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Despite being long considered to rank among the great musical statements in European compositional history, substantiating the textual identity of Bach’s Mass in B Minor has proven quite challenging. This results from the fact that Bach’s Mass as conveyed in a tangled body of original sources reflects a process of composition and compilation that stretched over nearly four decades and defies modern conceptions of artistic creation. The surviving manuscript sources reflect numerous different constituent elements composed for earlier uses which Bach then combined, along with other pre-existing bits and pieces, to form a totality that wholly reimagines the purpose and intent of its components. This study traces changing attitudes toward the integrity of musical compositions, the musical text of such compositions, and the notated sources that transmit those compositions, beginning with practices common in early eighteenth-century German courts and churches and continuing through to the foundation of the Bach Gesellschaft in 1850. In examining Bach’s music and its reception during the period between 1750 and 1850, this study demonstrates how changing intellectual and social concerns propelled the formulation of a stable textual entity that embodied the idea of the musical “work” and how music was adapted to new economic and social conditions. Over time the sources for Bach’s Mass in B Minor advanced varying representational objectives resulting in different versions of the Mass in B Minor that document distinct moments in history.
Understanding changing attitudes toward notated musical objects allows for the contextualization of the concept of textual authority that arose during this period.
Introduction

Scholars and commentators have long considered Bach’s Mass in B Minor to rank among the great musical statements in European compositional history, with the most assertive observation coming in the early nineteenth-century when the Zurich-based publisher Hans Georg Nägeli pronounced it “the greatest musical artwork of all times and all peoples.”¹ Despite this, substantiating the textual identity of Bach’s Mass has proven quite challenging. This is seen most clearly in editions published in 1856 and 1954, both of which quickly proved to be inaccurate.² But even more recent editors have pursued different ways of resolving the inherent contradictions of the original sources containing the Mass, resulting in ever more versions of the composition as opposed to a single, definitive and unifying version.³ The primary challenge results from the fact that Bach’s Mass as conveyed in a tangled body of original sources reflects a process of composition and compilation that stretched over nearly four decades and defies modern conceptions of artistic creation.

Some of Bach’s acknowledged masterpieces appear to reflect singular compositional acts and survive in cohesive and authoritative sources. The Goldberg Variations (BWV 988), for example, exhibits impressive internal musical cohesion and was published in an edition produced under the composer’s supervision. More common are examples such as the St. Matthew Passion (BWV 244), for which a unitary source masks the complex origins of the composition, or the St. John Passion (BWV 245), for which surviving sources document a more protean identity than the unifying title and

¹ “Ankündigung des größten musikalischen Kunstwerks aller Zeiten und Völker,” reproduced in NBA II/1 KB, 215.
² BG 6 (1856); BG 6a (1857); NBA II/1 (1954).
³ NBA II/1a (2005), Rifkin 2006, NBArev 1 (2010).
catalog number suggest. Frequently sources survive for compositions which reflect extensive reuse of previous music and in doing so hint at a body of material now wholly lost. The Mass in B Minor represents an outer extreme of these latter scenarios. The surviving manuscript sources reflect numerous different constituent elements composed for earlier uses which Bach then combined, along with other pre-existing bits and pieces, to form a totality that wholly reimagines the purpose and intent of its components.

This study traces changing attitudes toward the integrity of musical compositions, the musical text of such compositions, and the notated sources that transmit those compositions. Using Johann Sebastian Bach’s Mass in B Minor as a focal point, I treat these issues in a broad chronological order beginning with practices common in early eighteenth-century German courts and churches and concluding with the founding of the Bach Gesellschaft in 1850, which sought to publish an authoritative edition of the composer’s complete works.

In the years following Bach’s death in 1750, Europeans experienced seismic political, social, and economic shifts that resulted not only in new governments and industries, but also new attitudes toward art. In music, composers and performers began to direct their energies toward a broader concert public rather than toward service in courts and churches, which were decreasingly capable of supporting musical establishments. Concurrently, aesthetic thinking emerged that sought to substantiate an autonomous existence for music that served its own internal logic rather than external representational demands. In examining Bach’s music and its reception during the period between 1750 and 1850, I demonstrate how changing intellectual and social concerns propelled the formulation of a stable textual entity that embodied the idea of the musical
“work.” Moreover, I examine how music was adapted to changing economic and social conditions and consequently embodied and advanced new representational objectives. I do this through a consideration of the functions notated music served over the course of this period.  

As this study demonstrates, Bach’s music as it is known today is the product of various individuals’ engagement with it over a long period of time. Even though one must disentangle the music from later accretions, I do not propose to strip away the history of the music’s reception to reveal an untrammeled original, free of later distortions. Rather, I seek to demonstrate how the perception of the Mass in B Minor and the material record of this composition has depended on the needs of the individuals engaging with it at any given point in time. I propose to substantiate the legitimacy of the different versions of the Mass in B Minor as documents of particular moments in history and to do so through the material legacy of those different versions. This necessitates, in addition to the opportunity to engage with astonishingly sophisticated and satisfying music, embracing a body of scholarship that is vast and complex.  

---


5 The eminent German historian Reinhart Koselleck coined the term *Sattelzeit* to describe the period from 1750 to 1850, which encompassed the slow transition from the social, political, and economic order of the Old Regime to a market-based economy and society, cf. *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time*, translated by Keith Tribe (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004). The complexity of this period and the influence of Koselleck’s work on it is evidenced by the extent to which the applicability of the term “Sattelzeit” is debated, including discussion on a panel at the 2015 American Historical Association meeting, “Challenging and Extending Reinhart Koselleck’s Theories of Historical Time” and a recent book, Elisabeth Déculot and Daniel Fulda, eds. *Sattelzeit: Historiographiegescichtliche Revisionen*, Hallesche Beiträge zur europäischen Aufklärung 52 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2016).

Literature and Method

To a large extent, scholars have already treated nearly all topics relating to Bach, including all of the terrain covered by this dissertation. Nevertheless, this study contributes new information and analysis in each of the individual chapters. More importantly, the chapters connect to develop a novel interpretation of the manuscript transmission of the Mass in B Minor, and of Bach’s music more generally, that expands upon the contributions made at the chapter level.

There also exists a body of literature on editorial methods for music, but surprisingly no substantial history of the development of music philology has been published. James Grier provides a brief history of music editing and also acknowledges the role of the editor in shaping the music.\(^7\) Other historical treatments of music editing are found in localized studies of the history of individual compositions or a composer’s body of music.\(^8\) While the current study is also a localized consideration of the editorial history of a single composition, the methods developed to edit the music of Bach first by the Bach Gesellschaft in the nineteenth century and by the editors of the *Neue Bach Ausgabe* in the twentieth century have exerted an outsized influence on music philology. Indeed, it could even be said that work on Bach established and also led to changes in the norms of musical editing. Consequently, in studying Bach I seek to expose the logic underlying the editorial practices subsequently employed on a wide array of music of diverse styles and origins. I also seek to demonstrate the extent to which editorial intervention complicates the textual tradition.

---


It is fitting that Christoph Wolff compared Bach to the natural philosopher Isaac Newton, who said “If I have seen further, it is by standing on the shoulders of giants.”

Just as Wolff stood on the shoulders of his predecessors, so do all current scholars studying Bach stand on Wolff’s shoulders. His biography of Bach is an extraordinary accomplishment and a much needed addition to the literature. Previous biographical treatments of Bach suffered from ideological preoccupations, particularly the idea of Bach as a devoutly Lutheran composer whose most musically sophisticated compositions usually were construed to be the result of a sequence of progressively more accomplished products in a particular genre. This construct was overturned by a systematic re-evaluation of the chronology of Bach’s compositions in the 1950s by Georg von Dadelsen and Alfred Dürr, with further refinements made by Yoshitake Kobayashi regarding Bach’s late compositions, including the Mass in B Minor. A lack of a clear and firm chronology of Bach’s compositions proved one of the primary stumbling blocks in efforts to establish an authoritative text of the Mass in B Minor. Yet, the significance of the accomplishment of re-dating Bach’s compositions served as validation of source-critical methods and a vindication of the new edition of Bach’s complete works already

---

11 The standard biography of Bach was Philipp Spitta’s Johann Sebastian Bach (Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1873-80), which adopts the image of Bach as a devout Lutheran first developed in C. H. Bitter, Johann Sebastian Bach (Berlin: F. Schneider, 1865).
underway. These concerns continue to exert a strong influence on Bach scholarship, with revisions to volumes of the Neue Bach Ausgabe commencing in 2010 with a new edition of the Mass in B Minor.

Several general studies of the Mass in B Minor have been published, including relatively recent volumes by John Butt, George B. Stauffer, and Christoph Wolff, which largely serve as guides to the composition aimed at a general audience. Both Butt and Stauffer discuss the transmission and reception of the Mass, but in the most general terms. In the critical report to his edition for the NBA, Friedrich Smend provides a study of the manuscript transmission, source filiation, and history of the Nägeli and Bach Gesellschaft editions that remains an essential resource, despite inaccuracies in the dating of the two early manuscript copies of the Mass [D1: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 572/23/14 and D2: D-B Am. B. 3]. Specialized studies of Bach’s compositional process and close examination of Bach’s parody procedures are used here to reevaluate the composer’s conception of musical materials.

The advances in the dating of Bach’s compositions and improved understanding of the composer’s methods of composition have made possible the development of a

14 NBArev.
16 Butt, 25-41; Stauffer, 175-205.
17 NBA II/1 KB, 15-77.
much improved editorial technique. This has resulted in a shift from a policy in the *Neue Bach Ausgabe* of presenting what the editor determined to be the best version of a composition to that of publishing all authoritative variants in complete editions. The former policy resulted in editions that may have been consistent with sources but did not reflect the music as performed by Bach. The clearest example of this is Arthur Mendel’s edition of the *St. John Passion* (BWV 245), which published a version that survives in a partially autograph manuscript score but for which no matching performing parts exist. The result was a version of the *St. John Passion* that was never heard in Bach’s lifetime.\(^{19}\)

The newer policy justified an edition of the early versions of the Mass in B Minor, including the 1733 *Missa* (BWV 232\(^{1}\)), and the more distinct 1724 SSSATB Sanctus in D Major (BWV 232\(^{III}\)).\(^{20}\) The *NBArev* began in 2010 with a new edition of the complete Mass, which introduced the curious solution of inserting the variant readings of the 1733 *Missa* in a lighter-colored print. The *NBArev* will also include separate editions of the 1725 and 1749 versions of the *St. John Passion*, despite the appearance of editorially successful editions of the *St. John Passion* prepared by Peter Wollny.\(^{21}\)

In many respects, the combination of Uwe Wolf’s 2005 edition of the early versions of the Mass published in the waning days of the *NBA* and Joshua Rifkin’s edition of the later version of the Mass offer the best representation of the textual entities that survive in original sources.\(^{22}\) But, the continuing struggle to offer an editorially

---

20 *NBA* II/1a.
22 *NBA* II/1a; Rifkin 2006.
cohesive version of the Mass reflects the obdurate “work concept” still inherent in editing historical musical compositions.\(^\text{23}\)

The efforts to establish a fixed conceptual and textual identity for the Mass in B Minor resulted first from a desire to align the music that Bach produced with an aesthetic model of the autonomous “work” that emerged in the Romantic movement of the early nineteenth century.\(^\text{24}\) An interesting challenge to the construct of the “work” in musical historiography arose in response to the writings of Carl Dahlhaus.\(^\text{25}\) In the introductory chapter of his history of nineteenth-century music, Dahlhaus proposes a dichotomy between opera, as represented by the music of Gioachino Rossini, as an event-oriented music and instrumental music, as represented by the music of Ludwig van Beethoven, as text-oriented music. In this Dahlhaus clearly favors text-oriented music and consequently reinforces the primacy of musical works as the stuff of a hermeneutical music historiography.\(^\text{26}\)

This study further contests the utility of the work concept for music history. To offer an alternative means of understanding music, I opt for something like an event-oriented understanding of, not coincidentally, the repertory of German art music.


\(^{24}\) Lydia Goehr, *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works.*


However, musical events, like any historical event, are irretrievable. Instead, I utilize artefacts or relics as a means of establishing historical events — in this instance the manuscripts and first printed editions that transmitted Bach’s Mass to increasing numbers of musical consumers who put the music to an ever widening range of uses. These I seek to place within the social structure of musical life over the period between the 1730s and 1850s, which saw the transition from the putting-out system of an early modern economy to the industrialized market economy of the late modern era.

In addition to the autograph manuscripts that document the Mass in B Minor and its constituent elements in their earlier versions, approximately fifty manuscripts of the Mass in B Minor were produced roughly between 1765 and 1835. The manuscripts largely originated in Berlin, Hamburg, Vienna, and Frankfurt, with a distinct group of copies of the *Symbolum Nicenum* disseminated in England. Hans Georg Nägeli and the firm of Nikolaus Simrock published the first printed edition of the Mass in 1833, which consisted of a full score of the *Kyrie* and *Gloria*, a piano-vocal score of the entire Mass, as well as vocal parts for the entire Mass. A second volume containing the *Symbolum Nicenum*, *Sanctus*, and remaining movements appeared in 1845. Julius Rietz prepared a new edition of the Mass published by the Bach Gesellschaft in 1856, which was reprinted with revisions in 1857. The English sources, which reflect a distinct set of intellectual and social concerns, have received admirable treatment from Yo Tomita. This study focuses on the central European sources.

---

The approach I take draws on work that now coheres under the rubric “book history,” which itself relates closely or forms a sub-discipline within “material culture studies” and to which “thing theory” contributes. The “material turn” that Hicks and Beaudry envision follows on the “linguistic turn” in historiography of the 1980s and 1990s, which informs book history and is important to my consideration of how the discourse about music shaped subsequent conceptions of that music. At the same time, and as Hicks and Beaudry make clear, archaeology has long depended upon the interpretation of durable objects to understand society. Recent archaeological studies of craftsmanship and value offer examples of an approach that might translate well to music. Moving in such a direction first necessitates situating music more fully within an economic history, which I have sought to do here with the aid of studies on German economic institutions and more expansive economic histories. I have also relied extensively on political and social histories of Germany.

Bach scholarship served as one of the primary targets of Joseph Kerman’s critique of musicology in the early 1980s; while much has changed in the discipline since then, Bach scholarship has adapted more slowly than other subspecialties.\(^{35}\) Moreover, the density of our knowledge about Bach, his world, and the reception of his music allows for more nuanced and more fully contextualized conclusions. The inconclusive results following from the long insistence on establishing the text of the Mass in B Minor as Bach “intended it” should demonstrate the impossibility of this task, but also allows for a more sympathetic understanding of the motivations underlying those efforts. Continually changing historical circumstances have called forth new versions of the Mass that are themselves social, historical, and musical documents.\(^ {36}\) Capitalizing on this, I have sought to employ traditional musicological techniques of source evaluation and criticism to subvert the priority placed on what are conventionally considered authoritative sources to reveal particularized readings of individual objects.\(^ {37}\)


Argument and Structure

This study consists of six chapters that treat respectively the issues of composing, revising, copying, collecting, performing, and editing the Mass in B Minor. The first three chapters largely examine musical practices in the eighteenth century and the second three chapters turn to practices in the nineteenth century. However, as demonstrated in chapter three, already in the latter half of the eighteenth century music had begun to function in a market economy more commonly associated with the nineteenth century. And, as demonstrated in chapter four, the social function of music as a marker of status continued to operate on a personal level into the nineteenth century, even while other modes of a mass musical culture had already begun to wipe out most other characteristics of eighteenth-century musical life. Thus, while the chapters concentrate on successive time periods, no larger groupings have been imposed onto the six individuals chapters which overlap each other chronologically.

Chapter one focuses on the institutional structures that dictated the nature of musical practice in central Germany in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Of particular interest is the tension between the practical customs of the guild into which Bach was born and the speculative aspirations of the university-educated of capellmeisters and cantors. In chapter two I examine the extent to which a practical conception of music continued to remain operative beyond Johann Sebastian Bach’s lifetime by examining the habits of his son Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach. That Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach felt at liberty to alter details of the Mass is seen as support for the pragmatic view of musical materials consistent with guild conventions. In chapter three I examine the production of manuscript copies of the Mass in B Minor as a means of
understanding the new market driven environment created by the educated professional class, in which scores of historical music became a commodity of interest among a broader base of musical consumers. In chapter four I consider the collections of Bach’s music that were assembled in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, first among aristocratic and upper-class connoisseurs and later among professional musicians operating within an educated middle-class musical world. Chapter five considers the performances of music from the Mass in B Minor that began to occur in the 1820s as a means of examining the musical culture that emerged because of the interests and ambitions of an educated middle-class that filled the ranks of amateur choral societies throughout German urban centers. Chapter six describes the ambitions of the Bach Gesellschaft and places these within the context of political and intellectual life in mid-nineteenth-century Germany. By demonstrating that music has always been mediated and appropriated in furtherance of a variety of agendas, I hope to contextualize, and even contest, the notion that specific readings of music compositions are inherently legitimate and necessary.

**Terminology**

Bach’s Mass in B Minor comprises a number of elements originally composed for the Lutheran liturgy in Leipzig, which consequently reflect local usage. Most notably, the *Sanctus* does not include the “Osanna” or “Benedictus” as in the traditional Roman Ordinary. Rather, these movements are grouped in the autograph score of Bach’s Mass with the “Agnus Dei” and “Dona nobis pacem.” Moreover, Bach grouped the *Kyrie* and *Gloria* together. The resulting structure of the Mass manuscript is of four physically distinct sections, each with its own sequentially numbered title page, containing: 1. *Kyrie*
and *Gloria* (or *Missa*), 2. *Symbolum Nicenum* (as Bach refers to the *Credo*), 3. *Sanctus*, and 4. “Osanna,” “Benedictus,” “Agnus Dei,” and “Dona nobis pacem.” Because of the grouping of the *Kyrie* and *Gloria* and the unconventional grouping of the “Osanna” and “Benedictus” with the subdivided movements of the *Agnus Dei*, the conventional five-part division of the Roman Mass Ordinary is largely inapplicable to the Mass in B Minor. Additionally, Bach’s title page refers to the *Credo* as the *Symbolum Nicenum*, which is retained in some of the manuscript copies of the Mass. The four sections have been differentiated in the *Bach Werke Verzeichnis* with the *Missa* designated BWV 232\(^1\), the *Symbolum Nicenum* designated BWV 232\(^{II}\), the *Sanctus* BWV 232\(^{III}\), and the “Osanna” and remaining movements BWV 232\(^{IV}\). The Mass in B Minor consists of twenty-seven musically distinct movements; I have followed the movement numbering found in the *Neue Bach Ausgabe—Revidierte Edition*.

When referring to multiple movements, I will refer to the largest sub-section of the Mass to which the music belongs. For instance, nearly all of the manuscript copies of the Mass contain the *Kyrie* and *Gloria* together in a separate volume. While these movements were the first elements combined by Bach that would later form the composite Mass in B Minor, the later manuscripts do not make such a distinction. Rather, the sheer size of the manuscripts necessitate binding in multiple volumes. Nevertheless, when referring to the first volume of a manuscript, I will often refer to it as containing the *Missa*. When discussing the *Credo*, I will refer to it as the *Symbolum Nicenum* if that is how the section is titled in the manuscript or manuscripts being discussed. To simplify matters, I will also often refer to Bach’s fourth section as “the ‘Osanna’ and remaining
movements.” Individual movements titles will be set off by quotation marks, while the larger sections, such as the Kyrie or Sanctus, will be italicized.

I have adopted a two-part designation for each of the manuscripts discussed in this study consisting of each source’s numbering in the Neue Bach Ausgabe—Revidierte Edition (NBArev) along with the RISM siglum for the holding institution and the shelfmark of the manuscript in italics, usually in brackets.38 Thus, discussions of the autograph manuscript score include [A: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 180] or [A: P 180]. The first manuscript copy of the score is held in the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin with each of its three volumes bearing a distinct shelfmark: Mus. ms. Bach P 572 (containing the Missa), Mus. ms. Bach P 23 (containing the Symbolum Nicenum), and Mus. ms. Bach P 14 (containing the Sanctus and remaining movements). This manuscript and other multi-volume copies with distinct shelfmarks for each volume will usually be referred to as an aggregate, e.g. [D1: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 572/23/14], [F5: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 9-10], or [F6/7: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 11-12].

Chapter 1: Composing

Throughout his professional life, Johann Sebastian Bach’s work remained confined almost exclusively to the pillars of early modern German social and political life: town, school, court, and church. \(^1\) Regardless of the accommodations with and struggles against these institutions that have formed the narrative backbone of much biographical writing on Johann Sebastian Bach, his music belies the profound influence each had on his approach to composition. To develop a sense of his conception of the musical text and of notated musical materials, it remains essential to understand the nature of music making in this world. His musical life was first dominated by the professional guild of town musicians, then molded by the intellectual tradition of the German Latin School. He subsequently applied his training in the Lutheran church, and was continuously responsive to the power and prestige of the aristocratic court. His work reflects the pragmatism of the town musician and the scholasticism of the formally educated musician, and the forms embodied by Bach’s music were largely determined by the realms in which the composer made his living. As this study focuses on changing conceptions of the musical text, this first chapter seeks to develop a picture of the nature and uses of notated music in Johann Sebastian Bach’s creative and professional life. The habits of town musicians (including church musicians) and school cantors as producers of music will take priority, while the court and church will be contextualized as sites of musical consumption.

The Bach Family and Town Musicians in Early Modern Germany

The working life of most professional musicians in seventeenth and eighteenth century Germany must be viewed in the broader context of the craft guilds, whose

\(^1\) Wolff 2000, 21-22.
members made up the majority of the citizenry of German towns. The training and professional advancement of musicians adhered to the model of masters taking apprentices into their homes and businesses usually for a period of five years. These apprentices then commenced a period of at least two years as journeymen, usually under the supervision and control of a new master in a new town. The ability of a craftsman to obtain social and economic stability depended on his successful application for admittance to his craft guild in his hometown. After all, guilds functioned to: “…minimize competition from outsiders[,] … protect their markets[,] … limit the number of masters[,] and even] … ensure that only sons of masters or men who married their daughters or widows of masters could accede to mastership themselves.”

Moreover, citizenship in a town depended upon admittance into a profession. Thus, while in hindsight it appears that Bach’s lifelong retention of his citizenship in Eisenach was a badge of patriotic honor, it is at least as much a statement of his social standing and political autonomy in the midst of the changing circumstances of his employment throughout his lifetime. Bach may indeed have felt pride in and loyalty toward the town of his birth and early years, but in the economic world of the time that citizenship mattered.

As is widely recounted, in Thuringia the name Bach appeared to be synonymous with musician, reflecting the success of the members of the family in dominating their trade. In 1685, when Johann Sebastian Bach was born, his family could count four generations of professional musicians, beginning with the town musician of Gotha and

---


Wechmar, Johannes (Hans) Bach, who died in 1626.\(^5\) Hans Bach’s sons Johann (1604-1673), Christoph (1613-1661), and Heinrich (1615-1692) all became town musicians, serving at various points in the Thuringian towns of Suhl, Schweinfurt, Weimar, Erfurt, and Arnstadt. Similarly, each of them had three sons who would continue in the trade of town musician and would expand their scope of activity to the court and church, especially as organists. This third generation included Johann Ambrosius Bach, Johann Sebastian’s father, who had served the city of Erfurt and would eventually serve as the director of the town musicians in Eisenach.

Johann Ambrosius Bach (1645-1695) and his twin brother Johann Christoph (1645-1693) were born to Christoph Bach (1613-1661) and Maria Magdalena (née Grabler) in Erfurt on February 22, 1645. Their father served as a town musician there from 1642 to 1654, and thereafter as a town and court musician in Arnstadt. As was common in the guild tradition, Johann Ambrosius and Johann Christoph began an apprenticeship with their father in 1660 at the age of fifteen. Following their father’s death a year later, they completed the remainder of their five year apprenticeship with their father’s younger brother Heinrich (1615-1692), who served in Arnstadt as a town musician and organist. Following an additional two years as a journeyman under Heinrich, Ambrosius was appointed a town musician in Erfurt, replacing his cousin Johann Christian Bach (1640-1682), who had been promoted to the position of director of the town music company, which provided music for all civic functions and served as the musicians’ guild. Ambrosius also worked with his father’s older brother Johann (1604-1673), the organist at Erfurt’s Predigerkirche and the first composer of note in the Bach

\(^5\) Christoph Wolff’s biography of J. S. Bach has rightly become the standard account of the composer’s life; the following summary of the Bach family and J. S. Bach’s professional training draws primarily on the first three chapters, Wolff 2000, 13-75.
family. Ambrosius joined his twin brother Christoph in the Erfurt town music company, the latter having received an appointment there some months earlier. On April 8, 1668, about a year after joining the town music company in Erfurt and several years prior to the move to Eisenach, Ambrosius married Maria Elisabeth (née Lämmerhirt). On October 12, 1671, Ambrosius auditioned successfully to assume the role of director of the town music company in Eisenach, where his cousin Johann Christoph (1642-1703) served as town organist; both later served as court musicians.

Ambrosius himself supervised numerous apprentices and journeyman beginning in Erfurt. His 1671 audition in Eisenach included performing with an ensemble that most likely consisted of his three apprentices and one journeyman. By 1684 Ambrosius wrote the town council of Eisenach requesting dismissal in order to accept the position of director of town music in Erfurt. In this request he argued that the cost of employing three journeymen and numerous apprentices was not possible on his salary. While Ambrosius’s request was denied by the Eisenach town council and the ducal court, his appeal to the Eisenach authorities offers valuable perspective on the working life of musicians. Like his father, Johann Sebastian Bach experienced from birth the workings and interaction of professional music making in a German town, witnessing and later possibly participating in his father’s activities, while also having direct contact with his father’s cousin, Johann Christoph Bach (1642-1703), the town organist in Eisenach.

With this background in mind, we see that the Bach family proved quite successful functioning as a craft guild. Barbara Margaretha Bach, whom Johann

---

Ambrosius married shortly after the death of Johann Sebastian’s mother, observed in 1695:

… the Noble Count and Lord of that place most graciously inquired … in these words: whether there was not another Bach available who would like to apply for the post, for he should and must have a Bach again.8

The economic and social status of the Bach family depended upon successive generations of master musicians. Guilds served to protect the interests of skilled laborers by controlling access to work, which they achieved through a variety of means, including the apprenticeship system. Family connections existed at the heart of this system. A master musician’s regulation of his succession with the requirement to marry his daughter matches exactly the terms of employment common in other trades. Indeed, the seemingly curious story of the requirement that Dietrich Buxtehude’s successor as organist in Lübeck marry his daughter becomes far less odd when viewed in the context of the self-preservation and replication inherent in the guild system that dominated German towns.9

Similarly, the nearly closed system in Thuringia of apprenticeships and professional appointments held by Bach family members reflects the pervasive logic of guilds in this world. The viability of the Bach family depended largely on the perpetuation of the guild system across generations.10 However, the economic vagaries of family-based trade were visited upon the young Sebastian, when his father died on 20 February 1695, after which he was taken in by his oldest brother Johann Christoph in Ohrdruf.

8 NBR #7, 32-33.
Details of Johann Sebastian’s life during this period come to us almost entirely from much later sources, most notably the obituary that his second oldest son Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach wrote with Johann Friedrich Agricola, Emanuel’s colleague in Berlin and fellow student of Sebastian. Sebastian’s presumably formative years in Ohrdruf are described in a single paragraph, which also provides a glimpse at the uses of notated music:

Johann Sebastian was not yet ten years old when he found himself bereft of his parents by death. He betook himself to Ohrdruf, where his eldest brother, Johann Christoph, was Organist, and under this brother’s guidance he laid the foundations for his playing of the clavier. The love of our little Johann Sebastian for music was uncommonly great even at this tender age. In short time he had fully mastered all the pieces his brother had voluntarily given him to learn. But his brother possessed a book of clavier pieces by the most famous masters of the day—Froberger, Kerll, Pachelbel—and this, despite all his pleading and for who knows what reason, was denied him. His zeal to improve himself thereupon gave him the idea of practicing the following innocent deceit. This book was kept in a cabinet whose doors consisted only of grillwork. Now, with his little hands he could reach through the grillwork and roll the book up (for it had only a paper cover); accordingly, he would fetch the book out at night, when everyone had gone to bed and, since he was not even possessed of a light, copy it by moonlight. In six months’ time he had these musical spoils in his own hands. Secretly and with extraordinary eagerness he was trying to put it to use, when his brother, to his great dismay, found out about it, and without mercy took away from him the copy he had made with such pains. We may gain a good idea of our little Johann Sebastian’s sorrow over this loss by imagining a miser whose ship, sailing for Peru, has foundered with its cargo of a hundred thousand thaler. He did not recover the book until after the death of his brother.\textsuperscript{11}

Town musicians, just as with other skilled craftsmen of the early modern guilds, sought to maintain their position — and that of their progeny — through adherence to and protection of convention. Convention placed no small priority on skill and, indeed, used skill as a control on competition. The attainment of skill was rigidly imparted, was policed through apprenticeships and journeyman work, and was measured against and applied in narrowly defined, largely functional constraints. Musicians and their music

\textsuperscript{11} \textit{NBR} #306, 299.
fulfilled defined roles within community life and their standing depended on their reliability in these roles. Music for church or court fulfilled a function no different than tower music. In this context music was subservient to the order it supported. Similarly, notated music was viewed as an essential tool of the trade, and its value stemmed less from the aesthetic significance of the music it represented and much more so from its functional utility. Access to music and its notated manifestations served as one of several protective measures regulating the music trade.\textsuperscript{12}

Interpreting the account of Sebastian copying a manuscript of clavier pieces by moonlight through the lens of later notions of training, childhood, and creativity obscures the practical significance of notated music in Bach’s own world. C. P. E. Bach and Johann Friedrich Agricola share the story to demonstrate the precociousness of the young Sebastian. However, for Sebastian’s older brother and guardian, who had adhered to and had a responsibility for maintaining guild standards, notated music was a resource that was to be carefully controlled. The relationship between the master musician, his apprentices, and his journeymen consisted of a number of economic transactions, which included the master selling the right to copy music for a student’s personal collection. Uncontrolled access to it could unsettle the delicate balance in supply of professionally vetted musicians and their availability for the limited number of positions in German towns. However, the inflection of this story demonstrates that already by 1750 C. P. E. Bach and Agricola regarded musical training from a different perspective and assigned a different value to the musical text. Given that this story could only have come from Johann Sebastian himself, it may be that he also disagreed with this approach. To assume,

however, that Sebastian made things easier on his students might not be fully accurate, as he still maintained close control over notated music with very clear economic motivations.

