

current musicology

number 7/1968

NEAL ZASLAW EDITOR

ASSOCIATE EDITORS Alex Blachly
Shai Burstyn
L. Michael Griffel
Margaret Ross Griffel
Paul Helmer
Walter Hilse
David Josephson
Raymond Kennedy
Mary Obelkevich
Rose Rosengard
Libby Rubin

Mildred Shapiro EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

ASSISTANT EDITORS: Josephine Mongiardo
Mary Peckham
Cornelia Weininger

William Payne BUSINESS MANAGER

EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS: Kathryn Bumpass, Isabelle Emerson,
Sue Kenyon, Joan Long, Gianfranco Monacelli,
Sidney Moore, Léonie Rosenstiel, Lillian Steiner,
Carolyn Whittaker, Judy Zessis

EDITORS-AT-LARGE: Austin Clarkson
Jamie Croy Kassler

Joel Newman FACULTY ADVISORS
Ernest Sanders

Copyright © 1968, Department of Music
Columbia University, New York
Printed in Great Britain

CORRESPONDING EDITORS

Domestic

- | | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Raymond Kelton | Boston University, Boston, Mass. |
| Daniel L. Farber | Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass. |
| Mrs. Betty Jo Wareham | Carnegie-Mellon University |
| Richard D. Dinwiddie | Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio |
| Gary Zeller | Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C. |
| Stuart Chasnoff | City University of New York, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, N.Y. |
| Mrs. Barbara Hampton | City University of New York, City College, New York, N.Y. |
| Mrs. Bea Friedland | City University of New York, Queens College, Flushing, N.Y. |
| Kathryn Bumpass | Columbia University, New York, N.Y. |
| Graham Hardie | Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y. |
| Jon Appleton | Dartmouth College, Hanover, N.H. |
| Lucy Dyal | Florida State University, Tallahassee, Fla. |
| Lowell Lindgren | Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. |
| Michael Williams | Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind. |
| Judith Fiehler | Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, La. |
| J. Theodore Johnson | New York University, New York, N.Y. |
| John Carroll Collins | North Texas State University, Denton, Tex. |
| Howell Price | Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio |
| Ernest May | Princeton University, Princeton, N.J. |
| Floyd G. Sumner | Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J. |
| Bruce Carr | State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, N.Y. |
| William Mahar | Syracuse University, Syracuse, N.Y. |
| Mrs. Margaret Johnson | Tulane University, Newcomb College, New Orleans, La. |
| Mrs. Muriel Waterman | University of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz. |
| Laurence Brillson | University of California, Berkeley, Calif. |
| John Baker | University of California, Davis, Calif. |
| Kenneth Peacock | University of California, Riverside, Calif. |
| Orin Moe, Jr. | University of California, Santa Barbara, Calif. |
| Mrs. Ellen T. Winter | University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. |
| Harlan D. McConnell | University of Colorado, Boulder, Col. |
| David Leese | University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii |
| Jerald C. Graue | University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. |
| William B. Pepper | University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa |
| Robert D. Oursler | University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kan. |
| Lee Patrick | University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky. |
| Thomas Stoner | University of Maryland, College Park, Md. |
| Warren Spaeth | University of Miami, Miami, Fla. |
| Thomas W. Warburton | University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. |
| Charles Sigmund | University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn. |
| Dan Broucek | University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C. |
| Don Gillespie | University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C. |
| Elizabeth Berry | University of Oregon, Eugene, Ore. |
| Peter Bloom | University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. |
| Norris L. Stephens | University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa. |
| Priscilla M. Drucker | University of Rochester, Eastman School of Music, Rochester N.Y. |
| George S. James, III | University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif. |
| Zenoby Lawrshyn | University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada |
| Jean M. Walkinshaw | University of Washington, Seattle, Wash. |
| Edgar J. Lewis | University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo. |
| Robert J. Nicolosi | Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. |
| Caitriona Bolster | Yale University, New Haven, Conn. |

Foreign

- | | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Karl-Werner Gümpel | Albert-Ludwig University, Freiburg, Germany |
| Laszlo Somfai | Bartók Archives, Budapest, Hungary |
| Ladislav Burlas | Bratislava University, Bratislava, Czechoslovakia |
| Alan Brown | Cambridge University, Cambridge, England |
| Anna Amalie Abert | Christian-Albrechts University, Kiel, Germany |
| Reinhard Gerlach | Georg-August University, Göttingen, Germany |
| Don Harran | Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel |
| Reiner Kluge | Humboldt University, Berlin, Germany |
| Winfried Kirsch | Johann Wolfgang Goethe University, Frankfurt, Germany |
| Hubert Unverricht | Johannes Gutenberg University, Mainz, Germany |
| Othmar Wessely | Karl-Franzens University, Graz, Austria |
| Eberhard Klömm | Karl Marx University, Leipzig, Germany |
| Mrs. Olga Miklóssy | Karlova University, Prague, Czechoslovakia |
| Rita Egger | Leopold-Franzens University, Innsbruck, Austria |
| Theodor Göllner | Ludwig-Maximilians University, Munich, Germany |
| Bernd Baselt | Martin Luther University, Halle-Wittenberg, Germany |
| J. D. Bergsagel | Oxford University, Oxford, England |
| Horst Heussner | Phillips University, Marburg, Germany |
| John C. G. Waterhouse | Queens University, Department of Extra-Mural Studies,
Belfast, Ireland |
| Willem Elders | State University of Utrecht, Utrecht, Holland |
| Axel Helmer | Svenskt Music History Archives, Stockholm, Sweden |
| Seóirse Bodley | University College, Dublin, Ireland |
| Josephine M. Mason | University of Birmingham, Birmingham, England |
| Niels Martin Jensen | University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark |
| Michael Tilmouth | University of Glasgow, Glasgow, Scotland |
| Georg Borchardt | University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany |
| Anthony Ford | University of Hull, Yorkshire, England |
| Anne-Marie Bragard | University of Liège, Liège, Belgium |
| Andrej Rijavec | University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Yugoslavia |
| Ian D. Bent | University of London, London, England |
| John Steele | University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand |
| Marie Briquet | University of Paris, Paris, France |
| Robert Guilloux | University of Paris, Paris, France |
| Richard Marlowe | University of Southampton, Southampton, England |
| Ludwig Finscher | University of the Saarland, Saarbrücken, Germany |
| Georgio Pestelli | University of Turin, Turin, Italy |
| J. E. Maddrell | University of York, English Department, York, England |
| Hans Conradin | University of Zürich, Zürich, Switzerland |
| Åke Berglund | Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden |
| M. Witte | Westfälische Wilhelms University, Münster, Germany |

Communications to the corresponding editors should be addressed care of the music department of the university unless otherwise noted.

PUBLISHED
UNDER THE AEGIS OF

The Music Department
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
New York

contents

REPORTS

- | | | |
|---------------------------|----|--|
| | 7 | From the Domestic Corresponding Editors: Events on 20 American and Canadian Campuses |
| KATHARINE CALDWELL | 45 | From the Foreign Corresponding Editors
Hull: Conference of Research Students in Music |
| JAMIE CROY KASSLER | 47 | London: Cybernetic Serendipity |
| SEÓIRSE BODLEY | 60 | Dublin: Curriculum at University College |
| HUBERT UNVERRICHT | 62 | Mainz: Musicology since 1946 |
| HANS CONRADIN | 64 | Zürich: Methodology at the Musicological Institute |
| GEORGES FRANCK | 65 | Budapest: Second Annual Bartók Conference |
| WALTHER SIEGMUND-SCHULTZE | 68 | Halle: Handel Opera Renaissance |
| | 75 | Announcements |

77 EDITORIAL

ARTICLES

- | | | |
|------------------|-----|--|
| THURSTON DART | 81 | Comments on <i>Current Musicology's</i> Methodology Project |
| LINDA E. CORRELL | 87 | Structural Revisions in the String Quartets Opus 41 of Robert Schumann |
| MICHAEL SHAPIRO | 97 | Music and Song in Plays Acted by Children's Companies during the English Renaissance |
| FREDERICK HUDSON | 111 | Bach's Wedding Music |
| DON HARRAN | 120 | Musical Research in Israel |

DISSERTATIONS

- ROBERT L. MARSHALL 129 Richard Carroll Davis "Titles of dissertations"
Self Parody among the Cantatas of Johann Sebastian Bach

BIBLIOGRAPHICA

- 135 Announcement: Performance Practices
Bibliography
136 Contributors

Current Musicology's *Project on Musicological Method*: Some Comments

Thurston Dart

King's College, London (March, 1968)

In June of 1967 Michael Griffel asked me if I would look at *Current Musicology's* questionnaire on musicological method [Number 5/1967; Number 6/1968] and comment on some of the issues raised by the replies. I'm sometimes rather skeptical about the value of questionnaires. (Far too much of the time of British academics has been spent recently in completing them, and footling questions invite ridiculous answers. Still, the whole procedure is presumably very character-forming; no doubt it has been useful in frustrating our selfish desires to concentrate overmuch on such mischievous or downright antisocial activities as teaching or research or administration or trying to become learned or keeping up with the scholarly Joneses.)

Current Musicology's questionnaire, I confess, took me a little while to penetrate. "Methodology," for instance, is one of those gadfly words that hatched out not long ago. It buzzes, most distractingly, in and out of sundry academic reports, syllabuses, and curricula at the present time. I spend much energy in trying to swat it. I've been searching for a context in which "method" would not do just as well. Besides, this word saves 45% typing-time, which could be used for filling in yet more forms. . . .

The boundary between "science" and "humanities," too, is an entirely fortuitous one, unknown a few decades ago. The more blurring of this adventitious division we can do, the better it will be for the future of mankind. *All* serious students—old or young—are scientists, in that they study what is known. *All* serious students are involved in the humanities, in that they are human beings. "Nothing human do I deem alien to me." The further we advance into such fields as physics or biology or communications, the more evident it becomes that we are faced over and over again with problems of probability theory, ethics, orderliness, parsimony, morals, money, and logic entirely akin to those that occupied the attention of Aristotle, Confucius, or the Buddha, quite some time ago. The problems have certainly become far more urgent; but their essential nature, which is bound to the mystery of humanity itself, has not changed.

To my taste, then, all questionnaires are far too "either-or," and *Current Musicology's* is no exception. The most magical and alluring hours of the 24 are those at dawn and dusk, not high noon or deep midnight. The most fruitful areas for all human endeavor are the becoming and the dissolving, not the is or the is-not. All questionnaires, too, get very soggy and limp unless you ruthlessly kick out the abstract nouns and the passive verbs. The same goes for other prose. Underline for yourself the abstracts and passives in "What

attention is given to the methods employed in determining the performance practice for a specific work or group of works?" (*Current Musicology*, 5: 8).

In reading and re-reading the answers, I have found myself perplexed by certain gaps or slants that seem to recur many times. It is, perhaps, best if my report, for what it's worth, deals with these one by one, in no particular order.

Actualities. Universities have many jobs to do, but by no means the least of them has always been to teach people something about the problems of the societies and cultures of their own time. A University worthy of the name—and we can all think of many that are not—is in a perpetual state of “becoming.” It stands at the leading edge of the future. It locates areas of change; it surveys what has been; it helps young men and women to transmute themselves into adult and responsible members of society. It constantly passes the past under review; it continually re-defines the present; it must always play a vital part in determining possible futures, since these will to a certain extent depend upon the acts and thoughts of its graduates. These ideas are commonplace enough in, say, the natural sciences or linguistics. In music studies one has the feeling that they are scarcely touched on at all. If musicology is to deserve its place in the academic sun, it must grow out of a study of today's problems as well as those of yesterday, for music is about people, and people do not really change very much. The roles and functions of music in the societies and schools of our time; music as muzak or drug of addiction or placebo or panacea; the interlocking and interdependent problems of the composer, the performer, and the audience, or of the professional and the amateur; music in societies whose assumptions differ from our own, just as the assumptions of a medieval Christian society differed from those of Islam or Genghis Khan: these are some of our problems, as scholar-musicians. If we do not turn our attention to them, whoever else will? It seems to me that any attempt to come to terms with a professional composer like, say, Dufay will be superficial, naive, and misleading unless we know something of the problems confronting Lou Harrison or Gian Carlo Menotti, Richard Rodney Bennett or Sir William Walton. Nearly all the courses I have been reading about begin with the distant dead. Why are we so afraid of starting at the other end, with the near-at-hand and the living?

Taboo-subjects. There are a lot of these. One notes a few outstanding ones, with many misgivings. Music education, for instance, in which—for someone like myself—some of the most exciting and original work is at this time being done in the United States. Music criticism: does not this begin with writing reviews of composing methods, scores, performances, books, television spectaculars, of our own time? This is what all the great music critics of the past did: Mattheson, Morley, Shaw, Schumann, Hanslick, Berlioz. To read the average city paper in America is one of the most depressing things one can do, if it is music criticism one is after. Criticism of actualities of this kind will teach self-reliance, modesty, self-criticism, judgment; it will sharpen the edges of words and increase the cutting-power of ideas; it will unerringly locate areas of ignorance and infallibly isolate the built-in warps that weaken

most value judgments. It may even help to foster taste and discrimination, for these are plants of very slow growth.

Professionalism. There seems little or no contact between musicology, as it is taught in American universities, and professional music, as it is heard in concert or community hall, or opera house, or television studio, or radio program. Painting and sculpture are lonely arts, done in solitude. Music is a social phenomenon—always has been, always (with luck) will be—in which performer, composer, and listener intersect and interact in the here-and-now of a live performance. (Our addiction to the dead has virtually excluded that shy bird, the composer, from his natural roosting places, the concert hall, the opera house, the school, and the orchestra. It is good to know of the project the Ford Foundation has thought it right to set in motion to amend this situation, at least for schools.) “Performance practice” as a study will be meaningless and pernicious unless the would-be scholar is constantly and forcibly reminded of some elementary articles in the creed of every professional musician. For instance: “Whatever else I do, I must *not* bore my audience”; “I must make it new”; “My performance will of course take account of my mood, my instrument, the composer’s wishes, my audience’s reaction, my platform colleagues, my acoustical surroundings”; “I am not a pianola roll, programmed only to my teacher’s views of how to interpret”; “Our conductor today is either a knave or a zealot; since I don’t yet know which, and since my job is to serve the composer and my platform colleagues, I shall not feel obliged to look at him at all; ignoring him will be restful for me and will not make an atom of difference to the performance.” And so on.

Style. Have we any notion of what this means? All too often investigations of style are self-fulfilling prophecies, immensely gratifying to one’s self-esteem, but utterly useless to the advancement of scholarship. A really luminous investigation of, say, Bach’s style will depend on sorting authentic works from bogus ones. Such considerations are elementary among art historians; unless one begins with them, all one’s stylistic criteria will be contaminated and circular. As an experienced professional performer who also tries to be something of a scholar, I have yet to prove to my own satisfaction that any of the following keyboard works ascribed to Johann Sebastian Bach were in fact unquestionably composed by him: the six English suites, the chromatic fantasy and fugue, the triple concerto in A minor, all the other concertos for one to four keyboards, the organ toccata and fugue in D minor. If I am right, then something is very wrong. (If I am wrong, then will someone please *prove* the point to me, very soon?) Many replies to the questionnaire stress that musicology, like so much else, makes most of its advances through observation, analysis, hypothesis, and the back-and-forth thrusts of discussion. Are we firm enough in the way we teach these essential techniques of How To Rape Your Subject? Do we pay enough attention to the touchstone of anonymity? I cannot believe so.

Gong-words. Like taboo-subjects, there are lots of these. I mean terms like

“renaissance,” “classical,” “baroque,” “sonata form”: their reverberations are so strong and so diverse that they instantly blanket every discussion and deafen each debater. Best if we renounce our addiction to them as soon as we can get unhooked, for I cannot believe it to be good for us. (Next week will do.) Our conception of the relationship between style and chronology, too, is far too thin-textured and shapeless. Many professional musicians of my own acquaintance pride themselves on their simultaneous mastery of a number of different composing or performing techniques. After all, every craftsman enjoys acquiring and demonstrating his craft. It is equally likely that Dunstable prided himself on being able, at the drop of a benefice or the request of a duke, to write a simple Magnificat, a complex Mass cycle, an architectonic isorhythmic motet (complete with his own carefully composed alliterative verse to go with it), a fauxbourdon hymn, or a “top-twenty” song. If this was in fact the case—and I have no reason to believe otherwise—then most of our discussions of chronology based on style criteria (or of style based on shallow analyses of source criteria, as for instance with Bach’s *Brandenburgs* or Handel’s *Op. 6 concerti grossi*) will turn out to be otiose. Our conclusions are likely to be unbecomingly grotesque in consequence.

