modulation (FM synthesis) and sampling did not merely introduce new timbral possibilities — often impossible or difficult to realize with analog synthesis — but also rendered sound design more predictable, reproducible, and software-based. FM synthesis enabled the generation of highly complex, bright and dynamic timbres from relatively simple waveforms, while sampling technology made it possible to record acoustic instruments and environmental sounds digitally and replay them via a keyboard. Consequently, real and artificial sound worlds came together under the same digital umbrella

Another critical milestone of this period was the development of the MIDI (Musical Instrument Digital Interface). With MIDI, synthesizers, drum machines, and computer-based systems from different manufacturers could connect and communicate over a universal protocol, enabling the synchronized transmission of note information, control data, and timing across devices. This structure laid the groundwork for a modular, layered, and flexible music-production ecosystem — both in the studio and on stage.

Taken together, the developments centered around digital synthesis, sampling, and the MIDI standard mark a turning point — a period that established the technical and aesthetic foundations of modern music production.

Synclavier and Fairlight CMI: The Shaping of Digital Sound

The earliest examples of digital synthesis were conceived as large-scale, high-cost, multifunctional closed systems. Introduced in 1975 by New England Digital, the **Synclavier** stands out as one of the most striking examples of this approach. Developed as part of a research project at Dartmouth College, this instrument was built on a fully microprocessor-based architecture. Despite its complex software infrastructure, its button-based control panel offered a relatively user-friendly programming environment for its time. By combining additive synthesis with early forms of FM synthesis, the Synclavier provided the possibility of producing a wide palette of timbres; however, due to its very high cost, it remained accessible only to large-scale studios and a limited number of renowned musicians (Holmes, 2008, p. 265; Battier, 2020).

Released in 1979, the Fairlight CMI holds a separate and pioneering significance for popularizing sampling technology in music production practice. On the Fairlight CMI, any sound recorded via microphone could be transferred into the digital domain and replayed at different pitches via a keyboard. This granted composers and producers a virtually unlimited sound source, ranging from everyday environmental noises to orchestral instruments. The ability to edit waveforms on-screen with a light pen turned the system not only into a performance instrument but also into an interactive sound-design platform. Through the productions of artists such as Peter Gabriel and Kate Bush, this innovative structure played a decisive role in shaping the pop and art-rock aesthetic of the 1980s (Holmes, 2008, p. 325; Russ, 1997; Self, 2002).

From an organological perspective, Synclavier and Fairlight CMI can be regarded as two foundational reference points of the early period in which digital synthesis and sampling, through hybrid structures integrating hardware, software, and user interface, redefined the concept of the instrument.

The Bright Signature of FM Synthesis: Yamaha DX7 and the Digital Timbral Aesthetic of the 1980s

One of the most important thresholds enabling digital technologies to reach mass audiences was the implementation of FM synthesis in musical instruments. The method, developed by John Chowning at Stanford University, is based on the principle that the frequency of one oscillator is modulated by another, enabling the production of highly complex, dynamic, and bright timbres. Capitalizing on the potential of FM synthesis at an industrial scale, the company Yamaha released the Yamaha DX7 in 1983; the DX7 quickly achieved remarkable global commercial success and became one of the most widely used synthesizers of the 1980s. Its bright, metallic, sharply attacked sound character — including bell-like electric piano tones, tight and clear basses, and percussive timbres — was extensively employed in pop, rock, and R&B productions of the era. In contrast to the warm and organic timbres of analog synthesizers, the DX7's clean, sharp and "modern" sound profile aligned closely with the aesthetic tendencies of the 1980s (Jenkins, 2007, p. 74; Horner & Beauchamp, 2008; Lavengood, n.d.).

In this context, the DX7 concretizes several critical transformations on an organological level. First, while the instrument's body took the form of a durable, standardized keyboard housing shaped by industrial design principles, its timbral world was handed over to complex digital algorithms — meaning that within a supposedly "traditional" keyboard body, an entirely new sonic universe began to reside. Second, the large number of parameters and relative complexity of programming led many users to rely on factory presets rather than designing their own sounds; this resulted in certain sound sets evolving into widely recognized cultural signatures instead of realizing the instrument's full sonic potential. Thus, the DX7 became an example that reveals the dual nature of the digital instrument: on one hand democratizing sound synthesis, on the other hand reproducing certain aesthetic templates at mass scale (Lavengood, n.d.; Russ, 1997; De Poli, 2023).