**The Latin School and the Intersection of the Speculative and the Practical**

In the spring of 1700, near to his fifteenth birthday, Bach embarked on a journey remarkable for its personal and professional import. At exactly the age when he otherwise would have begun an apprenticeship with an acknowledged master musician such as his father’s cousin Johann Christoph Bach, organist and composer in Eisenach, or his brother’s master, Johann Pachelbel, Johann Sebastian instead traveled over two hundred miles north to attend the *Lateinschule* of St. Michael’s Church in the Hanseatic city Lüneberg. Bach had established a strong academic record in Eisenach and Ohrdruf and had most likely received the support of the Ohrdruf cantor Elia Herda to attend St. Michael’s, where the latter had himself recently studied. Bach and his Ohrdruf classmate Georg Erdmann both attended St. Michael’s as choristers on scholarship.

At St. Michael’s, Bach was instructed in the traditional liberal arts, with Lutheran theology also deeply informing his education. The focus of Bach’s musical training at St. Michael’s would have remained practical, but the influence of *musica speculativa* as perpetuated by Gioseffo Zarlino in his *Institutione harmoniche* (1558) and later by Athanasius Kircher in his *Musurgia universalis* (1650) most likely continued.\(^{13}\) Bach’s lifelong exploration of the speculative possibilities of music, but always within musical compositions as opposed to treatises, suggests his receptivity and eagerness to synthesize

---

the new musical horizons now in view. Moreover, Bach’s undoubted exposure to the
seventeenth-century North German organ tradition embodied in the figures of Georg
Böhm in Lüneberg and Adam Reinken in Hamburg would have demonstrated clearly
how the practical and speculative aspects of music making might converge.\(^\text{14}\)

Attendance at a Latin school opened up vistas never before encountered by a
member of the Bach family. Instead of replicating the time-honored guild custom of the
strictly regulated apprenticeship, then journeymanship, leading to a professional
appointment and citizenship in a home town, the Latin school served as the gateway to
university and the cantorate. This represented an opportunity to gain greater social status
and income not widely available to most members of the guild class. No other member of
the Bach family had held a cantorate to that time, nor would the guild structure have
allowed Bach the kind of geographic mobility to capitalize on professional opportunities
beyond the confines of Thuringia. However, it would take twenty years for Bach to
realize this potential.

Following the completion of his studies at St Michael’s, Bach would serve briefly
as a lackey at the court of Saxe-Weimar, most likely performing as a violinist in the court
capella in addition to carrying out other mundane responsibilities. He then soon became
an organist in Arnstadt, at the heart of his home region; shortly thereafter he moved to a
similar position in the nearby free city of Mühlhausen. This marked a return to the known
— the Thuringian music world dominated by town musicians and organists of the Bach
family. Whether or not this return to Thuringia reflects any agency on the part of Bach, it
marks a clear shift away from the direction toward university and the cantorate that St.
Michael’s had introduced. If Bach made this decision unwillingly, it may have come as a

\(^{14}\) Wolff 2000, 60-66.
result of financial necessity. Certainly, remuneration and status remained recurring themes throughout the remainder of Bach’s career. Just as telling of Bach’s awareness of the missed opportunity, he routinely sought to highlight his intellectual sophistication in musica speculativa and in theology that would have been presumed of a university-trained musician. From Mühlhausen, Bach would enter the service of the court of Saxe-Weimar as organist and later as concertmaster, after which he would become the Capellmeister at the small but musically advanced court in Cöthen. His attainment of the rank of Capellmeister exceeded anything any member of the Bach family had achieved, but was still within the normal realm of expectations for a guild musician.15

The cantorate, however, was generally attained not through the guild but through university training, for which the Latin school was prerequisite. It was his attendance at St. Michael’s in Lüneberg that both signified Sebastian’s potential and made new professional opportunities possible. While attendance at a Latin school would only result for Bach in access to a different role in German society, the potential consequences of such a change of course become more readily apparent in the case of Bach’s exact contemporary, George Frideric Handel. Had Handel remained on the course his initial training set, he would have become a university-trained cantor much like Georg Philipp Telemann. However, at exactly the age that Bach returned from St. Michael’s school to Thuringia to become a church organist, Handel chose to embrace the opportunity presented by the opera in Hamburg. For a guildsman like Bach becoming the Cantor at the St. Thomas school in Leipzig may have been almost as dramatic a break from

convention as Handel’s career in London represented. Bach’s route to the cantorate went through court appointments in Weimar and Cöthen. In the first, he served as organist, which represents a logical step from his position in Mühlhausen. He was then promoted to Concertmaster, but he failed to secure the position of Capellmeister in Weimar. He attained that position in Cöthen, but his delayed release from Weimar serves as a clear reminder of the subservience of all elements of the early modern German court to the authority of the ruler. Bach’s appointment in Leipzig came as a result of the successful efforts of a faction of the Bürgermeister to raise the profile of music in the city — perhaps in imitation of the aesthetics of court culture — through the appointment of a Capellmeister as opposed to a traditional cantor.

**Bach as Church Musician: Reuse, Parody, and Recomposition**

In his first years in Leipzig, Bach set for himself the immense challenge of introducing in the two main parishes of Leipzig a cantata of his own composition on each Sunday of the liturgical year on which figural music was performed. He began assembling a complete cycle of cantatas for the liturgical year by adapting cantatas he had composed in earlier positions and composing new cantatas for those Sundays and feast days for which he had not already written an appropriate choral work. For his first complete cantata cycle Bach composed thirty-six new cantatas, reused twenty cantatas that he had composed prior to assuming the position in Leipzig, recomposed two older cantatas, and also created parody versions of earlier music. Four cantatas (BWV 66, 134, 173, and 184) that came late in the first cycle were parodied in their entirety, all coming...
in the musically very busy times following Easter and Pentecost of 1724. As these cantatas and numerous others attest, Bach would work with a librettist to fit new words to a pre-existing composition so as to repurpose the music. On Trinity Sunday of 1724, Bach began a cycle of entirely new cantatas based on the texts and melodies of the revered repertory of chorales that had become the cornerstone of Lutheran corporate worship, beginning with the cantata *O Ewigkeit, du Donnerwort* (BWV 20) for the first Sunday after Trinity. Bach’s work on a cycle of chorale cantatas, however, came to an abrupt end on March 25, 1725 with *Wie schön leuchtet der Morgenstern* (BWV 1) for the Feast of the Annunciation. Evidence suggests that Bach completed at least one additional cycle, but sources do not survive to adequately reconstruct the scope or conception of these cycles in their entirety.

Even with the Chorale Cantata cycle, where an overarching design and musical agenda is clear, assertions about the aesthetic status of the cantatas or a cycle should be carefully couched. Within the sacred service in Leipzig the music was performed in a context with many other distractions, to a potentially inattentive congregation and, in this respect, bore some resemblance to the position of music at court. On a musical level, Bach also routinely refashioned individual movements of pre-existing music to fit immediate needs, drawing not just on choral music but also on instrumental music. For example, the opening sinfonia of the 1729 cantata for the second Sunday of Pentecost, *Ich liebe den Höchsten von ganzem Gemüte* (BWV 174) is a recomposition of the opening movement of the Brandenburg Concerto in G (BWV 1048). Similarly, in the

---

installation cantata *Wir danken dir, Gott, wir danken dir* (BWV 29), Bach orchestrates as a sinfonia for concertato organ, trumpets, oboes, strings, and continuo the opening prelude of the Partita for Unaccompanied Violin in E Major (BWV 1006). As further evidence of the fluidity of the musical content in Bach’s compositions, the entire cantata *Wir danken dir, Gott, wir danken dir* is itself a parody of an earlier cantata that has not survived; its opening chorus would reappear in the *Missa* (BWV 2321) and again at the close of the completed Mass in B minor.22

The two surviving Passion settings by Bach offer a different view of the mutability of musical content in Bach’s world. On the one hand, the surviving autograph manuscript of the *St. Matthew Passion* (BWV 244) lends credence to the notion of it as a masterwork: the manuscript is a carefully planned calligraphic fair copy, with the noteworthy use of red ink for the biblical text throughout, and for the chorale melody “O Lamm Gottes unschuldig” in the first movement. The object itself (perhaps in part because of the labor required to prepare it) held so much significance that Bach assiduously replaced numerous pages at the beginning of the manuscript that had become damaged at some point.23 By contrast, the *St. John Passion* (BWV 245) survives in an only partially autograph score, reflecting just one stage of the composer’s long engagement with the music.24

Bach began composing a setting of the Passion narrative from the Gospel of John in 1724 as one component of his first cycle of cantatas for Leipzig. The resulting *St. John Passion* (BWV 245) would stand as the most substantial composition of Bach’s career to

date, comprising three or four times as much music as a typical cantata or even the massive Magnificat setting in E-flat (BWV 243a) that he had composed in July of 1723 for the Feast of the Visitation and expanded for Christmas of that year. Bach would ultimately present the *St. John Passion* in three other forms in the Leipzig churches, not to mention further revisions in the score that were never performed.\(^{25}\) The scale and complexity of the *St. John Passion* certainly contributed to Bach’s ongoing engagement with this composition. The second version, prepared for Good Friday of 1725, would serve as a high point in the Chorale Cantata cycle of which it now formed an integral part. To fit the Passion setting to this new context, Bach replaced the original opening chorus “Herr, unser Herrscher” with a large setting of the chorale “O Mensch bewein dein Sünde Groß” for chorus and orchestra. Bach subsequently moved this magnificent chorale setting into the prominent position of concluding the first half of the *St. Matthew Passion* (BWV 244) in the version preserved in the 1736 fair copy, but the music itself may have originated in a Passion by Bach presented in Gotha in 1717.\(^{26}\) Bach made further revisions to the *St. John Passion* in the early 1730s, possibly coinciding with additions made to the Chorale Cantata cycle during this time, and yet another version of the *St. John Passion* was performed in 1749.

A different kind of manipulation seen with the *St. Matthew Passion* offers one of the most striking examples of Bach’s readiness to adapt music composed for previous occasions. Scholars have long known of a correspondence between the *St. Matthew Passion* and an ode prepared by Bach for the funeral of his former patron Prince Leopold

of Cöthen, who died in November 1728. With the dating of the St. Matthew Passion to 1727, the priority of the Passion setting and the appropriation of movements from it for the funeral music for the services for Leopold in March 1729 becomes more evident.\textsuperscript{27} This relationship confounds the long held and closely guarded belief that Bach routinely absorbed secular music into sacred compositions and not the reverse.\textsuperscript{28} Andrew Parrott has recently documented the extent to which Bach may have utilized music from the St. Matthew Passion and the Trauer-Ode (BWV 198) in the funeral music for Prince Leopold.\textsuperscript{29} The notion that Bach regarded his musical material from a very practical vantage receives strong support when a composition of such complex organizational and theological sophistication as the St. Matthew Passion could undergo renovation for other purposes. This scenario also demonstrates that a highly developed conception of \textit{affect} may have operated as the more fundamental basis of the integrity of musical material, that musical integrity adhered at the more particular level of an individual movement, and that the combination of music of different \textit{affects} would inform the rhetorical logic of a composition.

While Bach’s use of pre-existing music in the 1720s demonstrates a noteworthy pragmatism, in part driven by time constraints, in the 1730s Bach began to draw together music from a wider variety of sources in the process of giving older compositions new

purpose. Often, Bach would take music from a composition for a specific occasion, such as a congratulatory cantata, and would give it a more perennial function, as in a sacred cantata that could be reused on future instances of the liturgical occasion for which it was refashioned. However, as Gesa Kordes has argued in the case of Was mir behagt, ist nur die muntre Jagd (BWV 208), the process of parody also offered Bach the opportunity to fully explore the potential inherent in the musical material of the models. In the case of the parodied movements in this cantata, as in other parodied movements, the effort to rework the material in question well exceeded that necessary to compose entirely new material.

In fact, during the mid-1730s, Bach took to systematically refashioning earlier material to fit in new contexts. This can be seen especially well with the “Lutheran” masses (BWV 233-236), and in the Christmas Oratorio (BWV 248). All but four of the twenty-four movements in the “Lutheran” mass settings have known models from Bach’s sacred cantatas. In particular, Bach drew on four cantatas (BWV 179, 79, 102, and 187), for thirteen of the twenty-four movements; the other identifiable models originated in six additional cantatas and the early Kyrie “Christe, du Lamm Gottes” (BWV 233a). The alignment of the original German texts of the cantata movements with the corresponding Roman Mass Ordinary texts appears to have driven Bach’s decisions as to what music to reuse.

---

The Christmas Oratorio (BWV 248) provides the other conspicuous example of Bach employing previously composed music for new ends in wholesale fashion. Robert Marshall views the composition or compilation of the Christmas Oratorio as marking a mid-point in the thirteen years between 1729 and 1742. In the early 1730s Bach initially embraced popular galant idioms particularly appropriate for his Collegium musicum and the cantatas honoring the Saxon court. This was followed by a period of stock-taking in the later 1730s that resulted in the compilation of the “Great Eighteen” chorale preludes (BWV 651-658), the second book of the Well-Tempered Clavier (BWV 870-893), and culminated in the Art of Fugue (BWV 1080) in the early 1740s. The Christmas Oratorio of 1736 may itself have served as a fitting compendium of royal music originally written for the Saxony monarchy (including the birthday cantata Tönet, ihr Pauken! Erschallet, Trompeten! [BWV 214]) refashioned to celebrate the birth of Christ. It is a consolidation similar to that seen in the “Lutheran” mass settings and coincided with Bach reaching the age at which his father died. At the same time that he began to bring together related

---

33 Drawn from NBA II/2 KB, 216.
materials into larger wholes, Bach also began to amass a collection of music by members of his extended family that became known as the *Alt-Bachisches Archiv*.\(^3\)

In fulfilling his duties of providing music for the church — one of the primary musical venues of early modern Germany — Bach adhered largely to convention and very much intended to magnify the glory of the church. The demands of Bach’s position and his own ambitions for his music required a reliance on the craftsman-like efficiency and learned sophistication that he had cultivated from an early age. The results of his efforts in Leipzig, not just in the first years but extending well into the 1730s, epitomize the forms and functions of church music even as the compositions themselves routinely exceeded the institution’s conventions. In supplying music for aristocratic courts, Bach likewise contributed music in form and function fully in line with historical norms that glorified the court for which it was composed.

**The Court and the Compilation of the Missa, BWV 232\(^1\)**

While Bach served at the courts in Weimar and Cöthen, he made his most overt gestures of fealty toward the courts in Dresden and later in Berlin. Indeed, he composed the Kyrie and Gloria setting (BWV 232\(^1\)), with the hope of obtaining a title at the Saxon court in Dresden, as documented in the dedication accompanying the performing parts submitted to the Elector of Saxony in July of 1733. Specifically, Bach sought the elector’s “Most Mighty Protection,” having come into conflict with his church and municipal superiors in Leipzig on a number of occasions in the years leading up to this

---

In soliciting a title at the elector’s court, Bach sought to raise his standing in relation to the Leipzig authorities, who remained subservient to the elector.

Sometime in the years 1732-1735, Bach returned to his 1723 Magnificat setting, transposing it to D Major and removing the interpolated chorales. The close historical proximity of Bach’s preparation of the Missa for the Dresden court in July of 1733 with the preparation of the revised Magnificat demonstrates a renewed and more systematic interest in the genres of Latin liturgical music. That the revised Magnificat and the 1733 Missa share a common tonality is also worthy of note. This engagement with Latin liturgical texts shared Bach’s attention over the course of the 1730s and 1740s with his systematic treatment of instrumental forms in the second book of the Well-Tempered Clavier and the four volumes of the Clavier-Übung series. To achieve his goal of obtaining favor at the Saxon court, Bach submitted a Missa setting, commonly used in the Lutheran liturgy in Leipzig for high feasts of Christmas and Easter and also for the Roman Catholic liturgy of the Saxon and Polish Royal court church in Dresden. The petition was made to Friedrich August II, who had ascended to the throne as Elector of Saxony following the death of his father August the Strong on February 1, 1733. Following August the Strong’s death, Saxony observed a period of mourning, during

35 The text of the wrapper and the petition to the court are transcribed in The New Bach Reader as #161 and #162,156-158 and BDok I, #166 and #27 respectively. Regarding Bach’s conflicts with the Leipzig authorities, see Wolff 2000, 341-351.
which concerted music was not performed. Bach’s *Collegium musicum* resumed its performances on June 17, 1733, and concerted church music recommenced on July 2.\(^{38}\)

The pivotal event in the completion and submission of the *Missa* to the new Elector of Saxony was the appointment of J. S. Bach’s oldest son, Wilhelm Friedemann, to the position of organist at the Sophienkirche in Dresden. In May of 1733, Christian Petzold, the organist at the Sophienkirche, died. On June 7, the elder Bach wrote two letters on behalf of his son in application for the position. Wilhelm Friedemann then auditioned for the position on June 22 and received notice of his selection on June 23. The younger Bach assumed his position on August 1, having previously visited Dresden on July 11, most likely to inspect the organ. The significance of this for the completion of the *Missa* is found in the paleographical details of the parts submitted to the Elector as well as the petition dated July 27, 1733, copied by the Dresden scribe Gottfried Rausch.

The performing parts for the *Missa* were written on paper that was only ever used by Bach on this single occasion and was likely acquired in Dresden solely for this purpose. The paper differs from that used for the score of the *Missa*, which Bach presumably prepared in Leipzig, and which he and his copyists used almost exclusively for scores and parts prepared in Leipzig during the years 1732-1735.\(^{39}\) Moreover, he relied nearly exclusively on family members to copy the performing parts as opposed to his routine practice of having his students prepare the performing parts.\(^{40}\) Joshua Rifkin has also demonstrated the haste with which the parts were prepared, leading to the conclusion that Bach prepared the *Missa* only after Friedemann’s appointment on June 23.
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\(^{38}\) *NBR* #159 and 3160, 156.


\(^{40}\) Rifkin 1988, 794.
and that the parts were prepared after a large portion of Bach’s family traveled to Dresden in advance of the eldest son beginning in his new position on August 1.

No evidence survives to suggest that the Missa was performed during Bach’s lifetime. Despite this, the problematic notion of a performance in Leipzig during the new Elector’s visit to the city in April 1733 in the midst of the mourning period for his father remains stubbornly entrenched.\footnote{Wolff 2000, 367.} There is also disagreement about the proposition that the parts would have been used for a performance in Dresden.\footnote{Rikfin 1988, 792.} And, just as Christoph Wolff does not endorse Rifkin’s hypothesis regarding the precise dating of the composition, he also argues that the Missa was performed late in July at the Sophienkirche, possibly with Bach, Friedemann, Emanuel, and Anna Magdalena performing alongside Dresden court musicians.\footnote{Wolff 2000, 367-69.} While the organ part is transposed to kammerton to match the tuning of the organ at the Sophienkirche, no record survives of an actual performance. The only contemporaneous record of the Missa in Dresden is an entry of the petition in the court records on August 19, 1733.\footnote{BDok I, 75; Wolff 2000, 371.}

**Preparing the Manuscript**

It is best to describe Bach’s work on the Missa as less an act of composing and more as that of compiling. While Bach, especially with the “Lutheran Masses” and the Christmas Oratorio, had transformed and transferred occasional music into more durable genres, his use of parody as the basis for large compositions in the 1730s had begun most auspiciously with the Missa (BWV 232\textsuperscript{I}). Moreover, what is particularly distinctive about the Missa of 1733 is the dramatic realignment of the constituent elements that would
become the Missa, demonstrating a more ambitious and distinctive approach in his assemblage of materials than is apparent in any of his other parodied work. The four “Lutheran Masses” (BWV 233-236) draw on just four cantatas for thirteen of the twenty-four movements. Similarly, the Christmas Oratorio, BWV 248, draws on a group of three celebratory cantatas, BWV 213-215, as templates for the subsequent series of sacred cantatas for the days of Christmas season. Despite the survival of just two known models, all twelve movements of BWV 232\(^1\) can be shown to rely on pre-existing music, possibly from as many different sources.\(^{45}\)

Establishing that the other movements of the Missa derive from pre-existing compositions relies on a close examination of the autograph score.\(^{46}\) Bach belies the existence of parody models most noticeably in the character of his handwriting.\(^{47}\) Throughout his first years in Leipzig, with the extraordinary productivity he achieved, Bach’s scores exhibit a fluidity reflective of the time constraints under which he was working. As demonstrated in the cantata manuscripts, Bach composed in full score, often with a clear vision of the overall structure and the details of each movement conceived in advance, and he continued to show this well into the 1730s.\(^{48}\) By contrast, the manuscripts of parodied movements exhibit a much cleaner, calligraphic appearance. It is the calligraphic appearance of the score of the Missa that first suggests that each
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\(^{45}\) Rifkin 2006, XVIII.


movement relies on an existing model eventhough models of only two movements in the 
*Missa* survive in their earlier versions. The opening chorus of *Schauet doch und sehet, ob irgend ein Schmerz sei* (BWV 46/1) without its initial instrumental ritornello serves as the model for the “Qui tollis” (BWV 232¹/7b). The case of the model for the “Gratius agimus tibi” (BWV 232¹/6) is interesting in that the opening chorus of *Wir danken dir, Gott, wir danken dir* (BWV 29/2) shares a common model that is now lost.⁴⁹

**The “große catholische Messe”**

Bach continued sporadically to compose or compile settings of Latin liturgical texts. In the early 1740s, Bach composed a setting of the Credo intonation in a Mixolydian-inflected G Major, the sole surviving source of which is a manuscript from the third quarter of the eighteenth century in the hand of Bach’s student Johann Friedrich Agricola.⁵⁰ Though this source was only recently rediscovered and dates from after Bach’s death, Rifkin had observed that copying errors in the autograph score of the Mass in B Minor suggest a model in G, postulating that it might have served as an introduction to a composition by another composer, as is the case with a similar movement composed by Bach in about 1745 to open the Credo of a Mass by Giovanni Battista Basani (BWV 1081).⁵¹ Christoph Wolff had earlier proposed on stylistic grounds that the Credo intonation originated in the early 1740s, being consistent with the composer’s interest in *stile antico* texture at that time.⁵² Thus, sources must have once existed that predate both the autograph manuscript of the complete Mass in B Minor and the copy prepared by Agricola.

---

⁴⁹ Cf. Rifkin 2006, XVIII.  
⁵⁰ Source C: D-GO! Mus. 2° 54c/3.  
⁵¹ Rikfin 1982, [27].  
Later in the 1740s, Bach again turned to Latin liturgical music. Two documents from the mid-1740s have left scholars at a loss for a clear explanation of their origin and purpose, even as they demonstrate Bach’s deliberate engagement with materials that would form the basis for the complete Mass. The first is an unfigured continuo part dating from between 1743 and 1748 for the Sanctus in D Major (BWV 232\textsuperscript{III}), providing evidence of a performance of this Sanctus setting in the mid-1740s.\textsuperscript{53} More substantial and more difficult to firmly place is the manuscript score of the cantata \textit{Gloria in excelsis Deo} (BWV 191), which consists of the “Gloria” and slightly shortened versions of the “Dominus Deus” and “Cum Sancto Spiritu” of the 1733 \textit{Missa} (BWV 232\textsuperscript{1/4a, 7a, and 9b}).\textsuperscript{54} While the caption title on the manuscript indicates that it was prepared for the Feast of the Nativity, its Latin text argues against its use as an element of the proper in the Leipzig liturgy. Gregory Butler has proposed rather that both the additional performing parts for the Sanctus in D Major and the cantata \textit{Gloria in excelsis Deo} were prepared on short notice for performance at the Paulinerkirche, which served as the University church, to mark the signing on December 25, 1745 of a peace agreement between Saxony and Prussian to bring to a close the Second Silesian War.\textsuperscript{55} Butler also proposes that the combination of the D Major Sanctus and movements from the \textit{Missa}, of which the outer movements are also in D Major, should be viewed as a starting point for Bach’s work on a complete setting of the Roman Ordinary.\textsuperscript{56}

That Bach would re-perform the Sanctus conforms to his practice of re-using music to fulfill his duties in the Leipzig churches. In turning to the \textit{Missa} to harvest

\textsuperscript{53} D-B Mus. ms. Bach St 117, see the description in NBA II/1a KB, 94-99, esp. 97.
\textsuperscript{54} D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 1145.
\textsuperscript{56} \textit{ibid.}, 70-71.
music appropriate to Christmas Day, to the University church, and to a celebration of a peace treaty bears even more eloquent testimony to Bach’s extraordinarily adept re-use of pre-existing music. Indeed, the music in this form had been originally conceived to honor the Saxon Elector, who was concluding the treaty with Friedrich II of Prussia, and it appeared here in at least its third guise. Whether there existed in Bach’s mind an ideal form of any composition, Cantata 191 confounds any effort in locating it for this material. As was typical for Bach when returning to a composition, he made changes by adding new measures of music and expanding the scoring. Significantly, Bach did not carry his changes found in Cantata 191 back to the Missa score.\(^57\) Thus, for the movements in question, there are multiple competing readings: those that would be found in the original version, the parodied version found in the score of the Missa, the slightly more detailed readings of the performing parts of the Missa prepared for the Dresden court, and the new readings found in Cantata 191.

Regardless of whether preparing material for the 1745 celebration ignited Bach’s interest in compiling a complete setting of the Roman Ordinary, he only began to prepare the score of the Mass in B Minor in 1748 or 1749.\(^58\) Bach prepared the manuscript in a manner consistent with his practice when making a fair copy. When composing, Bach generally would take a single sheet of folio paper that had been folded in half to form a four page bi-folio on which staves were ruled. However, when preparing a calligraphic score, he usually interleaved bi-folios, as seen with the two interleaved bi-folios in the score of the cantata Gloria in excelsis Deo (BWV 191). In the case of the Missa (BWV 232\(^2\)), Bach prepared twelve gatherings of two bi-folios each. In the second portion of the


manuscript, the “Symbolum Nicenum” (BWV 232\textsuperscript{II}) consists of three gatherings of four bi-folios and one gathering of two bi-folios. The “Sanctus” (BWV 232\textsuperscript{III}) consists of a single gathering of four nested bi-folios. The “Osanna” and “Benedictus” are contained within a single gathering of three bi-folios and the “Agnus Dei” and “Dona nobis pacem” are contained within a gathering of two bi-folios. 59 Bach’s practice when writing new music is readily demonstrated by the folio structure of the early version of the Sanctus (BWV 232\textsuperscript{III}) from 1724, which consists of successive separate bi-folios. 60

Bach began to set the remaining elements of the Mass Ordinary in 1748, appending these to the manuscript score of the 1733 Missa. As he began to envision appending additional music to the massive 1733 Missa, the substantial five voice fugue of the G-Mixolydian Credo intonation must have come readily to mind. This flows directly into the fugue of the “Patrem omnipotentem” (BWV 232\textsuperscript{II}/11) relying on music that also appeared as the opening chorus of the cantata Gott, wie dein Name, so ist auch dein Ruhm (BWV 171), for New Year’s Day of 1729. However, given its calligraphic quality, the cantata autograph must have been drawn from yet an earlier composition which served as the model for both the cantata and the “Patrem omnipotentem” of the Mass. For the Mass, Bach makes a few notable revisions. The homophonic exclamation of the text “Credo in unum Deum,” linking it to the preceding movement, masks the initial


statement of the fugue subject in the bass and the subsequent entries by the tenor and alto. This material does not appear in the version of this music found in the Cantata 171.\textsuperscript{61}

The following “Et in unum Dominum” (BWV 232\textsuperscript{II}/12) presents two intriguing glimpses of Bach at work. A tantalizing hint about the origin of this music comes in the form of four crossed out measures of what appears to be an obbligato violin line for the duet “Ich bin deine, du bist meine” in the 1733 dramatic cantata \textit{Lasst uns sorgen, lasst uns wachen}, BWV 213.\textsuperscript{62} As is common with Bach, this thematic idea was the first music entered on the manuscript page. That he quickly chose to proceed in an entirely different direction with this movement is seen in the complete misalignment of the measures in the violin part with the remainder of the voices entered later. As noted above, in 1735 Bach used this cantata as a model for parts of the \textit{Christmas Oratorio} (BWV 248). The most consequential detail of the manuscript for “Et in unum Dominum” is the insertion at the end of the Credo movements of a single leaf that includes only the vocal lines of the duet re-texted to allow for a separate setting of the text “Et incarnatus est” (BWV 232\textsuperscript{II}/13), which moved the scene of the crucifixion to the center of Bach’s Credo setting. The music of the “Crucifixus” (BWV 232\textsuperscript{II}/14) comes from the opening chorus of the cantata \textit{Weinen, Klagen, Sorgen, Sagen} (BWV 12), which was first performed on April 22, 1714. The original is in a \textit{da capo} form, of which Bach uses the opening section in the Mass. Bach frames this material with a four measure introduction and conclusion, which leads into the following “Et resurrexit” (BWV 232\textsuperscript{II}/15).

As in so many other instances, the modified \textit{da capo} form of the “Et in spiritu Sanctum” (BWV 232\textsuperscript{II}/16) and the flawless calligraphic appearance of the movement in

\textsuperscript{61} Rifkin 1982, [28].
\textsuperscript{62} D-B \textit{Mus. ms. Bach P 125}. 
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the autograph score of the Mass suggests an earlier model that does not survive. However, it has been suggested recently that the model for this movement comes from the lost wedding cantata Sein Segen fliesst daher wie ein Strom (BWV Anh. I 14). By contrast, the extensive revisions found in the autograph score for the sophisticated contrapuntal “Confiteor” (BWV 232II 17a) offers the single incontrovertible example of new composition in the Mass. As seen with the “Patrem omnipotentem,” Bach repeats the final words of the “Confiteor” as the first phrase of the triumphal “Et expecto resurrectionem” (BWV 232II 17b) that concludes the Credo.