Notation. The case for concentrating on the period 1400–1600 is a very strong one. There is even a certain case for traversing this period backwards, so that one may proceed from the known to the unknown and may see for oneself how ambiguities and uncertainties arose. Printing had as decisive an effect on notation’s transformation as disc and videotape are having on music’s deformation today. It is never possible to generalize about manuscripts, since each of them is by its nature a unique human artifact. But music prints, whether from plates or movable type or the lithographic stone, are a different matter. The student musicologist, to my mind, ought *always* to begin with a thorough study of printed musical documents. There is much to be said for this start being made with the printed musical documents of the present day, for they are immediately available, at small cost; we pay a heavy price as scholars if we spend our entire time with microfilm or photographic copy. In this way the student will learn how to shape his own calculus of error and to formulate his own algebra of doubt. With these tools, and fortified by comparing them with the work of such outstanding scholars as McKerrow, Fredson Bowers, or Charlton Hinman, he will then be equipped to try to crack the safe of a single musical manuscript.

Knit Your Own Baroque. We do this very well nowadays, to judge from the majority of gramophone records I hear. It bears little resemblance to what earlier times heard and did. Synthetic instruments (e.g., so very many 20th-century harpsichords) are used to pull early music every which way. Artificial and mannered styles of performance, fashionable only at the French court between, say, 1710 and 1715 when royalty was present, are rammed into Purcell’s odes or Bach’s cantatas or Handel’s oratorios with all the hamfisted skill of a backwoods veterinary surgeon injecting an old cow suffering from the staggers. The cow may yet live, despite the vet. An analysis of changes in

beat-groups' performance practice during the last five years will focus one's prudence. Like the prospect of being hanged, it may even concentrate one's mind wonderfully. . . .

Aesthetics. Music seems more resistant to the formulation and application of aesthetic theories than any other art. A pity, then, that so little is taught to English-speaking music students about the work of French-speaking commentators of the past fifty years, in particular of some of the men and women now living and working in Paris and Brussels: Pierre Schaeffer, Wangermée, Souris, Collaer, Bridgman, Boulez, and the brilliant aestheticians of the Sorbonne. The Anglo-Saxon world, it seems to me, is all too apt to become excessively Anglo or Saxon (or both) when confronted with the French world. Better if we came to terms with it, for it's been there a long time. England has more than once been described as a French colony that turned out rather odd. To be classed as a great composer it is not *essential* to have been German-speaking, difficult, and dead, though this is evidently a great help. . . .

Here, then, set down pell-mell, are some of the thoughts and considerations that have come to my mind in reading these very instructive reports on musicological method in American graduate schools. I am only too aware of how disheveled and unoriginal they may turn out to be, but I hope that they will make some contribution to the discussion. It seems clear to me that the debate might, with advantage, be very searching. It must also begin very soon.

*Structural revisions in the String Quartets Opus 41
of Robert Schumann*

Linda E. Correll

The study of sketches affords many insights into the compositional process. Schumann's sketches for the three *String Quartets* Op. 41 are particularly noteworthy because they represent an attempt to solve problems that the large, abstract forms presented to composers of the second quarter of the 19th century. A comparison of the sketches with the printed editions of these quartets immediately reveals Schumann's concern with elements of structure. The present study attempts to illustrate this structural concern within the framework provided by Schumann's sketching techniques in general.

The manuscript material drawn upon constitutes two sets of Schumann autographs—the sketches¹ and the fair copy.² However, the quartets appear to be the subject of several entries in Schumann's *Haushaltbücher*,³ and it is probable that a set of preliminary sketches also exists.⁴

Schumann wrote the Op. 41 quartets in June and July of 1842. According to entries in the *Haushaltbuch*,⁵ in April and May of that year Schumann studied quartets by Mozart, Beethoven and Haydn. On June 2 he began "quartet essays,"⁶ and on June 4 he began composition of Op 41/1. Gerald Abraham states that the *Haushaltbuch* indicates simultaneous composition of the first two quartets.⁷

The autograph fair copies bear the following dates: Op. 41/1, June 24, 1842; Op. 41/2, July 5, 1842; Op. 41/3, July 22, 1842. The sketches are not dated systematically, but when dates are present they serve to suggest that Schumann sketched at a rapid pace, apparently with well defined goals. For example, the first two movements of Op. 41/1 were finished on June 5. In all likelihood the first two quartets were completely sketched before Schumann began the fair copy of Op. 41/1. The date of July 4 at the end of the first-movement sketch of Op. 41/3 shows the composition of that quartet to be concurrent with the preparation of the fair copy of Op. 41/2. The overlap implied by this chronology, coupled with the fact that multiple drafts of passages are rare, supports the assumption that the present sketches are not first drafts, but represent a somewhat later stage of composition.⁸

Schumann's sure grasp of the large formal outlines of the individual movements is indicated in the methods of musical shorthand that he employed. Details are seldom crystallized, but each movement is fully mapped out. The sketches are written predominantly in piano score, often with just melody and bass notated. In many instances only the melody is sketched (in whatever voice it may happen to occur). The plans for the general length of sections within movements often contain empty bars that were left to be filled in later. The material that consequently fills these bars is usually of a transitional, developmental, or modulatory nature; thus Schumann post-

pones many harmonic decisions. Occasionally bars are numbered and the numbers are then written over empty bars later in the sketch to minimize the task of writing out repeated passages. Repetitions are also indicated, especially in sonata-form movements, by the use of capital letters. These occur at both ends of the principal key area of the exposition, and the recapitulation merely indicates that the material *von A-B* should be inserted. In the first movement of Op. 41/1, the recapitulation constitutes such a close parallel to the exposition, that after the transitional passage a second set of capital letters directs that the secondary material should be repeated a fourth higher (*quadro höher*). In one instance (Op. 41/3, finale) Schumann writes memoranda for successive tonal areas quite far in advance of their actual entries, presumably as an aid in tonal planning and modulation.

The above methods are used throughout the sketches for Op. 41. However, quartets 1 and 2 illustrate them in a more orderly fashion. Quartet 3, evidently sketched more hastily, is less consistent in method, and the sketches for it are more fragmentary. The result is a greater number of structural changes from the sketch to the printed edition.

The available sketches for Op. 41 illustrate Schumann's preoccupation with matters of form. This is not to suggest that the composer was not concerned with refinements in the content of the music. On the contrary, modifications in detail are numerous. However, a study of preliminary sketches would appear to be prerequisite to a meaningful evaluation of the growth and subsequent modification of thematic ideas. Formal considerations, on the other hand, usually receive a later emphasis, and the present sketches clearly document this stage of the compositional process. For these reasons, in the following discussion alterations in detail are summarized and a more comprehensive approach applied to various types and stages of structural revision.

The sketches to Op. 41, in the true character of a working draft, often differ from the printed editions in matters of melodic detail, rhythmic patterns, and scoring. In fact, the slight changes that were later made, usually by the time of the fair copy, involve the vast majority of measures. The various musical elements appear to share equally in these revisions; alterations in rhythm are just as common as alterations in pitch, while scoring and register changes abound.

In those passages where rhythmic changes occur, the final version almost always substitutes more rhythmic uniformity for a tendency toward rhythmic variety in the sketch. This inclination toward a monorhythmic approach is particularly characteristic of Schumann's later works, and to find its conscious application in 1842 is noteworthy. Alterations in the melodic lines sometimes confirm this aspect of uniform rhythm. A particularly subtle example occurs in the third movement of Op. 41/1 (Example 1). With the exception of the third measure, the sketch and the printed edition are

identical. However, the presence of the suspension in the final version is consistent with the rhythmic feeling of first-beat suspensions so important for the entire passage.

Ex. 1 Op. 41/1, 3rd mvt., mm. 4-11.

Sketch:

Print:

Changes in instrumentation seem to have been postponed until the time of the fair copy. Although most of the sketches are written in piano score, several appear in full score, and often this scoring differs considerably from that of the fair copy. Incidentally, most of the alterations made by Schumann on the fair copy itself are concerned with matters of scoring.

Structural changes on the small scale are plentiful. They include many modifications in phrase lengths. Single bars are inserted or omitted frequently in the sketches (changing irregular phrase lengths to regular, or vice versa). In several instances changes in phrase structure coincide with modifications of the melodic lines and serve to alter the effect of sequential passages.

With respect to over-all structure, two general trends may be observed by comparing the sketches for Op. 41 with the completed compositions:

1. Most of the extensive alterations occur in transitional passages.
2. There are, with several exceptions, many more deletions from than additions to the final versions.

Large-scale formal modifications were made in the finales of Op. 41/1 and Op. 41/2. Both were originally planned and designated as rondos in the sketches; both were evidently changed to sonata forms when the actual writing of these sketches began. The result in Op. 41/1 is a rather unconventional sonata form in which the recapitulation (bars 152ff) begins with secondary material stated in the submediant (F major).⁹ The principal theme does not recur in the tonic (A minor) until bar 214, shortly before the coda. With this procedure the formal unity of the entire quartet is strengthened since the beginning of the recapitulation features synthesis, and at times, juxtaposition of the keys of F major and A minor/major—a most appropriate parallel to the beginning of the quartet where the intro-

duction, in A minor, leads to the allegro portion of the first movement in F major. Thus the type of tonal duality that allows an F-major first movement in this "A-minor" quartet is confirmed in the recapitulation of the finale.

The finale of Op. 41/2 is a more conventional sonata form, and the only indication (other than its designation) that it was planned as a rondo is the greater length of the original *A* period in the sketch. (This passage was crossed out in the sketch and evidently modified in the course of the composition.)

Occasionally in the final versions of the quartets the structural balance within a movement is significantly altered as a result of extensive reductions in the lengths of transitional passages. This has the effect of tightening the

Ex. 2 Op. 41/1, 4th mvt., mm. 148-151.

Print:

Ex. 3 Op. 41/1, 4th mvt., mm. 148ff, 1st version. [b]

Sketch:

* These brackets are present in the sketch. Perhaps they indicate that Schumann intended to delete the passage immediately.

Ex. 4 Op. 41/3, 1st mvt., mm. 36ff, 1st version.

Sketch:

Musical sketch for the first system, measures 36-40. The music is in G major (one sharp) and 3/4 time. The right hand features a melodic line with eighth-note patterns and a fermata over the final measure. The left hand provides a simple accompaniment.

Musical sketch for the second system, measures 41-45. The right hand begins with a fermata and a *rit.* (ritardando) marking. The tempo then returns to *a tempo*. The left hand continues with a steady accompaniment.

Musical sketch for the third system, measures 46-50. The right hand continues the melodic development with eighth-note patterns. The left hand accompaniment remains consistent.

Musical sketch for the fourth system, measures 51-55. The right hand features a melodic line with a fermata and an asterisk marking. The left hand accompaniment includes some chordal textures.

Musical sketch for the fifth system, measures 56-59. The right hand continues the melodic line. The left hand accompaniment includes some chordal textures. The system ends with the marking (mm. 46).

* illegible

formal design and also reflects Schumann's predilection for abrupt tonal changes. The four-bar transition (bars 148-51) that occurs before the recapitulation in the last movement of Op. 41/1 is a case in point. The final version (Example 2) features an ambiguity between, or perhaps a synthesis of, C minor and F minor (C minor had been prepared in the eight preceding bars of the development). As a result, the resolution to F major at the beginning of the recapitulation is particularly effective. The additional sixteen bars of transition in the sketch (Example 3) tend to weaken the tonal novelty of the recapitulation by placing premature emphasis upon the minor form of the submediant. F minor is implied for the entire twenty-bar length of the original transition (with the exception of the sequential tonicization of its flat-submediant, D \flat major). The arrival at F major merely seems to substitute the major mode for the minor.

A similar situation, this time involving changes in the modulatory scheme, appears during the transition between the principal tonal areas of the first movement of Op. 41/3 (bars 36-46 of the printed edition). Here a substitu-

Ex. 5 Op. 41/3, 1st mvt., mm. 36-45.

print

The musical score for Example 5, Op. 41/3, 1st movement, measures 36-45, is presented in two systems. The first system (measures 36-41) features a four-staff arrangement. The top two staves are in treble clef, and the bottom two are in bass clef. The key signature is G major (one sharp). The music begins with a forte (*f*) dynamic. In measure 37, there is a dynamic shift to sforzando (*sf*). The score includes various rhythmic values, including eighth and sixteenth notes, and rests. The second system (measures 42-45) continues the four-staff arrangement. It begins with a forte (*f*) dynamic and features a sforzando (*sf*) dynamic in measure 43. The notation includes slurs and ties across measures.

tion of material took place, evidently at the time of the fair copy, since the entire passage is crossed out in the sketch but no alternative version provided. In the fair copy the passage is pasted over a section of the score. Conceivably, Schumann had at least one additional thought before achieving the final form. The ten bars in question were originally twenty-three in the sketch (Example 4), and these constituted a more traditional continuation of the transition than that which appears in the final version. The theme is stated twice in the tonic (A major), then the final measure of the four-bar phrase is treated motivically and modulates through F# minor, eventually to arrive at the secondary tonal area, E major (bar 46 of the printed edition). The final version displays Schumann's affinity for tonal juxtaposition (Example 5). Instead of a conventional modulation, C major enters immediately at bar 36 of the printed score (a Neapolitan tonal relationship to the previous key in the transition—B major), and the final four bars of the transition (bars 42–45) modulate swiftly to the secondary area, E major.

Schumann's concern for conciseness is reflected in the passages cited above. It is significant to note that the deletions and substitutions were made in transitions, whereas additions and expansions seem, with one notable exception, to be confined to introductions and codas. One may surmise that the composer allowed himself to be more expansive primarily in those sections that did not affect fundamental formal design.

The coda to the third movement of Op. 41/2 appears to have been originally only four bars long (Example 6).

Ex. 6 Op. 41/2, 3rd mvt., original coda.

Sketch:

* illegible

Schumann apparently sketched the coda in a version close to its final form at another time, since the page in the sketch that contains the coda is separated by several pages from its proper place. This second sketch recalls the theme of the *Trio*, as does the coda of the printed edition, but lacks the cadential pizzicato of the final version. Similarly, the introduction to the first movement of Op. 41/3 must have occurred to Schumann after he was well into the exposition, since it appears at the bottom of page 1 of the sketch. This introduction was originally eight bars long instead of the seven bars of the final version. The first bar (four additional beats of the opening chord) was crossed out in the fair copy.

An interesting question arises concerning the proposed introduction to the first movement of Op. 41/2. Dickinson states that the last four bars (bars

30-33) of the introduction to Op. 41/1 were originally intended as the introduction to Op. 41/2.¹⁰ However, in the sketch to Op. 41/2 there is no hint of this proposed introduction. The passage occurs only in the sketch to Op. 41/1 with the last two bars compressed into one. Oddly enough, expanded to the four-bar length, it appears in the fair copy of Op. 41/2 but is crossed out. It seems as if Schumann considered establishing a melodic relationship between the two quartets. Both quartets, incidentally, feature opening *allegros* in F major.

In only one instance does an addition of musical material occur in the main body of a movement. At bars 113-23 in the finale of Op. 41/3 the principal theme occurs in F major (the tonic of the movement is A major). There is no evidence of this passage in the sketch. While the tonal succession is not altered by the additional passage in F major, there is little doubt that the presence of this material adds considerably more weight to the region of the flat submediant major. F major, at this point, reinforces the tonal area of the immediately preceding *Quasi trio*. Consequently, this tonal area is firmly established as a distant structural goal from which later statements of the principal theme (beginning in G major and A minor respectively) progress back toward the tonic. As a result, the traditional rondo procedure—that of presenting the principal theme in the tonic—already undermined in the preceding sections of the movement, seems from this point to be unequivocally abandoned. It is interesting to note that the sketch was closer to the rondo prototype, not only in the omission of this statement of the principal theme in F major, but also in the presentation of the theme in the A-major tonic at bars 65ff (in the final version the theme appears in F# minor at this point). The rondo-like character of the printed edition results primarily from the compartmentalization of the thematic material.

It has not been the purpose of this study to attempt a critical appraisal of the Op. 41 quartets. Rather, analytical procedures have been employed in an effort to illustrate some of the methods that Schumann used in achieving his structural objectives. It is evident that some movements, for example, the *Adagio* of Op. 41/1, required few changes. At the opposite pole is the hasty sketch of the finale of Op. 41/3, where even the over-all form of the movement appeared in a tentative version.