Conclusion

This article has treated the trajectory from the late-19th-century electromechanical experiments to the mid-1980s digital transformation as an organological re-reading of early electronic musical instruments. The evolutionary line under discussion is shaped around key technological rupture points that profoundly transformed the ways music is produced and performed. Rather than wholly rejecting the technology-centred historical framework outlined by Holmes and Jenkins, the study proposes an organological lens placed atop that framework — demonstrating that each periodical rupture signified not only a new sound-production technique, but also a redefinition of the instrument's body, interface, spatial disposition, and its relationship with the performer.

Pioneering and massive projects such as Telharmonium concretely demonstrated the viability of electronic sound production despite their practical limitations; the spread of vacuum-tube technology made possible instruments with unusual performance interfaces like Theremin and commercially successful models such as Hammond Organ. Magnetic-tape technology afforded composers unprecedented control over sound; voltage-controlled systems laid the groundwork for the first synthesizers suitable for individual use (such as systems by Moog and Buchla). With the rise of microprocessor-based digital systems, the prevalence of FM synthesis, sampling, and the establishment of the MIDI protocol mark a period that laid the technical and conceptual foundations of contemporary music production.

The instruments discussed in this study are evaluated not only as technical devices, but as cultural actors that transformed musical aesthetics, compositional practices, performance modes, and the sonic universe of popular culture. Aesthetic trends such as Musique Concrète and Elektronische Musik made the creative potential of electronic sound visible from different theoretical frameworks; the release of Switched-On Bach by Wendy Carlos helped legitimize the synthesizer as a "serious" musical instrument in the eyes of a wide listening public. The Yamaha DX7 became one of the primary sound sources defining a period's popular music aesthetic; through such instruments, composers and performers did not merely produce new timbres, but significantly expanded expressive possibilities by enabling detailed and instantaneous control over sound. In this sense, electronic musical instruments stand not only as new tools, but as carriers of creative possibilities that changed the direction of music history.

From an organological perspective, this historical process requires a fundamental rethinking of the concept of the instrument. The lineage extending from electromechanical behemoths to compact organs; from the touchless performance principle of the Theremin to the hybrid-interface Ondes Martenot; from studio-based systems to voltage-controlled modular architectures and digital synthesizers — all these developments make it necessary to reconsider core organological categories such as the instrument's body, sound-production mechanism, performance interface, spatial disposition, and socio-cultural usage in an electronic context. In this framework, the instrument should be seen not merely as a physical resonator, but as a holistic construct integrating electrical circuits, control voltages, digital protocols, and studio infrastructure. The building-scale body of the Telharmonium; the body–space interaction of the Theremin; the "extended instrument" function of large-scale studio recording and editing equipment; and the data-protocol–driven architecture of MIDI-based digital instruments all clearly demonstrate that the discipline of organology needs new categories beyond traditional instrument classifications.

The legacy of early electronic instruments continues to exist today — both technically and aesthetically. The synthesis methods developed through these instruments (additive, subtractive, FM) and the modular structure concept are being digitally re-implemented and extended in software-based virtual instruments. Computer-based music production is rooted directly in the production logic of early studio practices and the MIDI standard. On the other hand, the analog-revival movement that gained momentum from the 1990s onward renewed interest in these instruments and encouraged the design and production of a new generation of analog synthesizers (Jenkins, 2007, p. 13). Consequently, early electronic instruments are no longer mere historical curiosities — they have become aesthetic and technological models that are still referenced in contemporary music production.

In conclusion, this study positions early electronic musical instruments not as obsolete technical curiosities lost in history, but as the foundational links of the aesthetic, technological, and organological dynamics that continue to shape today's music production environment. The Telharmonium's extreme centralization and the portability of the Hammond Organ; the closed, programme-based systems of the studio era and the performer-centred design of voltage-controlled synthesizers; the tension between the "imperfect but warm" sound world of analog synthesis and the stable, predictable timbres afforded by digital technology — all these continue to form the core axes of debate in the relationship between music and technology. Approaching electronic instruments within the expanded scope of organology enriches discussions of instrument classification and enables a reconsideration of music-technology history at the intersection of body, space, and control. In this respect, the study provides a theoretical basis and conceptual framework for future organological research focused on electronic and digital instruments.