The six-voice Sanctus setting in D from 1724 (BWV 232III) matches the tonality of the Mass in B Minor and is the only composition among the composer’s four settings of the Sanctus that approaches the scale of the other components assembled for the complete Mass setting. The version of this Sanctus setting found in the Mass changes the earlier version very little, most notably in adjusting the assignment of the six voice parts from SSSATB to SSAATB.

The “Agnus Dei” (BWV 232IV/22) points to an origin as a setting of the text “Entfernet euch, ihr kalten Hertzen” from the wedding cantata Auf! süß entzückende Gewalt (BWV Anh. 196/Anh. I 14). The cantata, written for November 27, 1725, is not extant, but Bach also used the music deployed in the “Agnus Dei” for the aria “Ach bleibe doch, mein liebstes Leben” in the Ascension Oratorio (BWV 11) that was first performed on May 19, 1735. Bach made extensive changes to this music to fit to it the Mass text, far exceeding the amount of revision seen in the many other examples of

---

64 Cf. NBA II/1a, 143-168.
parodied music in the Mass or elsewhere in the composer’s oeuvre. In the final movement (BWV 232IV/23) of the Mass Bach aligns the text “Dona nobis pacem” to the music used for the movement “Gratias agimus tibi” in the Gloria, thus creating a cyclicality common in Masses written for the Dresden court.65

**Texts and Time**

The Mass stands as the last major composition prepared by Bach. No evidence exists to suggest that Bach had performing parts prepared for the Mass in its entirety.66 Moreover, there is no evidence that Bach conceived the Mass as an autonomous and inherently integrated composition. The Mass does suggest a whole that is greater than its parts, but its existence does not necessarily supersede and render irrelevant the other versions of the music that we find in the Mass. Those versions have, in fact, been treated by generations of scholars as having their own independent authority meriting discrete editions.67 But this valedictory compilation effort that the Mass represents has routinely been presumed to suggest an impulse toward perfectibility in this form. Even relatively recently, Robert Marshall invoked his mentor Arthur Mendel while propagating this notion:

Arthur Mendel [suggested] … that Bach may originally have intended some completely different music for the “Dona nobis pacem,” before he hit upon the splendid idea of returning to the music of the “Gratias agimus tibi” for the conclusion of the Mass. One would love to believe that this is the true explanation of the evidence, for it would bear witness to considerably more than the composer’s momentary forgetfulness about the number of voices in a particular chorus — to testify, as it were, to his mortality. It would declare rather that

---

66 Michael Maul, in proposing the possibility of a private commission from Vienna and of parts being prepared in fulfillment of such a commission, admits that this is pure conjecture. See Maul, “‘The Great Catholic Mass’: Bach, Count Questenberg and the Musicalische Congregation in Vienna,” in Exploring Bach’s B-Minor Mass, edited by Yo Tomita, Robin A. Leaver, and Jan Smazny (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2103), 84-104.
67 For Gloria in excelsis Deo (BWV 191), see BG xli and NBA vii.
Johann Sebastian Bach, in a final flash of inspiration close to the end of his life, had found a decisive way of assuring that posterity would understand that his last and greatest church composition, despite its protracted and sporadic gestation extending over a full quarter-century (virtually the entirety of his career in Leipzig), was indeed an emphatically unified whole: a single, profoundly monumental, yet integral masterpiece.68

However, this anachronistically applies to Bach’s music the “work concept” that only took shape decades after he had died, rather than allowing Bach’s parody practices to demonstrate the aesthetics of his own time.

By the nineteenth century, a musical score — as a tangible embodiment of a temporal art — had become a kind of metonym for an autonomous musical work.69 But the fluidity of Bach’s music, being repeatedly repurposed, already calls into question the applicability of a work concept to this composer and his oeuvre. To consider the notated manifestations of this music as synonymous with the works only further extends this fallacy. Indeed, the musical notation served an even more practical function than the music it represented, which for Bach was already quite transmutable. The discussion of parody in the Mass in B Minor and related compositions should adequately demonstrate the latter point. The inclusion of specific music in the Mass in B Minor lends it a transcendent permanence, but one must understand early modern notions of time to understand that permanence.

Recently, scholars have examined closely Bach’s position in relation to changing conceptions of time in the eighteenth century — Karol Berger employs geometric

---

metaphors in his monograph *Bach’s Cycle, Mozart’s Arrow*. For many of Bach’s contemporaries, there was no suggestion that the future would not continue to bear close resemblance to the past. In his last years, Bach saw with Friedrich II the ascendance of another German monarch that sought to glorify the state through public display, affirming the subjugation of music to other ends. In 1750, the average German would not have imagined that the collapse of the Old Regime was imminent and that a middle class would begin to usurp the aristocracy by asserting itself not just in political life, but also in culture. The routines of daily life replicated the perennial rhythms of the continually returning seasons and the annual repetition of the liturgical calendar. Thus, just as John Butt and Karol Berger see cyclicity in the formal elements of the *St. John* and *St. Matthew* Passions, Bach’s reuse, repurposing, and reordering of musical materials can be viewed as another manifestation of an early modern worldview oriented toward the celestial realm, which represented a figurative goal and provided the means of measuring the cycles of life. Donald M. Lowe proposes that seventeenth and eighteenth century Europeans maintained an epistemology of “representation-in-space.” The cyclicity that Berger and Butt locate in Bach’s music is a manifestation of this spatial epistemology. Similarly, the re-use of music so prevalent in Bach’s composing and in the practice of many of his contemporaries is itself a spatial re-ordering. It does not map onto

---


a notion of “development-in-time,” which represents an epistemological shift that Lowe locates to the last third of the eighteenth century and that is reflected in “Mozart’s Arrow.”

Appreciating the significance of notated music in this construct requires an examination of its function: that is, of ensuring a viable and advantageous performance. For Bach, the fullest notated realization of the composition usually came out in the performing parts prepared by his students. Generally the score leaves numerous details unresolved. This is often the case with scoring, which can be seen in cantatas as well as in the Missa (BWV 232). The surviving performing parts for Meine Seel’ erhebt den Herren (BWV 10), for instance, include an obbligato trumpet part that doubles, to glorious effect, the statements of the cantus firmus sung by the soprano in the first and fifth movements and the concluding chorale. However, no indication of an obbligato doubling instrument appears in the autograph score. Similarly, Bach’s scores usually lack the figures in the continuo line. This is true even in those instances where an autograph fair-copy score survives that offers many other indications of embodying an ideal form of a composition, such as the meticulously prepared score of the St. Matthew Passion (BWV 244). Again, significant details, appear only in the performing parts. The score of the Missa offers demonstration of both such instances, where the performing parts submitted to the Dresden court contain the only indication of the bass figures, the inclusion of bassoons, and the specific scoring of the flutes. Bach’s professional

73 Lowe, 11.
74 D-LEb Thomana 10.
76 D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 25.
77 D-B Mus. ms. Bach St 110, Faszikel 1.
78 D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 180 as compared to the parts, D-DI Mus.2405-D-21.
responsibilities certainly necessitated this workmanlike pragmatism, but the rather impractical Missa reveals that it was not limited to his functional music.

Even though printed music of Bach’s time might suggest greater stability than contemporaneous manuscripts, it was in fact often viewed as a more generic representation of a composition.\footnote{John Butt, “The Seventeenth-Century Musical Work,” 34-36.} The surviving copies from Bach’s personal library of a few of the already small number of compositions that were printed in his lifetime reflect the composer’s tendency to enter small corrections and changes.\footnote{See Andrew Talle, “A Print of Clavierübung I from J. S. Bach’s Personal Library,” In About Bach, edited by Gregory G. Butler, George B. Stauffer, and Mary Dalton Greer (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2008), 157-168.} Other examples, such as the Canonic Variations on “Vom Himmel hoch” (BWV 769) and the Art of Fugue (BWV 1080), that survive in both autograph manuscript and in printed editions prepared under the composer’s supervision, suggest even greater mutability. The differences between the manuscript and printed versions, which consist largely of reordering of movements, suggest an on-going interest in the implications of underlying materials as opposed to a desire to perfect details.\footnote{About the Canonic Variations, see David Yearsley, Bach and the Meanings of Counterpoint (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 110-127; also, Gregory G. Butler, “Scribes, Engravers, and Notational Styles: The Final Disposition of Bach’s Art of Fugue,” In About Bach, edited by Gregory G. Butler, George B. Stauffer, and Mary Dalton Greer (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2008), 111-123.} This becomes most evident in Bach’s personal copy of his Clavierübung IV (BWV 988, more commonly known as the Goldberg Variations). Here, Bach demonstrates his relentless working out of musical ideas, not only in the collections of variations and canons on a single bass line, but even more so in the manuscript addendum of an additional fourteen canons on the head motive of the same bass line.\footnote{Christoph Wolff, “Bach’s ‘Handexemplar’ of the Goldberg Variations: A New Source,” Journal of the American Musicological Society 29, no. 2 (1976): 224-241.} There are, indeed, “principles of design and order” in Bach’s music printed during his lifetime, but this should not rule out other possible combinations of
material. The seemingly endless possible combinations of canons (and instrumentation) found in *The Musical Offering* (BWV 1079) should be seen as a strong argument against any static ordering and for a very fluid conception of the musical elements.

In his printed, abstract music and in the often more practical parodied movements, Bach seems to have aimed to extend his material to its furthest limit or fullest implication. This practice resulted in scores that appear to be compositional testimonials. Perhaps the most notable is the Mass in B Minor, which suggests itself as a compendium of Bach’s greatest examples from his vocal *oeuvre*. By extension, an object such as the autograph manuscript score might readily be perceived as a masterpiece. But rather than viewing such a masterpiece through the lens of the idealist philosophy of Romantic aesthetics that argues for the autonomy of the musical work, it is beneficial to view the Mass as the product of a guild-trained composer of the early modern era. From this perspective, the Mass might merely be a composite of the composer’s craft, worthy of judgment by the fellow practitioners of his trade but not necessarily immutable in form. That Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach felt at liberty to alter details of the Mass would support such a view. Moreover, that C. P. E. Bach prepared a *Magnificat*, Wq. 215 — itself a kind of masterpiece — as an audition piece for his father’s position further affirms the continuing significance of guild practices in the Bach world. J. S. Bach certainly sought to assert his family’s prerogative to his position in Leipzig in a manner common among guilds and appears to have believed that the presentation of an appropriate demonstration of his son’s craftsmanship would aid in that project.

---

85 Cf. chapter 2 below.
In both the practical tradition of the guild musician and the speculative tradition increasingly foregrounded in Bach’s few printed compositions, music did not serve as an end unto itself. Indeed, in his speculative compositions, Bach demonstrates technical possibilities more than artistic inevitabilities. Bach’s contemporaries already recognized the fact that his music readily fit into preconceived notions of the practical and speculative traditions, as Lorenz Mizler and Johann Mattheson respectively highlighted.86 Yet, from a technical perspective the music in the speculative compositions is hardly more abstract than that found in the music Bach produced immediately after he assumed the position of cantor at St. Thomas in Leipzig. There Bach finally realized the opportunity — largely unavailable to him previously — to produce sacred music of a kind and in a volume that matched his ambitions. Whereas his speculative compositions owed an allegiance to the mathematically oriented Trivium, in these sacred compositions Bach pursued musical intersections with the linguistic arts of the Quadrivium.87 But in both, the music reflects a conception of time and the social world in which the future would continue to look very similar to the past.

---

87 Robin A. Leaver, *J.S. Bach as Preacher: His Passions and Music in Worship* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1984).
Chapter 2: Revising

An abundance of documentation demonstrates the decades-long fascination that the Mass in B Minor held for Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach. This includes several manuscript copies of the Mass prepared using as their model J. S. Bach’s autograph score, which Emanuel had inherited. Most substantial are the materials resulting from a 1786 concert that included the Symbole Nicenum from the Mass in B Minor and inspired the younger Bach to clarify readings in the autograph score. However, earlier manuscript copies of the Mass show that Emanuel had already engaged with this music during his time in Berlin, when this music served no practical use for him.

Emanuel’s entries, emendations, clarifications, and alterations to his father’s autograph score have garnered considerable scrutiny and consternation as more recent generations have sought to establish the music of the Mass as written by J. S. Bach. Of course, traditional philological method seeks to eradicate corruptions found in sources in order to substantiate texts as originally written. In the abstract this offers the ability to understand better the author and the world in which he lived. After all, in its most elemental form, philology concerns itself with grammar and syntax as vestiges and vessels of superseded ways of thinking. Returning to the original form of a text allows for a clearer appreciation of former times and peoples.

Yet, recent work on Emanuel’s Magnificat, Passion settings, and *Quartelstücke* has given credence to the fluidity of the musical text in eighteenth-century Germany, ironically as the result of the publication of a critical edition of the complete works of C. P. E. Bach. Meanwhile, little consideration has been given to how each new copy of the Mass in B minor bears the marks of its origins. Distinguishing and establishing a unique status for the revisions Emanuel made in his father’s score will serve here not as a means of arriving at a faithful recreation of the original text, but rather will substantiate the legitimacy of these new readings as reflections of a different time, place, and purpose.

**J. S. Bach’s Musical Estate**

Following Johann Sebastian Bach’s death, his musical estate was distributed among his family, but his sizeable and sophisticated collection of theological books apparently held less value for his heirs and was dispersed via the estate agent. By 1750 his two oldest sons, Wilhelm Friedemann and Carl Philipp Emanuel, had already established themselves as successful musicians and Bach could reasonably anticipate that his two youngest sons, Johann Christoph Friedrich and Johann Christian, would do the same. It appears that Sebastian hoped or even expected that his music would remain a valuable tool for practicing musicians, and thus, he arranged for an equitable distribution of the manuscripts among his heirs. The materials for his cantatas provide the clearest demonstration of this, with scores and performing parts for at least the three most complete cantata cycles being shared by each of Bach’s four musically active sons and his wife, Anna Magdalena. Carl Philipp Emanuel and Johann Christoph Friedrich shared the scores and parts for the first cantata cycle from 1723-24, and Emanuel and Johann

---

3 Cf. *CPEB: CW*, series IV and V.
Christian shared the score and parts for the third cantata cycle from 1725-26. For the chorale cantata cycle of 1724-25, Anna Magdalena inherited the entire set of parts with Wilhelm Friedemann inheriting the scores and duplicate parts. Friedemann also inherited materials from the first and third cycles for the major feasts for which he was required to present music in Halle. Of Sebastian’s sons, Emanuel tended to his musical inheritance most actively.

The catalog published in 1790 of C. P. E. Bach’s estate facilitates the tracing of those manuscripts of his father’s that he inherited as well as materials inherited by Johann Christian, which Emanuel had acquired from his youngest brother. Emanuel’s estate catalog includes entries for the autograph manuscripts of his father’s Magnificat in D (BWV 243) and the earlier version in E-flat (BWV 243a), the Christmas Oratorio (BWV 248), the four “Lutheran” Masses (BWV 233-236), the St. Matthew Passion (BWV 244), the St. John Passion (BWV 245), the Easter Oratorio (BWV 249), several settings of the Sanctus (BWV 237-240), and a large quantity of cantatas and keyboard music. Emanuel also came into possession of the Alt-Bachisches Archiv of compositions of earlier generations of the Bach family that his father had compiled. The rather extensive entry for the autograph of the Mass in B Minor (BWV 232) appears in the estate catalog on

page 72 and specifically refers to the performance parts and instrumental introduction prepared by Emanuel in the 1770s and 1780s.\textsuperscript{8}

The overwhelming impression is that the survival of J. S. Bach’s large-scale sacred music depended largely on C. P. E. Bach. The disheartening possibility that substantial portions of J. S. Bach’s musical legacy do not survive reflects at the very least the relatively low utility of the materials in the later eighteenth century. While Friedemann, Friedrich, and Emanuel drew from their father’s music in fulfilling their professional duties as church musicians in Halle, Bückeburg, and Hamburg respectively, the opportunities for and feasibility of presenting elaborate figural music in the Lutheran liturgy continually decreased over the course of the century.\textsuperscript{9}

In the absence of a consistent practical purpose for J. S. Bach’s music, its preservation depended on the appreciation of its artistic and historical significance, which had certainly existed and had begun to grow in the years after the composer’s death in 1750. Some evidence for this exists in the proliferating genre of compositional treatises by Emanuel and several of his colleagues and contemporaries, who readily pointed to the music of J. S. Bach as exemplary. However, these authors largely highlighted this music for its technical significance as opposed to its utility. Beyond his treatise on keyboard playing, Emanuel contributed to the technical consideration of his father’s musical legacy by bringing to press the \textit{Kunst der Fuge} (BWV 1080), for which Friedrich Wilhelm Marpurg, author of \textit{Abhandlung von der Fuge}, contributed a preface to the second

\textsuperscript{8} Nachlaß-Verzeichnis (1790): Facsimile Edition, 74.
printing. The formulation of technical principles in composition treatises, such as Marpurg’s and Johann Philipp Kirnberger’s *Die Kunst der reinen Satzes in der Musik,* helped create the means of analyzing and contemplating music as an abstract entity. This remained a necessary pre-condition for a new aesthetic. Indeed, aesthetic philosophy at that time had not yet fully developed a model that would value the compositions as autonomous artistic objects. Consequently, music by Sebastian that has become greatly admired since the nineteenth century remained relatively neglected for several decades after his lifetime, which seems to lend credence to the trope that Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy “rediscovered” Bach. However, that rediscovery is more a consequence of the emergence of a mass audience for music composed of educated middle-class connoisseurs, which did not coalesce until the nineteenth century. The discussion here of the manuscript transmission of the Mass in B Minor adds clarity and nuance to the manner in which later generations engaged with Bach’s music by examining C. P. E. Bach’s treatment of his father’s musical legacy. Subsequent chapters will consider how other professional musicians as well as amateur musicians approached the music of Bach, as reflected in their copies of the Mass in B Minor.

From the Bach Guild to the Bürgertum

By the eighteenth century accumulating objects served as an important means of signifying social status and intellectual attainment for both aristocrats and the bourgeoisie, particularly exotic items with curiosity value.\(^{14}\) Useful and mundane objects held little interest. While the Enlightenment fashion for collecting knowledge found adherents among German musicians, collections of musical scores remained oriented to practical use. Rather, this collecting fashion appears most clearly in biographical lexicons, including those by J. S. Bach’s cousin Johann Gottfried Walther and the son of one of J. S. Bach’s students, Ernst Ludwig Gerber.\(^{15}\) For Carl Philipp Emanuel, the collecting urge manifested itself in the large body of musician portraits that he amassed, catalogued, and proudly displayed for visitors.\(^{16}\) Gerber also built a prized portrait collection, which served as an embodiment of musical history and a point of departure for his Lexicon.\(^{17}\)

In the waning months of his life, Emanuel gave particular attention to finishing a catalog enumerating his own musical output, the musical legacy that he inherited from his father, exemplary compositions by contemporaries in his possession, and his portrait collection. This catalog probably originated in earlier lists of compositions sold individually in manuscript copies and ultimately served the purpose of facilitating the


ongoing sale by his wife and daughter of copies of his music from his estate.\textsuperscript{18} Here again, the music itself was marketed and sold largely for its practical musical value — even among amateur musicians — and not for its collectability.\textsuperscript{19} The fact that in the estate sale of Emanuel’s daughter Anna Carolina Bach one large lot contained Passion settings, dramas, cantatas, and other works demonstrates that in 1805 historic sacred music had not yet become uniquely prized. This is further reflected in the ability of C. F. G. Schwenke, Emanuel’s successor in Hamburg, and Johann Jacob Heinrich Westphal, an organist in Schwerin, to successfully obtain the vast majority of the autograph manuscripts of C. P. E. Bach’s and J. S. Bach’s music, which would in a few years become quite valuable and closely guarded.\textsuperscript{20} Even in 1824 Poelchau paid just 9 Mark Hamburger Courant for the autograph score of the \textit{St. Matthew Passion} (BWV 244), but paid 70 Mark for the autograph of a Mozart symphony.\textsuperscript{21} Throughout Emanuel’s lifetime, notated scores, especially of sacred vocal music, retained very practical significance, just as composing and musical training continued to closely reflect norms that had dominated throughout the preceding century. Indeed, it is important to appreciate the continuity in thinking from Johann Sebastian Bach and the guild tradition of the seventeenth and early eighteenth century to the end of Emanuel’s lifetime and the last years of the Old Regime.

Various factors led to J. S. Bach’s decision to seek the position of Cantor at St. Thomas in Leipzig, several of which he enumerated in a letter to Georg Erdmann, his

classmate from Ohrdruf with whom he attended the St. Michael School in Lünberg. Among these was the desire to make a university education available to his sons, which the school at St. Thomas and proximity to the university in Leipzig made significantly more plausible. In Leipzig Friedemann and Emanuel would have also had continuous exposure to a number of university students studying with their father. Previously Sebastian’s students had also lived with the Bach family and all of them took on musical responsibilities both in performances and, as is more securely documented, as copyists. The musical training of these apprentices and of his own sons remained consistent with tradition, as documented in Friedemann’s “Clavierbüchlein.” This is also reflected in the commonplace book of Bach’s student Heinrich Nikolaus Gerber, the father of the biographical lexicographer Ernst Ludwig Gerber. This format and function persists even in much later materials, as evidenced by a commonplace book of a student of Bach’s own student Johann Christian Kittel. However, Sebastian’s move to Leipzig assured for his sons access to the professional opportunities beyond the world of the trade guilds that only the Latin school and university afforded.

Following his studies at St. Thomas School, Emanuel matriculated at the university in Leipzig in 1731. Not long after, and at the same time that his brother

---

22 NBR #152, pp. 151-52.
Friedemann assumed the organist position at the Sophienkirche in Dresden in August of 1733, Emanuel applied unsuccessfully for an organist position in Naumburg. Then in September 1734 Emanuel moved to the university in Frankfurt an der Oder, where he studied law and where he was active musically as composer, performer, and teacher. Like many of his contemporaries, Emanuel remained a student until he was able to gain more stable employment.\footnote{Cf. Michael Maul and Peter Wollny, “Quellenkundliches zu Bach-Aufführungen in Köthen, Ronneburg und Leipzig zwischen 1720 und 1760,” Bach Jahrbuch 89 (2003): 110–19.} In 1738 Emanuel reportedly entered the service of Crown Prince Frederick of Prussia at his residence in Ruppin, even though he only first appears in court records in 1741, a full year after Frederick ascended to the throne.\footnote{Grove Music Online, s.v. “Bach, Carl Philipp Emanuel,” by Ulrich Leisinger.}

Emanuel held a position in Berlin that was highly esteemed, yet constrained by the conventions of court service. He was well paid and frequently accompanied the King in his evening music-making. In all, his work-load remained light, as he shared harpsichordist duties with Christian Friedrich Schale until 1745, and subsequently with Christoph Nichelmann. The harpsichordists alternated their responsibilities on a monthly basis, which afforded Bach the time to develop outside activities. These included teaching and writing his treatise on keyboard playing.\footnote{Versuch über die wahre Art das Clavier zu spielen mit Exempeln und achtzehn Probe-Stücken in sechs Sonaten erläutert (Berlin: in Verlegung des Auctoris, 1753-1762).} Emanuel must also have frequented the salons of Enlightenment Berlin, within which the court musicians maintained an active and influential presence. Emanuel’s large body of chamber music, concertos, and symphonies must have had regular performances in these contexts and Emanuel himself must have performed on a routine basis.\footnote{Hans-Günter Ottenberg, C.P.E. Bach. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), 62-3; on Emanuel’s concertos, see Rachel Wade, The Keyboard Concertos of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach (Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Research Press, 1979).} He was equally renowned as a conversationalist, a skill valued and likely refined in this context.
Likewise, the intellectual ambitions of Berlin’s musicians were presumably encouraged in the highly literary atmosphere of the salons, resulting in not just Bach’s keyboard treatise but also numerous treatises by his musical colleagues in the city, including Johann Philipp Kirnberger, Johann Friedrich Agricola, Christoph Nichelmann, and Friedrich Wilhelm Marpurg. In these settings Bach would become acquainted with the city’s leading literary minds, including Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, Johann Wilhelm Ludwig Gleim, and Karl Wilhelm Ramler. While still a servant of the crown, Bach, like some of his colleagues, began to develop a mode of existence in a public environment incrementally independent of the command economy of the Old Regime.

At the same time, Emanuel’s move in 1768 to Hamburg mostly likely reflected in equal proportion the decline of music-making at the court in Berlin, the even more secure financial position he would enjoy as Music Director in Hamburg, and the strong middle class culture of the independent trade city. There he established a series of public concerts, taught privately, coordinated the distribution of his music in printed editions and manuscript, and welcomed esteemed guests into his home for conversation in addition to maintaining the music of the five principal churches of the city. Moreover, he became well acquainted and in some instances intimate friends with the city’s leading intellectuals, among them Johann Andreas Cramer, Friedrich Gottlieb Klopstock, Heinrich Wilhelm von Gerstenberg, Christoph Daniel Ebeling, Johann Joachim Eschenburg, and Johann Heinrich Voss. He also took pleasure in exhibiting for his

visitors his carefully cultivated collection of portraits of composers, which served as a tangible demonstration of his abstract appreciation for music.\textsuperscript{35}

Emanuel’s portrait collection offers useful demonstration of the continuing ephemerality of notated scores as compared with other manifestations of musical permanence. Indeed, Emanuel’s catalog of his compositions and musical collection that became the Nachlaß-Verzeichnis articulates several different ways of conceiving of musical objects, but none of these attributes a distinct significance unto the musical score. Rather, the emphasis remains on workmanship. While the listing of Emanuel’s own compositions “… probably [represents] the earliest catalogue of the works of a single composer that can still satisfy the requirements of scholars today,” they are indexed for the value of their copies as saleable commodities.\textsuperscript{36} The listing of historical and contemporary music, including the Alt-Bachishes Archiv, the music of his father and siblings, and of other various “masters” such as Georg Benda and Carl Heinrich Graun, suggests the utility of this music as exemplary compositional models and musical resources. The catalog of the portrait collection serves almost exclusively as documentation of the collector’s taste and knowledge — “an important demonstration of education, social status, and means.”\textsuperscript{37}

What the Nachlaß-Verzeichnis does not do is establish a canon of musical works. The listing of compositions “Von verschiedenen Meistern” does not replicate anything like the systematic collection of exemplary individuals assembled among the portraits.\textsuperscript{38}

This suggests that the idea of the composer more so than the composer’s musical output

\textsuperscript{35} Annette Richards, Portrait Catalog.
\textsuperscript{37} Annette Richards, “C. P. E. Bach, Portraits and the Physiognomy of Music History,” 337.
\textsuperscript{38} Nachlaß-Verzeichnis (1790), edited by Peter Wollny, CPEB: CW VIII/5, 85-92.
merited greatest esteem and closely mirrors the high value in salon culture placed on the ability of an individual to converse with intelligence and grace, regardless of the topic discussed. The marketing of Emanuel’s estate, extending from an auction in 1788 of less significant items, to the sale of copies of items listed in the Nachlaß-Verzeichnis, to the auction of Emanuel’s daughter’s estate in 1805, reflects the continuing focus on the notated music as functional objects. It was not until several more decades had passed that musicians and connoisseurs began to place particular significance on the notated manifestations of compositions as objects obtaining something beyond their practical value. Looking at Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach’s practices as a composer and Music Director offers a particularly insightful case study for understanding later eighteenth-century attitudes toward notated scores and musical materials, which bear very close resemblance to the attitudes of earlier generations of the Bach family.

C. P. E. Bach’s Magnificat (Wq. 215) and the Continuation of Tradition

The guild in early modern German states served to regulate commerce in skilled trades, particularly access to and advancement within the trade. The example of Bach family members apprenticing with uncles or cousins and later succeeding each other in various positions reflects how guilds protected economic and family interests simultaneously. This continued well into Johann Sebastian Bach’s as well as his sons’ generation. Not only did five of Johann Sebastian Bach’s sons study music under their father, several of his nephews (Johann Bernhard, Johann Heinrich, and Johann Ernst)

40 For a discussion of the sale of items from Emanuel’s estate, see Peter Wollny, “Introduction,” in Nachlaß-Verzeichnis (1790), xi-xii.
undertook what was essentially an apprenticeship under him. Sebastian also sought to utilize his influence to secure or improve the positions for his sons (and himself). The visit to Dresden in 1733 upon the installation of Friedemann as organist at the Sophienkirche afforded Bach the opportunity to promote his son and to submit his petition to the Saxon court that accompanied the Missa (BWV 232). The fabled visit of Sebastian to the Prussian court at Potsdam on 7 May 1747 that prompted the composition and publication of A Musical Offering (BWV 1079), dedicated to Friedrich II, must also have come about with the hope of advancing the career of either Emanuel, himself, or both. Likewise, in the last year of his life, J. S. Bach sought to have his two oldest sons presented as candidates to succeed him as Cantor in Leipzig. On the first Sunday in Advent, 1749, Wilhelm Friedemann Bach presented his cantata Lasset uns ablegen die Werke der Finsternis (Fk 80), and C. P. E. Bach’s Magnificat (Wq 215) was performed in Leipzig on a Marian feast in 1749 or 1750.\footnote{Christine Blanken, “Introduction,” Magnificat (Berlin Version), Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach: The Complete Works V:1.1 (Los Altos, CA: The Packard Humanities Institute, 2012), xv.}

Importantly, C. P. E. Bach’s Magnificat closely resembles his father’s setting of this Latin liturgical text (BWV 243) and appears to replicate the practice of producing the Meisterstück routinely required of journeymen applying for admittance as a master within a guild.\footnote{Martin Petzoldt, “Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach und die Kirchenmusik seines Vaters: Bemerkungen zu den zwei Magnifikat-Kompositionen BWV 243 und Wq 215,” Jahrbuch des Staatlichen Instituts für Musikforschung Preußischer Kulturbesitz 2004: 32-42; Ulrich Leisinger, “Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach und das Magnificat seines Vaters,” Jahrbuch des Staatlichen Instituts für Musikforschung Preußischer Kulturbesitz 2004: 89-96.} Its similarity to his father’s composition, which had been heard in Leipzig on numerous occasions, quite possibly reflected favorably upon Emanuel. And, indeed, it begs the question of how essential uniqueness as a distinguishing feature mattered for functional music during this period. Church goers were not likely to have imagined the...
music they heard as something entirely distinct from the divine service of which it was just one component. Johann Sebastian’s liturgical or para-liturgical compositions, such as his cantatas and Passion settings, pushed to the outermost limits of the conventions associated with those genres, but he also willingly performed less technically sophisticated music by a variety of composers in fulfilling these same functions in the Leipzig churches.43

The use of parody in the “Lutheran” Masses (BWV 233-236) or the Christmas Oratorio (BWV 243) becomes less puzzling if it is understood that music fulfilled set functions and did not serve as an end unto itself. This perspective also helps to contextualize and explain Carl Philipp Emanuel’s heavy reliance on parody in his role in the Hamburg churches. In response to the substantial responsibilities that he assumed as Music Director in Hamburg — much like those of his father in Leipzig — Emanuel turned to sacred music by other composers that he respected, including his father, Georg Philipp Telemann, and Gottfried August Homilius. Not only did he perform in whole music by others, he also freely adapted music — by the aforementioned composers in particular — in parody and in pastiches to provide Passion settings and the music (known as the Quartalstücke) for the four high feasts of Christmas, Easter, Pentecost, and Michaelmas.44 Emanuel’s recourse to musical borrowing resembles to some extent his father’s practices in a similar office when faced with onerous demands and limited time. However, Emanuel seems to have viewed his office more expansively, wherein musical

44 See the Introductions to series IV and V in CPEB: CW, and Moira Leanne Hill, “Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach’s Passion Settings,” (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 2015).
compositions served a subsidiary function within a well-executed civic music. Indeed, Emanuel exhibited pride in presenting good music, regardless of its origins, and to comporting this music for a discerning audience in fulfillment of the tasks for which it was coopted. And in Hamburg still into the 1780s, the issue of originality did not serve as a primary consideration of taste, especially within the context of sacred music. Rather, the notion of *Originalgenie*, a designation regularly applied to Emanuel, placed emphasis on novelty more than profundity.  