The literature on the composer is quite consistent in stating that Schumann's talent was lyric rather than dramatic, and that his most inspired works were the early pianoforte pieces. Even though Boetticher's study of the manuscripts has shown that Schumann made a considerable number of revisions in his early works,¹¹ the fact that many of these works consist of a series of short pieces has served to perpetuate the older view that spontaneous, improvisatory composition was characteristic of Schumann's early style. The extended works that originated during and after 1841 are often discussed from the standpoint of the composer's inability to cope adequately with the larger forms. It is this writer's opinion that such generalized criticism is not

completely fair to Schumann, and that it cannot, with any degree of accuracy, apply in equal measure to the large number of works completed during these years.

Schumann's literary writings show that he thought a great deal about large-scale formal continuity.¹² The Op. 41 revisions provide evidence that these thoughts were not confined to prose essays; in almost every instance the revised version represents the better reading. From the purely objective standpoint, however, the revisions have great value in that they illustrate the approach of an important 19th-century composer to the structural demands of the abstract forms.

NOTES

¹ Forty-seven handwritten pages plus a title page dated Leipzig, June 1842. The sketches were signed over at a later date by Schumann to Johannes Brahms. They ultimately formed a portion of Brahms's *Nachlass* that was acquired in 1907 by the *Preussische Staatsbibliothek* in Berlin. Today they are in the *Musikabteilung* of the *Deutsche Staatsbibliothek* in East Berlin.

² Originally in the collection of Oscar Bondy, now in the possession of Rudolf F. Kallir of New York City. Dr. Kallir has given permission to the Toscanini Archive division of the New York Public Library to microfilm his collection and for the present writer to study the microfilm.

³ According to Wolfgang Boetticher, *Robert Schumann. Einführung in Persönlichkeit und Werk* (Berlin, 1941), p. 626, the *Haushaltbücher* were in the *Preussische Staatsbibliothek*, Berlin, in 1941. Presumably they are still there (*Deutsche Staatsbibliothek*).

⁴ Since neither preliminary sketches nor the *Haushaltbücher* could be consulted by the present writer, secondary sources have had to be relied upon for information that these manuscripts may contain. In some instances the secondary sources specifically cite their sources of information, in others they are not so precise and it must be presumed that they borrowed information either from each other or from the Schumann documents referred to above.

⁵ As quoted by Gerald Abraham in an editorial footnote to A. E. F. Dickinson's essay "The Chamber Music," in *Schumann: A Symposium* (London, 1952), p. 139, footnote 1.

⁶ Presumably these are preliminary sketches.

⁷ Abraham, *op. cit.*, p. 139, footnote 1.

⁸ Preliminary sketches, including those of the thematic-working-out type, undoubtedly exist. If this is not the case, Boetticher (*op. cit.*, pp. 568ff) is in error in calling bars 148–51 of the fourth movement of Op. 41/1 the theme of the rondo (the movement was originally entitled rondo in the sketch). Abraham follows Boetticher in referring to these bars as the rondo theme, and calls attention to the fact that this theme is stated only once in the final form of the movement (Abraham, *op. cit.*, p. 146, footnote 1). The passage, slightly expanded, occurs only once in the sketch also, and at approximately the same place in the movement; thus, the fact that both writers call this the original theme suggests the existence of earlier sketches.

⁹ The tonic of the movement is A minor. In the exposition the secondary tonal area was the relative major, C major.

¹⁰ Dickinson, *op. cit.*, p. 142.

¹¹ Boetticher, *op. cit.*, pp. 521ff. An entire section of the book is devoted to the sketches.

¹² References to Schumann's views of musical form are contained throughout Leon B. Plantinga's *Schumann As Critic* (New Haven and London, 1967).

Music and Song in Plays Acted by Children's Companies during the English Renaissance

Michael Shapiro

In recent years, an impressive amount of scholarship has concerned itself with music and song and their uses in Shakespeare's plays. In addition to the earlier studies of Naylor, Noble, and Cowling, we are now fortunate to have John H. Long's and Frederick Sternfeld's more specialized studies of the uses of music and song in the comedies and tragedies respectively, Peter Seng's useful compendium of information on the songs, and John Cutts's edition of songs used in the later plays. Although we can only rejoice over this significant body of work, it has created the impression that Shakespeare's plays are typical of the period in their uses of music and song. While this hypothesis may turn out to be valid, it cannot be tested until scholars have thoroughly investigated the uses of music and song in plays written by other dramatists and in plays performed by other acting companies during the same period.

In fact, a cursory view of English Renaissance drama suggests, if anything, the atypicality of Shakespeare's uses of music and song. For example, the plays acted by the companies of child actors which flourished between 1599 and 1612 are even richer in music and song than are the plays written by Shakespeare and others for adult companies during the same period, and often use music and song in radically different ways. Moreover, the musical conventions in the plays acted by children's troupes were developed in and for small, indoor "private" theaters, and were often adopted by adult troupes after 1609 when they began to move to those theaters from their large, open-roofed "public" theaters.

A few scholars have recently continued the exploration of non-Shakespearean private theater music begun by Arkwright, Lawrence, and others. Cutts and Andrew J. Sabol have unearthed several settings for songs from plays acted by children's troupes, and W. R. Bowden in *The English Dramatic Lyric: 1603-1641* has investigated the use of song in plays acted in both public and private theaters by both adult and boy companies. The forthcoming¹ collection of essays, edited by John H. Long, on music in non-Shakespearean plays of the period promises to be of great interest. Much more remains to be done, but few literary scholars are equipped for the tasks involved. When the texts of plays supply lyrics for songs, as they frequently do not, musicologists who are familiar with sixteenth- and seventeenth-century collections of music—printed and manuscript—are likely to be more successful than literary scholars in discovering settings. Even when settings can be located, they need to be edited and translated into modern notation before directors can use them for modern productions or literary scholars can discuss their dramatic effects, although such discussions too might best be conducted by musicologists.

One of the aims of this article, therefore, is to invite musicologists to collaborate with literary scholars in investigating music and song and their

uses in non-Shakespearean drama of the English Renaissance, particularly in the plays acted by troupes of child actors. It is hoped that the brief history of the children's companies and the discussion of music and song in their plays will stimulate further investigation and exploration in the area of non-Shakespearean theater music of the English Renaissance. Perhaps the list of references that follows the discussion will be of some use to musicologists wishing to undertake such inquiries.

A brief outline of the history of the children's troupes in England will explain why their plays are richer in music and song than contemporaneous plays acted by troupes of adult actors (Hillebrand 1926; Chambers 1923: II, 8-76). In England, most of the children's troupes were originally troupes of choirboys; the two most prominent companies of boy actors styled themselves as the Children of St. Paul's Cathedral and the Children of the Chapel Royal. As choirboys, they were taught to read music, sing prick song, and also to play instruments, such as organs, viols, cornets, virginals and recorders (Harrison 1958: 186, 191, 214; Woodfill 1953: 144). Most of the boy choristers became adult choristers when they reached maturity, and some, like the composer Thomas Ravenscroft, a boy chorister at Paul's, went on to make significant contributions to English musical life (Lawrence 1924: 418-23).

During Elizabeth's reign the choristers from St. Paul's, the Windsor Chapel, the Chapel Royal, and Westminster Abbey performed plays at court as part of the Christmas-Shrovetide revelry. Sometime around 1576, the Children of Paul's and the Children of the Chapel Royal acquired their own private theaters, which were probably little more than typical Tudor banqueting halls. Although the children's troupes charged admission to performances in these halls, such performances were considered rehearsals for performances in the banqueting halls at court and probably accommodated courtiers and would-be courtiers who were unable to attend the court performances. After an eight- or nine-year period of dormancy, the Paul's boys and the Chapel Children were reactivated around 1599 and flourished for about a decade, performing plays, mostly satiric comedies, by such dramatists as Jonson, Webster, Chapman, Middleton, Marston, and Dekker.² It is difficult to say whether the members of the acting companies were more than nominally choirboys after 1599. The members of a children's troupe like the Children of the Kings Revels, which acted at Whitefriars, were not choristers. The children's troupe that acted at Blackfriars, once called the Children of the Chapel Royal, lost its connection with the Chapel Royal shortly after the Accession of James in 1603, but the Children of Paul's probably consisted of choristers and was directed by the Cathedral choirmaster until the troupe's dissolution in 1607.

In view of the origin and history of the children's troupes, it should be no surprise that their plays use music and song more profusely than do contemporaneous plays acted by adult companies, although it is an exaggeration to describe them as resembling "the musical or musical operetta of today"

(Sternfeld 1964: 14). A statistical approach is illuminating. Of the thirty-two extant children's plays acted before 1591, twenty-nine (91%) have a total of 128 songs, or an average of 4.4 each. Garter's *Susanna*, one of the three plays that have no songs, apologizes in the Epilogue for this lack. In the post-1599 period, sixteen of the twenty-one plays (76%) acted by the Children of Paul's contain a total of eighty songs, or an average of 5 each, while 72% of the plays acted by the Chapel Children contain an average of 2.4 songs per play. By comparison, only 49% of the plays acted by Shakespeare's troupe during a corresponding period contain songs, the average of 1.4 songs per play is considerably lower than that for the plays acted by children's troupes, and plays acted by other adult troupes contain even less music (Bowden 1951: 126-28; Shapiro 1967: 346).

The plays acted by children's troupes can be conveniently divided into two distinct phases, falling on either side of a hiatus in the dramatic activities of these troupes that lasted from about 1591 to 1599 or 1600. In the plays acted before 1591, few of the songs have much dramatic relevance and the two plays with the most songs—*Summer's Last Will and Testament* and *The Arraignment of Paris*—are more like music-hall revues than plays. Moreover, there is little variety in the use of music and song in the pre-1591 children's plays. Nearly all of the songs in these plays, as well as most of the songs in plays acted after 1599 by the Children of Paul's, fall into four categories, which describe the dramatic function of the songs: complaint, servant song, pastoral or supernatural song, religious song.

Complaints

One type of song which is virtually unique to the plays acted by children's troupes before 1591 is the complaint, usually a solo song by a female character. Bowden describes the singers of this type of song as temporarily frustrated lovers, forsaken lovers, or bereaved lovers (1951: 24-26; Sabol 1960: 224-25), but the complaint tradition originated earlier and is broader than Bowden suspects, and included laments of friends, children, and parents, as well as lovers. The complaint is almost always a personal expression of the character's emotions and, as such, usually has some relevance to the dramatic action. The complaint thus differs from sad but impersonal songs, like the one sung to viol accompaniment in *Wit and Science* or the "dolefull ditty" that laments Summer's approaching death in *Summer's Last Will and Testament*.

One of the earliest of these dramatic complaints is "Awake ye wofull wights," the lament of Pythias for Damon in Edwardes' *Damon and Pythias* (1564), a play acted by the Children of the Chapel Royal. The stage direction stipulates that Pythias was accompanied by regals, but the song also survives in settings for lute accompaniment. Long has printed the tune, recitative-like in character, which was probably used in the play (1967: 247-

50). Like most dramatic and non-dramatic complaints of the period, "Awake ye wofull wights" is highly alliterative, intoning Pythias' sorrow in such lines as: "Gripe me, you greedy grief,/And present pangs of death!" (1924: ll. 612-13). Similar complaints occur in *Patient Grissel*, *Misogonus*, *The Arraignment of Paris*, and *Sapho and Phao*.

Furthermore, Arkwright found a number of extant complaints, which seem to belong to plays, in manuscript collections of music (1906: 341-3, and 401-3; 1909: 30-40 and 112-17; and 1914: 117-38). The most famous of these is "Alas, ye salt sea Gods," the lament of Panthea for Abradad, ascribed to Richard Farrant and set for treble voice and four strings. Noting Farrant's connection with the Children of the Chapel Royal, W. J. Lawrence argued that the song belonged to a play acted by that troupe, *The Wars of Cyrus* (pub. 1594), which contains characters named Panthea and Abradates, although the printed text of the play makes no provision for such a song (1921: 514). "Alas, ye salt sea Gods," like most complaints of this type, is heavily alliterative, contains repeated exclamations and stock phrases like "grievous groans" and "weep and wail," and includes a plea for the singer's death. It is one of several complaints sung by noble women who are threatened with captivity, sexual violation, the death of or separation from a lover, or with some equally heart-rending fate, and it is therefore quite possible that the type of dramatic complaint under discussion was a standard feature of the "pathetic heroine" play, which was popular with the children's companies in the 1560's, 1570's, and early 1580's (Brawner 1943: 455-64). Complaints even occur in a few plays acted by children's troupes after 1599. In the anonymous *Maid's Metamorphosis*, the pathetic heroine sings "Ye sacred Fyres, and powers above" and "Since hope of helpe my froward starres denie," while Marston seems to have had his heroine sing a complaint of this type in *Sophonisba* and may have used complaints in *Antonio and Mellida* and *Antonio's Revenge*.

If the alliterative and repetitive style of the lyrics and the recitative-like character of the tunes make the complaints seem somewhat heavy-handed, one should remember that sophisticated musical settings probably made them into effective expressions of grief and sorrow. Gustave Reese, writing about Elizabethan songs with viol accompaniment in general, including the "tragic songs of Farrant and Parsons," described the settings as follows:

The upper voice generally carries a syllabic setting of the poem, while the lower voices, faster moving and noticeably less melodic, weave an amorphous polyphonic texture below the tune, and fill in gaps between its phrases (1959: 817).

But we are not even sure if the so-called tragic songs of Farrant and Parsons were intended to be sung in dramatic performance, and much work remains to be done not only in locating and analyzing settings of complaints but also in defining the relationship between dramatic and non-dramatic complaints.

Servant Songs

A second type of song in children's plays is the servant song, usually sung by two to four pages or maidservants. Although Sabol and others have pointed out the use of servant songs by Edwardes and Lyly (Sabol 1958a: 147-48), the convention is more extensive and more dramatically relevant than has been realized. Songs of this type occur in *Tom Tyler* (c. 1540), *Respublica* (c. 1552), and *Nice Wanton* (c. 1560), as well as in the plays of Edwardes and Lyly. These servants, descended from the witty slaves of Roman comedy and the vices of morality plays, are the agents of mischief, mockery, and merriment, and their songs generally ridicule figures of authority and celebrate festive revelry, with emphasis on drinking and sex. The song in II.ii of *Misogonus* (c. 1577), for example, combines nearly all of these motifs:

Let snurgis lurke & druges worke,
we doe defie their slaverye
he is but a foole, that gois to schole
all we delight in braverye.

It is the best, to live at rest,
and takt as god doth send it
To haunt ech wake, & mirth to make
and with good fellowes spend it.

The merye, man with cupp & cann
lives longer then doth twentye
The misers wealth, doth hurt his health
examples we have plentye.

In cardes & dice, our comferte lies
In sportinge and in dauncinge
Our mindes to please and live at ease
and sometime to use praunsinge.

With bes & nel we love to dwell
In kisinge and in hakinge.
But whope hoe hollie, with trollye lollye
to them weil now be walking.

(second, fourth, sixth, and tenth stanzas)

A quartet, consisting of the prodigal-son protagonist and three of his attendants, sings this song to the well-known tune of "Heart's Ease." Before the song is sung, one of the attendants assigns the parts:

Well then bycause you take me for your deane
Ile apoynt the partes my selfe by saint John

You shall singe the false kinde I meane you know what
& thoust bere the bas because thou art rustye
the counterfet tener is youres by youre lott
my selfe will singe the truble & that very trusty.

R. W. Bond, the editor of the play, informs us that "false kinde" has been written in the manuscript above the word "tenthier," which has been deleted (1911: 197, 309-19). Unfortunately, Bond's note on these directions is so brief and vague that one would welcome further commentary on the musical terms and any attempt to describe the style of the setting used in the play. As the reference to a bass part suggests, the children's troupe acting *Misogonus* included at least one adult actor, a practice not uncommon among children's companies before 1591 (Hunter 1962: 237).

In plays acted after 1599, small groups of servants sing very much as they did in the plays of Edwardes and Lyly, that is at the end of short scenes of pert, audacious dialogue. As in the pre-1591 plays, such scenes rarely further the dramatic action but supply contrasting attitudes, parody theme and action of the main plot, create an atmosphere of levity, and usually culminate in song. Such scenes, with this type of song, occur in the plays of William Percy (intended for Paul's but probably never performed there), and in plays acted by the Chapel Children at Blackfriars, but most of all in plays acted by the Children of Paul's.