Biodata of Author

Lecturer Dr. **Serkan Çolak** was born in 1990. He graduated in 2011 from the Band Conducting Programme of the Department of Composition and Conducting at Hacettepe University Ankara State Conservatory, which he entered in 2007. In 2018, he completed the Sound Technologies Master's Programme at the Institute of Science, Bahçeşehir University, with his master's thesis titled "Comparison of Acoustic Models Obtained by the Convolution Method with Actual Room Reflections." In 2019, he began the PhD Programme in Music Sciences at the Institute of Music and Fine Arts, Ankara Music and Fine Arts University, and completed this programme in 2024 with his doctoral dissertation titled "Comparative Analysis of Modulation Types Used in Ultrasonic Loudspeaker Systems." Between 2019 and 2022, he worked as a Research Assistant in the Department of Music Technology at the Faculty of Music Sciences and Technologies of Ankara Music and Fine Arts University. Since 2022, he has continued his work in the same department with the title of Lecturer. His areas of interest include concert sound engineering, live recording engineering, and mixing and mastering engineering. **Institution**: Ankara Music and Fine Arts University, Faculty of Music Sciences and Technologies, Department of Music Technology, Ankara, Türkiye. **E-mail**: serkancolak@mgu.edu.tr
ORCID: 0000-0001-5445-6378
Web site: https://www.mgu.edu.tr/personnel/ogr-gor-dr-serkan-colak/

References

Battier, M. (2020). The emergence of interactive music: The vision and presence of Joel Chadabe. *Leonardo, 53*(2), 218–220. https://doi.org/10.1162/leon_a_02180

Collins, N., Schedel, M., & Wilson, S. (2013). Electronic music: New sounds and new instruments up until 1948. In N. Collins & J. d'Escriván (Eds.), *The Cambridge companion to electronic music* (pp. 15–30). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511820540.003

De Poli, G. (2023). Sound models for synthesis: A structural viewpoint. *Musica/Tecnologia, 17*, 7–31. https://doi.org/10.36253/music_tec-14417

Diduck, R. (2015). *Global controller: Making the musical instrument digital interface, 1983–1999*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Concordia University.

Gil Noé, J. V. (2015). ¿Música o magia? La presentación de las ondas musicales de Maurice Martenot en España. *Anuario Musical, 70*, 185–198. https://doi.org/10.3989/ANUARIOMUSICAL.2015.70.09

Holmes, T. (2008). *Electronic and experimental music: Technology, music, and culture* (3rd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429425585

Horn, M. S., West, M., & Roberts, C. J. (2022). Modular synthesis. In M. Filimowicz (Ed.), *Foundations in sound design for linear media: A multidisciplinary approach* (pp. 313–336). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003033240-19

Horner, A., & Beauchamp, J. W. (2008). Instrument modeling and synthesis. In T. D. Rossing (Ed.), *Springer handbook of acoustics* (pp. 903–932). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-30441-0_24

Jenkins, M. (2007). *Analog synthesizers: Understanding, performing, buying—from the legacy of Moog to software synthesis*. Focal Press.

Kogan, R. (n.d.). *Brief history of electronic and computer musical instruments* [Online document]. Retrieved from https://stefanofasciani.com/2014/08/16/history-of-digital-musical-instruments/

Lavengood, M. (n.d.). What makes it sound '80s? The Yamaha DX7 electric piano sound. *Journal of Popular Music Studies, 31*(3), 73–94.

Menoche, C. (2005). Analog days: The invention and impact of the Moog synthesizer (Review). *Notes, 62*(2), 409–411. https://doi.org/10.1353/NOT.2005.0141

Pinch, T., & Trocco, F. (2002). *Analog days: The invention and impact of the Moog synthesizer*. Harvard University Press.

Russ, M. (1997). *Sound synthesis and sampling*. Focal Press.

Schnell, N., & Battier, M. (2002). Introducing composed instruments: Technical and musicological implications. In *Proceedings of the 2002 Conference on New Interfaces for Musical Expression (NIME-02)* (pp. 1–5). https://doi.org/10.5072/ZENODO.205167

Self III, H. L. (2002). Digital sampling: A cultural perspective. *MUSICultures, 29*(1), 9–34. https://doi.org/10.5070/LR892027036

Terrio, R. D. (2005). Electronic and computer music (Review). *Notes, 61*(3), 709–711. https://doi.org/10.1353/NOT.2005.0037

Théberge, P. (n.d.). Transitions: The history of recording technology from 1970 to the present. In *The Cambridge companion to recorded music*. Cambridge University Press.

White, A. G. (2022). Unstable structure: The improvising modular synthesiser. *Organised Sound, 27*(1), 36–46. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1355771821000595

Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2021). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri* (12th ed.). Seçkin Yayıncılık.