The Passions and *Quartelstücke* exhibit quite clearly Emanuel's efforts to present coherent music woven together from different sources. The extensive reworking of his Magnificat (Wq. 215) further demonstrates his efforts to take advantage of the very best music available for a particular function while also respecting his audience’s desire for fresh music. As noted above, Emanuel appears to have composed the Magnificat as an audition piece for the Leipzig cantorate. This composition would subsequently enjoy numerous performances during the composer’s lifetime. At the same time, Emanuel also reused every movement from the Magnificat in parody form in the course of preparing music for other uses in Hamburg. Thus, when the original setting of “Et misericordia” became well known in its parodied version in the frequently performed *Passions-Cantate* (Wq. 233, no. 2), Emanuel replaced it in the Magnificat with a new, well-wrought but simpler setting of the Latin text. Mention was also made in the press of revisions having been made for other public performances in Hamburg, further suggesting that freshness seemingly took precedence over originality.

---

46 See Table 1 in *CPEB:CW* V:1.1, xii.
47 See Table 2 in *CPEB:CW* V:1.1, xiii.
At the same time, the tradition of concert performances of Emanuel’s Passions-
Cantate (Wq. 233) in Hamburg and Carl Heinrich Graun’s Der Tod Jesu in Berlin begins
to demonstrate that reprising well-established favorites was becoming routine. Emanuel’s
benefit concert in Hamburg for the “medezinische Armeninstitut” on April 9, 1786, best
known today as the first performance of the Symbolum Nicenum from Sebastian’s Mass
in B minor, fits well the model of a public concert through which compositions became
fixed in a performance tradition. It also suggests that he sought to add new music into
that popular repertory, notably his own Magnificat and double choir Heilig. While his
own music concluded the concert, the introduction of his father’s Symbolum Nicenum
(BWV 232II) is quite remarkable. To prepare the audience for the mammoth and complex
composition that anchored the concert’s first half, Emanuel composed a short
instrumental introduction. Following the Credo, the first half of the concert concluded
with the aria “I know that my Redeemer liveth” and the “Hallelujah” chorus from George
Frideric Handel’s Messiah. The second half of the concert comprised a symphony by
Emanuel, the Magnificat (Wq. 215, in its later version), and his Heilig (Wq. 217).48 As
with the adjustments he had made routinely to the Magnificat, Emanuel also made
adjustments to the Credo to ensure its best possible reception, most notably with — but
not limited to — the addition of the “Einleitung.” This concert and Emanuel’s
interventions in his father’s Mass setting adheres to patterns of borrowing already
familiar from his fulfillment of routine responsibilities in Hamburg’s principal churches.
The concert also marks the culmination of Emanuel’s engagement with his father’s Mass,
which had extended back to at least the 1760s.

48 BDok III, no. 190.
C. P. E. Bach’s Revisions to the Mass in B Minor

While Emanuel often resorted to his father’s music in fulfilling his responsibility for providing sacred music for the churches of Hamburg, no sources survive that clearly suggest that Emanuel made use of the music from the Mass in B minor for any of his official duties. Nevertheless, when Emanuel performed the Symbolum Nicenum from the Mass in the benefit concert for the “medizinische Armen-Institut” in on April 9, 1786, he made substantive changes to the Credo in preparation for the performance of that portion of the Mass. Sources also suggest an earlier performance that took place in Hamburg, which did not include the instrumental introduction.

In all, six phases of revisions can be differentiated in manuscript copies of the Mass. Documentation of Emanuel’s engagement with his father’s Mass survives in his father’s autograph score [A: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 180], two manuscript copies of the complete Mass prepared in Berlin in the 1760s [D1: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 572/23/14, and D2: D-B Am. B. 3], a set of performing parts prepared at two different stages of revision [E1: D-B Mus. ms. Bach St. 118], and four manuscript scores of the Symbolum Nicenum (BWV 232II) prepared in Hamburg in the 1780s (E2: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 1212; E3: D’Andrea collection; E4: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 22; E7: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 7).49

49 Uwe Wolf identifies five stages of revisions in his article “C. P. E. Bachs Revisionen am Autograph der h-Moll-Messe,” in Er ist der Vater, wir sind die Bub’n: Essays in Honor of Christoph Wolff, edited by Paul Corneilson and Peter Wollny (Ann Arbor, MI: Steglein Publishing, 2010): 1-19. However, Wolf does not incorporate the performing parts into his description of the stages of revision. Rifkin argues that the parts in the hand of H. G. M. Damköhler reflect a distinct stage of revision and also document a performance of the Symbolum Nicenum in the 1770s, a proposition with which I agree. Consequently, I have differentiated the Dämköhler parts as a distinct stage of revision (Stage III). Additionally, as relates to Stage I revisions, Rifkin argues that the earliest revisions to the autograph only appear after Hering prepared his copy, whereas Wolf argues that some of CPEB’s revisions to the autograph pre-date Hering’s copy.
Table 2.1: Stages of Revision by CPEB to the Mass in B Minor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>STAGE</th>
<th>NBA\textsuperscript{REV}</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>Scribe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1733-1749</td>
<td>original</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D-B \textit{Mus.ms. Bach P 180}</td>
<td>J. S. Bach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. 1765</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>D-B \textit{Mus.ms. Bach P 572/23/14}</td>
<td>J. F. Hering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1769</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>D-B \textit{Am. B. 3}</td>
<td>Anon. 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before 1775</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>E1a</td>
<td>D-B \textit{Mus. ms. Bach St. 118}</td>
<td>H. G. M. Damköhler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before 1784</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>E2</td>
<td>D-B \textit{Mus. ms. Bach P 1212}</td>
<td>L. A. C. Hopff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. 1786</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>D’Andrea collection</td>
<td>L. A. C. Hopff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. 1786</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>E1b</td>
<td>D-B \textit{Mus. ms. Bach St. 118}</td>
<td>J. H. Michel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780s</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>E7</td>
<td>D-B \textit{Mus. ms. Bach P 7}</td>
<td>unidentified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1786</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>E1c</td>
<td>D-B \textit{Mus. ms. Bach St. 118}</td>
<td>C. P. E. Bach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after 1786</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>E4</td>
<td>D-B \textit{Mus. ms. Bach P 22}</td>
<td>J. H. Michel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Berlin Sources (Revision Stages I and II)

The earliest layer of revisions to the Mass reflect the need to clarify ambiguous readings in the autograph manuscript score of the Mass (A). In several places, J. S. Bach’s reworking of musical passages to fit the Latin Mass text resulted in passages too difficult to decipher. When preparing the first copy (D1), the copyist Johann Friedrich Hering left measures blank in several places in order to allow Emanuel to enter readings into this new manuscript. C. P. E. subsequently entered his clarified reading from Hering’s copy into the autograph score.

Figure 2.1: Stage I Revisions to the Symbolum Nicenum (Hering’s Copy with Insertion by CPEB)

The second copy of the Mass (D2) was prepared at the behest of Johann Philipp Kirnberger. In July 1769 Bach, at that point residing in Hamburg, sent Kirnberger the autograph manuscript of the Mass, in order that Kirnberger might have a copy of it made.

In a letter to Kirnberger dated 21 July 1769, C. P. E. Bach writes:

I had a few sheets of the Mass be copied, but they were full of mistakes, so I tore them up and I am sending you the original. Please do keep it clean and send it back again after making the copy. The beginning is already somewhat torn, but the rest is in good condition. Please do not put postage on the return, I am paying the postage beforehand. Please show the Mass to our Princess when you have the chance.50

The resulting two-volume manuscript was prepared by a copyist often employed in preparing materials for the library of Kirnberger’s employer, Princess Anna Amalia, the youngest sister of the Prussian king, Friedrich II.\(^{51}\)

The text found in this second copy reflects a state of the autograph after C. P. E. Bach had made further revisions in that manuscript but prior to the most significant changes made in preparation for his performance of the Credo in Hamburg. Thus D2 reflects another important intermediate stage in C. P. E. Bach’s engagement with the Mass. More significantly, D2 is widely believed to have served, directly or indirectly, as the model for the vast majority of manuscripts that would be prepared throughout the remainder of the eighteenth century and into the nineteenth century.\(^{52}\)

**Figure 2.3: Stemma of Revision Stages I and II**

\(^{51}\) Generally known in the Bach literature by the designation Anon. 402 applied by Paul Kast in *Die Bach-Handschriften der Berliner Staatsbibliothek*, Tübinger Bach-Studien, edited by Walter Gerstenberg, Heft ⅓ (Trossingen: Hohner-Verlag, 1958), p. 139; Eva Renate Blechschmidt applied the designation “J. S. Bach II” in *Die Amalien-Bibliothek: Musikbibliothek Der Prinzessin Anna Amalia von Preussen (1723-1787)*. Berliner Studien Zur Musikwissenschaft, Bd. 8. (Berlin: Verlag Merseburger, 1965); more recently Christoph Henzel has identified this copyist as the court hornist Schober, *Graun-Werkverzeichnis: (GraunWV)*. Ortus Studien 1. (Beeskow: Ortus Musikverlag, 2006).

\(^{52}\) Friedrich Smend refers to this branch of the manuscript transmission as the “Typus AmB3,” NBA II/1 KB, 23-37.
The Hamburg Sources: Revision Stages II-VI

The earliest manuscripts of the Mass originating in Hamburg are three performing parts in the hand of Heinrich Georg Michael Damköhler for Violin I, Violin II, and an unfigured Basso continuo (E1a: D-B Mus. ms. Bach St 118).\textsuperscript{53} These three parts copied by Damköhler reflect the state of the autograph score after the revisions of Phase 2 and are, thus, consistent with the text found in source D2. However the parts contain extensive revisions made by C. P. E. Bach, all of which concern performance details. For instance, in the violin part, one finds movement headings, dynamic indications, and added slurs and trills, easily distinguished by the unsteady penmanship of Emanuel’s late handwriting. The appearance of Damköhler’s handwriting in these parts would date them to the 1770s,\textsuperscript{54} as would the inclusion of many of the readings in the parts into the first score of the \textit{Symbolum Nicenum} prepared in Hamburg in the later 1770s or early 1780s. Emanuel’s attention to performance details offers a strong argument for a presentation of the \textit{Symbolum Nicenum} in Hamburg in the 1770s, even in the absence of corroborating evidence, such as a libretto or newspaper notices or accounts.\textsuperscript{55} In addition to the slurs and trills, the scoring of the violins in Movement 16, “Et in Spiritum sanctum,” in place of the oboes (or possibly in addition to the oboes) offers an example of the changes to the music that Emanuel made and were carried over into a new set of primary parts in the


\textsuperscript{54} Jürgen Neubacher dates the parts to 1785/6 in “Der Bach-Kopist Heinrich Georg Michael Damköhler und seine Rolle im Hamburger Musikleben der 1770er und 1780er Jahre Mit neuen Quellen zur Handel-Rezeption in Hamburg,” \textit{Bach-Jahrbuch} 100 (2014): 97-130, cf. Abb. 1, p. 121. However, the appearance of the handwriting in E1a is very close in appearance to the score depicted in Abb. 6 from 1775.

hand of Johann Heinrich Michel [E1b] presumably prepared for the 1786 performance.⁵⁶

That the surviving Damköhler parts are duplicates suggests two equally plausible scenarios: that Emanuel lent the primary parts to someone for performance elsewhere or that Emanuel’s extensive emendations rendered the primary parts unusable.

**Figure 2.4: Stage III Revisions to the Symbolum Nicenum**


As with the parts just described, the earliest score of the Mass copied in Hamburg contains only the *Symbolum Nicenum* [E2: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 1212].\textsuperscript{57} The score, copied by the violist Ludwig August Christoph Hopff, incorporates most of the performance indications that Emanuel entered into the first set of manuscript parts [E1a] and subsequently added to the autograph score [A]. Certain details demonstrate that the autograph score served as the model for this copy, rather than the early parts: for instance, in E2 the “Et in Spiritum Sanctum” retains the obbligato oboes, while both the early parts [E1a] and the later parts in Michel’s hand [E1b] replace the oboes with violins.

Evidence suggests that Emanuel gave E2 as a gift to Charles Burney, reflecting Emanuel’s active cultivation of social connections and providing important information for the dating of both this score and the early parts in Damköhler’s hand.\textsuperscript{58} In his 1789 *A General History of Music* Burney refers to “… a Credo [by Sebastian Bach] for five voices with accompaniments, of which I am in possession of the score, which is one of the most clear, correct, and masterly, I have seen.”\textsuperscript{59} However, already in the 1772 edition of *The Present State of Music in Germany, the Netherlands, and United Provinces*, Burney writes that “… [C. P. E. Bach] presented me with several of his own pieces, and three or four curious ancient books and treatises on music, out of his father’s collection, promising, at any distant time, to furnish me with others, if I would only


acquaint him by letter, with my wants.”

In the 1775 edition he added a footnote observing that “... since that time Mr. Bach has obliged me with several of his own and his father’s most curious compositions.” Thus, Burney must have received the manuscript copied by L. A. C. Hopff [E2] between 1772 and 1789, and probably already by 1775. That Burney’s score [E2] contains readings that postdate the first parts in the hand of Damköhler [E1a] and that the score most likely predates 1785 provides grounds for assuming that the Damköhler parts did not originate in conjunction with the 1786 performance.

In providing scores to Burney, Emanuel may have hoped that the interest in his father’s music would develop and possibly lead to a performance of the Symbolum Nicenum in London. Certainly Burney’s account of the 1784 Handel commemoration in London caught Emanuel’s attention, possibly serving as an impetus to Emanuel to offer comparison between the music of Handel and that of his father in his 1786 benefit performance. But already in the 1770s, Emanuel’s friend and colleague Christoph Daniel Ebeling had been presenting Handel’s oratorios in Hamburg with his own German translations of the text, including a performance of The Messiah in 1777 conducted by Emanuel. Moreover, Ebeling employed H. G. M. Damköhler, the primary copyist for the Hamburg theater, in preparing the bulk of the materials for his Handel concerts in the 1770s and 1780s. The copy that came into Burney’s possession contains annotations that clearly suggest both performance and close examination, most likely in England; that strong interest in Bach emerged in England in the nineteenth century suggests that

---

62 New Bach Reader, p. 400-409; BDok III, No. 927.
Emanuel’s hopes were realized. Nevertheless, the absence of figures in the bass in E2 demonstrates that the score provided to Burney was not entirely performance-ready and confirms that Emanuel’s figures in the *Symbolum Nicenum* were added in the autograph score [A] after E2 had been prepared.

The second score copied in Hamburg [E3: D’Andrea collection], also in the hand of L. A. C. Hopff, incorporates additional dynamic indications, ornaments, and further note changes. Given the inclusion of the variants in this score but not in the autograph, it would appear that this second copy by Hopff served as the model used by J. H. Michel to prepare a new set of performing parts [E1b] shortly after this score was completed. E3 also served as the model for another score copy of the *Symbolum Nicenum* in an unknown hand [E7: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P7], which itself would come to comprise one part of a larger manuscript complex [F3, E7, F4: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 6/7/8] that included early nineteenth-century Berlin copies of the other portions of the Mass. The inclusion of continuo figures in the “Credo” and “Patrem omnipotentem” movements, which do not appear at all in E2 nor as extensively in D1, suggest that Emanuel had already inserted these into the autograph score at the time that Hopff copied E3. These figures may have been inserted into the continuo from the first parts [E1a] by Emanuel as he made revisions to the other parts. These then might have served as the model from Emanuel’s

67 This manuscript complex reflects an important stage of reception of the Mass in early nineteenth-century Berlin, as discussed in Chapter 4; NBA rev 1, p. 292.
insertions into the autograph score [A]. Moreover, the number of insertions of practical
details found in E1a and E3 further reinforce the notion that a performance of the
Symbolum Nicenum took place in Hamburg in the 1770s.⁶⁸

C. P. E. Bach’s engagement with his father’s Mass seems to have culminated with
the performance of the Credo (BWV 232ⅱ) in April of 1786 as part of a benefit concert to
support a medical institute for the poor. The surviving evidence documenting this
performance consists of a concert program and a set of manuscript performing parts [E1]
that comprise the materials most likely used for this performance.⁶⁹ The last of the
manuscript scores prepared in Hamburg [E4: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 22] reflects the state
of the Credo following the final revisions that appear in the performing parts [E1b/c].
Unlike previous phases of revisions, these last changes were not incorporated into the
autograph manuscript. The new manuscript also includes the single instance in which the
score of the “Einleitung” written by C. P. E. Bach to precede the Credo appears in score
form.⁷⁰

⁶⁸ I am grateful to Michael D’Andrea for granting permission to Yo Tomita to share with me the photos of
E3. I remain deeply indebted to Prof. Tomita for his generosity in this and other matters.
⁶⁹ NBA II/1 KB, 39 reproduces the first page of the program; CPEB: CW VIII/3.3, 319-322 reproduces all
four leaves of the program booklet (D-B Mus. T 1925 R): 1r contains the concert program, 1v contains the
text of the Nicene Creed in Latin, 2r contains a German translation of the Nicene Creed, 2v is blank.
**Figure 2.5: Stemma of Revision Stages II-VI**

- **P 180 Revisions (CPEB)**
  - Rev. II = 1770s

- **E1a**: St 118+
  - Rev. III > 1775

- **P 180 Revisions (CPEB)**
  - Rev. IV ≤1775

- **E2**: P 1212
  - 1775-1784

- **P 180 Revisions (CPEB)**
  - Rev. V ≤1786

- **E3**: D’Andrea
  - ca. 1786

- **E7**: P 7
  - 1780s?

- **E4**: P 22
  - 1786

- **P 180 Revisions (CPEB)**
  - Rev. VI = 1786

- **E1b**: St 118
  - 1786

- **E1c**: St 118
  - 1786

**Figure 2.6: Stage II Revisions to the Symbolum Nicenum**

Figure 2.7: Stage IV Revisions to the Symbolum Nicenum


Figure 2.8: Stage V Revisions to the Symbolum Nicenum

Figure 2.9: Stage VI Revisions to the Symbolum Nicenum


Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach’s intervention in the text of the B-minor Mass is not extensive. Indeed, it remains largely pragmatic, primarily ensuring correct phrasing and articulation in the performing parts. The earliest stage of revision focuses on clarifying ambiguous readings in the autograph score. The infrequent and slight revision to the musical content, as in the addition of a more pronounced rhythmic pulse in measures 69 to 71 of the “Patrem omnipotentem,” serves to keep the music fresh and comprehensible to an audience in the 1780s. In fact, Bach enthusiasts in Vienna, supported and encouraged by Gottfried van Swieten at exactly this time, introduced similar and often even more invasive modifications to the music J. S. Bach. Yo Tomita has noted that revisions found in Viennese manuscripts of the second book of the Well-Tempered Clavier smoothed melodic lines, removed poignant harmonies such as suspensions and
diminished seventh chords, and simplified the fugal texture. At this time, adapting music to current aesthetic preferences remained entirely customary.

Ultimately, C. P. E. Bach’s revisions to his father’s Mass only appear exceptional in comparison to the later transmission of the composition. The majority of the manuscript copies of the Mass derived from D2 that came into circulation in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries lack the bulk of Emanuel’s interventions. Likewise, until the third decade of the nineteenth century, a good portion of these later manuscripts served no performance function and, as a result, remained quite free of clarification or practical emendations. By contrast, the Hamburg copies bear the clear traces of the routine practice of borrowing and revising previously composed music, just as in those instances when Emanuel employed previously composed music in fulfillment of his duties in the churches of Hamburg.

While Emanuel’s promotion of his father’s music was animated by his role in maintaining an active concert life in Hamburg, several of his contemporaries, including Johann Friedrich Agricola, Johann Philipp Kirnberger, Charles Burney, or Johann Nikolaus Forkel, turned to the music of J. S. Bach in a spirit of historical classification and abstract analysis. Emanuel’s engagement with historical music was largely limited to the music of the Bach circle, including not only his father’s music, but also that of his godfather and predecessor in Hamburg, Georg Philipp Telemann, and his contemporary and fellow student of Sebastian, Gottfried August Homilius. This approach served in the maintenance of performing tasteful music in the public life of Hamburg. His portrait collection, while approaching an encyclopedic collection of musical figures, served
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conversational ends, just as his performances for visitors served to demonstrate not just his technical or compositional skill but more so his standing as a man of enlightenment and culture. His apparent ambition to establish a tradition of performance that included his father’s music, along the lines of the Handel commemorations then common in England, achieved some success in the long term. But, indeed, this did not occur for a number of years after Emanuel’s lifetime and only with the advent of a new historically conscious aesthetic in Germany in the nineteenth century.

The political and social landscape that had emerged in the last decade of the eighteenth-century engendered attitudes toward music that could hardly have been conceived just fifty years earlier, when Johann Sebastian Bach was attempting to codify his choral style in a composite setting of the Roman Mass Ordinary. J. S. Bach lived his life entirely within the confines of the institutions of the early modern German lands. His music resounds the conventions of guild-governed skilled labor in Lutheran towns, schools, churches, and courts. In his ambition, Bach routinely sought to exceed and thus expand those conventions, but in doing so never undermined those conventions. Thus, his musical materials also remain rooted in pragmatism and subject to state and church. His most abstract compositions serve as demonstration of the practical, technical skills of invention, variation, and elaboration — themselves products of the application in music of the rhetorical arts learned in Latin schools. Sebastian’s more quotidien compositions prepared for functions of church or court give even greater evidence of the pragmatism of the skilled craftsman. In particular, Bach’s sacred music — even for its most sophisticated and refined details — evinces a priority placed on functionality. While the
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Mass in B Minor rests at the apex of the composer’s oeuvre of sacred music, its details bear clear evidence of the bounded world in which it originated — perhaps most especially the fact that as few as one movement was composed explicitly for this setting of the Latin Ordinary. And, though even by 1750 the narrow horizons of early modern German lands had begun to expand noticeably, the functions of music remained rooted in the institutions of the Old Regime.

Johann Sebastian Bach’s students, particularly his sons, lived their lives at the precipice of a very different social reality, but retained many of the habits of tradition. For all the enlightened, bourgeois elements of C. P. E. Bach’s thinking and private activities, his professional life followed the pattern of his father’s career remarkably closely. Emanuel served at the court of Friedrich II of Prussia and then served the churches of the commercial city of Hamburg, much as his father served courts in Weimar and Cöthen before entering into the service of the churches of the commercial city of Leipzig. Likewise, Emanuel made extensive use of pre-existing music, chosen with careful consideration for its musical and affective appropriateness, in the course of fulfilling his civic duties. Music in his lifetime continued to serve the ends of the state and church. With his death in late 1788, Emanuel would not witness the fall of absolutism signaled by the storming of the Bastille in the summer of following year.

While the appreciation and veneration of a systemized, abstract knowledge of the past took root in this age of encyclopedists, the professional pragmatism of the Bach family continued to impart a practical significance to music. The individualism that informed the conception of both the composer as an artist and the composition as an autonomous work
of art is a product of the political, economic, and subsequently aesthetic revolutions that had not yet existed in the world of J. S. Bach or C. P. E. Bach.

Highly esteemed compositional models existed, as Emanuel’s promotion of the Mass in B Minor clearly confirms. Adherence to established conventions began with the training Emanuel, his brothers, and his peers pursued under Sebastian’s tutelage, just as Sebastian studied and imitated the compositions of master musicians during his formative years. Emanuel’s use of his father’s Magnificat and Passion settings as models for his own settings of those texts largely conforms to norms among musicians of his time. Yet, in seeking to better establish an awareness of his father’s music among a broader audience, extending beyond the realm of professional musicians into the world of the cultivated amateur, Emanuel not only affirmed his own standing as an arbiter of taste but also offered an example of how historical music could be appreciated outside of its practical function. The early nineteenth-century concert culture that grew beyond the confines of the aristocratic salon would result in an aesthetic of historical music to which concert life in the twenty-first century owes its origin and in which contemporary attitudes toward musical texts find their logic. The incipient veneration of historical music hinted at in the portrait collections of E. L. Gerber and C. P. E. Bach would come to fuller fruition as later collectors turned to systematically accumulating the musical scores of past masters.
Chapter 3: Copying

Musicians in Berlin prepared as many as nine manuscript copies of the Mass in B Minor before the end of the eighteenth century. Two more copies were produced in Vienna at turn of the nineteenth-century. Eventually these manuscripts would fill the shelves of music enthusiasts, aiding in the collectors’ self-representation as cultured connoisseurs of music and reinforcing their position in the upper echelons of society. It is apparent that these manuscripts were not prepared with performance in mind, even though traces in the score that belonged to Gottfried van Swieten suggest private performance in Vienna.\(^1\) Indeed, with the exception of Emanuel’s presentation of the _Symbolum Nicenum_ in Hamburg, no public performances of any portion of the Mass took place until Carl Friedrich Zelter’s partially-open rehearsals with the Berliner Sing-Akademie of movements from the Mass which began in October of 1811 and continued incrementally for several years.\(^2\) Nevertheless, the manuscripts offer valuable glimpses into a transitional period that began with the centralization of musical knowledge among professionals and developed into the world of the emerging _Bildungsbürgertum_ where specialized knowledge became a social tool among amateurs.

While a good amount of information exists about the collectors, the lives and identities of the individuals who prepared the manuscripts remain almost entirely unknown.\(^3\) As a conclusion to the first half of this study, which has focused on the engagement among professional musicians with the Mass in B Minor, this chapter will consider the objects produced by those musicians who made their living as copyists or
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3. Chapter four considers collectors and collecting.
supplemented their incomes with copying work. This chapter also outlines how the production of copies of the Mass in B Minor reflects a newly emerging social structure of musical life in the latter half of the eighteenth century. The subsequent chapters of this study will focus on amateur musicians and their interest in the Mass at a time when amateur music-making and the music of Bach became popularized, at least within a certain segment of the population.

In the eighteenth century acquiring musical scores typically required preparing or commissioning a manuscript copy, as most German music during this period did not appear in print. For practicing musicians that usually meant copying manuscripts by hand, either for one’s self or for the master to whom he was apprenticed. For bourgeois amateurs with the means to collect and play music for leisure, acquiring music scores often involved commissioning a professional copyist to produce music to order. Throughout the century, Bach’s keyboard music held interest for accomplished amateurs and professionals alike, with both groups of individuals using the music for practical ends — be they for employment or amusement. During the same period, scores of sacred music served almost exclusively the needs of professional musicians.

However, just at the time when music’s role in the Lutheran church began to diminish, the interest in sacred music among amateurs grew markedly. Several of the first copies of the Mass in B Minor were prepared on commission for amateurs, such as Princess Anna Amalia of Prussia, Baron Friedrich van Swieten, and Count Otto von Voß, and even among musicians copies of the Mass served new purposes, as seen with Johann
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Philipp Kirnberger and Johann Nikolaus Forkel. While the production of manuscript
copies reflects mechanisms developed over the preceding century for facilitating
performance and simultaneously training apprentices, the collecting of music scores by
amateurs suggests an emulation of some professional musicians now actively codifying
musical learning.

The performing materials for the *Symbolum Nicenum* prepared in Hamburg under
Emanuel’s direction offer some demonstration of the kinds of copying done in service of
performance. Unlike his father, who relied on students, Emanuel relied on professional
copyists, namely Heinrich Georg Michael Damköhler, Ludwig August Christoph Hopff,
and Johann Heinrich Michel, to prepare the performing materials for the *Symbolum
Nicenum*. This shift not only differs from his father’s practice of utilizing apprenticed
students as copyists but in fact reflects the decline of the musical apprenticeship,
especially in a north German commercial center. Whereas apprentices functioned within
a broader “putting-out” system of the early modern era, wage labor reflected economic
practices that emerged within a market economy decreasingly beholden to the authority
of princes and guilds.  