In Act II of Marston's *Antonio and Mellida*, two pages and a maid sing "the descant on our names," the lyrics to which are lost but must have been extremely bawdy because the pages' names—Dildo and Catzo—are Italian terms for penis. Marston's *What You Will* requires three page songs, all of them unfortunately lost, although Sabol has found two songs in Ravenscroft's *Melismata* that might well have been used (1959: 8). While this approach can rarely yield more than conjectural results, it opens up possibilities of matching lyrics from manuscript and printed collections of music with plays with blank songs. In I.ii of *Blurt, Master Constable*, probably by Middleton, three pages sing "What meat eats the Spaniard?", which pokes fun at one of their masters (Sabol 1958a: 146-49). In II.ii of the same play, two maidservants sing a bawdy question-and-answer duet, "In a fair woman that thing is best?" This song is sung in response to a request for a "light song," of the kind that "go nimble and quick, and are full of change, and carry sweet division" (II.ii. 47-49). The lyrics are ostensibly a sonnet written by another character, which the maids read before singing, perhaps because a polyphonic setting rendered the words unintelligible (Evans 1929: 44-45, 59-60; Bowden 1951: 129; Long 1955-61: I, 4; and Sabol 1960: 229-30).

Thus, the children's troupes seem to have carried over the servant song from their pre-1591 plays when they resumed dramatic activities in 1599. This type of song belongs exclusively to the plays acted by children's companies, for adult troupes rarely if ever had more than two or three boys

capable of taking more than a walk-on role and those boys usually played female roles. When adult companies did use groups of children, as in *Midsummer Night's Dream* and *Merry Wives of Windsor*, the children are given roles which require a good deal of singing and dancing but little or no speaking. Many of the plays of the children's troupes, however, count heavily on the pages to fulfill their traditional functions both in speech and song. One would like to know more about the musical aspects of the servant song.

Pastoral and Supernatural Songs

A third type of song in the children's plays is the song for pastoral or supernatural characters, usually a choral song, such as the Nymph's song in Peele's *Arraignment of Paris*. When choral groups were assigned a collective role, they were usually cast as muses, nymphs, shepherds, or fairies, probably because of the traditional association of music with such groups. Muses sing in Edwardes' *Damon and Phythias*, while Cupid sings with a group of nymphs in II.ii of Lyly's *Gallathea*, and troupes of fairies dance in II.iii of *Gallathea* and sing and dance in IV.iii of Lyly's *Endimion*, possibly to one of the songs in Ravenscroft's *Briefe Discourse* (Lawrence 1924: 418-23). Moreover, such songs occur in a few plays acted after 1599. There is a fairy chorus in Act III of *The Wisdom of Doctor Dodypoll* and a chorus of nymphs in *Wily Beguiled*. *The Maid's Metamorphosis* calls for rival singing choruses of shepherds and woodsmen in Act I; the lyrics of the shepherds' song are not given, but a song found in Ravenscroft's *Melismata*, "The Crowning of Belpheobe," would fit the context (Sabol 1959: 7-8). In Act II of the same play there is a chorus of fairies who sing and dance first alone and then with pages, and settings of both songs appear in Ravenscroft's *Briefe Discourse* (Lawrence 1924: 420; Sabol 1958: 153). Songs of this type were naturally used rarely by adult companies, although they do occur in *Midsummer Night's Dream* and *Merry Wives of Windsor*. Even the children's troupes abandoned this type of song in the early 1600's as they began to perform realistic satiric comedies set in contemporary London instead of the Ovidian romantic comedies made popular by Lyly.

Religious Songs

A fourth type of song in plays acted by children's troupes was the religious song—a hymn or prayer, usually sung by a chorus. As most of the children's companies were groups of boy choristers, they were accustomed to singing hymns or prayers in choral ensembles for religious services, so that considerable time and energy could have been spared by their using the same songs in dramatic productions. Thus, a number of plays contain hymns or prayers, usually at the end, which could have been used for devotional purposes. For example, the "Hymnus" at the end of Act III of *Sapientia Solomonis* is a Latin verse rendering of Psalm 72. In other plays, where the lyrics are not given,

almost any religious selection would fit the context, as in *Godly Queen Hester*, where Hester asks her chapel to "Syng some holy himpne [sic] to spede us this day" (1904: l. 861). Many of these religious songs come at the ends of plays, invoking blessings for the Queen, the court, and sometimes the commons; this type of song has little relevance to the dramatic action but is highly relevant to the theatrical occasion of a court play, the function of which was to praise or flatter the sovereign and, by extension, the members of the court and even the country as a whole.

None of the Paul's plays produced after 1599 concludes with this prayer for the health and well-being of the sovereign and nobility, with the possible exception of Marston's *Antonio's Revenge*, which concludes with a request for "a solemne hymne . . . /To close the last act of my vengeance." The request and the hymn which must have followed it underscore the revengers' desire for purification, and the dramatic relevance of the hymn probably precluded the conventional prayer for the sovereign. Other plays use final songs, not necessarily religious, for dramatic effects, and such songs are usually integrated with the theme and action. Thus, *The Maid's Metamorphosis* concludes with a "roundelay" of general rejoicing, and *Westward Ho!* closes with a rowing song, for the trip back to London, which turns into a *plaudite*. Plays like *The Maid's Metamorphosis* and *Sophonisba*, which are set in classical antiquity, use hymns to Phoebus and Hymen, just as Shakespeare uses a song to Bacchus in II.vii of *Antony and Cleopatra*. It would be interesting to know whether these pagan hymns and prayers were set to or modelled after Christian religious music. Some scholars have suggested that Shakespeare's song to Bacchus, for example, may be a parody or imitation of the Pentecostal hymn *Veni Creator* (Noble 1923: 127; Sternfeld 1964: 86-87; Seng 1967: 212).

In the first few years after their revival in 1599, the children's troupes continued to employ the same basic types of song that they used before 1591, albeit with greater flexibility and dramatic relevance. Even the few new types of song, which they probably borrowed from adult companies, were used in more interesting ways. For example, several of the plays acted by children's troupes after 1599 contain serenades, a type of song usually associated with plays acted by adult troupes. The serenade is generally sung by a suitor's servants or by hired musicians to a lady who usually appears "above" at a window or balcony. Because nearly all the sponsors of serenades are rejected as lovers, modern scholars regard the serenade as a conventional means of representing unsuccessful courtship. The convention of the vicarious serenade was evidently based on contemporaneous notions of social and dramatic decorum. No one of noble rank, either on or off stage, would sing or play an instrument except on very rare occasions and then only after great protestation. In plays, the production of music is generally left to servants, professional musicians, effeminate courtiers, lower class characters, or characters associated with loose sexual behavior (Ingram 1957: 154; Bowden 1951:

19–22, 44–45, 123; Sternfeld 1964: 7–8). The vicarious serenade is used in the conventional way in plays acted by adult troupes, such as Shakespeare's *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, as well as in *Blurt, Master Constable*, acted by the Children of Paul's, where a soon-to-be-rejected suitor instructs his musicians to "speak movingly" beneath his love's casement. But other plays acted by the children's troupes use the convention in a freer and more playful manner. In *Jack Drum's Entertainment* three rival suitors appear in succession under the lady's casement. One directs his page to sing "Delicious beautie that doth lie," the second, a miser, has his page sing a song of money, "Chunck, chunck, chunck," while the third, the successful lover, makes music out of his apology for not bringing any music:

Unequall *Katherine*

I bring no Musick to prepare thy thoughts
 To entertaine an amorous discourse:
 More Musick's in thy name, and sweet dispose,
 Than in *Apollo's* Lyre, or *Orpheus* close.
 I'le chaunt thy name, and so inchaunt each eare,
 That *Katherinas* happie name shall heare.
My Katherine, my life, my *Katherine*.

(1934–39: III, 198)

Similarly, the lover in *What You Will* directs his page to sing a lute song under the lady's window, but Marston then undercuts the convention of the vicarious serenade by having the lover lament the professional singer's inability to express authentic emotion:

Fie, peace, peace, peace, it hath no passion int.
 O melt thy breath in fluent softer tunes
 That every note may seeme to tricle downe
 Like sad distilling teares and make—O God!
 That I were but a Poet now t'expresse my thoughts,
 Or a Musitian but to sing my thoughts,
 Or any thing but what I am, sing't ore on[c]e more:
 My greefes a boundles sea that hath no shore.

(1934–39: II, 249)

The most unconventional use of the vicarious serenade occurs in Marston's *Dutch Courtesan*, a Blackfriars play, in which a young gallant twice sings to his lady without protest or fear of debasing his rank.

Much has been written about the dramatic relevance of songs in plays acted by children's troupes. Earlier critics tended to view these songs as extraneous entertainment (Wright 1927: 261–74; Moore 1929: 167); more recent critics, on the other hand, seem to regard most of the songs in these plays as dramatically relevant (Bowden 1951: 83; Kiefer 1954: 163–71; and Ingram 1957: 154–64). One difficulty in dealing with this question is arriving at a satisfactory definition of "dramatic relevance." If earlier scholars tended

to define it too narrowly, more recent scholars may be said to err in the opposite direction. One could reach his own working definition of the term by examining the functions attributed to the songs in Shakespeare's plays by the various critics whose remarks are quoted or paraphrased in Peter Seng's useful book. Moreover, anyone assessing the dramatic relevance of a song ought to consider any extant settings, or at least speculate about the kind of setting such lyrics might have required. Even with the songs in Shakespeare's plays this procedure has not always been followed. For instance, Feste's song in II.iv of *Twelfth Night*—"Come away, come away, death"—has often been regarded as a folk song because the Duke describes it as such before it is sung:

Mark it, Cesario, it is old and plain.
The spinsters and the knitters in the sun
And the free maids that weave their thread with bones
Do use to chant it. It is silly sooth,
And dallies with the innocence of love,
Like the old age. (II.iv. 44-49)

The lyrics themselves, however, suggest a highly sophisticated art song. The usual explanation for this discrepancy involves a possible change in singers suggested by the text, but the discrepancy may have its own dramatic function as well, for the Duke's inaccurate, pseudo-nostalgic description of the song may be another manifestation of his posturing as a melancholy lover (Seng 1967: 109-115).

Instrumental Music

Very little instrumental music occurs in the children's plays acted before 1591, and most of it was probably played off stage, like the mourning song played by the regals in *Damon and Pythias*. Off-stage regals also produced the unusual effect called for in *The Arraignment of Paris*—"an artificial charm of birds being heard within." In *Sylva Sylvarum* Bacon explains how the effect is produced: "In regals, (where they have a pipe they call the nightingale-pipe, which containeth water) the sound hath a continual trembling" (1862: IV, 255). The same effect was later called for in *The Dutch Courtesan* and *Blurt, Master Constable*.

The instrumental music which was produced on stage in plays acted by children before 1591 was played by the choirboy-actors, who were often trained instrumentalists. Only occasionally are there groups of supernumeraries who may have been professional musicians, such as the "noyse of Musicians" in *Summer's Last Will and Testament*. Four of the performers of *Wit and Science* were skilled violists and relatively competent actors, for they each assumed several roles in order to accompany the hero's dancing and their own singing. Similarly, characters in plays by Udall, Lyly, and Peele are also required to play pipes, fiddles, and lutes.

If the repertory of the Children of Paul's is any indication, instrumental music was used even more frequently in children's plays acted after 1599 than in those acted before 1599. As on the public theater stage, singers usually accompany themselves on the lute or lyra viol, although singers use the harp in *The Maid's Metamorphosis* and *Antonio and Mellida*, and the tabor and pipe in *Jack Drum's Entertainment*. In the last-mentioned play, another singer calls for a whole consort of viols to accompany her song on stage.

The purely instrumental music in the plays acted by the children's troupes after 1599 was produced by a wide variety of instruments. Probably for acoustical reasons, the indoor private theaters used different instruments from those used in the larger, open-roofed public theaters (Cowling 1913: 53-63). Thus, cornets rather than trumpets are used for sennets and flourishes, and may have been played offstage by professional musicians (Long 1955-61: I, 33-34). Stage directions in some plays acted by children's troupes call for "still flutes," or recorders, while those in *Sophonisba* or *A Mad World, My Masters* call for organs.

For instrumental ensembles, the Children of Paul's seem to have employed whole consorts, usually of viols and sometimes of cornets, whereas the Blackfriars troupe, like the adult troupes, was by 1602 employing a broken consort of organ, lute, mandolin, bandora, viol, and pipe, according to the diary of Duke Philip Julius of Stettin-Pomerania (Chambers 1923: II, 47).

It is difficult to tell whether the members of the whole consorts used at Paul's were professional musicians or whether they were specially trained choirboys, like the viol players in *Wit and Science*. Unlike the musicians in earlier plays, like *Wit and Science*, the musicians rarely play on stage, and in the one exception—*Westward Ho!*—they are identified as "the Town consort" and a "noyse of Fidlers." Moreover, none of the members of these consorts has a speaking part, except in *Northward Ho!* It is possible that professional musicians, or waits, were hired for the plays, as was apparently done for college plays at Cambridge and for the plays of the King's Men produced at Blackfriars after 1609 (Greg 1923: 207-08; and Woodfill 1953: 40-41), but it is also possible that the musicians at Paul's after 1599 were specially trained choirboys, as they had been before 1591.

Regardless of the identity of the musicians, it was probably this consort of viols that produced the entr'acte music at Paul's. Whether or not there was entr'acte music in the public theaters and if so who supplied it are thorny problems, but most scholars agree that entr'acte music was more important at the private theaters (Harbage 1955: 46-47; Sternfeld 1964: 14-15). Many of the plays acted by the Children of Paul's after 1599 call for entr'acte music, and in the plays of William Percy, written for Paul's but probably not acted there, every act but the last is followed by this stage direction: "Here they knockt up the consort." Furthermore, in many plays acted at Paul's and Blackfriars the entr'acte music is woven into the action. There is no evidence that the musicians at Paul's offered a musical prelude or postlude, but the performance at Blackfriars witnessed by the Duke of Stettin-Pomerania in

1602 was preceded by an hour-long offering by the broken consort (Chambers 1923: II, 46-47).

The children's troupes of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries seem to have used both vocal song and instrumental music more often and more variously than did the adult troupes of the same period, and may even have influenced their elders. In 1609, Shakespeare's company began using the Blackfriars theater as their winter quarters and the next few years saw other adult troupes acquiring private theaters. There is some evidence to suggest that these adult troupes preserved many of the conventions regarding the use of music and song that had been developed when the children's troupes occupied the same theaters. The influence of the children's troupes and the private theaters on the adult troupes is an important subject in theater history, for the so-called private theater became the dominant type of theater in the Stuart period and has remained so down to the present. Many readers of this journal could no doubt make significant contributions to the musicological aspects of this chapter in theater history.

NOTES

¹ It was only after correcting the galley proofs that the writer was able to examine *Music in English Renaissance Drama*, edited by John H. Long (University of Kentucky Press, Lexington, 1968). While the seven contributors to this symposium cover topics ranging from music in medieval mystery plays to music in semi-dramatic royal entertainments, two of the articles deal directly with music and song in private theater plays: R. W. Ingrams' essay, "Patterns of Music and Action in Fletcherian Drama," and Vincent Duckles' extremely useful bibliography of primary sources of music for lyrics in early seventeenth-century English drama.

² The reader can establish the repertoires of the children's troupes by consulting Schoenbaum's revised edition of Harbage's *Annals of English Drama*. Craik, Bevington, Hillebrand, Shapiro, and Harbage's *Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions* are also helpful.

REFERENCES

Arkwright, G. E. P.

1906 Death Songs of Pyramus and Thisbe. In *Notes and Queries*, Vol. 84, pp. 341-43 and 401-03.

1909 Early Elizabethan Stage Music. In *Musical Antiquary*, Vol. I, October, pp. 30-40.

1913 Early Elizabethan Stage Music. In *Musical Antiquary*, Vol. IV, January, pp. 112-17.

1914 Elizabethan Choirboy Plays and Their Music. In *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association*, 40th Session, pp. 117-38.

Bacon, Francis

1862 *Sylva Sylvarum*. In *The Works of Francis Bacon*. Ed. James Spedding et al. Brown and Taggard, Boston, IV, 255.