Copying for the sake of developing a music collection for study by professional
musicians represents another motive for the creation of manuscripts and certainly existed
at the time of the rise of an amateur market for notated music. The knowledge of strict
contrapuntal forms and techniques reflected in the music of Johann Sebastian Bach
suggests a strong inclination toward his own abstract contemplation of his art. However,
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University Press, 1989), 24-40, and 105-24; and James M. Brophy, “The End of the Economic Old Order:
The Great Transition, 1750-1850,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Modern German History*, ed. by Helmut
the extent to which Bach collected or studied music and music treatises can only be partially reconstructed.⁷ At the same time, contemporaries of Bach certainly collected music for study and emulation.⁸ This became even more pronounced among Bach’s own students and admirers, especially those concentrated in Berlin from the 1750s onward, who collected and wrote extensively about historical compositional and performance techniques. Among those were numerous former students of Johann Sebastian Bach, including C. P. E. Bach, Christoph Nichelmann, Johann Friedrich Agricola, Johann Philipp Kirnberger, and the Bach enthusiast Friedrich Wilhelm Marpurg, all of whom published treatises on music.

Among Bach’s students and collectors of his music, J. F. Agricola remains an enigmatic figure. As the co-author with C. P. E. Bach of the obituary of Johann Sebastian Bach published in Johann Mizler’s *Musicalische Bibliothek* in 1754, Johann Friedrich Agricola stands among the earliest advocates of the elder Bach’s music. Yet, his own writings and compositions do not reflect an inordinate musical debt to his former teacher. This, perhaps, stems from the professional need to maintain allegiance to the aesthetic dictates of Friedrich II, in whose court Agricola served. However, the survival of manuscripts associated with Johann Friedrich Agricola that document early versions of J. S. Bach compositions suggests a unique relationship to the musical legacy of his teacher. The manuscript of the early version of the *St. Matthew Passion* (BWV 244b) represents the most extensive and significant example of a manuscript owned by Agricola

containing an early version of a Bach composition. Another of these manuscripts preserves in Agricola’s hand an early version of the “Credo in unum Deum” (BWV 232II/10) of the Mass in B minor [C: D-GO! Mus. 2° 54c/3]. In contrast to the A Major version in the autograph score [A: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 180], this four page manuscript presents an identical setting in G Major. Johann Friedrich Agricola’s influential role in the dissemination of this music further reinforces the notion that he served as a leading proponent of strict contrapuntal repertoire. An interest in and promotion of music highly admired by J. S. Bach may explain Agricola’s role in the writing of his teacher’s obituary for and obvious connection to the interests of Lorenz Mizler’s Correspondierende Societät der musicalischen Wissenschaften.

Agricola, in addition to his role at the court, hosted on Sunday evenings a musical salon “Das Concert,” which reportedly included both instrumental and vocal music. However, details about much of the private music-making that took place in mid-eighteenth-century Berlin remains obscure except in the glimpses offered by surviving manuscripts. Certainly, the large number of surviving manuscripts of contemporary chamber and orchestral music demonstrate an interest and demand for the most recent compositions by the many composers in and around Berlin. Still, some of these manuscripts, including the archaizing fugal writing by Bach found in Agricola’s copy of the G Major Credo, reflect a very strong interest in historic music among a number of
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9 D-B Am. B. 6-7; NBA II/5a is a facsimile of the manuscript; NBA II/5b KB provides a description of the source based on recent research.
10 NBArev 1, p. 290.
12 The otherwise lightly documented role of C. P. E. Bach in the salon culture of Berlin finds strong evidence in the large number of manuscripts if his music that circulated and have come to rest in collections in many countries, cf. Boomhower, “C. P. E. Bach Sources at the Library of Congress,” Notes 70, no. 4 (2014): 597-660.
musicians in Berlin at the time. Recent research on Berlin sources of the organ music of Johann Jacob Froberger, Johann Krieger, Girolamo Frescobaldi, and Dietrich Buxtehude, all of whom are mentioned in Bach’s obituary, places Agricola squarely in the middle of a group of individuals promoting historic music that J. S. Bach had himself highly esteemed.\textsuperscript{13} Indeed, despite composing in very current idioms, C. P. E. Bach and Agricola produced performance treatises that prove largely backward looking, concerning themselves primarily with preserving a style increasingly less well known. This suggests that the younger Bach and Agricola may have played at least as influential a role in the promotion of historic music and the music of J. S. Bach as the archly conservative treatise writers Johann Philipp Kirnberger and Friedrich Wilhelm Marpurg.

Yet, in the first years of his reign, Friedrich II of Prussia’s \textit{galant} musical tastes dominated a flourishing salon culture in Berlin that subsumed within it numerous private concert societies employing professional musicians and often drawing on the members of the king’s \textit{capella}. Indeed, a primary concern in the private salons was to demonstrate a closeness to the court, not only in demonstrating an ability to afford such entertainments, but also in promoting the musical style associated with the court through the performance of the compositions of the King’s favorites, specifically Carl Heinrich Graun, Johann Gottlieb Graun, Johann Joachim Quantz, and the Dresden Kapellmeister Johann Adolf Hasse. Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach’s music must also have been performed in these settings, as many surviving copyist manuscripts of his music were produced by those same individuals preparing manuscripts of the music of the Graun brothers and other

Berlin musicians for this private market. However, the tastes of the king stagnated with a continuing preference for C. H. Graun’s music who died in 1759. By contrast, the growing interest in J. S. Bach in the latter eighteenth century demonstrates a shift among the educated elite toward distinguishing themselves from court dictates.

**First Copies of BWV 232**

Two important early copies produced in Berlin in the 1760s provide valuable information about the Mass and J. S. Bach’s autograph score prior to the revisions C. P. E. Bach made mostly in preparation for a performance of the *Symbolum Nicenum* in 1786. A musician by the name of Johann Friedrich Hering prepared the first of these [D1: D-B *Mus. ms. Bach P 572/23/14*] in about 1765, and a musician at the Prussian royal court by the name of Schober prepared the second [D2: D-B *Am. B. 3*] in 1769 for Johann Philipp Kirnberger. Musicologists have only recently identified these copyists by name.  

Previously, Bach scholars relied on the identifiers Anonymous 300 for J. F. Hering and Anonymous 402 for Schober supplied by Paul Kast to distinguish these two prolific copyists. The other copies of the Mass prepared in Berlin during this period exhibit the work of otherwise anonymous individuals, with the exception of portions of one score in the hand of Hering [F9: D-B *Mus. ms. Bach P 1172*]. However, inferences from the music that survives in their hands offers extensive opportunity to understand the work of these individuals and their position in musical life in eighteenth-century Berlin.

Prior to the preparation of Hering’s copy in about 1765 (or quite possibly in order to facilitate the preparation of a copy), C. P. E. Bach had already begun to make changes...
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to his father’s autograph manuscript of the Mass. Regardless, D1 preserves a reading of
the Mass that pre-dates most of the insertions that C. P. E. Bach would make in his
father’s score. More significantly, C. P. E. Bach reviewed Hering’s copy and entered
clarifications and corrections both in the copy and in the autograph score. In several
places the corrections and revisions that J. S. Bach had made in his autograph manuscript
in the course of composition were so difficult to decipher that Hering left the
corresponding measures in his copy blank. C. P. E. Bach then entered readings into
Hering’s manuscript and subsequently added these clarifications into the autograph
manuscript.\textsuperscript{16} No clear evidence exists to answer the question of why or for whom Hering
prepared this manuscript.

The second copy of the Mass [D2 = D-B \textit{Am. B. 3}] was prepared at the behest of
Johann Philipp Kirnberger. In July 1769 Bach, at that point residing in Hamburg, sent
Kirnberger the autograph manuscript of the Mass, in order that Kirnberger might have a
copy of it made.\textsuperscript{17} The resulting two-volume manuscript was prepared by a copyist
known to have produced copies of a variety of music and often employed in preparing
materials for the library of Kirnberger’s employer and long referred to in Bach

\begin{footnotes}
\item[16] See figures 2.1 and 2.2 above.
\item[17] \textit{Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach: Briefe und Dokumente, Kritische Gesamtausgabe}, edited by Ernst Suchalla,
#75 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994), vol. 1, 177-8; \textit{BDok} III, no. 754, 203.
\end{footnotes}
Figure 3.1: Manuscripts of the Mass in B Minor reflecting Berlin origins
scholarship as “Anon. 402.” Recently, Christoph Henzel identified Anon. 402 as a horn player by the name of Schober at the court of Frederick the Great from June of 1757 until 1769, who then appears to have moved into the service of the crown prince (after 1786, King Friedrich Wilhelm II) until 1796. The extent of the materials dating from the reign of Friedrich Wilhelm II in the hand of Schober in the Prussian Royal Library, now held in the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin Preußischer Kulturbesitz, documents Schober’s role as the primary copyist for the court. The similarly large number of items copied by Schober for the library of Princess Anna Amalia of Prussia exhibits his extensive service to the Prussian royal family for the majority of the second half of the eighteenth century.

As described in chapter two, the text found in the manuscript copy of the Mass in B Minor prepared by Schober [D2] reflects a state of the autograph after C. P. E. Bach had made revisions in that manuscript but prior to the most significant changes made in preparation for his performance of the Credo in 1786. Thus D2 reflects an important intermediate stage in C. P. E. Bach’s engagement with the Mass. Following Friedrich Smend’s extensive study of manuscript copies, D2 has been viewed as the model, directly or indirectly, for the vast majority of manuscripts that would be prepared throughout the remainder of the eighteenth century and into the nineteenth century. While Smend did not examine every manuscript of the Mass that originated in Berlin in the late eighteenth century.
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century, through his work with D1, D2, F2, F9, and F5 he correctly noted that D2 contained the readings most widely distributed in the much larger number of surviving copies of the Mass prepared well into the nineteenth century. Though D2 would eventually become incorporated into Princess Anna Amalia’s library, the presence of Kirnberger’s signature on the bottom right corner of the manuscript’s title page clearly links this particular manuscript to Emanuel’s sending of the autograph to Kirnberger in July 1769. However, examination of additional sources suggests that D2 was less central to the later transmission of the Mass than was proposed by Smend, as outlined in Figure 3.1.

**Second Generation Copies**

In the 1770s Kirnberger had a second copy of the Mass prepared for the collection of Anna Amalia [F2: D-B Am. B. 1-2]. This later, two-volume copy would immediately join the princess’s growing collection of Bach manuscripts, and would take the pre-eminent place among this collection with the shelfmark Am. B. 1 and 2. The copyist generally referred to as Anon. 403 prepared this manuscript for Anna Amalia and is also responsible for perhaps the largest portion of the manuscripts in Anna Amalia’s library, which came to include a diverse selection of music by Agricola, Caldara, Durante, Fux, Gasparini, Handel, Palestrina, Schütz and Bach.

At about the same time as the preparation of F2, Anon. 403 also prepared a copy of the Mass [F1: A-Ee N 1518a, KIR 1449] now held in Eisenstadt, Austria, that would seem to have been presented to Gottfried van Swieten, the music-loving Habsburg ambassador to Prussia and host in Vienna of a musical salon. His musical gatherings in
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22 NBA II/1 KB, 23-29.
23 Paul Kast, *Die Bach-Handschriften Der Berliner Staatsbibliothek.*
Vienna would welcome Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven, and Swieten’s copy of the Mass would, in fact, eventually come into the possession of Haydn. Whether Swieten received the Mass manuscript from Kirnberger or Anna Amalia remains unclear, but during his time in Berlin Swieten collected a number of manuscripts of Johann Sebastian Bach’s music. With this collection, Swieten actively promoted Bach’s music and instigated the creation of a sizeable body of additional manuscripts copied from his collection, including several copies of the B-minor Mass discussed below. In Swieten’s copy of the Mass are some indications that he may have hosted a performance of this composition, if perhaps with only keyboard accompaniment.

Kirnberger’s own copy and these two further manuscripts prepared by Anon. 403 exhibit the importance of J. S. Bach in the musical world promoted at Anna Amalia’s court. Yet, the notion Smend develops of Kirnberger’s copy as the primogenitor for nearly all subsequent copies requires some qualification, which will also further illuminate the slightly broader cultivation of Bach’s legacy in Berlin in the later eighteenth century. While it is true that D2 served, directly or indirectly, as the model for as many as twenty surviving manuscripts from the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, musical details in some of these copies complicate the primacy of D2. Specifically, D2 lacks figures in the bass line in the Credo that appear quite clearly in the autograph score [A]. Moreover, while Emanuel added many further figures to the Credo in preparation for his performances in Hamburg in the 1770s and 1786, the presence of figures in measures 6-13 in D1 would affirm that they existed in the autograph.

manuscript prior to Emanuel’s insertion of the additional figures in the 1770s or 1780s.\(^{26}\) Thus, while D2 served as the model for the music of many additional manuscripts, there are some with the bass figures in the Credo from the autograph score [A] and later copies with these figures must have relied on an additional model for that detail.

One such source is F9 [D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 1172]. In the 1780s Johann Friedrich Hering oversaw the preparation of this copy of the B-minor Mass, copying about a third of the music himself and employing the help of two other unidentified copyists to complete the remainder. And, it appears that Hering did not use the early version that he himself had copied [D1] as the model for this later manuscript; rather Kirnberger’s copy [D2] seems to have served as the model for Hering’s second copy. Hering may have opted to use the D2 version as his model because he knew that further clarifications had been added to the autograph score by C. P. E. Bach before Kirnberger had a new copy prepared. Thus Hering would have sought out Kirnberger’s copy because of these additional clarifications. In order to include the bass figures in the Credo, however, Hering must have referred back to his earlier copy [D1] to confirm the readings in this short passage. And, in fact, while an unidentified copyist prepared the score of the Credo, the figures in D2 appear to be in the hand of Hering.

That Johann Friedrich Hering revised details in passages of F9 prepared by the other copyists proves consistent with evidence found in numerous other manuscripts. A large body of trio sonatas in Hering’s hand survive, and a substantial number of additional manuscripts prepared by other copyists contain bass figures and revisions in Hering’s hand.\(^{27}\) This practice lends credence to the notion that Hering made his living as

\(^{26}\) Both NBArev 1, pp. 132-133, and Rifkin 2006, pp. 121-122, include these figures as autograph.

\(^{27}\) See Peter Wollny, “Ein 'musikalischer Veteran Belins',” 80-113, esp. 101-113.
a publisher of manuscripts, making available music in limited demand that would not prove profitable as printed editions. Johann Gottlob Immanuel Breitkopf, who published both printed editions and maintained an extensive catalog of music available for purchase in manuscript copies, offers the best demonstration of the existence of the parallel commercial distribution of printed and manuscript music.\textsuperscript{28} However, whereas Breitkopf made available a geographically more diverse selection of music, the manuscripts linked to Hering reflect a nearly exclusive focus on music of Berlin composers, particularly J. G. Graun, C. H. Graun, and C. P. E. Bach. Hering also served as the sales agent in Berlin for the music C. P. E. Bach published after Emanuel moved to Hamburg and Hering appears to have developed at least a professional relationship with Wilhelm Friedemann Bach after 1774, when Friedemann moved to Berlin. With access to the music collections of the two eldest Bach sons, Hering’s operation may have served into the 1790s as the primary source in Berlin of music by and associated with J. S. Bach.

At the same time, the significant body of manuscripts of music by J. S. Bach amassed by J. P. Kirnberger and by his patron Princess Anna Amalia suggests that they also had access to the autograph scores owned by C. P. E. Bach. Emanuel certainly proved willing to make this material available to Kirnberger, as he demonstrated by sending the autograph of the Mass in B Minor to allow Kirnberger to have a copy made. Whether this was purely a friendly gesture between colleagues or was somehow transactional can not be confirmed from surviving sources, just as the nature of the relationship between Emanuel and J. F. Hering remains difficult to substantiate given the lack of documentary evidence. However, Emanuel carefully managed the market for his

\textsuperscript{28} See Barry Brook, \textit{The Breitkopf Thematic Catalogue; the Six Parts and Sixteen Supplements, 1762-1787} (New York: Dover Publications, 1966); George B. Stauffer, ed., \textit{J.S. Bach, the Breitkopfs, and Eighteenth-century Music Trade}, Bach Perspectives 2 (Lincoln: The University of Nebraska Press, 1996).
own music, printing only those items for which a wide market existed and selling manuscript copies of music for which he could not justify the cost of engraving, printing, and warehousing.

Indeed, Emanuel operated as a publisher for much of his music. The presence of his corrections in the work of copyists has led to the notion of a “compositional workshop,” similar to what existed in his father’s household. But, rather than employing apprentices in preparing copies of his music, Emanuel relied on professional copyists in Berlin and Hamburg. However, in Berlin Emanuel may have worked through Hering for the production of manuscript copies of his own compositions and other music in his personal collection. Given the significant number of manuscripts in which Hering only played a limited role in their creation, often correcting and entering the most sophisticated details, it appears that Hering hired the services of various copyists in Berlin to fulfill orders. This possibility does not upend the notion that Bach would review the copies prepared from his autograph manuscripts. Indeed, the close collaboration in establishing a correct text is seen in Hering’s first copy of the Mass in B Minor [D1], where he left problematic passages blank for Emanuel’s clarifications. Hering could then oversee the production of subsequent copies, which would explain the prevalence of authoritative readings of Emanuel’s music in copies produced through the agency of Hering and the presence of accurate corrections made by Hering in manuscripts prepared by third parties.

In addition to Hering providing manuscript publishing services for Emanuel,

---

sources suggest that Kirnberger may have commissioned Hering for copies of music to add to his own collection. At the very least, manuscripts produced by copyists generally associated with the production of manuscripts for Kirnberger and Anna Amalia, in particular Schober and Anon. 403, show evidence of close collaboration with Hering. For instance, in the large body of surviving trio sonata manuscripts from eighteenth-century Berlin, examples include copies in the hand of Anon. 403 with figures supplied by Hering.\(^{31}\) Additionally, numerous manuscripts document Hering’s employment of Friedrich August Klügling, a student of Kirnberger’s.\(^ {32}\) The manuscripts of the Mass in B Minor produced by Schober [D2] and Anon. 403 [F1 and F2] also suggest a role played by Hering in their production. While Hering’s hand is not present in those copies, that Hering produced a copy of the Mass [F9 = P 1172] that follows the reading of D2 poses a question that previous scholarship has not adequately addressed. If F9 was not produced prior to Kirnberger’s death in 1783, it is unlikely that Hering would have had access to D2 after it became a part of Princess Anna Amalia’s music collection along with the rest of Kirnberger’s musical estate. However, Kirnberger may have commissioned Hering to produce a copy for him and that Hering contracted the distinctively skilled Schober, who produced D2. It would appear that Hering simultaneously had an additional copy prepared for his own purposes.

A copy of the Mass [F23/24: private collections] that has remained unavailable to scholars would seem to suggest the plausibility of this scenario, based on the handwriting of another anonymous copyist associated with Hering that can be seen in the reproduction

of a single page of this manuscript in a recent auction catalog.\textsuperscript{33} Surviving manuscripts prepared by this copyist, referred to by Christoph Henzel as “Berlin 32,” date from the 1750s and 1760s, more than one of which belongs to the complex of trio sonatas prepared under Hering’s direction.\textsuperscript{34} It is quite likely that F23/34 represents the copy prepared for Hering’s use at the same time that D2 was being prepared. The wide dissemination of readings consistent with D2 even though that manuscript was unlikely to be available for use as a model would more likely stem from the fact that Hering possessed a comparable copy for his use. If Kirnberger had commissioned Hering to produce D2, rather than having commissioned Schober directly, then the presence of readings found in D2 in other manuscripts prepared under Hering’s direction makes more sense.

It is hard to determine whether Kirnberger would have also commissioned Hering to produce the additional copies of the Mass in the hand of Anon. 403 that came into the possession of Anna Amalia and Gottfried van Swieten, but it is certainly plausible given the collaboration of this copyist with Hering on other manuscripts. Moreover, the close stemmatic alignment of manuscripts of similarly arcane repertoire that survive in the hand of Schober, Anon. 403, and Hering would further reinforce this possibility. For instance, collections of seventeenth-century organ music linking back to J. S. Bach survive in copies by both Hering and Schober, using as their common model a copy prepared by Agricola.\textsuperscript{35} These manuscripts may even suggest that Hering had privileged access to music in Agricola’s possession. Similarly, the copies of the \textit{Well-Tempered Clavier} books one and two [BWV 846-870, BWV 871-893] associated with Kirnberger
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share readings with copies in the Voß-Buch collection, which very likely were commissioned from Hering, raising the possibility that Hering may have possessed or had access to the missing model for these manuscripts.\(^{36}\) Indeed, the sale catalog of the musical estate of Eduard Grell, who owned many copies prepared by Hering, lists manuscripts of both books of the *Well-Tempered Clavier*, which might represent those missing models.\(^{37}\) While Erich Prieger is known to have acquired the second book from Grell’s collection, the provenance of the manuscript of the first book can not be traced to any owner after Grell.\(^{38}\) In addition, the current location of neither of these manuscripts is known. Hering certainly did not hold absolute control of the market for music manuscripts in Berlin. But, his close connection to Bach’s students in Berlin, including C. P. E. Bach, Agricola, and Kirnberger, and the large number of manuscripts of music associated with these individuals produced by or with Hering suggests that he was central in the dissemination of historical repertoire in Berlin.

Unlike C. P. E. Bach’s handling of the autograph, all of the Berlin copies remain largely untouched — they are fair copies. There was an obvious effort in the first two copies [D1 and D2] on the part of Hering and Schober to prepare accurate readings of the musical text as clarified by C. P. E. Bach’s emendations of the autograph, but not to re-compose as Emanuel would do in preparation for his performance of the Credo. Once the musical text had been thus clarified in those early copies, particularly in D2, additional copies could easily be produced, as the copies for the collections of Anna Amalia [F2],

\(^{36}\) See NBA V/6.1 KB, 86-89, and NBA V/6.2 KB, 66-69 and 162-163; Faulstich, nos. 639 and 648, pp. 194-195.

\(^{37}\) *Aeltere Instrumental- u. Vokal-Musik, zum grössten Theile aus der Sammlung des Professor Eduard Grell (†1886.)* Catalog 56 (Berlin: Leo Liepmannssohn Antiquariat, 1887), 2, nos. 16 and 17.

Swieten [F1], and Hering [F23/34] demonstrate already at this fairly early stage.

The next phase of Bach reception in Berlin saw further standardization among sources of Mass in B Minor. In the 1790s, Otto Carl Friedrich von Voß commissioned a copy of the Mass [F5: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 9-10]. Given that the title pages for its two volumes read “Atto 1mo” and “Atto 2do,” preceding the Missa and Symbolum Nicenum and remaining movements respectively, it has been assumed that the copyist worked primarily for the opera.\(^\text{39}\) As a clean copy of the Mass, it may have served to supplant the first copy prepared by J. F. Hering [D1], which at some point had come into Voß’s possession. A devoted amateur, Voß studied composition with Hering in the 1770s and would acquire a substantial number of Bach manuscripts from Hering’s estate around 1810.\(^\text{40}\) At what point D1 came into Voß’s possession remains uncertain. The three separate volumes that comprise D1 appear to be listed in a manuscript catalog of the collection from approximately 1805 with the numbers “512” for the Missa (corresponding to D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 572), “513” for the Sanctus (corresponding to D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 14), and “518” for the Symbolum Nicenum (corresponding to D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 23).\(^\text{41}\) However, only the Symbolum Nicenum volume reflects this numbering on its title page, where “518” replaces the cancelled numbering “no. 145.”\(^\text{42}\) That F5 served to replace D1 in Voß’s collection is suggested by the fact that the three volumes of D1 [P 572, P23, and P14] did not all remain in Voß’s collection in 1851 when it was given to the Royal Prussian Library. Rather, P 23 (containing the Symbolum

\(^{39}\) NBA II/1 KB, 33.


\(^{41}\) Faulstich, 60-89; D-B Mus. ms. theor. K 21, Kap. VIII, see reproduction in Faulstich, 80.

\(^{42}\) Regarding this numbering, see Smend NBA II/1 KB, 16-17.
Nicenum) and P 14 (containing the Sanctus and remaining movements) were retained, possibly resulting from the misperception that they contained separate works. By contrast, P 572 (containing the Missa) may have more clearly replicated F5 upon superficial examination. With its removal from the Voß collection, the first volume of D1 would only become integrated into the Royal Prussian Library in 1887 following the acquisition of materials from the estate of Eduard Grell, the director of the Berlin Sing-Akademie from 1853 to 1876.43

The copies of the Mass that would come to form a portion of Georg Poelchau’s library exhibit a similarly inveterate collector seeking to perfect his collection. Poelchau, a singer, music teacher, and concert organizer in Hamburg prior to moving to Berlin 1813, was able to acquire a substantial number of manuscripts from the estate of C. P. E. Bach’s daughter and from Emanuel’s successor, C. F. G. Schwenke. Among these, Poelchau obtained two copies of the Symbolum Nicenum, one in an unidentified hand that reflects an intermediate stage in Emanuel’s revisions of the Symbolum Nicenum [E7: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 7] and one prepared by J. H. Michel that reflects the final stage of Emanuel’s revisions of this section of his father’s Mass [E4: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 22]. After moving to Berlin, Poelchau focused his energies on tending to his music collection and that of the Berliner Sing-Akademie. Having Michel’s fair copy of the now somewhat autonomous arrangement of the Symbolum Nicenum [E4], it appears that Poelchau commissioned a copy of the Missa and the Sanctus and remaining movements [F3 and F4 = D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 6 and P 8] to complement his other copy of the middle section of the Mass [E7]. F3 and F4 date from 1816, with F9 [P 1172] serving as the model from which an unidentified copyist worked. Just as it is not possible to determine whether

43 Peter Wollny, “Ein ‘musikalischer Veteran Berlins’,” 97.
Hering retained this copy in his working library, in whose possession it was in 1816 remains unknown. Perhaps dissatisfied with this cobbled-together copy of the complete Mass, Poelchau came into possession of a copy prepared in Vienna on commission from the music publisher Johann Traeg in the late eighteenth-century [F6 and F7: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 11-12], for which Swieten’s copy [F1] served as the model. Interestingly, Poelchau’s copies of Mass materials that he acquired after he left Hamburg are all copies of copies.

Two or more further copies appear to have been prepared in the early nineteenth century in Berlin, though little is known about these. One [F11: D-Bhm H 960/1-2] now belongs to the Universität der Künste in Berlin, the successor institution of the Königliches Institut für Kirchenmusik, to which the item has belonged since the nineteenth century. The organist August Wilhelm Bach, who was unrelated to the family of J. S. Bach, long taught at the institution and performed portions of the Mass at the Marienkirche in Berlin in 1827, 1833, and 1834. Consequently, this manuscript could have belonged to him. Annotations on the title pages of each volume that indicate movements that could be excluded in concert suggest their use in performance. The two volumes of the manuscript bear the headings “Atto I.\textsuperscript{mo}” and “Atto 2.\textsuperscript{do}”, which suggests that the manuscript in the Voß collection [F5], which bears the same headings, served as

---

44 F9 would eventually come into the possession of the Berlin composer and scholar Franz Commer (1813-1887), prior to being acquired by the Prussian Royal Library from the sale Commer’s estate: Leo Liepmannssohn Antiquariat, Katalog 65 enthaltend die musikalische und hymnologische Bibliothek des Professor Franz Commer (+1887). (Berlin: Liepmannssohn, 1888), no. 38, p. 3.
Another late eighteenth-century Berlin copy [F22] is held in an unidentified private collection. Its most recent known owner, Heinrich Sievers of Hannover, allowed Friedrich Smend to consult the manuscript in the 1940s or 1950s as the latter prepared his edition of the Mass. Owned in the first half of the nineteenth century by Friedrich Griepenkerl, who studied with Johann Nikolaus Forkel in Göttingen, this copy may likely be the manuscript described in the sales catalog of Forkel’s estate. Smend proposed that F22 derived from a copy prepared with D2 as its model. He also suggests a connection to the Berlin Sing-Akademie.

Indeed, the Sing-Akademie and its Director Carl Friedrich Zelter would expose a growing portion of the Bildungsbürgertum to the music of Bach. Making use of their disposable income and time for leisure activities, a notable portion of this new segment of the German social structure took to cultivated recreational activities, such as choral singing, to expand and exhibit their cultural attainment. While similar pursuits can be observed in the eighteenth century salons, the number of individuals able to participate in such activities at this time remained small and limited to the aristocracy and the most wealthy non-aristocratic families, such as that of the banker Benjamin Itzig. The choral associations of the nineteenth century, by contrast, could attract the economic elite as well as a growing number of educated professionals and bureaucrats. It was in these amateur associations that professional musicians began to find employment as directors or as teachers in newly forming conservatories and these musicians created a continuing demand for music manuscripts. Thus, we find nineteenth-century manuscripts copies of
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48 Verzeichniss der von dem verstorbenen Doctor und Musikdirector Forkel in Göttingen nachgelassenen Bücher und Musikalien... (Göttingen: Gedruckt Bey F. E. Huth, 1819).
49 NBA II/1 KB, 31-2.
the Mass in B Minor prepared for musicians in Berlin [X12 and F17], Dresden [F13], Breslau [F20], Frankfurt [F14 and F15], Halle [F16], Leipzig [X5], Vienna [F10 and X8], St. Petersburg [F21], and Paris [F18].

Vienna

Before the end of the eighteenth century interest in the Mass already extended beyond Berlin and Hamburg. As described above, Gottfried van Swieten’s copy of the Mass served as both inspiration for the composers in his circle, including Mozart, Haydn, and Beethoven, but also as the model for further transmission of manuscript copies of the Mass in Habsburg lands. Two Viennese copies of the Mass [F6/7: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 11/12 and F8: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 182] date from the early nineteenth century. Both are also closely linked with the publisher Johann Traeg, who advertised the availability of Bach’s Mass in the 1804 supplement to his 1799 catalog of music. Not only the presence of closely related watermarks (both depicting three crescent moons), but also the well established identities of the copyists offers strong evidence for the dating and origin of the manuscripts.

Johann Traeg established himself in Vienna in the 1780s as a copyist, having moved to the seat of the Habsburgs in the late 1770s from Gochsheim in northern Bavaria. In 1782 he had his first advertisement for music manuscripts on sale published in the Wiener Zeitung. By May of 1789 he had opened a music shop and he printed his first edition in 1794. He also sold music published by foreign publishers, serving in 1798 as an agent for Breitkopf & Härtel. However, his main business remained manuscript copying, for which he relied on a number of copyists. In 1799 he published an expansive

---

50 Discussed in chapter five below.
51 Verzeichniss alter und neuer sowohl geschriebener als gestochener Musikalien, welche bei Johann Traeg erschienen sind (Vienna: Traeg, 1804), 58, no. 151.
catalog of available music, which he expanded in a revision published in 1804.\(^{52}\) While music of his contemporaries, including Cherubini, Michael Haydn, Pleyel, Reicha, Steibelt, and Vanhal, comprised the bulk of the music available from Traeg, his catalog included a remarkable number of historical composers, such as Corelli, Frescobaldi, Froberger, Fux, Handel, and Lully. At the time of the 1804 catalog, Traeg provided commercial access to an unprecedented quantity of music by J. S. Bach, offering for sale both books of *The Well-Tempered Clavier* (BWV 846-893), the inventions and sionfalias (BWV 772-801), the first three books of the *Clavier-Übung* series (BWV 825-830; 971 and 831; 552, 669-689, 802-805) the organ sonatas (BWV 525-530), the Canonic Variations on “Vom Himmel hoch” (BWV 769), the *Kunst der Fuge* (BWV 1080), the *Musikalisches Opfer* (BWV 1079), the partitas for solo violin (BWV 1002, 1004, 1006), the cello suites (BWV 1007-1012), concerti, and most significantly two Mass settings, the Magnificat (BWV 243), six sacred cantatas and a secular cantata, and choruses from the *Christmas Oratorio* (BWV 248).\(^{53}\)

The earliest of the manuscripts of the Mass produced for Traeg [F6/7: D-B *Mus. ms. Bach P 11-12*] reflects the work of a copyist known to have produced numerous copies of the music of both W. A. Mozart and Joseph Haydn.\(^{54}\) One of this manuscript’s most distinctive feature is found in the “Et in unum Dominum,” where both the early version of this movement (that became superseded with Bach’s composition of the “Et incarnatus est”) and the later version appear together in a single score. In all respects, the

---


two volumes of this manuscript appear to have originated together. However, the first volume contains the entire Missa (BWV 232), while the second volume includes the last two movements of the Missa prior to the Symbolum Nicenum; this presumably stems from an oversight on the part of the copyist. Deriving from Swieten’s copy, from whom Traeg presumably acquired access to a large quantity of music, it seems likely that Traeg had this volume copied for use as the model for additional copies.55

The dating of a second copy [F8: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 182] remains unclear. The watermark would date it close to the other copy prepared for Traeg [F6/7]. However, annotations in the score suggest a date in the early nineteenth century, possibly 1817, which would mean that it resulted from a commission to Traeg’s son, who operated his father’s business from 1803 until 1819 or 1820. Like the other copy prepared for Traeg [F6/7], this copy presents the two versions of “Et in unum Dominum” juxtaposed in a single score. And, like F6/7, F8 is copied in oblong form, but is a single volume, and does not include the repetition of the movements found at the end of F6 and the beginning of F7. The Singspiel composer Johann Georg Anton Mederitsch prepared this manuscript, presumably using F6/7 as the model and on commission from Traeg. While Mederitsch enjoyed popularity and modest success as a composer of Singspiele, he also produced a sizable body of manuscript copies of music by other composers. Significantly, of the copies identified by one scholar in the 1970s, the music of Johann Sebastian Bach represents the largest quantity of copies produced by Mederitsch among the variety of composers whose music he reproduced.56

The copy of the Mass in B Minor [F8] that Mederitsch prepared exhibits several

significant annotations. The right hand side of the title page bears a column listing the movements and their respective tonalities. At the bottom is written “67½ Bogen,” reflecting the number of leaves used in the copy (equalling 135 pages) as a means of calculating the price of the copy.\(^{57}\) Also on the lower right of the title page appears the signature of Joseph Fischhof (1804-1857), an avid collector of Bach’s music.\(^{58}\) As Fischhof had only moved to Vienna in 1822 and initially studied medicine, he presumably acquired this manuscript second hand.\(^{59}\) Added on the verso of the title page is “Herauszuscreiben angefangen den 25 Sept. 822,” indicating that parts were prepared from this manuscript beginning on that date. Below this appears an encomium about the Mass, and, in a later hand (possibly that of Fischhof), a description of the concert on April 23, 1844 lead by Mendelssohn for the dedication of the Bach monument in Leipzig that included the Sanctus of the Mass [BWV 232\(^{\text{III}}\)] as well as Beethoven’s Mass in D.\(^{60}\)

The parts prepared from the manuscript described above may presumably be those that survive in the Musikarchiv, Piaristenkirche Maria Treu in Vienna with shelfmark “23” [F19: A-Wp 23]. The large number of corrections indicate the work of an amateur copyist, even though these annotations and corrections give no firm indication of a performance. Indeed, that the \textit{colla parte} materials were not copied into the parts would have hampered performance.\(^{61}\) An additional manuscript score [F25: A-GÖ \textit{Mus. Pr. 59}] survives in the music archive of the Benediktinerabtei in Göttweig, Austria. It, like the two earlier scores prepared for Traeg [F7 and F8], contains both versions of the “Et in


\(^{58}\) NBA II/1 KB, 20; Fischhof’s collecting is discussed in chapter four, below.


\(^{60}\) NBA II/1 KB, 20-21.

\(^{61}\) NBA\textsuperscript{rev} 1, 297.
unum Dominum” in juxtaposition. It likely dates from after 1833, as it is bound with the edition of the Kyrie and Gloria published by Hans Georg Nägeli that year.\textsuperscript{62}

The activities of Johann Traeg as publisher parallel the work being done in Leipzig by Breitkopf, and to a lesser extent by Johann Friedrich Hering in Berlin.\textsuperscript{63} While Breitkopf would utilize printing much more extensively than Traeg, they both conducted a sizable trade in manuscript copies. They, like C. P. E. Bach, appreciated that the varying demand for music, the cost of producing engraved plates, and the necessity of warehousing printed copies made on-demand manuscript copies more cost effective.

Interestingly, the repertory of music by J. S. Bach made available in manuscript copies by Breitkopf and Traeg differed noticeably. Whereas Breitkopf’s offerings appear rather haphazard, possibly reflecting the assortment of Bach’s music surviving in later eighteenth-century Leipzig collections, Traeg’s offerings prove quite systematic. Indeed, Traeg could provide copies of nearly all of Bach’s major compositions and collections from the 1730s and 1740s, which preponderantly hewed toward the contrapuntal. This selection of music clearly suggests that Traeg relied on a well-informed source for this music, who more than likely had close connections with the Bach students and collectors based in Berlin. Not coincidentally, Hering appears to have been the primary supplier of the market for Bach’s music in Berlin and promulgated similar repertory. Given his connections to Berlin, Gottfried van Swieten seems the obvious conduit between Traeg and Hering.

There is no evidence to suggest that Traeg was in direct contact with Hering.

\textsuperscript{62} NBA\textsuperscript{Mw} 1, 298.
Rather, Swieten’s promotion of Bach’s contrapuntal music in Vienna created a market for this music that bore close resemblance to the market Hering served in Berlin. What is important for this study is the differences in the business practices of Hering and Traeg. Whereas Hering appears to have conducted his business primarily through personal contacts with professional musicians providing music for aristocrats, such as Anna Amalia and Otto von Voß, or for private salons, Traeg actively marketed his music in the popular press and through his catalogs. The earlier adoption of such practices by Breitkopf in a commercial city such as Leipzig or in a more dynamic public sphere such as Vienna comes as no surprise. Berlin remained a more rigidly structured public sphere directed by the Prussian monarchy well into the nineteenth century. While this did not prevent the emergence of public music life, it did not compare to other European capitals. What is consistent between Breitkopf, Traeg, and Hering is that, despite the different scales of their businesses, they had clearly rationalized the production of music materials in response to a public market for their goods and in doing so rendered the manuscript “putting-out” system seen in J. S. Bach’s household unnecessary.

Moreover, by the end of the eighteenth century amateurs had come to form the larger segment of the market for notated music. For these individuals solitary contemplation and semi-public self-representation provided the primary motivation for their collecting. Whereas C. P. E. Bach often engaged with his father’s music with practical ends in mind — as his treatment of the Mass offers some indication — the copies of the Mass produced in Berlin and Vienna appear to have belonged to

---

individuals with a new kind of interest in music. An interest in Berlin in the music of Johann Sebastian Bach marks a distinct turn in the later eighteenth century away from those composers explicitly favored by Friedrich II. Interest in J. S. Bach also indicates a growing concern among the educated elite with music as an intellectual pursuit in contrast to the rapidly expanding popular musical entertainments in the Prussian capital. By the early nineteenth century individuals began to collect the music of J. S. Bach and engaged with it as artefact, marking a distinct historical moment when a broader base of knowledge became a hallmark of an emergent class not defined by birth or trade.

In the new market driven environment created by the educated professional class, scores of historical music became a commodity of wider interest in the population of musical consumers. In this we begin to see the objectification of the musical text — the basis on which the concept of textual authority rests. Concern for authoritative texts of music would slowly develop following from the new view among the middle class of music as an end in itself and of a composition as a discrete object meriting careful contemplation. In the course of the nineteenth century music scholars would emerge from the ranks of the educated class who would pursue the verifiable task of textual scholarship. Johann Nikolaus Forkel, who edited Bach’s keyboard music for publication in the early nineteenth century, and Hans Georg Nägeli, who published the contrapuntal compositions and eventually the B-minor Mass, attempted to meet what they hoped would be an appropriate level of demand for this music and in the process further solidified the conception of music as a market commodity. However, they often worked from unreliable manuscripts sources. The organizers of the Bach Gesellschaft, in their ambition to secure the music of Bach in authoritative editions, made the musical text an
abstract entity unto itself, employing to that end the newly established methods of
philology and source criticism. In the process, the men of the Bach Gesellschaft would
further objectify the musical manuscript, but not always with the full knowledge or
appreciation for the fact that the ends the sources originally served differed greatly from
the ends to which the editors would put them. In the decades following C. P. E. Bach’s
interventions in the B-minor Mass a musical text emerged assuming the fixed form of a
market commodity subject to the scrutiny of the new humanistic sciences, adhering to the
standards of a market economy, and fulfilling the discerning expectations of an educated
middle class audience.
Chapter 4: Collecting

The function of music collections and of the scores contained in them depends on the social and economic circumstances in which they were created. Johann Sebastian Bach and his sons operated in a social order defined by class distinctions that were reinforced by guild customs promulgated by several previous generations of musicians in the Bach family. The constraints imposed by this hierarchy are already apparent with Sebastian, who struggled against the limitations on him resulting from his lack of a university education. Sebastian’s ambition to free his sons from these constraints by assuring their access to a university education bore only modest success. Only his youngest son, Johann Christian, succeeded in truly liberating himself from employment at court or church that defined his family’s professional existence, and he did so in London, where the economic constraints of central German life did not apply. By contrast, the court and church largely defined the scope of the professional successes of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach.

The exception in the case of Emanuel was his foray into publishing and concert production, both of which served a growing market among an emergent middle class. Indeed, whereas early eighteenth-century music publishing, such as that of Georg Philipp Telemann, still largely served the needs of practicing musicians, Emanuel clearly embraced the Kenner und Liebhaber.1 The emergence of a broader market for published music resulted in new forms of employment for musicians, as seen with the manuscript publishers Johann Friedrich Hering and Johann Traeg. Whereas copyists had previously

functioned within a guild-based hierarchy often serving the interests of state and church, the musicians producing music scores in the waning years of the eighteenth century functioned in a market economy serving the needs and interests of individual consumers.²

In Berlin this incipient free market for musical goods first emerged within the city’s Enlightenment salons — an integral part of the emerging “public sphere” in the eighteenth century. Musical establishments had certainly existed in German aristocratic households prior to the late eighteenth century, as seen in J. S. Bach’s dedication of a collection of concertos to the Margrave of Brandenburg and his loan of performing parts for the early version of the Sanctus in D (BWV 232III) to Count Franz Anton Sporck.³ However, in the latter half of the century, music enthusiasts and musicians themselves organized salons that gave particular attention to music, paralleling the more renowned literary salons. There nobles engaged with music alongside non-nobles and music served as the focal point for discussion.⁴ In support of this, musicians and hosts amassed substantial music collections.

With the rise of amateur musical associations, such as the Berliner Sing-Akademie, these private gatherings would come to be somewhat more inclusive and participatory. Such associations also became a new means of employment for musicians, including both those whose training closely resembled that of traditional guild practices and those who developed a musical career more independently, as in the case of Carl Friedrich Zelter. In either scenario, the professional musician continued to rely on a stock of music for performing and often actively sought to expand the available repertory by

drawing on historical music. Similarly, a growing number of music publishers sought to serve the market for music scores among a broader audiences of amateurs. Chapter five, below, considers the performing tradition of the Mass in B Minor begun by German choral associations in the early nineteenth century and its implications for the textual transmission of the Mass. The current chapter focuses on the emergence of private music collections among the nobility and bourgeoisie at the turn of the nineteenth century as a reflection of the dramatic change in the musical landscape as the social hierarchy of the Old Regime gave way in the course of the Revolutionary Era.

**Collecting for Practical Purposes**

Amassing collections of notated music scores served largely practical purposes well into the eighteenth-century, at least in central Germany. As discussed in previous chapters, the music held value in particular for its effectiveness and utility in fulfilling societal functions within the context of state and church. The music collection amassed by Johann Sebastian Bach, to the extent that it can be reconstructed, seems to have held primary value because of its practical utility.\(^5\) Nevertheless, the inclusion of a significant quantity of music of less immediate practical value, in particular the music of previous generations of composers in the Bach family, provided exemplary compositional models.\(^6\) With this music Bach projected the norms and power of early modern German guild conventions, which existed to protect family and professional economic interests through closely regulated control of access to resources and markets. The “Alt-Bachische Archiv” served to demonstrate the social significance of the Bach family within the
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musical life of central German towns and to reinforce this position through demonstration of compositional achievement. Yet, even in contemporaneous instances where individuals built collections of less immediate practical value, the assemblages served to reinforce established state and ecclesiastical structures.

J. S. Bach’s dispersal of his music collection among his family members with the expectation that it would prove useful to them professionally reflects a pragmatic thinking about the scores as tools. Emanuel seems to have adopted a very similar attitude toward the scores of his own music, his father’s, and that of others. Certainly his liberal reuse of music composed by others to fulfill his duties in Hamburg reflects this utilitarian approach. Moreover, his conception of his own music collection as a reservoir of models to be used for the production of copies for sale further highlights the practical logic of this body of materials. And, at the same time that Emanuel mined his father’s music for usable material in the churches of Hamburg, other students of J. S. Bach routinely copied and adapted the composer’s music for use in the fulfilling their professional duties.

In 1789, not long after Emanuel’s death, an auction in Hamburg of 395 lots of manuscripts and printed editions from his estate took place. These lots predominantly

8 For instance, the restaging of music from earlier years became a routine practice at the court of Louis XIV, making the preservation of performance materials a necessary task. Yet, at the same time, the collection amassed by André Danican Philidor served to enshrine and lend prestige to the repertory of the French court, thereby affirming the priority of the king’s taste. See Laurence Decobert, “La ‘Collection Philidor’ de l’ancienne bibliothèque du Conservatoire de Paris,” Revue de Musicologie 93, no. 2 (2007): 269-316; Françoise Waquet, “Philidor l'Ainé, Ordinaire de la Musique du Roy et garde de tous les livres de sa Bibliothèque de Musique,” Revue de Musicologie 66, no. 2 (1980): 203-16.
9 See Chapter 2.
consisted of printed editions and manuscripts of music by Emanuel’s contemporaries as well as contemporary and historical treatises. The remainder of Emanuel’s collection, however, was retained by his wife Johanna Maria Bach (d. 1795) and daughter Anna Carolina Philippina Bach, who continued the practice of selling copies derived from the models in the collection. Following Anna Carolina Philippina’s death in 1804, the items in the collection were sold at auction, with much of Emanuel’s music listed in separate lots and with other music, including the “Alt-Bachisches Archiv” and that of J. S. Bach, grouped in larger lots. Lot number 108 contained the “Alt-Bachisches Archiv,” which, as Georg Poelchau noted, sold for 35 Marks. Lot 128 contained “Ein Starker Stoß mit Passionsmusiken, Dramen, Cantaten u.[s.w.],” including the original scores and performing parts for six secular cantatas (BWV 201, 211-215) and for the *St. Matthew Passion* (BWV 244) and *St. John Passion* (BWV 245). Georg Poelchau recorded that this lot along with the preceding lot sold for a total of 25 Marks. The modest prices realized resulted most likely from the music’s diminishing practical value and the not yet pronounced sense of the music’s historical value.

Christian Friedrich Gottlieb Schwenke, Emanuel’s successor as music director of the principal churches in Hamburg, acquired many of the lots from the Bach auction, presumably because of the continued practical utility of materials in the Bach collection at least in Hamburg, where the music remained relatively well known and highly
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regarded. Indeed, he appears to have acquired all of the lots with J. S. Bach compositions at the auction of the music in Anna Carolina Philippina Bach’s possession at the time of her death, including the autograph scores of the *St. Matthew Passion* (BWV 244) and both versions of the *Magnificat* (BWV 243 and BWV 243a). Schwenke used his music collection in much the same way as his predecessor, creating pastiches to fulfill the routine responsibilities of his position. Knowledge of the results of the auction of A. C. P. Bach’s music comes from Georg Poelchau, who attended the 1804 auction and would eventually come into possession of many of the J. S. Bach items sold to Schwenke as well as numerous other important Bach manuscripts. The circumstances that resulted in Poelchau not acquiring the J. S. Bach items already in 1804 exhibits the still limited market for historical music documents at that time: it appears that Schwenke’s professional needs still outweighed Poelchau’s avocational interests.

**Collecting for Theoretical Purposes**

Parallel to this, other Bach students cultivated collections of Sebastian’s music primarily out of speculative interest. Beyond his writings, Johann Philipp Kirnberger remains most notable for his expansive collecting of the music of J. S. Bach for himself and for his patron, Princess Anna Amalia. However, the role of Johann Friedrich Agricola as a collector of J. S. Bach’s music has not received extensive consideration. This partly results from the scattered transmission of materials that had once formed a
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16 See the auction catalog of Schwenke’s estate, *Verzeichniss der von dem verstorbenen Herrn Musikdirektor C.F.G. Schwencke hinterlassenen Sammlung von Musikalien aus allen Fächern der Tonkunst* (Hamburg: Hermann'schen Erben, 1824). http://hdl.handle.net/1802/28708
part of Agricola’s collection, but perhaps also stems from the still limited consideration among scholars of Agricola’s place within music history.\footnote{18}{Beverly Jerold calls into question the primacy of Kirnberger as theoretician and, in the process, suggests one way that Agricola contributed to musical discourse in Berlin. See her “Johann Philipp Kirnberger and Authorship,” Notes 69, no. 4 (2013): 688-705.}

Johann Friedrich Agricola was born in 1720 in Dobitschen, Saxe-Altenburg, about fifty kilometers south of Leipzig, the son of a government agent and jurist. He studied at the University of Leipzig from 1738 to 1741, after which he moved to Berlin. During his time in Leipzig he studied with Bach and continued his study of music with Johann Joachim Quantz in Berlin.\footnote{19}{Grove Music Online, s.v. “Agricola, Johann Friedrich,” by E. Eugene Helm and Darrell Berg, accessed 17 Sep. 2016, http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com.} His translation of and commentary on Pier Francesco Tosi’s 1723 singing treatise *Opinioni de’ cantori antichi e moderni* remains Agricola’s most extensively considered contribution to music history.\footnote{20}{Anleitung Zur Singkunst (Berlin: Georg Ludwig Winter, 1757); Introduction to the Art of Singing, translated and edited by Julianne Baird (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).} Of course, this treatise reflects Agricola’s promotion of a soon-to-be eclipsed style of Italianate musical writing as well as a prioritization of performance concerns over compositional matters. However, his contributions to the obituary of J. S. Bach and to Jakob Adlung’s *Musica mechanica organoedi* (Berlin, 1768) suggest a strong theoretical bent.

Agricola’s music collection exhibits his various interests. His Bach collection contained a number of cantata manuscripts, excerpts from the *Kunst der Fuge* (BWV 1080), the *Musikalisches Opfer* (BWV 1079), the early version of the *St. Matthew Passion* (BWV 244b), and the early version of the Credo later incorporated into the Mass in B Minor (BWV 232\textsuperscript{11} 10), most of which he copied himself.\footnote{21}{Alfred Dürr, “Zur Chronologie der Handschrift Johann Christoph Altnickols und Johann Friedrich Agricolas,” Bach-Jahrbuch 1970, 44–65; cf. D-B Am. B. 6-7, Am. B. 22, Am. B. 33-35, Am. B. 37-38, Am. B. 58, Am. B. 73; D-GOl Mus. 2° 54c/3.} These clearly exhibit a strong interest on Agricola’s part in the most complex compositions of J. S. Bach.
Agricola also owned noteworthy manuscripts of other strict contrapuntal music, which by the late eighteenth century were quite archaic in style if not particularly old. ²² Many of these manuscripts were acquired by Kirnberger after Agricola’s death in late 1774. Yet, Agricola also possessed a substantial number of manuscripts of concertos, sonatas, and vocal music, which most likely served his needs as host of a musical salon known as “Das Concert” from 1754 or earlier. Kirnberger apparently passed over this repertory and some portion of the materials eventually came into the possession of the Berliner Sing-Akademie. ²³

Given the extent of Agricola’s music collection and its inclusion of a wide variety of complex contrapuntal music, the absence of a complete score of the Mass in B Minor seems like a glaring omission. However, because Agricola’s music collection has not survived intact, there is the chance that one of a number of manuscript copies of the Mass of uncertain provenance could have belonged to Agricola. Moreover, as much of the music of J. S. Bach that can be traced to Agricola’s collection was acquired by Kirnberger, it seems quite plausible that Kirnberger would not have acquired scores from Agricola’s estate of compositions for which copies were already present in his own or Anna Amalia’s collection. This would have been the case for the Mass in B Minor, as Kirnberger and Anna Amalia each possessed manuscripts prepared in the late 1760s and early 1770s. However, another of the contemporaneous manuscripts might have belonged to Agricola, such as F23/F24. Indeed, that this manuscript seems to have originated with

Johann Friedrich Hering, who himself seems to have had a close working relationship with Agricola, makes Agricola at least a plausible owner of this score.  

**Aristocratic Collecting**

Of course, Johann Philipp Kirnberger stands as the most prominent of Bach’s promoters in the latter half of the eighteenth century owing both to his treatises, including *Die Kunst des reinen Satzes in der Musik*, and to the importance of the collection he built for himself and for Princess Anna Amalia. Anna Amalia of Prussia was the youngest sibling of the Prussian king, Frederick the Great. Unmarried, she devoted much of her attention to the study of music, learning the then-prevalent keyboard instruments as well as flute and violin. She also composed music, primarily to religious texts, under the tutelage of Kirnberger, her private Kapellmeister. Anna Amalia maintained an active musical salon attended by the Prussian elite as well as foreign guests, including the Habsburg ambassador to Berlin Gottfried van Swieten.

The so-called *Amalienbibliothek* expanded to its final proportions in 1783 with the acquisition of Kirnberger’s music collection following his death. Through the combination of these collections, the *Amalienbibliothek* came to contain a systematic assemblage of much of J. S. Bach’s music reflective of the systematic thinking apparent in Kirnberger’s theoretical writing. The preeminence of the Mass in B Minor in the Amalien-Bibliothek, where the two copies bear the shelfmarks Am. B. 1-2 and Am. B. 3, offers an early indication of the position it had come to hold in the conception of the

---


compositional oeuvre of J. S. Bach in the course of the eighteenth century. The Amalienbibliothek is also exemplary of the trend toward the development of music collections among aristocratic amateurs in the waning years of the eighteenth century that would subsequently serve as models for collecting among the Bildungsbürgertum in the following decades. Upon her death in 1787, Anna Amalia’s library was donated to the Joachimsthalische Gymnasium, a school for the nobility. In 1914 the Amalien-Bibliothek was transferred to the Prussian Royal Library.

Another aristocratic collector of Bach’s music was Gottfried van Swieten (1733-1803), the Habsburg ambassador to court of Frederick the Great from 1770-1777. Though the full extent of Swieten’s music collection is impossible to reconstruct, it is through this collection that Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven became acquainted with the music of J. S. Bach and G. F. Handel. Indeed, Swieten’s hosting of musical performances formed an important component in the development of a more public music life in Vienna, as also seen with the rise of new musical venues outside of the court in Berlin. Swieten’s interest in historical music and his active collecting of this music greatly influenced the nature of Viennese classicism, with Mozart and Haydn clearly responding in their music to the influence of Bach and Handel. As noted in Chapter 3, Swieten’s collection of Bach also seems to have been accessible to Johann Traeg. Traeg advertised a notably thorough collection of J. S. Bach’s most substantial compositions, all
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of which can also be traced to Swieten’s collection and to which Swieten had unique access through his Berlin connections. The copies of Bach’s Mass in B Minor produced by copyists for Traeg clearly take Swieten’s copy of the Mass as their model. And, though the creation of just two copies [F6/7 and F8] of Bach’s Mass in Vienna in the first decade of the nineteenth century certainly does not suggest staggering demand, that Haydn came to own Swieten’s manuscript copy of Bach’s Mass in B Minor and that Beethoven also sought on various occasions to acquire a copy of Bach’s Mass and the Well-Tempered Clavier does suggest the importance of Swieten’s collection.\(^3^1\)

In many respects, Swieten’s activities in 1780s Vienna imitates musical salons that had become well established in Berlin already in the 1750s. In their earliest manifestations, these venues replicated and reinforced norms established at Friedrich II’s court, but as musical life at court stagnated in the 1760s private salons and public concerts developed new interests.\(^3^2\) In contrast to the more popular styles beginning to be heard in public concerts in gardens and coffee houses, certain salons actively cultivated a conservative repertory embracing the music heard at court while also engaging with the music of J. S. Bach, which Friedrich II had willfully ignored.\(^3^3\) For the nobility and the growing ranks of an emerging Bildungsbürgertum in Prussia, the task of articulating a clear cultural identity was complicated by the perilous negotiation of loyalties as political
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\(^3^3\) For instance, consider Friedrich II’s apparent disinterest in the *Musical Offering* (BWV 1079) that J. S. Bach dedicated to him, cf. NBA VIII/1 KB, 46-62.
revolution rocked the social order throughout Europe. Collecting the music of J. S. Bach, however, offered an important opportunity to assert independence from the King’s tastes while also asserting one’s loyalty to Germany. Given the upheaval of the Revolutionary Era, collecting historic music served an ever more important function in establishing identity and in the development of influence.\textsuperscript{34}

Otto Carl Friedrich von Voß (1755-1823) offers a prime example of how an individual used music collecting to assert his social and political position. As common with many landowning aristocrats, the Voß family lived primarily at their residence in Berlin, where Otto von Voß was born in 1755, as opposed to their rural holdings.\textsuperscript{35} Music formed an important component of Voß’s education, as documented in a large collection of realized figured bass exercises with a title that reads “Regeln des General-Basses von dem Herrn Musico Heering” and the owner’s inscription “Otto von Voß 1771.”\textsuperscript{36} This tantalizing hint at the teaching activities of Johann Friedrich Hering not only offers the indication that Voß studied with a musically well-connected individual, but also that Hering worked for the most elite clientele.

Voß pursued legal studies in Frankfurt an der Oder beginning in 1773 and continued his studies in Göttingen from 1775. In Göttingen he furthered his study of music with the future Bach biographer Johann Nikolaus Forkel. In 1777 he became a barrister in Berlin, following a tour of German courts. Voß entered into the service of the


Prussian government in 1786, but disagreements with Friedrich Wilhelm II led to his resignation in late 1795. He returned to government service under Friedrich Wilhelm III in 1797 with continually expanding responsibilities through the French occupation of Berlin in 1806. However, following the appointment of reformist Karl Freiherr vom Stein as chief Minister in 1807, Voß found that his opposition to the governmental and social reforms of Stein’s predecessor would not be heeded. Indeed, Voß was pushed out of a formal role in the Prussian government, signaling the setbacks for those interested in preserving hereditary privileges.\(^37\) Despite Voß’s opposition to Stein and his successor Karl von Hardenberg, Friedrich Wilhelm III continued to consult with Voß. In September of 1822 Voß was appointed Vizepräsident des Minister- und Staatsrat and, following Hardenberg’s death on November 26, 1822, Voß became Ministerpräsident. However, Voß took ill in December of 1822 and died the following month.

During the period between 1797 and 1807, while serving as a Minister in the Prussian government, Otto von Voß maintained an active musical salon in his Berlin residence. This also coincided with the most active development of his music collection, though his youngest son, Otto Carl Philipp von Voß (1794-1836), continued cultivating the collection. Like his father and his brother Carl, Otto von Voß jun. studied music with Johann Nikolaus Forkel while a student at the university in Göttingen. While the music collection was largely amassed by Otto von Voß sen., the son assumed the task of cataloging the extensive collection that included nearly 400 manuscripts of music by J. S. Bach. However, following the deaths of Otto von Voß Sr. in 1823 and Otto von Voß Jr. in 1836, active management of the collection ceased, and its use largely limited to Otto

\(^{37}\) On Voß’s role in Prussian politics, see R. C. Raack, *The Fall of Stein* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965); on the reforms in Prussia, see Sheehan, *German History*, 291-310.
Jr.’s sister Caroline. Their brother Carl donated the family’s music collection in its entirety to the Prussian Royal Library with a gift first in 1851 and another in 1863 following the death of Caroline. A close associate of King Friedrich Wilhelm IV as well as the Romantic nationalist poets Clemens Brentano, and Achim and Bettina von Arnim, Carl von Voß was active in Prussian civic life and staunchly patriotic. In donating his family’s music collection to the Royal Library, he not only further affirmed his loyalties, but also further solidified the centrality of Bach and the Frederician repertory in the Royal Library’s music collection.