Barjona, Laurentius

1911 *Misogonus*. In *Early Plays from the Italian*. Ed. R. W. Bond. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

- Bevington, David
1962 *From "Mankind" to Marlowe*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Bowden, William R.
1951 *The English Dramatic Lyric, 1603-1641*. Yale University Press, Yale Studies in English, New Haven, Vol. 118.
- Brawner, James P.
1943 Early Classical Narrative Plays by Sebastian Westcott and Richard Mulcaster. In *Modern Language Quarterly*, Vol. IV, pp. 455-64.
- Chambers, Edmund K.
1923 *The Elizabethan Stage*. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 4 vols.
- Cowling, G. H.
1913 *Music on the Shakespearian Stage*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Craik, Thomas W.
1958 *The Tudor Interlude*. Leicester University Press, Leicester.
- Cutts, John P.
1957 A Note on 'The Maydes Metamorphosis.' In *Notes and Queries*, Vol. 202, pp. 292-93.
1959 *La musique de scène de la troupe de Shakespeare*. Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris.
- Evans, Willa McClung
1929 *Ben Jonson and Elizabethan Music*. Lancaster Press, Lancaster, Pa.
- Greg, W. W. (ed.)
1904 *Godly Queen Hester*. Materialien zur Kunde des Älteren Englischen Dramas, A. Uystpruyst, Louvain.
1923 *The Academic Drama at Cambridge*. In *Malone Society Collections*, Vol. 2, Part 2.
- Harbage, Alfred
1952 *Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions*. Macmillan, New York.
1955 *Theatre for Shakespeare*. University of Toronto Press, Toronto.
1964 *Annals of English Drama*. Revised by Samuel Schoenbaum. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.
- Harrison, Frank Lloyd
1958 *Music in Medieval Britain*. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.
- Hillebrand, Harold N.
1926 *The Child Actors*. University of Illinois Press, Urbana. University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature. Vol. II.
- Hunter, G. K.
1962 *John Lyly: The Humanist as Courtier*. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.
- Ingram, R. W.
1956 The Use of Music in the Plays of Marston. In *Music and Letters*, Vol. 37, pp. 154-64.
- Kiefer, Christian
1954 Music and Marston's "The Malcontent." In *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 51, pp. 163-71.
- Lawrence, W. J.
1908 Music in the Elizabethan Theatre. In *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, Vol. 44, pp. 36-50.
1912 *The Elizabethan Playhouse, First Series*. Shakespeare Head Press, Stratford-upon-Avon.
1920 Music in the Elizabethan Theater. In *Musical Quarterly*, Vol. 6, pp. 192-205.
1921 The Earliest Private Theatre Play. In *London Times Literary Supplement*, Aug. 11, p. 514.
1924 Thomas Ravenscroft's Theatrical Associations. In *Modern Language Review*, Vol. 19, pp. 418-23.
1927 *Pre-Restoration Stage Studies*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Lindsey, Edwin S.
1929 The Original Music for Beaumont's Play "The Knight of the Burning Pestle." In *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 26, pp. 425-43.

- Long, John H.
 1955-61 *Shakespeare's Use of Music*. University of Florida Press, Gainesville, 2 vols.
 1967 Music for a Song in 'Damon and Pithias.' In *Music and Letters*, Vol. 48, pp. 247-50.
 1968 *Music in English Renaissance Drama*. Ed. Long. University of Kentucky Press, Lexington.
- Macdonald, Emslie
 1953 Three Early Settings of Jonson. In *Notes and Queries*, Vol. 198, pp. 466-68.
- Marston, John
 1934-39 *The Plays of John Marston*. Ed. H. Harvey Wood. Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh, 3 vols.
- Moore, John R.
 1929 The Songs of the Public Theatres in the Time of Shakespeare. In *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, Vol. 28, pp. 166-202.
- Naylor, Edward W.
 1931 *Shakespeare and Music*. J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd., London.
- Noble, Richmond
 1923 *Shakespeare's Use of Song*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Reese, Gustave
 1959 *Music in the Renaissance*. Revised edition. W. W. Norton, New York.
- Sabol, Andrew J.
 1958a Two Songs with Accompaniment for an Elizabethan Choirboy Play. In *Studies in the Renaissance*, Vol. 5, pp. 45-59.
 1958b A Newly Discovered Contemporary Song Setting for Jonson's *Cynthia's Revels*. In *Notes and Queries*, Vol. 203, pp. 384-85.
 1959 Ravenscroft's *Melismata* and the Children of Paul's. In *Renaissance News*, Vol. 12, pp. 3-9.
 1960 Two Unpublished Stage Songs. In *Renaissance News*, Vol. 13, pp. 222-32.
- Seng, Peter J.
 1967 *The Vocal Songs in the Plays of Shakespeare*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Shakespeare, William
 1948 *The Complete Works*. Ed. G. B. Harrison. Harcourt, Brace, and Co., New York.
- Shapiro, Michael
 1967 *The Plays Acted by the Children of Paul's, 1599-1607*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Columbia University.
- Sternfeld, F. W.
 1959 Songs in Jonson's Comedy. In *Studies in the English Renaissance Drama*. Ed. J. W. Bennett et al. New York University Press, New York, pp. 310-21.
 1964 *Music in Shakespearean Tragedy*. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.
- Woodfill, Walter L.
 1953 *Musicians in English Society from Elizabeth to Charles I*. Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Wright, Louis B.
 1927 Extraneous Song in Elizabethan Drama after the Advent of Shakespeare. In *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 24, pp. 261-74.

Bach's Wedding Music

Frederick Hudson

Within the corpus of some 200 sacred cantatas which Bach composed, those which graced marriage services are probably the least known. The reasons are not far to seek. A mere handful survives of a much greater output, public and broadcast performances are extremely rare, and, as far as the writer is aware, no commercial recordings exist. Only six *Trauungskantaten* are known to us by name; the music of five survives in whole or in part, but the source material of two of them is fragmentary. In order of composition the complete list consists of:

<i>Der Herr denkt an uns</i>	(complete)	BWV 196
<i>Sein Segen fließt daher wie ein Strom</i>	(libretto only)	„ Anh. 14
<i>O ewiges Feuer, o Ursprung der Liebe</i>	(incomplete)	„ 34a
<i>Herr Gott, Beherrscher aller Dinge</i>	(incomplete)	„ 120a
<i>Gott ist unsere Zuversicht</i>	(complete)	„ 197
<i>Dem Gerechten muss das Licht</i>	(complete)	„ 195

The list is extended slightly by three chorales which Bach composed for use in lieu of a wedding cantata:

<i>Was Gott tut, das ist wohlgetan</i>	(Vor der Trauung)	BWV 250
<i>Sei Lob und Ehr dem höchsten Gut</i>	(Nach der Trauung)	„ 251
<i>Nun danket alle Gott</i>	(Nach dem Segen)	„ 252

Outside the scope of the marriage service are three surviving *Hochzeitskantaten*, that is, cantatas composed to entertain the bridal party and guests at the wedding breakfast which followed the service:

<i>Weichet nur, betrübte Schatten</i>	(Cöthen)	BWV 202
<i>Vergnügte Pleißen-Stadt</i>	(February 5, 1728)	„ 216
<i>O holder Tag, erwünschte Zeit</i>	(1734 or 1735)	„ 210

Terry,¹ Scherring² and Hans Brandts Buys³ have suggested, without documentation however, that the three chorales were composed for the wedding of Bach's daughter Elizabeth ("Lieschen") and Johann C. Altnikol on Sunday, January 20, 1749. Schweitzer⁴ suggests that BWV 97, *In allen meinen Taten*, and BWV 100, *Was Gott tut, das ist wohlgetan*, were used as wedding cantatas, while Schering⁵ adds as possibilities BWV 9, *Es ist das Heil uns kommen her*, BWV 93, *Wer nur den lieben Gott lässt walten*, BWV 99 or 100, *Was Gott tut, das ist wohlgetan*, and BWV 111, *Was mein Gott will, das g'scheh allzeit*.

At the writer's request the Bach Archives, Leipzig, under the direction of Professor Werner Neumann, graciously carried out a thorough investigation

of the registers of St. Thomas' and St. Nicholas', the two main Leipzig churches for which Bach was required to provide figural music, from 1723 to 1750. At St. Thomas' the verger or registrar had been meticulous in entering "*gantze Brautmesse*" (literally, "complete bridal mass") for each wedding graced by a cantata. Due to his attention to detail we know that cantatas were performed in St. Thomas' at 31 weddings during Bach's Leipzig period, the first on Tuesday, July 13, 1723, and the last on Sunday, February 18, 1748.⁶ The next *gantze Brautmesse* was held on September 20, 1751. The search in St. Nicholas' marriage registers did not prove so fruitful, since the registrar there had not thought it necessary to add this important detail. During Bach's period of office there is only one entry of *gantze Brautmesse*—Sunday February 17, 1749—and it is here that the handwriting changes, showing that a new registrar had taken over this duty. As St. Thomas' and St. Nicholas' were used equally, sharing the cantata choir and orchestra on alternate Sundays, we may speculate that as many wedding cantatas were performed in the latter as in the former. If this is true, then Bach was responsible for performing cantatas at some 60 marriage services in the main Leipzig churches. It is possible that BWV 195 was performed at weddings in at least three versions and the double text in BWV 34a suggests performances at two different weddings. We may suppose with Schweitzer and Schering that BWV 9, 93, 97, 99, 100 and 111 could have been used for marriage services, and there is the further possibility that Bach may have used cantatas by other composers. Of the six known wedding cantatas, BWV 196 is pre-Leipzig, so this leaves a mere five out of a large corpus of such music irretrievably lost to us—proportionately the greatest loss in any single genre.

When Bach died in 1750 his cantata autograph scores were divided between his oldest sons, Wilhelm Friedemann and Carl Philipp Emanuel. His widow, Anna Magdalena, retained many of the performing parts, and these she sold to the Leipzig Town Council in 1752 to alleviate her poverty: 44 sets of parts were thus preserved. Wilhelm Friedemann's inheritance included BWV 196, 34a and 120a, and of these there survives solely the second half of BWV 120a. C. P. E. Bach took much better care of his inheritance: in 1790, two years after his death, a long catalogue of his music library was published in Hamburg—*Verzeichniss des musikalischen Nachlasses . . .*⁷—and almost everything from this treasury exists today. This catalogue includes the two wedding cantatas which survive complete in autograph score at the present time, BWV 197 and 195.

The earliest of the surviving wedding cantatas is *Der Herr denket an uns*. Though the autograph is lost, a copy of the score which belonged to Kirnberger, Bach's pupil 1739–41, is preserved in the Princess Amalie collection. This is probably one of the earliest cantatas composed by Bach in any category. There are no recitatives, there is no division into the usual *Vor . . .* and *Nach der Trauung*, and the thematic material and its use are similar to those of other early works which can be dated with some assurance, quite apart from the immaturity of its style and scoring. After a 21-measure

Sinfonia in dotted rhythm, the four following movements are a setting of Psalm 115, vv. 12-15:

2. Chorus: *Derr Herr denket an uns und segnet uns.* v. 12
Er segnet das Haus Israel, er segnet das Haus Aaron.
3. Aria: *Er segnet, die den Herrn fürchten, beyde Kleine und Grosse.* v. 13
4. Duet: *Der Herr segne euch je mehr und mehr, euch und eure Kinder.* v. 14
5. Chorus: *Ihr seyd die Gesegneten des Herrn, der Himmel und Erden* v. 15
gemacht hat. (Amen.)

It was Bach's custom to make copious references in his wedding cantata texts to the occupation or circumstances of the bridal couple, often by the use of happy metaphor and simile. Beginning with Spitta, writers have read significance in the references to "He will bless . . . the house of Aaron" and "The Lord shall increase you more and more, you and your children." They have suggested that the first reference could apply only to a pastor of a Church, and the second to the re-marriage of a widower with many children by his first wife. They have pointed to the wedding of Bach's aunt, Regina Wedemann, to Pastor Johann Lorenz Stauber on Tuesday, June 5, 1708, as fitting these circumstances. Stauber was Pastor at Dornheim, a widower with many children, and his wedding took place at nearby Arnstadt. The previous autumn Bach had left Arnstadt to take up his appointment at St. Blasius, Mühlhausen, and had himself been married to his cousin Barbara by Pastor Stauber at Dornheim. The evidence for BWV 196 being performed at this wedding is circumstantial, but the musical evidence points to the year 1708, towards the end of Bach's office at Mühlhausen, as the date of composition. The only dissentient is Alfred Heuss,⁸ who would place this cantata in the Weimar period.

A piece of "modern" development, which some of us would call vandalism, was entirely responsible for the little we know about *Sein Segen fliesst*. In 1902 the authorities ordered a new road made at the side of St. Thomas', Leipzig, which involved the demolition of the old St. Thomas' School. During the demolition a wall-cupboard was revealed in the Cantor's quarters, containing an exercise book with Greek homework in the handwriting of C. P. E. Bach and a printed libretto of this wedding cantata. This is now in the Bach Museum, Eisenach, and consists of a four-page folio, folded down the middle in octavo size, slightly damaged in the top right-hand corner. The first page gives us the names of and information about the bride, bridegroom, and bride's father, and states Bach's titles and appointments in full, together with the date of the wedding: February 12, 1725. The bridegroom was Christoph Friedrich Lösner, who is described as *Floss-Verwalter*. An investigation of the Royal and Electoral Archives of the *Sächsischen Landeshauptarchiv*, Dresden,⁹ showed that Lösner held an important and responsible appointment under August the Strong, 1670-1733, Elector of Saxony and King of Poland. His duties included the care and maintenance of all rivers, streams, and watercourses in Saxony, and responsibility for the transportation, by means of rafts, of logs

and other timber needed throughout Saxony for military as well as domestic use. In the wedding libretto delightful use has been made of the bridegroom's association with watercourses and rafts. The cantata is in the usual *Vor . . .* and *Nach der Trauung* sections, each of three movements. There is no chorale movement and the cantata could be for chorus and soloists, or soloists alone. The text of the first movement comes from Ecclesiastes 39, v. 22: *His blessing covered the dry land as a river and watered it as a flood.* Then follows a recitative in which Lösner is compared to Hiram, King of Lebanon, who supplied King Solomon with cedar and fir trees by means of rafts for the building of the Temple at Jerusalem. The third movement is an aria based on Ezekiel 47, in which God's blessing is invoked for the bridal pair like the holy, unfathomable waters which proceeded from the altar and through the threshold of the several doors. In the *Nach der Trauung* section there are references to the bitter waters of Mara being made as sweet as honey by the blessing of Moses, and to the Garden of Eden from which flowed four rivers.

The entry for this wedding of February 12, 1725 was found in St. Nicholas' registers. It was not held in the church, however, but in "D. Phillips Gasthof in a room on the first floor at 6 o'clock in the evening." We may exercise a little imagination and visualize four of Bach's prefects struggling up the staircase earlier in the day with a chamber organ for the cantata. The annual inventory of musical instruments in St. Thomas' School, *An Musikalischen Instrumenten*, has an entry in 1720 for such an organ made *um bey denen Hauss-Trauungen zu gebrauchen* ("for use at House-Weddings"), and special mention is made that this little organ had four handholds. The following day Bach performed yet another wedding cantata, this time in St. Thomas', for the wedding of Christian Heinrich Hennig, *Bürger und Krämer*, and Amelia Rosina Küttner, daughter of a *Pergamentmacher*.

In historical order the next surviving wedding cantata is *O ewiges Feuer*. To say that it survives is half the truth, for the musical evidence consists merely of an incomplete set of seven original parts.¹⁰ These are for soprano, alto, tenor, bass, first violin, viola, and continuo, in the hands of five different writers, one of whom may possibly be Bach himself helping out his hard-pressed family and pupils in their copying. In the seventh and last movement the alto and tenor parts are missing and the continuo part stops at bar 34 at the end of a loose folio. The reverse side of this folio contains 13 staves without notation, so one may conclude that the remaining 62 bars were written on a further loose folio, now lost. The surviving material is sufficient to show that this was a full-scale cantata with many unique features, among them the incorporation in the final chorus of the three-fold Aaronic blessing set to the traditional plainchant. The Aaronic blessing was normally pronounced from the altar steps at the conclusion of the main Sunday morning service as well as at the marriage service. Our impressions would necessarily rest on the incomplete parts, except that Bach made use of three movements in a later Whitsunday version, BWV 34, with the same title, which can be dated between 1740 and 1742. He re-arranged these movements in the order of

1, 5, and 4, interposed two new recitatives, adapted the libretto for Whitsunday, and reworked the music in part. The autograph score of the Whitsunday version (with some later additions in the hand of Wilhelm Friedemann)¹¹ employs Bach's full festival orchestra of three trumpets and timpani, two oboes and strings in the choruses (Nos. 1 and 4), and two transverse flutes with muted strings in the lovely alto aria (No. 5) which begins the *Nach der Trauung* section of the original wedding version. A study of the original wedding parts and the score of the Whitsunday version over a period of years convinced the writer that a reconstruction of this wedding cantata would be possible, and this task was begun with the hope that something of the original spirit would emerge, even if the exact letter of Bach's text should be impossible to achieve.¹² No insurmountable difficulties were presented in Nos. 1, 4, and 5 in spite of Bach's reworking for the later version, and the wedding recitatives, Nos. 2 and 6, were of the *secco* type and complete in the surviving parts. Nos. 3 and 7 gave the greatest trouble and heart-searching, for the fragmentary parts were the sole foundation on which to build. No. 3 is a tenor aria in four sections, each section followed by an alto recitative which expounds and comments on the previous aria section. The text of the aria sections is from Psalm 128, vv. 4-6, the Psalm appointed to be read in the marriage service. The last section, *Yea, that thou shalt see thy children's children*, is followed by the chorus, No. 4, which begins with a massive statement of . . . and *peace upon Israel* which completes this Psalm verse. The beginning of No. 4 is thus a continuation of No. 3 and appears in a new light, restored to its original position from that of final chorus in the Whitsunday version.