Among the most interesting items in the collection owned by the Voß family is the earliest copy of the full score of the Mass in B-minor [D1: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 572/23/14], which came into the Voß collection from the estate of Johann Friedrich Hering. The manuscript is listed in an appendix to one of the catalogs of the Voß collection with an explanation that the items listed had been acquired after 1808, largely from the Hering estate. The three components of the Mass manuscript [D1] are listed separately as: “512. Missa ___ J. S. Bach, part[itur]; 513. Sanctus a 4. Voci con Str., Hosanna, Benedictus, Agnus Dei, et Dona nob. p. a 8 v. c. Str. _ J. S. Bach, part[itur]; … 518. Symbolum Nicenum ___ J. S. Bach” [Figure 4.1]. Of these, only the Symbolum Nicenum [D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 23] bears this numbering, which appears on the upper right corner of the title page, replacing the cancelled “no.145.” Alongside these manuscripts, the Voß catalog lists manuscript copies of the St. Matthew Passion (BWV 244) as item “514,” and the St. John Passion (BWV 245) as item “517.” Both of these
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39 Faulstich, Die Musikaliensammlung, 29-33.
survive and offer further evidence of the association between Hering and the copyists who copied the *St. Matthew Passion* manuscript (“Palestrina II”) and the *St. John Passion* manuscript (“Anon. 403”).

**Figure 4.1: Voß Manuscripts Acquired from the Hering Estate**


Prior to the acquisition of items from Hering’s estate, the Voß family already owned another copy of the Mass in B Minor, which is listed in the same catalog as item “389”: “Missa a 5 Voci, con Str: in due Atto ___ Seb. Bach, part[itur].” This manuscript [F5: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 9-10] follows the readings found in the copy prepared for J. P. Kirnberger [D2: D-B Am. B. 3] and bears the curious headings on the title pages of each of its two volumes: “Atto I\textsuperscript{m}” and “Atto II\textsuperscript{m},” respectively. The copyist of this manuscript remains unidentified, but it can be dated to the late eighteenth century based on the watermark. As with possibly all other manuscripts of the Mass produced in eighteenth century Berlin and given Otto von Voß Sr.’s close association with him, it seems likely that it was prepared on commission by a copyist contracted by Hering.

The Voß family’s music collection reached an impressive scale of nearly 3,000 items and contained a significant representation of music by Haydn (215 items) and Mozart (153 items), but few items by the somewhat younger composers Beethoven and Johann Nepomuk Hummel. Moreover, the composers Giuseppe Maria Cambini and Luigi Boccherini patronized by Friedrich Wilhelm II, with whom Otto von Voß Sr. had personal disagreements, are hardly represented in the Voß music collection. Rather, the older composers esteemed by Friedrich II, including Johann Adolph Hasse and the Graun brothers, are extensively represented in the collection. Finally, perhaps as many as 150 compositions by Giovanni Pierluigi Palestrina, who would come to be highly esteemed in

\[\text{\textsuperscript{42} D-B Mus.ms.theor. Kat. 21, [122].} \]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{43} NBA II/1 KB, 33.} \]
nineteenth century Germany, are found in the collection. However, the extensive representation of J. S. Bach and, to a lesser extent, C. P. E. Bach reflects a turn toward an increasingly idealized German past that closely mirrors the political conservatism of many in the Voß family’s aristocratic ranks. That this would take on a religious dimension is also already apparent in the strong representation of sacred music and the growing interest in the sacred music of Palestrina in particular.

Bourgeois Collecting

It is useful to contrast the musical activities of Otto von Voß with that of Sara Levy, which is itself a contrast between the hereditary Besitzbürgertum and the acquired status of the Bildungsbürgertum. Levy, the daughter of the influential Jewish banker Daniel Itzig and great-aunt to Fanny and Felix Mendelssohn, studied with Wilhelm Friedemann Bach and her oldest sister took lessons with Johann Philipp Kirnberger, clearly linking their family to the Bach establishment in Berlin. Levy would become prominent for her salon, which was frequented by, among others, E. T. A. Hoffmann and Carl Friedrich Zelter. Along with hosting salons, collecting high art served as a vehicle for members of the Itzig family to exhibit their acculturation. In Levy’s music collection the preponderance of highly advanced keyboard music reflects her accomplishment as a musician, but its focus on the Bach tradition, which had become intellectualized by the composer’s followers in Berlin, and on the conservative Frederician repertory served to reinforce her connection to Berlin’s musical elite. Levy’s
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45 Faulstich seeks to reconstruct the full extent of Voß collection; *Die Musikaliensammlung*, 119-478.
collection of music consisted primarily of music by J. S. Bach and his composing sons, Wilhelm Friedemann, Carl Philipp Emanuel, Johann Christoph Friedrich, and Johann Christian. In fact, she made great efforts to collect this music. Having no personal contact with the youngest two brothers, she became a subscriber to prints of J. C. F. Bach’s music and relied on dealers to assist in acquiring the music of J. C. Bach. Otherwise, her collection primarily included the more conservative styles of music then common, as represented by music of George Frideric Handel, Johann Adolph Hasse, Johann Gottlieb Graun, Johann Gottlieb Janitsch, Giovanni Pergolesi, Johann Joachim Quantz, and Friedrich II.  

Many of her manuscripts would eventually become part of the library of the Berlin Sing-Akademie, with which she and other members of her family had a close affiliation. Participation in this organization should be seen as one means of attaining assimilation and acceptance in Berlin society, just as changing her given name from its Yiddish form of Zereleche can also be seen in this same light. These were all steps taken even after the Itzig family was granted hereditary Prussian citizenship in 1791, decades before any other Jewish family received similar status with the promulgation of the Emancipation Edict of 1812. It was, however, in the generation of her nieces and nephews, including Lea Solomon and her husband Abraham Mendelssohn, that the question of religious identity took on particular significance, with a notable number of prominent Jewish families converting to Christianity. Still in Levy’s generation the idea of acculturation and assimilation remained plausible, in no small part because of the

49 Lowenstein, “Jewish Upper Crust,” 192.
50 Lowenstein, “Jewish Upper Crust,” 185.
reforms advanced by Hardenberg and Stein. Thus, the complete absence of copies of sacred music by members of the Bach family in the music collections of members of the Itzig family comes with little surprise. But, the tortured negotiations that the Mendelssohns endured over their religious identity relates quite directly to the anxiety felt by many Prussians and other Germans over national identity in the wake of the Napoleonic era. As seen in the collecting activities of other members of the German upper middle class or Bildungsbürgertum, historic sacred music, especially that of Johann Sebastian Bach, became increasingly important as a manifestation of individual and national identity. The conservatism of the Voß family finds more vocally nationalistic proponents in individuals such as Johann Nikolaus Forkel and Georg Poelchau, who would equate the preservation of Bach’s music with the preservation of Germany.

Johann Nikolaus Forkel (1749-1818) provides an early affirmation of these nationalist concerns and the place of Bach in this cause. In the preface to his 1802 biography of Johann Sebastian Bach that served as a companion to the Leipzig publisher Hoffmeiser & Kühnel’s editions of Bach’s keyboard music, Forkel writes:

This undertaking is not only of the highest advantage, in every respect, to the art itself, but must contribute more than any other of the kind to the honor of the German nation. The works which Joh. Seb. Bach has left us are an invaluable national patrimony, with which no other nation has anything to be compared. Whoever rescues them from the danger of being disfigured by faulty copies, and being thus gradually consigned to oblivion and destruction, erects to the artist an imperishable monument and deserves well of his country; and everyone to whom the honor of the German name is dear is bound to support such a patriotic undertaking and to promote it to the utmost of his power… the preservation of the memory of this great man… is an object in which not merely the interest of the art but the honor of the nation itself is deeply involved.
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52 Sheehan, German History, 268-9.
Forkel and the publisher intended the *Oeuvres complètes* of Bach’s keyboard music to provide “a complete and critically correct edition” and offers some indication of their view of the appropriate means of venerating Bach.\(^5^4\) Prior to this, Forkel provided exposure to the music of Bach to students of the university at Göttingen, many of whom were aristocrats like Otto and Carl von Voß. The son of a cobbler and to some extent a self-taught musician, Forkel attained a position at Göttingen following two years of study at the University funded by the Duke of Schwerin, where he had served as a choral prefect at the cathedral.\(^5^5\) He developed a close association with C. P. E. Bach and, through him gained access to a significant quantity of J. S. Bach’s music.\(^5^6\) Forkel’s collection of Bach’s music included a copy of the Mass in B Minor [X4], as indicated in the auction catalog for his estate, which lists as item number 67: “Missa a 5 Voci 6 Stromenti e Continuo. | P[lus?] Grand[?].”\(^5^7\) The formulation of the title adheres exactly with D2 and many of the manuscripts derived from that source. Forkel’s copy of the Mass in B Minor may have been acquired by his student Friedrich Griepenkerl, who would actively perform the Mass and other of Bach’s choral compositions in
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\(^5^6\) BDok VII: B1-B7, 104-110.

\(^5^7\) *Verzeichniss der von dem verstorbenen Doctor und Musikdirector Forkel in Göttingen nachgelassenen Bücher und Musikalien…* (Göttingen: Gedruckt Bey F. E. Huth, 1819): 137.
Braunschweig. In the event that Griepenkerl did acquire Forkel’s copy of the Mass, it is a copy [F22] formerly in the possession of Heinrich Sievers in Hannover, Germany (and to which Friedrich Smend had access) that is now in an unidentified private collection.58

Other manuscripts from Forkel’s collection came into the possession of Carl Friedrich Zelter, the famous director of the Berliner Sing-Akademie.59 Zelter (1758-1832), like Forkel, came from a family grounded in guild practice; his father was a mason and his mother was the daughter of a cloth-worker. Zelter also became a master mason and partner in his father’s business. However, Zelter, despite his early interest in music, only began formal musical training with Carl Friedrich Christian Fasch in 1784, at the age of 26. Zelter’s association with Fasch proved pivotal. By the late 1780s, Fasch had begun to assemble his students to perform choral music in private homes and in 1793 relocated to a large room in the royal stables, where the academies of arts and sciences also met. Through the association with the academies of arts and sciences, the choral society succeeded in being named the Sing-Akademie, lending credence to the intellectual aspirations of the amateur membership.60 Over the course of the 1790s, Zelter would assume increasing responsibility for the Sing-Akademie’s activities for the ailing Fasch, and following Fasch’s death in 1800, Zelter succeeded him as the director.

Under the leadership of Carl Friedrich Zelter, the Berlin Sing-Akademie would become perhaps the most important center for the cultivation of interest in Bach’s music. Besides introducing many amateur singers and the large audience of the famous 1829 performance of the St. Matthew Passion to the music of Bach, the Sing-Akademie

58 See NBA II/1 KB, pp. 19 and 31-2.
accumulated a quite substantial collection of Bach scores. Likewise, Zelter developed a personal collection of Bach scores. These collections became of great importance in the very long gestation of the Berlin Sing-Akademie’s Bach performance tradition. Through this collection, the function of the musical score shifted from serving trained musicians’ professional needs into something purveyed by those musicians to educated dilettantes. It is particularly significant that Forkel and Zelter, neither of whom obtained their musical training through guild conventions, would stand at the vanguard of this shift in the function of notated music. Rather than controlling the means of music making, Forkel and Zelter functioned in an economy where amateur musicians and a growing middle class became the primary market for music. The institutions and businesses developed to serve this market also served as an increasingly predominant means of employment for musicians, replacing the traditional venues of the court and church.

From the very first years of the nineteenth century, Zelter used Bach’s motets, such as Singet dem Herrn (BWV 225) and, beginning in 1811, movements from the Mass in B Minor in regular rehearsal. Even earlier, Fasch had rehearsed the motet Komm, Jesu, komm (BWV 229). However, neither Fasch nor Zelter had ever sought to perform these compositions publicly, opting instead to regularly present compositions less demanding on performers and audiences, such as Graun’s Der Tod Jesu. Over the course of three and half decades, though, the amateurs comprising the Sing-Akademie chorus became well acquainted with the music of Bach, evidenced not only by the regular rehearsal of Bach’s music, but also by the Sing-Akademie’s substantial collection of
Bach’s music. Indeed, it became a beacon that attracted individuals seeking to conserve historic music and its notated manifestations, particularly the collector Georg Poelchau.\textsuperscript{61}

It is unclear from what source Zelter would have known the Mass in B Minor. However, it is plausible that one extant copy of the Mass [F9: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P1172] could be traced from its earliest known owner, the nineteenth-century music historian Franz Commer, back to Zelter and Fasch.\textsuperscript{62} Commer studied composition with Carl Rungenhagen, who succeeded Zelter as the director the Berlin Sing-Akademie in 1833. Rungenhagen may have acquired this from Zelter, who in turn may have acquired it from Fasch. The manuscript dates from the 1780s, thus making it very likely that Fasch would have commissioned this copy from Hering, who copied a portion of the manuscript himself.

Georg Poelchau (1773-1836), a professional singer, concert promoter, and teacher in Hamburg, assembled the largest and most important collection of Bach manuscripts in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century. Poelchau, the son and grandson of Protestant pastors — a very common path toward access to the educated middle class — had closely observed the sale of Anna Carolina Philippina Bach’s music collection inherited from her father, but did not have the means to acquire the most prized items until after his marriage in 1811 to the daughter of a wealthy Hamburg aristocrat. In 1813 Poelchau moved to Berlin and joined the Sing-Akademie in 1814. He eventually would obtain from the collection of C. F. G. Schwenke and others many autograph manuscripts of J. S. Bach’s music as well as those of other composers.\textsuperscript{63} In 1833, following Zelter’s death in 1832, Poelchau took charge of the

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[61]{Applegate, \textit{Bach in Berlin}, esp. chapter four, “Musical Amateurism and the Exercise of Taste,” 125-172.}
\footnotetext[62]{\textit{Katalog 65 enthaltend die musikalische und hymnologische Bibliothek des Professor Franz Commer (†1887)} (Berlin: Leo Liepmannssohn Antiquariat, 1888).}
\footnotetext[63]{Zahn, “Autographe J. S. Bachs im Besitz von C. F. G. Schwenke,” 337.}
\end{footnotes}
Sing-Akademie library, which included much of the collection Zelter had assembled for himself and on behalf of the choral society.\footnote{Grove Music Online, s.v. “Poelchau, Georg Johann Daniel,” by Konrad Küster, accessed October 2, 2016, http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com.}

The number of copies of the Mass in B Minor in his music collection offers a good demonstration of Poelchau’s unrelenting pursuit of musical sources. He obtained from Schwenke’s collection the fair copy of C. P. E. Bach’s arrangement of the 
\textit{Symbolum Nicenum} (BWV 232\textsuperscript{III}) prepared in 1788 by J. H. Michel \[E4: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 22\] and the original performing parts from Emanuel’s performances of the 
\textit{Symbolum Nicenum} \[E1a-c: Mus. ms. Bach St 118, alter Bestand\]. To the latter Poelchau and other copyists added a large number of additional choral parts in 1827 for a performance under Gaspare Spontini at the Royal Opera in Berlin \[E9: St 118, neuer Bestand and E10: D-B Mus. ms. Bach St 595\]. He probably also acquired from Schwenke’s collection the autograph score \[B3: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 13\] and original parts \[B4: D-B Mus. ms. Bach St 117\] for J. S. Bach’s Sanctus in D Major that the composer re-cast for inclusion in the Mass in B Minor (BWV 232\textsuperscript{III}). He owned yet another copy of the \textit{Symbolum Nicenum} produced in Hamburg that reflects an intermediate stage in Emanuel’s revisions \[E7: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 7\]. To complement this, Poelchau commissioned copies of the score for the \textit{Missa} (BWV 232\textsuperscript{I}) \[F3: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 6\] and the \textit{Sanctus} and remaining movements (BWV 232\textsuperscript{III-IV}) \[F4: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 8\] so that he would have a separate score of the Mass in its entirety. Possibly at a later date he acquired, most likely through a Vienna contact such as Aloys Fuchs, one of the copies produced by Johann Traeg’s firm \[F6/7: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 1\textsuperscript{11-12}\].
Poelchau connected his endeavor directly to the tradition of assembling systematic collections of art, antiquities, and scientific specimens, but observed the lack of music collecting in this tradition. Moreover, Poelchau proposed the importance of the collecting of music for the study of history, writing that:

Only through [a collection of musical monuments] will it be possible for a researcher to become acquainted with the spirit of earlier centuries, only through this will the observant reader be positioned to examine the rightness of the given results, and thus to engage in singular research, only through this ultimately will it be possible to see in a single view the step-wise development and diverse variations of the art, to experience centuries in a few hours, and to compare period with period, nation with nation and artist with artist.65

In this Poelchau sought to position music as a systematic science and to perpetuate the increasingly forceful notion of an impending perfection of human culture in Germany.66 Laying the conceptual foundation of German musical scholarship, Poelchau further explained the purpose of “… positioning an archive of musical art on a scientific plane, to establish for every friend of art a gallery of the most learned and eminent artists and to preserve the memory of men, who lent honor to the fatherland in this art, great and beautiful.”67 Poelchau’s logic moves the project of collecting Bach’s music subtly, yet decisively from the older agenda of preserving and perpetuating the pinnacle


achievements in a craft tradition to the agenda of systematically establishing a musical patrimony. While this had clearly begun with Forkel, Poelchau calibrates the argument to the more rigorous standards of historicist thinking. While presenting his argument in more reserved language than Forkel, Poelchau’s collecting suggests the imaginary power of the certitude conveyed by the orderly library.

**New Functions of Music Collections**

While Poelchau’s 1823 offer of his collection to the Royal Library was rejected, his son’s offer in 1841 to sell the collection to the Royal Library was accepted. This may have resulted from, at least in part, the historicist interests of the new king, Friedrich Wilhelm IV, who had ascended to the throne in 1840. With this acquisition, the Prussian Royal Library assumed an increasingly expansive role in preserving a German musical patrimony that future acquisitions would soon reinforce. While much in the Voß collection mirrored at least the more conservative interests already apparent in the Royal Library, the gift of the Voß collection in 1851 added over 400 manuscripts of the music of Johann Sebastian Bach, significantly expanding the impressive collection that Georg Poelchau had assembled. Then in 1854, the Sing-Akademie sold to the Royal Library its most important manuscript holdings, including many Bach materials. With the further additions from the Voß collection in 1863, the Prussian Royal Library had come to encompass a nearly systematic collection of J. S. Bach’s compositional legacy, such that the kind of inquiry Poelchau had envisioned had become entirely plausible. Indeed, the unruliness resulting from the scale of this assemblage of manuscripts served to propel the Bach Gesellschaft’s rationalization of the composer’s output and in so doing helped to legitimize musical inquiry within the human sciences and on behalf of the nation.
If by 1850 this systematization of knowledge would serve as the foundation on which professional expertise would be based, it was preceded by a shift in thinking about professional knowledge in the field of music. Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy’s path from virtuoso pianist and composer to authority on historical music replicates a broader shift in society in the first half of the nineteenth century. Like his musically accomplished great-aunt Sara Levy, who performed as a keyboard soloist at her own salon and with the Berlin Sing-Akademie, Mendelssohn and his sister Fanny first established their musical credibility as piano performers. Mendelssohn’s organization of the first modern performance of Bach St. Matthew Passion with the Sing-Akademie in 1829 marks an inflection point both in Mendelssohn’s own career and in the trend which would eventually give increasing priority to historical knowledge alongside an individual’s performing ability. The St. Matthew Passion performance itself did not prioritize historical accuracy, but it did spur a popular interest in historic music that generated new attention to repertory that had previously only enjoyed attention from a small number of individuals.  

Indeed, for his performance the St. Matthew Passion Mendelssohn made numerous alterations to the structure of the composition. While he possessed a copy of the entire St. Matthew Passion, other materials were prepared for use in the famous 1829 performance with the Berlin Sing-Akademie that reflect the numerous cuts Mendelssohn made. Johann Friedrich Rietz, the father of Mendelssohn’s esteemed violinist colleague Eduard Rietz, copied the full score of the St. Matthew Passion, on commission from
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Mendelssohn’s grandmother Bella Salomon, who likely gave it to Felix on his birthday in 1824.\footnote{Todd, p. 123; the copyist had been previously identified as Eduard Rietz. Todd’s suggestion that Johann Friedrich Rietz, a violinist at the court, was the copyist is more consistent with employment patterns for musicians up to this time (see Chapter 3 above). The emergence of lithographic printing of music in the nineteenth century substantially altered demand for the work music copyists.} Rietz also prepared a score of the Mass in B Minor which Mendelssohn owned [F17: GB-Ob MS. M. Deneke Mendelssohn c. 66/67].\footnote{Margaret Crum, Catalogue of the Mendelssohn Papers in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, Vol. II: Music and Papers (Tützing: Hans Schneider, 1983), p. 29; again, the copyist is erroneously identified as Eduard Rietz.} However, unlike his treatment of the St. Matthew Passion, Mendelssohn’s engagement with the Mass, which took on greatest intensity more than a decade later in the 1840s, came with much greater concern about the conflicting readings that he knew to exist in surviving manuscript sources.

Aware of the performing parts of the Missa that Bach had submitted to the king of Saxony in 1733 and were preserved in the Saxon Royal Library, Mendelssohn diligently compared his score with the original Missa parts and revised his score to match the readings he found in these historic materials.\footnote{Anselm Hartinger, “‘A Really Correct Copy of the Mass’? Mendelssohn’s Score of the B-minor Mass as a Document of the Romantics’ View on Matters of Performance Practice and Source Criticism,” in Exploring Bach’s B-minor Mass, edited by Yo Tomita, Robin A. Leaver, and Jan Smaczny (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 244-266.}

While Forkel, Zelter, and Poelchau had come from non-musical backgrounds, they found in their systematic approach to historic repertory a means of exhibiting mastery that had previously remained a jealously guarded guild prerogative. Jews such as the Mendelssohns also sought to exhibit cultural attainment as a mechanism of acculturation and assimilation within German society. However, the limit on how greatly such cultural distinction could serve as a means of advancement is seen in Felix Mendelssohn’s failure in 1833 to secure the appointment as successor to Zelter as director of the Sing-Akademie, which has often been seen as a manifestation of the anti-
Semitism in Friedrich Wilhelm III’s Prussia. Nevertheless, Mendelssohn would continue to instigate many of the innovations that realigned musical life in Germany in accord with the changing market for music. Building on the practice of conducting large choral concerts for mass audiences already seen in the performance of Bach’s St. Matthew Passion, Mendelssohn built his career in Düsseldorf and Leipzig conducting large amateur choruses and professional orchestras in historical music as well as his own large oratorios. In 1843 in Leipzig, Mendelssohn also established a modern professional music training program at the Conservatory, which assumed responsibility for musical training formerly provided by guilds and choir schools. And, it was in the context of formal music education that a musical canon became operative if not imperative. But, for this canon to have authority, Mendelssohn and his contemporaries came to believe that their understanding of the music needed to be rooted in historical accuracy that collation of autograph sources assured.

Several collectors who obtained copies of the Mass in B Minor in the first decades of the nineteenth century made significant contributions to the rise of professional music schools and, as detailed in chapter six below, would establish the Bach Gesellschaft to publishing a complete and authoritative edition of the composer’s oeuvre. Franz Hauser (1794-1870), who built a substantial Bach collection, retired from a career as an operatic baritone in 1838, after which he taught singing in Vienna, and in 1846 became the
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director of the newly founded conservatory in Munich. He is believed to have commissioned a copy of the Mass in 1825 [X5]. Joseph Fischhof (1804-1857), a composer, pianist, and teacher in Vienna, also amassed a music collection for which he is now primarily remembered. It included a manuscript in the hand of Johann Mederitsch of the Mass in B Minor [F8: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 182], that can be traced to the Viennese publisher Johann Traeg. Another copy of the Mass in the hand of a Viennese copyist by Aloys Wolfgang Passer [F10: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 1208] may have been prepared from the copy in Franz Hauser’s possession for Fischhof, as other items in Passer’s hand also formed a part of Fischhof’s collection. In 1833 Fischhof would become a member of the faculty of the conservatory of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde in Vienna.

The music historian Aloys Fuchs, who served as an agent for a number of collectors, may also have commissioned the copy by Passer. Fuchs was, himself, a distinguished collector and scholar. In 1829, Fuchs was appointed to the board of Vienna’s Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde, to which he donated a number of items from his collection; his catalogs and scholarship focused primarily on Gluck and Mozart. Like Fuchs in Vienna, the music historian Franz Commer (1813-1887) amassed a sizable
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79 For example, D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 190; D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 441; D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 457.


music library in Berlin, which included a manuscript of the Mass partly in the hand of J. F. Hering [F9: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 1172], which possibly came from the collections of successive directors of the Berlin Sing-Akademie. A final collector of note, Eduard Grell (1800-1886), who served as director of the Berlin Sing-Akademie from 1853 to 1876 and faculty member at the Akademie der Künste, acquired the first volume of Hering’s first copy of the Mass [D1: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 572], which was probably deaccessioned as a duplicate from the Voß collection prior to the donation of the Voß collection to the Prussian Royal Library. Grell has only recently received serious scholarly attention. And, despite the large quantity of eighteenth-century manuscripts that can be traced to Grell’s collection, including many other manuscripts in the hand of Hering, substantive discussion of Grell’s music collection in the scholarly literature has remained limited and has resulted primarily from work on composer-centered catalogs and editions that have relied upon manuscripts formerly in Grell’s collection.

In their collecting activities, these teachers and scholars reoriented the function and significance of musical scores. Guild musicians in the Old Regime treated musical
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83 Katalog 65, enthaltend die musikalische und hymnologische Bibliothek des Professor Franz Commer (Berlin: Liepmannsohn, 1888).
scores as tools of their trade that they needed to carefully control in order to preserve the economic interests of the guild membership. Somewhat later, amateur collectors at the turn of the nineteenth century used musical scores as a marker of economic, social, and intellectual distinction. However, the new class of professional musicians collected musical scores in order to develop and substantiate specialized knowledge that itself was a commodity. This positioned them to serve as the purveyors of this professional knowledge in an economic environment that had become slightly more open to individuals of different backgrounds following Hardenberg’s reforms in Prussia in the early nineteenth century reduced the control of guilds over economic life and removed restrictions on Jews.\textsuperscript{86} With the demise of traditional methods of training musicians, conservatories provided a new mechanism for musical education paralleling the role of German universities in other professional realms.\textsuperscript{87} Under such conditions, the musical score remained a professional tool. However, with the growth of amateur collecting and the ability of individuals to utilize their possessions as markers of attainment, the professional musician’s score collection offered the opportunity to project learning and expertise. This learning positioned individuals such as Zelter, Mendelssohn, Griepenkerl, and Grell to serve as the paid leaders of amateur musical associations, and individuals such as Mendelssohn, Hauser, and Fischhof to serve as conservatory instructors.

Recalling the case of C. P. E. Bach’s portrait collection offers the opportunity to contextualize the shift in the function and significance of collecting. A collection such as Emanuel’s reflected “… a singular logic [that] moved human society toward the completion of a rational plan or universal scheme, [and even though] this upset the static

\textsuperscript{86} Sheehan, 304-7.
nature of early modern time, [the individual in the Enlightenment] retained a faith in the legibility and knowability of history." However, in the wake of the French Revolution and Napoleonic Wars, which began just months after C. P. E. Bach died, a dislocation occurred that imputed shards of the past with new meaning. Just as the medieval ruins of the Rhine valley powered the imagination of the Romantic generation, so too did the musical legacy of J. S. Bach take on a highly charged significance for music collectors. Like building stones scattered around the ruins of medieval German sites, the dispersion of Bach manuscripts could be seen as part of the dispossession of an imagined national and sacred patrimony. For an aristocrat such as Otto von Voß Sr., Bach might have represented a time of social and religious stability prior to the liberalization and secularization of Prussian society. For Georg Poelchau, stitching together a composite manuscript to reflect the complete dimensions of the Mass in B Minor, as seen in the three associated volumes containing F3, E7 and F4, could be seen as an act of historic restoration. For the Jewish elite in Friedrich II’s Berlin, perpetuating a historically oriented, state-sanctioned repertory affirmed their belonging. As princely art collections became opened to the public, they also perpetuated a notion of nation and became conservators of that identity in the wake of social upheaval, at least as much as the collecting of folk songs by Herder, or fairy tales and language by the Grimm brothers.

91 Matthias Röder, “Music, Politics, and the Public Sphere,” 87-88.
served to establish the idea of a German nation.\textsuperscript{92} Contributing to the Prussian Royal Library became a means of affirming or even projecting a vision of the nation on an increasingly monumental collection at a time of decreasing confidence in a stable class or national identity.\textsuperscript{93} Similarly, participating in cultural associations, such as Sing-Akademien, created a sense among participants of belonging to something more unifying and universal. Simultaneously, the collecting and study of music history became professionalized as a means of negotiating one’s relationship to time and place, mirroring broader trends in the development of historical thinking. As discussed in the final chapter of this study, this process, which can be traced to individuals such as C. P. E. Bach and E. L. Gerber’s portrait collections, continues with the work of Johann Nikolaus Forkel, becomes increasingly focused and systematic in the collecting and publishing activities of Aloys Fuchs and Franz Commer, and takes on monumental form in the complete edition of the music J. S. Bach published by the Bach Gesellschaft.

Chapter 5: Performing

Felix Mendelssohn’s performance on March 11, 1829 of Bach’s *St. Matthew Passion* with the Berlin Sing-Akademie has attained mythical status. From the beginning this depended greatly on the novelty of a public performance by the Sing-Akademie, which its director Carl Friedrich Zelter had largely cloistered in service to the idea of individual cultivation central to the middle class project known as *Bildung*. More significantly, as Celia Applegate has written: “It was a moment of consolidation, perhaps even of transformation, in collective life, and for many listeners a moment of self-realization, which encompassed all that their philosophers and writers had been saying of the relationship between individuality, spirituality, nationality, and the aesthetic life.”\(^1\) This performance most assuredly did capture the imagination of its Berlin audience, harnessing Bach’s music in conceptualizing a German nation through a large-scale, secular performance of a historical, and decidedly Protestant, sacred composition. However, Mendelssohn’s performance of the *St. Matthew Passion* built on and, at the same time, stands in contrast to prior performances in Berlin of parts of Bach’s Mass in B Minor.