The dating for *O ewiges Feuer* is still uncertain, but the evidence suggests a marriage service celebrated either on March 6, 1726 or on November 8, 1728. The weight of evidence points rather to 1728, if indeed the wedding was held in one of the Leipzig churches, and not in a church in some other city. To summarize this evidence: 1) there are three direct and unmistakable references in the libretto which make it certain that the bridegroom was a Pastor of the Church; 2) the abundance of biblical references in the text and the aptness and good taste displayed suggest an author who had an extensive and intimate knowledge of the scriptures. Wustmann (*Bachs Kantatentexte*, 1913) was the first to suggest Christian Weiss senior, Pastor of St. Thomas' 1714-36, as the author of 11 cantata texts of this character belonging to Bach's early Leipzig period; 3) the watermarks in the original parts point to a date during Bach's early years in Leipzig, and the scoring and thematic figuration of the alto aria, No. 5, *Wohl euch, ihr auserwählten Schafe*, are similar to those used in movements of this period (in BWV 249 and 249a, and in *O Mensch, bewein'* which was originally in the *St. John Passion* before being transferred to the *St. Matthew Passion*); 4) a search of St. Thomas' and St. Nicholas' marriage registers for weddings of pastors which had been graced by a cantata pointed to Monday, November 8, 1728, as the marriage celebration best fitting the evidence. On this day a cantata was performed in St.

Thomas' at the wedding of Friedrich Schultze, Bachelor of Theology and Deacon of St. Wenceslas' in Naumburg, and Johanna Elisabeth, daughter of Dr. Christian Weiss, senior Pastor of St. Thomas'. Dr. Alfred Dürr (Bach Institute, Göttingen) thought this dating possible, but believed that the watermarks and copyists suggested early 1726 rather than 1728. The registers of St. Nicholas' record a wedding held there on March 6, 1726, but the bridegroom was a barrister and not a pastor. The evidence is, then, that in the first half of 1726 no weddings of pastors were celebrated in St. Nicholas', and no weddings of pastors in St. Thomas' were graced by a cantata. If BWV 34a was not composed for St. Thomas' on November 8, 1728, then the alternative is that it would have been composed for and performed at a wedding in a church outside Leipzig. In the final chorus there is an earlier text, partly crossed out, both texts being equally suitable for the wedding of a pastor, and this suggests the possibility of BWV 34a having been performed at two different weddings.

Herr Gott, Beherrscher aller Dinge, on the other hand, is not an original composition, for five of the eight movements are reworkings from earlier cantatas. Eight of the original parts are extant,¹³ together with the fragmentary autograph score which provides the second half of the cantata.¹⁴ The parts are for soprano, alto, tenor, bass, viola, with three continuo parts, one of which is transposed down a whole tone because of the *Chorton* pitch of the Leipzig organs. The first five movements of this organ part are in the handwriting of Johann Ludwig Krebs which, since Krebs was Bach's pupil from 1725 to about 1737, sets terminal dates for the composition and first performance of this cantata. The fragmentary autograph score was in the possession of Johann Ludwig Erk until his death in 1883, after which it passed to the Royal Library, Berlin. Erk had noted at the beginning of the fragment that it was from BWV 137, *Lobe den Herren*, because of the final chorale which both cantatas share, and it was not until some 50 years later that Georg Schünemann identified the fragment with BWV 120a and published an article on his discovery in the *Bach-Jahrbuch* for 1936. The first surviving page of score begins 11 measures from the end of No. 4, a Sinfonia with organ obbligato. The oldest form of this movement is the *Preludio* of Partita III in E flat for solo violin, BWV 1006, of about 1720, and there exists an autograph of a reworking of the whole Partita for an unnamed instrument (clavier? harp?), BWV 1006a, of 1737. Apart from a few small differences the surviving wedding source material is identical with the Sinfonia in BWV 29, *Wir danken dir, Gott*, first performed in the Council Election service on August 27, 1731.

Nos. 1, 3, and 6 of *Herr Gott, Beherrscher* are reworkings of Nos. 2, 4, and 1 respectively of BWV 120, *Gott, man lobet dich in der Stille*. The opening ritornello of BWV 120, No. 2 was used also in *Et expecto resurrectionem*, Credo, B minor Mass. The material of BWV 120, No. 4 goes back to BWV 1019a, No. 3, the Sonata in G for Violin and Cembalo, but Smend¹⁵ suggests that the original was a vocal version of the Cöthen period, now lost. Though

BWV 120a, No. 1 is three measures longer than BWV 120, No. 2, other differences are slight and arise mainly from the new verbal text. No. 2 of BWV 120a is an original composition and the surviving material is adequate for a reconstruction. No. 3 can be recovered easily from No. 4 of BWV 120, and No. 4 similarly from the Sinfonia in *Wir danken dir, Gott*. From the last 11 measures of the Sinfonia the wedding autograph score is complete. The reconstruction of BWV 120a¹⁶ proved less difficult than that of BWV 34a, largely because of a comparative wealth of surviving source material. Unfortunately, sources and records give no clue to the identity of the bridal party or to the date of the wedding. Only the period 1728–36 can be put forward for its composition. The libretto shows a strong affinity with the music set to it: Bach may have adapted and written the libretto as well as the music and, if so, both together evidence his deep religious feeling for the spiritual significance of the marriage service.

The autograph score of BWV 197, *Gott ist unsre Zuversicht*, is extant¹⁷ but the original parts are not. It is a magnificent full-scale cantata scored for Bach's high festival forces of three trumpets and drums, oboes, string and continuo, four-part choir, and soprano, alto, and bass soloists. There are ten movements divided equally *Vor . . .* and *Nach der Trauung*, the wedding service proper, up to the point where the pastor pronounces them man and wife and blesses them, taking place in between. The second part begins when the bridal couple and the Pastor have proceeded to the altar steps. The first five movements in the autograph score give evidence that Bach carried out his normal compositional processes on these folios: they show second thoughts and improvements as he went along, crossing out notes and groups, entering his second thoughts in the space available, and occasionally writing the letter-names of notes above the staff where the corrections were unclear. In Nos. 6 to 10 there is not the same evidence of erasure and correction, and the score gives the impression that it is a fair copy and not an original composition. This is especially true of the main movements, the arias Nos. 6 and 8, the other movements being recitatives with a simple chorale to finish. These two arias are reworkings of arias which appear in the fragmentary Christmas cantata, BWV 197a, *Ehre sei Gott in der Höhe*. The last two folios survive (four written pages), at present in the possession of the Heinemann Foundation, New York. In the first aria the original is for alto solo, two flutes, cello obbligato, and continuo, which Bach has rescored for bass solo, oboe, bassoon obbligato, strings, and continuo, both versions being in the same key. The original of the second aria is for bass solo, oboe d'amore obbligato, and continuo, and he has reworked this for soprano solo, violin obbligato, two oboi d'amore, and continuo, this time transposing it up a fourth from D to G major. The reworking in each case is an improvement and extension of the original. The libretto of the Christmas cantata comes from the third part of Picander's *Gedichte*, 1732. The libretto structure of the wedding cantata has a striking resemblance to that of BWV 120a, and there is a strong probability that Bach himself was responsible for adapting the original texts,

changing them into wedding similes and metaphors, and adding new texts for the newly composed movements. From the paper and watermarks of the full score, BWV 197 may be dated 1737–38 with some assurance.

Both the original parts¹⁸ and the original score¹⁹ of BWV 195, *Dem Gerechten muss das Licht*, are available today. The unraveling of the history of this source material and the weddings at which it was used presents greater problems than that of any other wedding cantata. The first half begins with a chorus for maximum forces—four-part choir, four solo voices, three trumpets and drums, two transverse flutes, two oboes, strings, and continuo. Four movements follow—a bass recitative, a bass aria for strings and oboi d'amore, a dramatic soprano recitative, and a chorus comparable to the opening movement. The *Nach der Trauung* section consists merely of a chorale, scored for two horns instead of trumpets, the other instruments doubling the voices. Between the first and second folios of the original score a libretto has been inserted setting out the words as in Part I, but in Part II giving the words of an aria, recitative, and chorus. On the last page of the four Bach has entered in stiff, crabbed handwriting the score of the final chorale. This chorale is not part of the original libretto, but was intended as a substitute for the three movements of Part II at the last performance of the cantata towards the end of Bach's life.

There are 23 performing parts extant (first violin in duplicate) in the hands of 19 different writers, one of whom is Bach, who wrote out the first 30 or 40 measures of the 1st, 3rd, and 5th movements in 11 parts, and added the final chorale in 22 parts. The greater part of the original score has been written by four different copyists, one of whom has written the whole of the first and fifth movements. Bach has written the recitatives, second and fourth movements, only measures 1–12 in the third movement, and for the fifth movement merely the title, *Chorus*, the clefs and key-signatures, and possibly the notes of the first measure. These autograph entries were sufficient to show his copyists how he wished them to proceed, and the obvious conclusion is that they were in part copying and in part rescoring from movements already in existence. Bach's crabbed, difficult writing in parts and score is similar to the handwriting in the revised and added sections of the *St. John Passion* parts used for the last performance of his life. The SATB ripieno parts of the wedding cantata are older than all other parts, and give evidence that they were used for a performance previous to that which substituted the final chorale for the three movements of Part II of the libretto. The parts for these movements have been cut off with a sharp knife or pair of scissors, the paper format is smaller, and for the second to fourth movements of Part I they refer to *Basso tacet*, *Tenor tacet*, and *Alto tacet*, pointing to the original movements from which the bass recitative and aria and the soprano aria were reworked.

Thus, at least three performances of this cantata were given at different times. Space allows merely a summary of conclusions:

First Performance: Autograph score and original parts, now lost; a setting of

all eight movements as in the full libretto; the chorus parts only for four and not eight voices.

Second performance: Autograph score, now lost; all original parts lost except for the SATB ripieno parts; the vocal parts now for eight voices; the second to fourth movements for bass, tenor, and alto respectively; all eight movements present as in the full libretto.

Third performance: A new draft of the full score (that which survives today); new parts written for voices and instruments except for the old SATB ripieno parts (again those which survive today); the second movement recitative newly composed by Bach; the third movement tenor aria reworked for bass; the fourth movement recitative newly composed or reworked for soprano; the substitution of the final chorale in place of the three movements of Part II of the libretto.

An attempt to identify this splendidly proportioned cantata with the wedding for which it was originally composed brought a promising result. The text of the opening chorus is from Psalm 97, vv. 11–12, *Light is sprung up for the righteous . . .*, and in the following recitative the bass sings, *Hochedles Paar an dem man so Gerechtigkeit als Tugend ehrt*, (“Right noble pair, whom one honours for righteousness as well as virtue”). Then in the recitative of Part II of the libretto there is another reference to *Hoch Edles Paar*—a further indication that the bridal couple were highly respected and certainly of some rank. *Gerechtigkeit* (“righteousness”) and *Tugend* (“virtue”) appear to be the outstanding qualities of the bridal pair and, with these clues to help, a search of the registers of St. Thomas’ and St. Nicholas’ pointed to the following rather than to any other wedding graced by a cantata. In St. Thomas’ on September 11, 1741, Dr. Gottlob Heinrich Pipping, . . . *berühmter Rechtsconsulent und Bürgermeister in Naumburg*, married Johanna Eleonore Schütze, daughter of Dr. Friedrich Wilhelm Schütze, senior Pastor of St. Thomas’. From the marginal note, *gantze Brautmesse*, it is certain that a cantata was performed at this wedding, and what better combination of attributes could one have than “righteousness” for a famous lawyer who is also Mayor of an important city, and “virtue” for the daughter of Leipzig’s leading clergyman? No ordinary wedding lasting the usual half-hour or so would be a fitting tribute to such a marriage; it must have taken over an hour to perform the eight movements of the original setting of BWV 195.²⁰

NOTES

¹ *J. S. Bach—a Biography*, London 1928, p. 258, Leipzig 1929, p. 312.

² *J. S. Bach und das Musikleben Leipzigs im 18. Jahrhundert*, Leipzig 1941 (= *Musikgeschichte Leipzigs*, Vol. 3), p. 97.

³ *J. S. Bach—48 Praeludia*, Haarlem & Antwerp, 1950, p. 214.

⁴ *J. S. Bach*, Leipzig, 1908, p. 619, London, 1911, Vol. 2, p. 242.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 54.

⁶ The complete and detailed list is printed in the *Neue Bach-Ausgabe*, Series I, Vol. 33, (*Traugungskantaten*), *Kritischer Bericht*, Kassel-Basel-London-New York-Leipzig, 1958, pp.12–15.

⁷ Reprinted in the *Bach Jahrbuch*, 1938, p. 106 ff.; 1939, p. 81 ff.; and 1940–48, p. 161 ff. (BWV 197=BJ 1939, p. 88; BWV 195=BJ 1939, p. 89.)

⁸ *Zeitschrift für Musik*, 1934, p. 191.

⁹ The writer is greatly indebted to the Director, Prof. H. Kretzschmar, for his laborious search of these and other documents in his care.

¹⁰ *Mus. ms. Bach St 73*, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Berlin.

¹¹ *Am. B. 39*, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Berlin.

¹² The fullscore, piano/vocal score, and performing parts of this reconstruction are currently in the press, and will be published by Breitkopf und Härtel, Leipzig.

¹³ *Mus. ms. Bach St 43*, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Berlin.

¹⁴ *Mus. ms. Bach P 670*, Dahlem, Berlin.

¹⁵ Friedrich Smend, *Bach in Köthen*, Berlin, 1951, p. 64.

¹⁶ Reconstruction of BWV 120a published by Curwen (London) and Schirmer (New York) 1955.

¹⁷ *Mus. ms. Bach P 91*, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Berlin.

¹⁸ *Mus. ms. Bach St 12*, Dahlem, Berlin.

¹⁹ *Mus. ms. Bach P 65*, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Berlin.

²⁰ Full information concerning Bach's Wedding Music, sources and history, is contained in the critical report to NBA I/33, Bärenreiter, Kassel, 1958, Deutscher Verlag für Musik, Leipzig, 1958.

Musical Research in Israel: Its History, Resources, and Institutions

Don Harran

The history of musicology and ethnomusicology in Israel is closely interwoven with developments on the national educational and artistic scene.¹ Seeds of an indigenous musical culture were planted around 1910 with the opening of the country's first music school and, in 1911, of the Israel School of Music, the latter headed by Abraham J. Idelsohn. Growth accelerated with the founding of the Hebrew Opera by Mordechai Golinkin (1923), the formation of a Society for New Music (1929), and the launching of the Palestine Orchestra, today the Israel Philharmonic Orchestra, by Bronislaw Huberman (1936) and, in the same year, of the radio station Voice of Jerusalem with its own chorus and orchestra. The year 1933 marked the inauguration of the first Conservatory of Music (now the Rubin Academy of Music, Jerusalem), and the year 1945, the first Teachers' Training School for Music (Tel-Aviv). The educator Leo Kestenberg (1882–1967),² to whose initiative the latter is due, drew up a blueprint for an educational system predicated on the specificity of the Jewish cultural heritage. It was no easy matter to find a "didactic" norm among the different ethnic strata of Israeli society, each with its own language, folkways, and artistic traditions. Nor was it easy to reconcile the correspondingly different opinions that raged then—and now—about what music education in this country should be like.

⁶ The complete and detailed list is printed in the *Neue Bach-Ausgabe*, Series I, Vol. 33, (*Traugungskantaten*), *Kritischer Bericht*, Kassel-Basel-London-New York-Leipzig, 1958, pp.12–15.

⁷ Reprinted in the *Bach Jahrbuch*, 1938, p. 106 ff.; 1939, p. 81 ff.; and 1940–48, p. 161 ff. (BWV 197=BJ 1939, p. 88; BWV 195=BJ 1939, p. 89.)

⁸ *Zeitschrift für Musik*, 1934, p. 191.

⁹ The writer is greatly indebted to the Director, Prof. H. Kretzschmar, for his laborious search of these and other documents in his care.

¹⁰ *Mus. ms. Bach St 73*, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Berlin.

¹¹ *Am. B. 39*, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Berlin.

¹² The fullscore, piano/vocal score, and performing parts of this reconstruction are currently in the press, and will be published by Breitkopf und Härtel, Leipzig.

¹³ *Mus. ms. Bach St 43*, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Berlin.

¹⁴ *Mus. ms. Bach P 670*, Dahlem, Berlin.

¹⁵ Friedrich Smend, *Bach in Köthen*, Berlin, 1951, p. 64.

¹⁶ Reconstruction of BWV 120a published by Curwen (London) and Schirmer (New York) 1955.

¹⁷ *Mus. ms. Bach P 91*, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Berlin.

¹⁸ *Mus. ms. Bach St 12*, Dahlem, Berlin.

¹⁹ *Mus. ms. Bach P 65*, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Berlin.

²⁰ Full information concerning Bach's Wedding Music, sources and history, is contained in the critical report to NBA I/33, Bärenreiter, Kassel, 1958, Deutscher Verlag für Musik, Leipzig, 1958.

Musical Research in Israel: Its History, Resources, and Institutions

Don Harran

The history of musicology and ethnomusicology in Israel is closely interwoven with developments on the national educational and artistic scene.¹ Seeds of an indigenous musical culture were planted around 1910 with the opening of the country's first music school and, in 1911, of the Israel School of Music, the latter headed by Abraham J. Idelsohn. Growth accelerated with the founding of the Hebrew Opera by Mordechai Golinkin (1923), the formation of a Society for New Music (1929), and the launching of the Palestine Orchestra, today the Israel Philharmonic Orchestra, by Bronislaw Huberman (1936) and, in the same year, of the radio station Voice of Jerusalem with its own chorus and orchestra. The year 1933 marked the inauguration of the first Conservatory of Music (now the Rubin Academy of Music, Jerusalem), and the year 1945, the first Teachers' Training School for Music (Tel-Aviv). The educator Leo Kestenberg (1882–1967),² to whose initiative the latter is due, drew up a blueprint for an educational system predicated on the specificity of the Jewish cultural heritage. It was no easy matter to find a "didactic" norm among the different ethnic strata of Israeli society, each with its own language, folkways, and artistic traditions. Nor was it easy to reconcile the correspondingly different opinions that raged then—and now—about what music education in this country should be like.

Kestenberg, as far-sighted in his own right as was his teacher Busoni, geared his reform to encompass both the past with its 2,000-year-old history of Jewish music and the present with its colorful ethnic practices. His conviction that a system of education must grow out of its own national and cultural roots—that it must be invested with its own content and guided by its own purposes—is one to give food for thought in an era when Israeli music, folk and artistic, is following a pattern of increasing Westernization. Those who believe that music education in Israel ought to be like unto itself may take heart from Israeli musical research which has been—and, as long as music withstands the process of acculturation, promises to remain—true to the character of its subject matter.

Those two areas about which Kestenberg's program turned were, from the very beginning, the two directions in which musical research in the country evolved. The first, the music of the Jews and its history from Biblical times to the present, may, generally speaking, be divided into three phases: music in the Bible (Old Testament), its development in the post-Biblical period, and music in modern times (from the 16th century on). Knowledge about Biblical music rests in large measure upon the correlation of the information gleaned from scriptural writings with the findings of the historians and archeologists. The objects of inquiry are various: musical instruments, their names, classes, ancestry, and functions; the texts that underlay vocal music (e.g., Psalms and their prosody); the music, its varieties, its performance practices (e.g., soloistic, antiphonal, responsorial), and, as much as can be reconstructed, the build of its melodies and rhythms; the occasions for which music was employed (merrymaking, warfare, signaling, harvesting, etc.); the grounds for a distinction between sacred and secular forms; psychic effects of music, its application as a therapeutic aid, the role women played in its performance, and the affiliation of music with dance.

The sources of knowledge about post-Biblical music—extending from the Hellenistic period through the Middle Ages and down to the 16th century—are the later books of the Old Testament (Daniel, Ecclesiastes), the apocryphal writings, the Dead Sea Scrolls, the New Testament, patristic literature, and the oral traditions of ancient Eastern communities (e.g., the melodies collected by Idelsohn and others among Jews of Syria, Persia, Babylonia, etc.). Its subjects are synagogal music and its centers (Palestine, Babylonia, and later, eastern and western Europe), its relation to Christian chant (during the first six or seven centuries A.D.), its instruments (the shofar was the only one permitted by Talmudic authorities, but were there others?), its varieties (psalm singing; cantillation of the Pentateuch, the Prophets, etc.; post-Biblical prayer hymns or *piyyutim*); the influence of Hellenistic culture—and with it the new importance that accrued to secular music; the organization of the synagogue service, the functions of the *shamash* (beadle) and the *chazan* (cantor), the extent of congregational participation, and the use of singing in the Talmudic schools; the practice of cantillation (*te'amim*), its kinds, its correlation with the different modes assigned to the Biblical books,

its development from an oral tradition to a system of written stenographic signs, the differences in the meanings of these signs from one period or locality to another, and the later theoretical fixation of these meanings; *chazanut* (cantorial singing), its structural types (or prayer motives), its improvisational practices, and the balance struck between the two; the historical and sociological questions that surround the shift from music in the religious ceremonial of the Temple to that of the synagogue; the degree to which the former was transmitted to and preserved by the latter; the development away from a group mode of performance (as entrusted to the Levites) to a soloistic practice (as carried on by the *chazan*); the early growth of cognate musical traditions—Ashkenazic, Sephardic, Eastern—following upon the breakup of Babylonian culture; the study of the dozen or so theoretical tracts in Hebrew dating from the 10th to the 15th centuries.

The history of Jewish music from the 16th century on has been explored along the following lines of investigation: later developments in the various synagogal traditions; the division of the Ashkenazic line into an eastern and a western European branch; the incorporation of melodically fixed chants—drawing no little sustenance from the style and content of Gentile music—into the synagogue service (e.g., *Kol Nidre*, *Ma-oz Tsur*, *Adonai Melech*, etc.); the paths of assimilation to or alienation from European art traditions in the synagogal music of western Europe; the institution of reform movements in the same; the popular religious songs (*niggunim*) of the Hassidim; the *zmirot* or table chants employed for the singing of grace; art music in the Jewish communities of the Diaspora; the life and works of the internationally-famed Jewish composers of the 19th and 20th centuries (e.g., from Mendelssohn to Schönberg); and art music and its composers in Israel from the time of the first waves of immigration to the founding of the State (1948) and down to the present.

The second large area to engage the interest of researchers here falls rightly within the province of ethnomusicology, though it is difficult to draw hard and fixed bounds between it and the "history" of Jewish music. Its investigators are concerned in the main with recording and analyzing the musical practices—religious and secular—of the ancient Jewish and non-Jewish communities of the Near and Middle East, in particular, those settled today in modern Israel. Like his colleagues abroad, the Israeli ethnomusicologist wrestles with the usual problems of methodology and, sometimes, epistemology previous and subsequent to the notation of his material: how does he best go about recording it? what kind of transcription reveals the general contour of the music while, at the same time, doing justice to its wealth of subordinate detail? how does one achieve, in analysis, an equilibrium between stylistic description and the marshalling of pertinent ethnic, social, and cultural data? to what extent can the information served up by music help to revise the tried and true concepts established by the latter? Beyond the study of separate ethnic groups, the researcher is intent on furnishing answers to the wide range of ancillary questions that touch

upon knowledge about cultural or ethnic contacts, the relationship between present musical practices and those of earlier, perhaps ancient, times, the acculturation that overtakes these practices as they are passed on from one generation to the next, the origins and wanderings of musical instruments, performance traditions and the personality of the Oriental musician, and the degree to which theoretical and musical systems are the bedrock on which live musical practices are grounded.

Despite the quickening of the pace of ethnomusicological research within recent years, it is still too early to speak of an attrition of musical sources. Israel is a small country, to be sure, yet within its circumscribed boundaries there lies a rich store of ethnic materials waiting to be recorded and brought to the research table.

A further branch of the "ethnomusicological" area of Oriental musical research is the study of the folk-song traditions that grew up, following the destruction of the Second Temple, among the Jewish communities dispersed throughout eastern and western Europe. These are the songs, properly speaking, of the ghettos, and they range from semi-spiritual and ceremonial types to tunes patterned on the social and domestic conditions of Jewish life in the Diaspora (work songs, love ballads, dances, wedding songs, dirges, lullabies, etc.). They command attention for their texts (of which most are in Yiddish, Hebrew being the sacred language reserved for worship), for their styles (which, in most cases, represent a hybrid mixture of Europeanisms flavored by the modal and, sometimes, improvisational idiosyncrasies of the Orient), and for their connection with the social conditions that begot them.

Folk song in modern Israel is still another branch of investigation. It is as varied as the ethnic sources from which it sprang. By and large, the pattern of development may be traced to the geographical origins of the migrations beginning in the 1880's and continuing to the present. Jews flocked to their religious and, after 1948, national homeland, some as a refuge from persecution and pogrom, others as a fulfilment of Zionist ideals. They brought with them their songs and folkways, and these were the separate alloys which melted together into the amalgam that is Israeli folk song. Its "history" spans the songs of the pre-World War I years—melodies whose style was more or less of a hodgepodge of Russian, Ukrainian, Germanic, and Hassidic ingredients; the first attempts (starting with Yoel Engel in the later '20s) to create an indigenous popular literature by welding together—with greater homogeneity than hitherto had been achieved—a Western-styled *melos* (Slavic or Germanic) with Eastern modes; the borrowing of dance rhythms (among them the boisterous "horah") and the more conscious imitation of Near Eastern melodies—free in rhythm, narrow in range, formally asymmetrical, deviant from major-minor modality—both of which characterize the tunes of the '40s and early '50s; and the stylistically variable, highly Westernized popular music repertory that has formed since then. The acculturative processes to which art and music submit are, for the most part,

beyond the control of the researcher, whose function it is to observe and explain their workings.³ Still, in the wake of the increasing Americanization of popular song, it is hard not to sigh at, if not outwardly deplore, the ensuing loss of national musical identity.

Musical research in Israel would not be what it is today were it not for the host of scholars—musicological and ethnomusicological—who have made it so. They range from its distinguished “founders,” Abraham J. Idelsohn (who took up residence in Jerusalem from 1907 to 1921 while working on his fundamental ten-volume *Thesaurus of Hebrew-Oriental Melodies*, 1914–32) and Robert Lachmann (in Jerusalem from 1935 until his death four years later), to the several scholars active outside of Israel whose research has advanced the methods and enriched the content of musicology at home (Curt Sachs, Eric Werner, Paul Nettl, Egon Wellesz, *et al.*), and the later generation of musicologists living in Israel, chief among them Edith Gerson-Kiwi and Hanoah Avenary. For a review of their achievements until the year 1958, the reader is referred to Edith Gerson-Kiwi’s excellent article on “Musicology in Israel.”⁴

Just as musical research would not be what it is were it not for its researchers, so its researchers would not be what they are without the availability of adequate opportunities and materials for research. Musical scholarship here owes an untold debt to the efforts of Robert Lachmann (1935–39) and Edith Gerson-Kiwi (after 1947) in building up the impressive collection of recorded materials now housed in the Record Archives of the National Library (Hebrew University). To Lachmann’s original nucleus of 2,500 or so recordings Dr. Kiwi added some 4,500 more, and these were later augmented by extensive supplements from different quarters. The largest percentage of these thousands of phonograms is constituted of examples of Jewish liturgical music (nearly half). The rest may be distributed among Jewish non-liturgical music (about one-third) and the music of separatist or non-Jewish ethnic groups (Samaritans, Karaites, Moslems, etc.) in and out of Israel. This vast museum of sound materials places a rich and diversified body of primary sources in the hands of the musical scholar.

The further expansion of these archives and the co-ordination of the separate endeavors of native researchers have been the guiding goals in the foundation (as an affiliate of the National Library) of the Jewish Music Research Center in 1964. The Center employs the talents of its scholars in the classification and analysis of the musical, literary, and recorded documents on Jewish and Oriental music housed in the National Library. Its most notable accomplishment to date is the publication of a *Festschrift* in tribute to Eric Werner and “his achievements in the field of Jewish music studies” on his 65th birthday⁵: *Yuval’ Studies of the Jewish Music Research Center* (Jerusalem, The Magnes Press of Hebrew University, 1968). Among the contributors figure both Israelis and such lights of the musicological world as Higinio Anglès, Jacques Chailley, Dika Newlin, and Bence Szabolcsi. Planned for the future, as part of the internationally-scaled projects of the

International Repertory of Musical Sources (RISM), is a complete inventory of the primary sources, musical and literary, of Jewish music throughout the ages. It will bear the same relation to Alfred Sendrey's fundamental *Bibliography of Jewish Music* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1951) as do the various volumes of RISM to Eitner's *Bio-bibliographisches Quellenlexikon*.

Another fund of materials is stored in the Center for Israeli Music, founded in 1968 under the auspices of the Music Division of the Public Council for Culture and Art. It aims to bring together the music (scores, records, tapes) of Israeli composers of art music from the turn of the century to the present and, at a later stage, to do the same for Israeli folk and popular song. Once the Center has achieved its aims, the way will be cleared at last for a systematic appraisal of modern Israeli music—its composers, schools, and developments—and the writing of a history of contemporary music in Israel.

Further research materials are held by the Israel Institute for Religious Music, founded in 1955 under the auspices of the Ministry for Religious Affairs and the Ministry for Education and Culture. Its phonoarchive contains several thousand items from the Jewish religious sphere only. One must mention, in addition, the general bibliographical materials belonging to the Music Division of the National Library (in Jerusalem) and, on a lesser scale, those belonging to the Central Music Library (in Tel-Aviv), to the library of the Music Academy and Department of Musicology of Tel-Aviv University and that of the Rubin Academy (in Jerusalem), and to the library of the Ethnological Institute for Jewish Music (in Haifa). The researcher may have further recourse to the ethnic materials held by the National and Rockefeller Museums (Jerusalem) and the Museum of Ethnology and Folklore (Haifa), to the private collection of musical instruments originally built up by Edith Gerson-Kiwi during the years 1953–58 for the now defunct Ethnological Institute for Oriental Jewish Music at Hebrew University, and to the impressive assembly of African and Asiatic instruments—secured through the offices of a number of foreign embassies in this country—housed in the Rubin Academy of Music in Jerusalem.

An aid of inestimable value in ethnomusicological research is the melograph, an instrument for notating single melodies. It registers sounds diagrammatically: a needle traces on graph paper the up and down contours of linear movement. Exact intervals are later measured by reference to a numerical scale fixing cent distances. Such an apparatus was built in 1957 at Hebrew University for what is now the Ethnological Division of the Center for Electronic Music in Israel (founded in 1958). Just as mechanical aids have revised or reversed established opinion in the social and physical sciences, the users of the melograph envision the possibility of a reanalysis of Near Eastern music with no less crucial results for ethnomusicological research.⁶

Musicology in Israel officially came into its own with the founding in 1956 of an Israeli branch of the International Musicological Society. Largely silent until the early '60s, the society was reconstituted in 1967 as the Israel Musicological Society. It sponsors lectures and public forums, and com-

municates through a bulletin. The first issue of this bulletin (May, 1968) reviews the activities of the society for the year 1967-68, states the official bylaws, and lists the current members.

Mention should be made of the first International Congress for Research in Jewish Music held under the auspices of the World Jewish Congress in Paris, 1957. Its various resolutions—the preparation of a complete *Corpus Musicae Hebraicae*, listing all writings on and documents of Jewish music as well as collections of ethnological materials; the development of comprehensive phonogram archives; the publication of an annual on Jewish musical research; etc.—have largely been taken over by the Center for Research on Jewish Music (see above).

The first musicological congress of international scope to be held in Israel took place in Jerusalem in the summer of 1963. It also marked the 16th annual congress of the International Folk Music Council. Its theme, "East and West in Music," was explored in depth through lectures and live concerts. To mark the occasion, a number of monographs by local scholars were published covering such diversified aspects of Jewish and Eastern music as folk song in Israel; Hebrew, Syrian, and Greek liturgical recitative; the Persian doctrine of Dastga-composition; and the performance of Arabic song in the Middle Ages.

The annual congresses of the Israel Institute for Religious Music—held during the week of Hanukkah—provide an important forum for communication about research on Jewish liturgical and non-liturgical music. Its lectures and proceedings are subsequently gathered together and published in the annual *Duchan* ("Pulpit," 1960 on).

Beyond the publications of this institute (which include an annual bulletin on world-wide activities in the field of Jewish religious music as well, 1960 on) and of the Center for Research on Jewish Music, many original research papers of Israeli scholars are scattered about in local journals, chief among them *Bat-Kol* ("Echo," two vols., 1956 and 1961) and *Tatvil* ("Chord," 1961 on).

Perhaps the most significant step in the advancement of musical research in Israel has been the inauguration of academic training programs in musicology. Hebrew University opened its doors to musicology with the founding of a department in 1965-66, and Tel-Aviv University followed suit in 1966-67. Their programs of undergraduate studies are spread out over three years, and comprise a number of historical, theoretical, and methodological subjects set up in the form of preparatory courses, lectures, discussion groups, proseminars, and seminars. Plans for graduate departments should materialize in the not-too-distant future.

About the paths of Israeli musicology in the years to come, perhaps the best signpost is the title to the above-mentioned convention: "East and West in Music." That Israel stands at the crossroads between Eastern and Western musical cultures places it in a unique position. The kind of universality evidenced in the multiple ethnic structure of Israeli society suggests as its

corollary the universal attitudes that should inform its musical (and humanistic) research. Israel has the sources and talents for a direct, vital study of Semitic music. It has assimilated Western musical culture and the intellectual habits of Western scholarship as well. What this means is that studies of Eastern and Western music are equally viable areas as a framework for future scholarship. Explored separately, and then conjointly, the combination of the two should open up a perspective for a vigorous, rewarding comparative research.

NOTES

¹ The writer acknowledges his gratitude to the Bialik Foundation (in Jerusalem) for permission to excerpt this article—with minor changes—from his forthcoming book, *An Introduction to Musicology* (in Hebrew).

² For a general account of Kestenbergs educational reforms in Germany and elsewhere, the reader is referred to the article and bibliography in *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart* 7:863-65 (1958).

³ A number of Israeli scholars—less dispassionate about this issue than the present writer—feel it is their duty not only to engage in research, but to stem the tide of change overtaking its objects. They advocate an accelerated program of education in native folk and ethnic traditions designed to preserve the old and to resist the new. Such a program—as they see it—would enlist the aids of discretionary radio and television programming, professional training facilities in Near Eastern music and its practices, publication of trustworthy editions, and live interchange with Eastern musicians and musicologists invited to come and discuss their own music. The whole question of where the researcher's role begins and ends is, at any rate, one that invites heated debate in this country.

⁴ In *Acta Musicologica* 30:17-26 (1958).

⁵ Actual publication was delayed for technical reasons by 18 months.

⁶ See Dalia Cohen and Ruth Katz, "The Melograph, Some Remarks Concerning Its Use," *'Yuval' Studies of the Jewish Music Research Center* (see above), pp. 155-68.

Dissertations

Richard Carroll Davis—*Self Parody among the Cantatas of Johann Sebastian Bach*

Ann Arbor: University Microfilms (UM order no. 62-4542),
1962. (547 pp. in 2 vols., Boston University diss.)

Robert L. Marshall

Scholars have been fascinated by J. S. Bach's practice of parody almost from the very beginnings of Bach scholarship. As early as 1855 Wilhelm Rust, the principal editor of the Bach-Gesellschaft complete edition, briefly discussed Bach's parody procedures in the foreword of his first volume of cantatas for the BG (Vol. V¹). Eighteen years later, in Vol. XX² of the BG, Rust presented a more thorough description of the extent and nature of Bach's use of parody. He reported there for the first time that large portions of such important lost works as the *St. Mark Passion* and the funeral music for the death of Prince Leopold of Anhalt-Cöthen were almost entirely preserved in the music of the *Trauer-Ode*, BWV 198, and the *St. Matthew Passion*, respectively. In the same year, 1873, the first volume of Philipp Spitta's classic biography appeared, containing further discussion of parody-related pieces. Since then the potentialities and importance of investigation in this field of Bach research have been abundantly clear. But, as Mr. Davis remarks in the introduction of his dissertation, although many valuable articles and monographs on this subject have been written in the 20th century, no one has "undertaken a complete analysis of all extant parodies and their models."

The dissertation under review here does not attempt to embrace *all* the surviving parody compositions but only those cast in the form of cantatas and based on other cantatas written by Bach himself. It therefore does not consider such works as the *B minor Mass* or the *Christmas Oratorio*. Those compositions are the subject of a companion doctoral dissertation, "The use of *Contrafacta* in the Large Choral Works of J. S. Bach," submitted to Boston University in 1960 by Robert William Holmes. The present review is concerned only with the study of Mr. Davis.

The dissertation is in two parts. Part One, *General Discussion of Parody Works and Movements*, is just under 200 pages long and, in the words of the author, "reflects the work of many musicologists of the past and present."

It is a review, then, of the secondary literature, dealing with biographical, chronological, and philological information, "and other pertinent historical facts" designed to "familiarize the reader with the parody cantatas." Part Two, *Classification and Analyses of Changes*, represents "the original contribution of the author." This section is close to 300 pages long and is followed by an appendix.

The four chapters of Part One (Ch. 1: Parodies from Weimar Models, Ch. 2: Parodies from Coethen Models, Ch. 3: Parodies from Leipzig Models, Ch. 4: Parodies of Miscellaneous Isolated Movements) present the historical background to each parody pair in chronological order. Throughout this part traditional broad generalizations are quite naïvely accepted or new ones just as naïvely proposed without sufficiently rigorous or critical evaluation. Before turning to a critique of details, it is more profitable to consider first some of the larger questions raised or latent in Part One.

Davis assumes that all the models discussed in his thesis have "at least one point in common. Bach himself considered each of them important enough for parody. . . ." There is, however, no biographical information concerning Bach's attitudes that justifies this remark. Surely it would have been sufficient to assume only that Bach found these works *suitable* for parody. This assumption, of course, raises the question: what makes a work suitable for parody? This question, highly relevant, is not considered in the dissertation.

The author maintains several times that "Bach's revision of existing music for new works often seemed to require as much if not more effort than that required for the composition of fresh musical material," a statement which evidently assumes that a large-scale change reflects a large-scale effort. While there is no way of knowing precisely how much effort any compositional act—large or small—represented for Bach, it would have been possible to approach an answer to this question by examining the autograph scores. The author was convinced, however (p. xxi), that a "pilgrimage to European libraries to seek out manuscripts and lost originals was not necessary for the analysis in Part Two." Such a pilgrimage would not only have been thoroughly enjoyable but also a revelation. It would have prevented a number of erroneous judgments bearing not only on the degree of effort Bach expended in a particular situation, but, more significantly, on whether a composition is indeed an original or a parody.

But if, for the moment, we share Mr. Davis' assumption that a parody often represented a considerable creative effort, then it puzzles one how often parody compositions are deemed by him to be of "inferior quality," or how "poor declamation" can be put forth as a criterion for establishing that a work is a parody. There is, in fact, a certain ambivalent attitude on the part of the author toward the entire parody process. This is perhaps most clearly evident in the following passage:

All of the musical examples presented in this chapter [on declamation and interpretation of the text] so far show that Bach's somewhat mechanical manipulation of phrase and note [?] structure was not wholly an

instinctive process. Some of the changes were obviously rendered with considerable deliberation and care. At times the original beauty of a phrase was damaged by a necessary alteration, sometimes it was improved. Considering that a seemingly insignificant change made by a tyro can easily reduce great art to a mere banality, most of the alterations are commendable and disclose the flourishes of a master's touch (p. 366f.)

The internal inconsistencies of this passage—along with the confused use of “all,” “some,” “most,” etc.—reveal that the author is uncertain in deciding whether the parody compositions are to be considered refinements and improvements of works which Bach thought “important” enough to submit to revision and often transformation, or whether they were more or less successful rearrangements and adaptations of earlier compositions that happened to be handy when a new work had to be prepared on short notice. It is possible, of course, that in some cases the one explanation applies and in some cases the other. Perhaps this is even what the author had in mind when, as a justification for the existence of Part One, he wrote that an analysis of the kind to be presented in the second half of the dissertation “obviously” requires the knowledge of the correct chronology. But nowhere is the chronological information made relevant to the study. It merely provides a convenient means of determining the order in which compositions or examples are discussed. The question whether Bach's technique of parody or his attitude towards the practice changed during his career is not investigated in the dissertation.

This whole complex of issues—the “importance” or “suitability” of the models, the criteria for determining whether a composition is a parody in the first place (and if so, whether it is or is not successful), the evidence bearing on the degree of “effort” or mere “mechanical manipulation” in the parody process, and the relevance of chronology to all these questions—should have been sorted out and considered somewhere in the dissertation.

Part One, unfortunately, is also unreliable as a summary of earlier research. A few examples taken from Chapter I should illustrate this. The description of pitch and tuning perpetuates the misunderstanding of Spitta and the older Bach research that the Weimar organ was tuned in *hoher Chorton*, a minor third higher than the *Kammerton* pitch of the woodwinds. The publications of Alfred Dürr (*Studien über die frühen Kantaten J. S. Bachs*, cited in Davis' bibliography), Arthur Mendel (“On the Use of Pitch in Bach's Time,” *The Musical Quarterly*, 1955, not cited in the bibliography), and others, however, have long established that the Weimar organ was not tuned in a high key, but rather that the woodwinds at times were tuned in the *Tief-Kammerton*. In the same chapter Erdmann Neumeister is referred to as Bach's librettist. While there are a number of librettists with whom Bach collaborated closely, such as Salomo Franck, Christian Hunold, and Picander, Neumeister was not one of them and indeed was no more closely associated with Bach than Metastasio was with Mozart.

With no mention of his source, Davis asserts that Bach performed the "Hunting Cantata," BWV 208, at Weissenfels "against the will" of his Weimar patron Duke Wilhelm Ernst, and that this "cost Bach his promotion to Kapellmeister." Spitta claims, though, that Wilhelm Ernst in fact directed Bach and "his librettist" Salomo Franck to compose the cantata for the festivities at Weissenfels.

In the course of Chapter II Davis offers a generous summary of the findings in Friedrich Smend's *Bach in Köthen* and cites Smend's method for finding lost Cöthen works: deduce the characteristics common to known parodies whose originals were written in Cöthen and then attempt to locate missing ones by comparison of these identifying elements. Davis himself makes no attempt to apply this method, or, for that matter, to develop any new criteria for identifying parodies, or for reconstructing lost originals from parody compositions. (On p. 442 one reads that "Bach's methods are so unpredictable that some [sic] movements cannot be authentically reconstructed with absolute certainty." Which ones can be, and how does one go about it?) As mentioned earlier, he frequently resorts to the traditional criterion—poor declamation—as confirmation, or even proof, of parody. Thus he maintains (p. 32) that the declamation in the chorus "Nimm auch, grosser Fürst, uns auf," BWV 173a/8, is "curious enough to prove that the music existed previously in some other form." But in discussing the parody pair BWV 173a/1–BWV 173/1 a few pages earlier (p. 27), Davis concedes that the text of the parody represents an "improvement in declamation and artistic content" over the original. He writes in another place that "it is axiomatic that wherever faulty accentuation exists, or that absolute agreement between text and music is lacking, the movement is a parody" (p. 193). There is, however, no such axiom. Poor declamation is no infallible proof of parody. Friedrich Blume proposed at the New York Congress of 1961 that many of the arias written by Bach during his first few years in Leipzig surely must be parodies, for there were numerous instances of poor declamation and missed opportunities for word-painting. Of the five movements mentioned by Blume at the Congress as possible parodies, however (BWV 144/2, 5, BWV 25/5, BWV 2/5, and BWV 38/3), three (BWV 144/2 and 5, and BWV 2/5) exist in autograph composing scores and are clearly not parodies. (There are no surviving autograph scores for BWV 25 and 38.) The autograph score of BWV 173a, too, is clearly a "composing" score throughout and not a parody.

Part Two of the dissertation, representing the "original contribution of the author," is an "analysis of the various musical techniques used in parodies, such as instrumentation, declamation, fragmentation." The author's method was to make a "note by note comparison of all parody cantatas with their models for which music is available. Wherever differences exist, an attempt is made to determine Bach's reasons for making these changes. . . ." The five chapters of this part are entitled (1) Instrumentation, (2) Octave Displacement of Melody, (3) Ornamentation, (4) Declamation and Interpretation of Text, (5) Fragmentation.

The material presented in the first three chapters of Part Two—over 100 pages of the text—describes compositional acts that are not peculiar to the process of parody. Almost all the instances of substitution, addition, or deletion of instruments recorded in Chapter I are attributed by Davis, no doubt correctly, to external circumstances concerning the availability of instruments or performers and related matters. Similar revisions often accompanied later performances of original works as well, when circumstances, or taste, dictated. Alterations such as the transposition of a note or group of notes up or down an octave to secure an effective melodic accent or a strong structural bass line, or to keep a part playable; the subsequent addition of ornaments; the correction of outright errors such as parallel fifths and octaves or inexact repetition of identical material—all such gestures are observable in the surviving manuscript material of original compositions, as well as in the scores of parodies. They thus testify to Bach's working habits in general rather than casting any special light on the technique of parody.

The same comment applies even to the chapter on "fragmentation." In the words of the author, fragmentation

refers to insertions, deletions or exchanges of measures or fractions of measures when parodies were formed. Usually fragmentation was necessitated by a new and dissimilar text. Sometimes it occurred for less obvious reasons within instrumental sections. In either case, fragmentation changes are of special interest because they alter the symmetry [i.e., structure?] of a movement (p. 400).

He continues, "Considering the difficulties encountered while fitting a new text of different meter and proportions to an existing work, Bach's reasons for troubling himself with these problems are a mystery" (p. 402). His speculations about Bach's possible reasons reveal again his ambivalence about parody: (1) "the need for a number in a hurry with nothing more appropriate available" (i.e., the negative—and paradoxical—attitude: why employ a particularly difficult technique when the work has to be done in a hurry?); (2) "a requirement [desire?] for music which fits the meaning of a new text rather than its physical form" (a good explanation, but not always appropriate. As Davis points out in discussing the parody pair BWV 75/7–BWV 100/6, fragmentation technique—here the addition of measures—is employed even though the two texts have exactly the same structure and are indeed different verses of the same chorale); (3) "recognising the potentialities of old music with a desire to improve it and use it again" (i.e., the positive attitude towards parody).

In fact, the fragmentation technique is not peculiar to parody compositions. Werner Neumann's description of "permutation" and "combination" in Bach's choral fugues, Alfred Dürr's description of the "ritornello quotation" in the arias, Emil Platen's analysis of the structure of Bach's chorale choruses all call attention to the large-scale use of the fragmentation technique, i.e., to Bach's facility in combining and recombining component parts (measures or groups of measures) into new configurations. The implication

to be drawn from the pervasiveness of this technique seems clear; it is surely that the notion of an "organic" theme is essentially irrelevant in a discussion of Bachian melody. "Phrases" are rather chains of motives that, like molecules, could be joined together or detached as the composer saw fit. The fragmentation technique thus afforded Bach a flexibility that enabled him to adjust pre-existent phrases to new texts, and Davis' examples amply illustrate Bach's resourcefulness in applying it in choruses, arias, and recitatives.

Only the fourth chapter of Part Two is concerned with the particular problems of parody composition. Bach's methods of replacing few syllables with many, or the reverse, are imaginative yet usually simple. Often apparently nothing more was involved than texting a melisma, subdividing a long note, or adding or deleting one or two notes or rests. Of course, something more was involved, at least in the more successful passages: the unfortunately (or fortunately) unanalyzable factors of artistic instinct—of taste. At other times the structure of a vocal line seems quite transformed, although, as Davis points out, the resemblance to the original is still discernible. Even these techniques, however, can be found in original compositions. They are all in some way manifestations of the baroque ostinato and concerto principles: free obbligato lines continually spun out against the recurring theme or *tutti ritornello*.

Appended to the dissertation are two forbidding compilations, giving in volume, page, and measure numbers the location of every instance in which discrepancies between model and parody appear. The tables are intended, of course, as a convenience for the reader and future scholars, but any prospective student of the parody process will doubtless prefer to place the scores of the related works side by side and see the changes for himself in context rather than turn to these lists.

The last straw in this dissertation, however, is the last paragraph. One reads there in this age of enlightenment the following:

An interesting study would be the further investigation of other works by Bach which indicate carelessness in writing, but which have no extant parodies. Based upon observation of analogous situations in the known parodies, one may correct and refine all of Bach's work in a manner which the master himself may have done. Practical editions of Bach's works should strive for perfection of these musical forms, a perfection for which Bach continuously strived. They should not always strive for perfect fidelity to the manuscript, which often contains great errors that escaped a hurried hand (p. 474).

Before anyone is tempted to embark upon that interesting study he may be reminded that the "complete analysis" of Bach's parody technique still has to be written. That study will be supported by a sturdy biographical and bibliographical foundation; it will make extensive and thoughtful use of all relevant manuscript material; and it will consider the technique and practice of parody within the larger context of the Bachian compositional technique in general.