Before Mendelssohn’s *Passion* performance, several performances included portions, sometimes substantial, of the Mass. These continued in the years to follow. It is not wrong to frame the 1829 *St. Matthew Passion* performance as a pivotal moment in Bach reception, but, as has been more frequently acknowledged of late, it must be viewed in the broader context of a continuous tradition of Bach reception. As this study has sought to demonstrate, the textual transmission of Bach’s music provides tangible
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evidence of this history and expands our understanding of the scope of that reception. Looking just at the number of eighteenth and early nineteenth-century copies of the St. Matthew Passion and the Mass in B Minor, it becomes evident that the Mass was much more extensively copied and more widely distributed than any of Bach’s other large scale choral compositions.² This chapter describes the sources drawn on for numerous performances of music from the Mass in B Minor contemporaneous with Mendelssohn’s St. Matthew Passion performance, considers the transmission of sources not associated with performances, and observes the close the connection between the performances and the publication of Bach’s sacred music in the first decades of the nineteenth century. In addition, just as the eighteenth-century sources containing the Mass in B Minor allow for a more tangible appreciation of the conception of notated music among musicians of that era, so to do the nineteenth-century sources employed in a growing Bach performance tradition record the concerns of the individuals to whom the manuscripts belonged. In both instances, the evidence of the scores exhibits social and political realities encountered and engaged by musicians in at least as great a measure as it documents the minutely musical concerns on which they focused.

Popular attention had already been directed to the Mass in B Minor in the July 22, 1818 issue of the Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung, where Hans Georg Nägeli and Georg Poelchau announced an edition of the Mass that they planned to publish. The notice observes that the composition had enjoyed renown for many years, but only by

² For example, sources for the St. Matthew Passion are indexed at: http://www.bach-digital.de/receive/BachDigitalWork_work_00000304; the sources for the Mass in B Minor are indexed in the bibliography below and in NBArev 1, 286-99.
reputation. The notice highlights the edition prepared by Poelchau of the Magnificat (BWV 243a) and published by Nikolaus Simrock in 1811. Simrock also published an edition of the Mass in A (BWV 234) edited by Poelchau. In both instances, Poelchau possessed the autograph manuscript scores. Curiously, the edition of the Magnificat presents the earlier version in E-flat Major but excludes the interpolated chorales which are the most distinctive feature of that version, even though Poelchau also owned the autograph manuscript score of the version in D Major. Other than Breitkopf & Härtel’s 1802 edition of Bach’s motets (BWV 225-229), these editions of Bach’s Latin liturgical represented the only vocal music by J. S. Bach printed since the editions of Bach’s chorale settings published in the 1760s and 1780s, which themselves offered a highly selective representation of the composer’s music. In 1805 Breitkopf & Härtel had also published a Mass in G Major for eight voices that they attributed to J. S. Bach (BWV Anh. III 167, now believed to be by Johann Ludwig Bach or Antonio Lotti). Not surprisingly, public performances of the Magnificat, the Mass in A, and the Mass in G, along with private readings by the Berlin Sing-Akademie, occurred soon after the appearance of these editions. Thus, Nägeli must have felt optimistic about the reception his edition of the Mass would receive, but, despite the call for subscribers to an edition of
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4 Johann Sebastian Bach, Magnificat, à Cinque Voci Due Violini, Due Oboe, Tre Trombi, Tamburi, Basson, Viola e Basso Continuo (A Bonn: Chez N. Simrock, 1811); RISM A/I B 435.

5 Missa à 4 voci, due flauti, due violini, viola ed organo ... N°. 1, [Plate no.] 1580, (Bonn: N. Simrock, 1818); RISM A/I B 433.

6 Johann Sebastian Bachs vierstimmige Choralgesänge ... erster Theil [-zweyter Theil] (Berlin: Friedrich Wilhelm Birnstiel, 1765-69); RISM A/I B 448, and Johann Sebastian Bachs vierstimmige Choralgesänge, erster ... [-vierter Theil] (Leipzig: Breitkopf, 1784-87); RISM A/I B 449.

7 Messa a 8 voci reali e 4 ripiene coll’ accompagamento di due orchestra, [Plate no.] 262 (Leipzig: Brietkopf & Härtel, 1805); RISM A/I B 427.

the “greatest musical art work of all times and peoples,” the necessary subscriptions seem
to have come in too slowly to invest in production. Xaver Schnyder von Wartensee,
Nägeli’s agent in Frankfurt, reported just two subscribers and Friedrich Griepenkerl only
reported an additional five in Braunschweig.

Twelve years later, the edition of the *St. Matthew Passion* published in Berlin by
Schlesinger in 1830 appears to have benefitted greatly from Mendelssohn’s
performance. Schlesinger’s apparent success, with over 300 subscribers to the full score
or piano-vocal score listed at the beginning of the edition, may also have breathed new
life into Nägeli’s plans for the Mass in B Minor. All the same, the first volume of
Nägeli’s edition, containing the Kyrie and Gloria, would not appear until 1833. The
remainder of the Mass was not published until 1845. However, in 1833 Nägeli and
Simrock did publish a piano-vocal score and choral parts for the entire Mass. Prior to
that time, though, numerous performances occurred using only manuscript sources (see
Table 5.1).
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9 *B Dok* VI, C 50, pp. 462-3.
10 A. B. Marx’s contract with Schlesinger to prepare the piano-vocal score of the *St. Matthew Passion*,
dated April 8, 1829, in the midst of the three performances of the *Passion* by the Berlin Sing-Akademie,
recently sold for GBP 11,250 at Sotheby’s, Lot 86, Music and Continental Books and Manuscripts,
London, 24 May 2016. Interestingly, a large number of records from the Schlesinger firm, from which the
Marx contract was presumably removed for sale as a separate lot, failed to sell in the same auction (Lot
144, estimate GBP 150,000-200,000).
11 *Große Passionsmusik nach dem Evangelium Matthaei* [Plate no.] 1570 (Berlin: Schlesinger, 1830);
RISM A/I BB 436a (full score); *Große Passionsmusik nach dem Evangelium Matthaei*, Vollständiger
Klavierauszug von Adolph Bernhard Marx [Plate no.] 1571 (Berlin: Schlesinger, 1830); RISM A/I B 436
(piano-vocal score).
12 *Messe … nach dem Autographum gestochen, erste Lieferung*, [Plate no.] 6 (Zürich: Hans Georg Nägeli;
Bonn: Nikolaus Simrock, 1833); RISM A/I B 430.
13 *Die hohe Messe in H-moll … nach dem Autographum gestochen, Partitur, II. Lieferung*, [Plate no.] 4377
(Bonn: Nikolaus Simrock; Zürich: Hans Georg Nägeli, 1845); RISM A/I B 431.
14 *Die Hohe Messe in H-moll, für Zwei Sopran, Alto, Tenor und Bass* (Bonn: Bei N. Simrock; Zürich: Bei
(Bonn: Bei N. Simrock, 1834). The “Chorstimmen” were not indexed in RISM when first published, nor in
the addendum volume. These would presumably be numbered RISM A/I BB 432a.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Performers</th>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>Musical sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1770s</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>CPE Bach</td>
<td>\textit{Credo}</td>
<td>A? + E1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/04/1786</td>
<td>Saal der Handlungs-akademie, Hamburg</td>
<td>CPE Bach</td>
<td>\textit{Credo}</td>
<td>E3?; E1a-c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td>Marienkirche, Berlin</td>
<td>AW Bach</td>
<td>“Et incarnatus est”</td>
<td>F11?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/10/1828</td>
<td>Frankfurt</td>
<td>JN Schelble; Cäcilienverein</td>
<td>\textit{Credo}</td>
<td>F14 + lost parts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/30/1828</td>
<td>Königliches Opernhaus, Berlin</td>
<td>G. Spontini, members of the Königliches Oper</td>
<td>\textit{Credo}, mvmts. 1-6</td>
<td>E7; E1 + E9 + E10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/05/1831</td>
<td>Frankfurt</td>
<td>JN Schelble; Cäcilienverein</td>
<td>\textit{Kyrie, Gloria}</td>
<td>F14 + lost parts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/04/1831</td>
<td>Domkirche, Frankfurt</td>
<td>JN Schelble; Cäcilienverein</td>
<td>\textit{Kyrie, Gloria, Credo}</td>
<td>F14 + lost parts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1833</td>
<td>Marienkirche, Berlin</td>
<td>AW Bach</td>
<td>“Christe eleison,” “Gloria”</td>
<td>F11?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/21/1833</td>
<td>Frankfurt</td>
<td>JN Schelble; Cäcilienverein</td>
<td>\textit{Gloria}</td>
<td>F14 + lost parts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/19/1833</td>
<td>Vereinslokal, Frankfurt</td>
<td>JN Schelble; Cäcilienverein, (without orch.)</td>
<td>“Et incarnatus est,” “Crucifixus”</td>
<td>F14 + lost parts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/1834</td>
<td>Singakademie, Berlin</td>
<td>CF Rungenhagen, Sing-Akademie</td>
<td>\textit{Kyrie, Gloria, Credo} (all abridged)</td>
<td>F9? or X12? + Simrock Chorstimmene?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Performers</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1834</td>
<td>Marienkirche</td>
<td>AW Bach; Königliches Musik-Institut</td>
<td>Details unknown</td>
<td>F11?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 1834</td>
<td>Braunschweig</td>
<td>FK Griepenkerl; Singakademie</td>
<td>Several movements</td>
<td>F22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/12/1835</td>
<td>Singakademie, Berlin</td>
<td>CF Rungenhagen; Sing-Akademie</td>
<td>abridged</td>
<td>F9? or X12? + Simrock Chorstimmen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/16/1835</td>
<td>Weidenbuschsaal, Frankfurt</td>
<td>JN Schelble; Cäcilienverein (without orch.)</td>
<td>“Et incarnatus est,” “Crucifixus,” “Et resurrexit,” “Confiteor,” “Et vitam venturi”</td>
<td>F14 + lost parts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/15/1836</td>
<td>Probesaal, Frankfurt</td>
<td>F. Hiller; Cäcilienverein (without orch.)</td>
<td>Gloria</td>
<td>F14 or F15 + lost parts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>Frankfurt</td>
<td>C. Voigt; Cäcilienverein (without orch.)</td>
<td>Gloria</td>
<td>F14 or F15 + lost parts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01/1838</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Choral Harmonists’ Society</td>
<td>Credo</td>
<td>E?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/1838</td>
<td>York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>Singakademie, Berlin</td>
<td>CF Rungenhagen; Sing-Akademie</td>
<td>Credo</td>
<td>Published materials hereafter[?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>Frankfurt</td>
<td>C. Voigt; Cäcilienverein (without orch.)</td>
<td>Gloria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/21/1841</td>
<td>Gewandhaus, Leipzig</td>
<td>F. Mendelssohn; Gewandhaus-Orchester</td>
<td>“Crucifixus,” “Et resurrexit,” Sanctus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Conductor</td>
<td>Symphony</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/23/1843</td>
<td>Gewandhaus, Leipzig</td>
<td>F. Mendelssohn; Gewandhaus-orchester</td>
<td>Sanctus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>Düsseldorf</td>
<td>Details unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Frankfurt</td>
<td>FJ Messer; Cäcilienverein (without orch.)</td>
<td>Credo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/30/1850</td>
<td>Singakademie, Berlin</td>
<td>CF Rungenhagen, Sing-Akademie</td>
<td>Ten movements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>John Hullah, cond.</td>
<td>Credo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>Singakademie, Berlin</td>
<td>AE Grell, Sing-Akademie</td>
<td>Abridged (excluded several solo mvmts.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/28/1856</td>
<td>Frankfurt</td>
<td>FJ Messer; Cäcilienverein</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/1857</td>
<td>Frankfurt</td>
<td>FJ Messer; Cäcilienverein</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/1857</td>
<td>Frankfurt</td>
<td>FJ Messer; Cäcilienverein</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/10/1859</td>
<td>Thomaskirche, Leipzig</td>
<td>C. Riedel; Riedelscher Verein</td>
<td>Complete (in German; duets and arias partly abridged)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*An Age of Discovery*

Already in 1811, Carl Friedrich Zelter, Mendelssohn’s composition teacher, had begun reading portions of the Mass in B Minor with the Berlin Sing-Akademie, expanding upon the tradition of rehearsing Bach begun by Carl Friedrich Christian Fasch, Zelter’s own composition teacher and founder of the Sing-Akademie.16 By comparison,

16 *BDok VI, D 54-5, p. 598-9; regarding Fasch, see *BDok III, #986, pp. 532-3.*
Zelter first began to rehearse the *St. Matthew Passion* in June of 1815. The first documented public performance of any portion of the Mass since C. P. E. Bach’s concert performance of the *Symbolum Nicenum* in Hamburg in 1786 occurred in 1827. August Wilhelm Bach, organist and music director at Berlin’s Marienkirche and member of the Berlin Sing-Akademie, directed a performance of the “Et incarnatus est” at the Marienkirche. This performance, while garnering mention in the musical press, occurred within the context of the sacred liturgy. The following March, Johann Nepomuk Schelble performed the entire *Credo* with the Cäcilienverein in Frankfurt, which he had founded in 1818 and which fulfilled a socio-cultural function similar to the Berlin Sing-Akademie. A month and a half later, on April 30, 1828, Gaspare Spontini conducted a large-scale performance of the first six movements of the *Credo* with the chorus of the Royal Opera in Berlin, of which he was the director. The Cäcilienverein maintained the Mass in its repertory for years to come, while the Berlin Sing-Akademie would begin regular performances of portions of the Mass in 1834, and Friedrich Griepenkerl would perform portions of the Mass in Braunschweig soon thereafter. In the 1840s Felix Mendelssohn would also introduce the Mass to the audience of the Gewandhaus concerts in Leipzig.

In all, August Wilhelm Bach performed portions of the Mass at the Marienkirche on at least three occasions, including the performance of the “Et incarnatus est” in 1827, the “Christe eleison” and “Gloria” in 1833, and unspecified movements in 1834. By 1827 A. W. Bach (1796-1869), no relation to Johann Sebastian Bach, had attained an influential position in the musical life of Prussia. The son of the organist of the

---

17 *BDok VI, D 82, p. 619.*
18 *BDok VI, D 56, 599.*
Dreifaltigkeitskirche in Berlin, A. W. Bach, following study with his father and formal schooling, served as a private tutor to an aristocratic family. He would then become organist at the Gertraudenkirche in Berlin before moving to the prestigious position at the Marienkirche. In 1822, Zelter appointed him to teach organ and music theory at the Institut für die Ausbildung von Organisten und Musiklehren, which served as a key component in Zelter’s program to raise musical standards in Prussia. In 1826 Bach assumed official responsibility for overseeing organ building in Prussia and following Zelter’s death in 1832, he was appointed director of the Institut für die Ausbildung von Organisten und Musiklehren.

A. W. Bach’s familiarity with the Mass must have come from the relatively numerous copies of the score already in circulation in Berlin. The manuscript score of the Mass [F11: D-Bhm H 960/1-2] that is preserved today in the Akademie der Künste, the modern successor to the Institut für die Ausbildung von Organisten und Musiklehren, may have come from A. W. Bach’s collection. The headings “Atto I. mov” and “Atto II. do” suggest that a copy in the Voß collection [F5: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 9-10] served as its model. While A. W. Bach’s performances of movements from the Mass in B Minor did not take place on the monumental scale of Mendelssohn’s St. Matthew Passion performance, they reflect the effort to reintroduce J. S. Bach’s music into the sacred service and to assert the historical function of the composer’s music. While A. W. Bach had to accomplish this within a liturgical context that bore little resemblance to that for which Johann Sebastian Bach composed so much of his sacred music, J. S. Bach’s setting

19 Later the Königliches Institut für Kirchenmusik; on Zelter’s musical politics, see Applegate, Bach in Berlin, 141-50.
21 NBA I, 295.
of Roman liturgical texts fit easily into the Protestant liturgy of early nineteenth century
Prussia. In all likelihood, A. W. Bach’s performances used organ accompaniment and
the vocal lines might have been learned by rote, thereby obviating the need for
performing parts.

Just as A. W. Bach’s liturgical performances of excerpts from the Mass garnered
uncommon attention in the musical press, Johann Nepomuk Schelble’s performance of
the Credo also attracted the attention of his colleagues, even if the broader public’s
appreciation of this event did not reach the level of adoration that Mendelssohn’s
performance of the St. Matthew Passion would soon spark. The Cäcilienverein in
Frankfurt differed from the Berlin Sing-Akademie in that it performed public concerts on
a regular basis and by 1828 had presented to its audience large-scale choral compositions
by Handel, Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven. An undertaking such as a performance of
the Credo from Bach’s Mass in B Minor represented a logical extension of performances
of Handel’s oratorios and may have already been on Schelble’s mind in 1818 when he
was identified as one of the two subscribers to Nägeli’s announced edition secured by
Xaver Schnyder von Wartensee. The impetus to perform Bach’s music may have been
further bolstered by Franz Hauser, the singer and music collector. Hauser had moved to
Frankfurt in 1826 and joined the Cäcilienverein at the invitation of Schelble, who may
have become more intimately acquainted with Bach’s music through Hauser. By the time
Schelble performed Bach’s Credo in 1828, he may have already been planning a

---

23 “Vollständiges Verzeichniss der Aufführungen des Cäcilien-Vereins zu Frankfurt a.M. während der 50
performance of the *St. Matthew Passion*.\textsuperscript{24} Even though Schelble had obtained a manuscript of the Mass [F14: D-F Mus Hs 145] by 1825 or 1826, Hauser possessed copies of these compositions that he had prepared himself and must have encouraged Schelble’s efforts to perform these compositions.\textsuperscript{25} Schelble would conduct the *St. Matthew Passion* on May 2, 1829, just two months after Mendelssohn’s performance in Berlin.\textsuperscript{26} It was through Mendelssohn that Schelble had obtained his copy of the *St. Matthew Passion*.\textsuperscript{27}

As mentioned, Schelble had committed to purchasing Nägeli’s edition of the Mass soon after it was announced in 1818, but Nägeli’s long delay in producing the edition prompted Schelble to seek from Nägeli access to the Mass in manuscript. References in Nägeli’s correspondence with other individuals provides evidence for the arrangements Schelble had made with the publisher to have a copy of the Mass prepared from materials in Nägeli’s possession. By June of 1825 Nägeli had already loaned to Schelble a manuscript copy of the Mass.\textsuperscript{28} In a letter to Nägeli dated March 1, 1826, Nägeli was asked whether he intended to publish the Mass by Bach that he had lent to Schelble, as the correspondent was presumably eager to obtain his own copy of the Mass.\textsuperscript{29} In his letter to Wartensee Nägeli expresses his anxiety about the manuscript loaned to Schelble, stating to Wartensee that if he wanted to examine it, he must assure that he would

\textsuperscript{24} Applegate, *Bach in Berlin*, 26-7.  
\textsuperscript{25} Hauser’s copy of the Mass does not survive. His copy of the *St. Matthew Passion* is found in Berlin with the bulk of his collection, D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 1178.  
\textsuperscript{27} *D-F Mus HS 147*. See also Martin Geck, *Die Wiederentdeckung der Matthäuspassion im 19. Jahrhundert: Die zeitgenössischen Dokumente und ihre ideengeschichtliche Deutung* (Regensburg: Gustav Bosse Verlag, 1967), 75-86.  
\textsuperscript{29} NBA II/1 KB, 35.
personally get the score and return it himself. This would seem to suggest that the score in question was of particular value and, consequently, must have been the autograph manuscript that Nägeli had acquired through C. F. G. Schwenke from the estate of A. C. P. Bach. However, the readings in Schelble’s copy demonstrate that the Frankfurt copyists working for him must have worked from two different manuscripts. In fact, Nägeli’s demand that Wartensee carefully handle the manuscript loaned to Schelble most likely did not stem from its object value. Rather, Nägeli had assumed that his possession of the autograph conferred publishing rights for the music. Thus, in his communications with Wartensee and with others, he was expressing his fear that another publisher would prepare an edition that would undermine his plans to publish the Mass.30

The first volume of Schelble’s copy, containing the Kyrie and Gloria, follows the readings conventionally associated with the early Berlin copy Am. B. 3 [D2], while the second volume, particularly the Symbolum Nicenum, follows the readings in the autograph score that C. P. E. Bach had inserted in the course of revising that section for performance in Hamburg in the 1770s and 1780s.31 This suggests that Nägeli possessed two different manuscripts of the Mass. Presumably due to the delay in publishing his edition, Nägeli had lent two different manuscripts of the Mass to Schelble, so that the latter could have copies prepared. By March 19, 1827, Nägeli sought the assistance of Schnyder von Wartensee in getting Schelble to return the manuscript still in his possession, noting that the Kyrie and Gloria had been engraved but the remainder had not. Thus, it appears that Schelble relied on a non-autograph copy of the Mass for the Kyrie and Gloria while Nägeli retained the autograph for use by his engraver. However,

30 Cf. BDok VI, C 49, pp. 461-2; C 57, p. 468; C 58, pp. 469-70; C 60, pp. 471-2..
31 NBA II/1 KB, 35 and Shabalina, “Manuscript Score No. 4500,” 207.
at a later point Nägeli appears to have needed to lend the autograph to Schelble to allow him to copy the remaining movements, suggesting that Nägeli’s second copy of the Mass only included the Kyrie and Gloria. Circumstantial evidence suggests that F23 (private collection in New York) is the non-autograph copy that was in Nägeli’s possession.³² F24 (unknown private collection), containing the Credo, was prepared by the same copyist, but must have been separated from F23 prior to Nägeli’s acquisition of the latter. The separation of these manuscripts may have resulted from the impression that the two volumes represented distinct compositions, which also seems to have brought about the dispersal of the three volumes of D1.³³

As should be expected, the copy produced for Schelble [F14] now contains numerous performance-related annotations in red and blue.³⁴ It also contains numerous corrections to the music, most of which were entered by Schelble. As Tatiana Shabalina has observed:

It is significant that all the layers of corrections, even the first one, involve changes to the initial text. Broadly speaking, corrections in the first three layers are those of minor details and of obvious mistakes. The fourth layer, besides these, includes new variants, such as pitch revisions to octaves, fifths and so on, as well as the addition of passages and separate notes (sometimes these are affected by squeezing in small symbols without actually deleting the original symbols). The final stage of the corrections in the Frankfurt manuscript also includes numerous indications of dynamics (p, pp, f, mf, cresc., dim.), articulation signs (slurs and dots) and markings such as ‘ritard.’, ‘Tempo’, ‘Fine’, ‘Solo’, ‘Tutti’ as well as indications of instruments doubling the main lines, such as ‘Clarinetti’, ‘Fagotti’, ‘Corni’ and so on, where were marked in pencil.³⁵

Shabalina has also demonstrated that Schelble’s copy of the Mass served as the model for at least three other copies [F16: D-HAu Ms. 174, F18: F-Pn D. 538, and F21: RUS-SPk

---

³² This manuscript has remained in private hands and largely inaccessible to scholars. It is now in a private collection in New York.
³³ See the discussion in Chapter 3 of D1 within the context of the Voß collection.
³⁴ NBArev 1, 296.
³⁵ Shabalina, “Manuscript Score No. 4500,” 203.
distributed widely throughout Europe. Again, this presumably arose due to the absence of a printed edition, which did not appear until 1833, at which time only the first portion of the Mass was available in full score. Moreover, it appears that a wide range of Schelble’s professional colleagues were aware of the presence of the Mass in his collection and his willingness to allow it to be copied, despite Nägeli’s pronounced anxieties about this possibility.

**Defining A German Musical Legacy**

A third performance of material from the Mass in B Minor, conducted by Gaspare Spontini in April 1828, demands close consideration. By 1814 the Prussian king, Friedrich Wilhelm III, had sought to attract Spontini to Berlin from Paris, where the composer had attained prominence for his operas and as director of the Théâtre Italien. In 1819 the composer accepted this offer, following an increasingly negative reception in Paris, only to become the object of even greater disdain from critics and administrators at the Royal Opera in Berlin, where Spontini focused his activities as the leading court musician. As in Paris, Spontini readily submitted his work in support of the reigning political forces, notably with the historical operas *Fernand Cortez* for Napoleon and *Agnes von Hohenstaufen* for Friedrich Wilhelm III. However, Spontini’s compositional productivity fell short of expectations, and he routinely quarreled with the two intendents of the opera with whom he worked, Count Karl von Brühl and Count Wilhelm Friedrich von Redern. Indeed, part of Spontini’s difficulties stemmed from Brühl’s desire to see Carl Maria von Weber appointed to a position in Berlin, reflecting growing support for

---

German opera.\textsuperscript{37} This coincided with the music critic Adolf Bernhard Marx’s championing of the instrumental music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven over the sensual pleasures of Italian opera, especially that of Rossini but also the music of Spontini. Marx formulated this in unequivocally nationalistic terms, drawing on Hegel’s notion of the progress of the “world spirit” through successive peoples and nations toward higher states of consciousness. Just as with Hegel, who envisioned Prussia as the successor to France, for A. B. Marx Germans had attained a higher musical consciousness than the French or Italians. Marx’s opposition to Spontini, however, paled in comparison to the xenophobic vitriol directed by Ludwig Rellstab at the composer.\textsuperscript{38}

Despite all of this, Spontini conducted the first six movements of Bach’s \textit{Credo} in a public performance in Berlin an entire year before Mendelssohn’s triumphant presentation of the \textit{St. Matthew Passion}. Additionally, the concert included C. P. E. Bach’s \textit{Heilig} (Wq. 217), the Kyrie and Credo of Beethoven’s Mass in D (the \textit{Missa solemnis}, Op. 123), the Coriolan Overture (Op. 62), and the Symphony No. 5 in C Minor (Op. 67).\textsuperscript{39} Spontini included in the performance of Bach’s \textit{Credo} the instrumental introduction written by Emanuel. Significantly, Spontini seems to have enjoyed support from Georg Poelchau as demonstrated in the manuscript sources associated with this 1828 performance of movements from Bach’s \textit{Credo} at the Berlin Royal Opera. For this performance 109 instrumental and vocal parts [E10: D-B Mus. ms. Bach St 595] were prepared. These relied on one of Poelchau’s copies of the \textit{Credo} [E4: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 22] as the model. Moreover, the copyist of the parts prepared for Spontini’s


\textsuperscript{39} BDok VI, D 60, 602.
performance also assisted in preparing parts of the entire *Credo* [E9: D-B *Mus. ms. Bach St 118, neuer Bestand*], which complemented the original Hamburg performing materials that Poelchau had acquired from Schwenke [E1: D-B *Mus. ms. Bach St 118, alter Bestand*]. Finally, P 22 and St 118 are the only surviving sources of Emanuel’s introduction, further substantiating Poelchau’s association with the performance. In fact, the parts for the complete *Credo* most likely served as the rehearsal materials for the Berlin Sing-Akademie, which would have been in use for over a decade prior to this.

The entirely Germanic repertoire of Spontini’s concert begins to suggest that he was not indifferent to the concerns of his critics. The inclusion of substantial compositions by Beethoven suggests a commitment to recent repertory that had become highly esteemed, but Spontini had already established himself as an active proponent of German symphonic works — a reality that confounded A. B. Marx and his arguments against the foreigner holding the leading musical position in Prussia.40 Beyond the Beethoven, Spontini appears to have very thoughtfully positioned the music of Bach for the members of his audience, who remained less well acquainted with the earlier composer than they would soon become. Contrasting music from J. S. Bach’s *Credo* with Beethoven’s Mass setting as well as C. P. E. Bach’s treatment of the German translation of the *Sanctus* demonstrated the historical lineage of the more recent and better-known composers, regardless of whether Spontini knew of Beethoven’s actual familiarity with the Mass in B Minor through Gottfried van Swieten.41 Moreover, Spontini may have perceived the settings of the Latin liturgy as having broader appeal at a time of growing

40 Pederson, “A. B. Marx,” 100.
interest in Catholic composers of the Renaissance, especially Giovanni da Palestrina, and of increasing secularization. Nonetheless, Marx proved quick to criticize the performance for the inclusion of the instrumental introduction to Bach’s *Credo*, the inadequacy of Emanuel’s *Heilig* in contrast to his father’s music, which Marx dubbed the “holiest Mass,” and the changes in instrumentation, particularly in Bach’s “Crucifixus.”

Carl Friedrich Zelter, in letters to Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, similarly found Spontini’s concert wanting, both immediately after the concert and on reflection two years later, despite the high regard Spontini enjoyed for his conducting. Prior to the concert itself the seventeen year old Mendelssohn referred to the idea of Spontini conducting Bach as “nonsense,” thus exhibiting the young composer’s negative predisposition toward Spontini and willful disregard for the thoughtfulness of the concert program that the latter presented.

Despite the apparent opposition between Spontini on the one hand and Zelter, Marx, and Mendelssohn on the other, it is clear that they all saw Bach as a key figure in the conceptualization of a uniquely German musical legacy. By 1828 an overt musical nationalism had already taken shape in Prussia and other German states. As Katherine Hambridge has observed about a novelistic recounting of a spontaneous eruption of singing of a patriotic song at a theatrical performance in 1805:

… in 1852 [the date of the novel], public communal singing had long been established as a political act, and one particularly associated with the German national politics of the student societies (*Bursenschaften*), the male-voice choirs, the *Rheinlieder* of 1840, and the violent protests across German lands in 1848. In 1805, however, … this apparent display of patriotic enthusiasm via musical participation was both an unusual and a significant occurrence. Indeed, it was in these early years of the nineteenth century that ideas of popular political

---

42 *B*Dok VI, D 61, pp. 602-4; see also Applegate, *Bach in Berlin*, 120-1.
44 Applegate, *Bach in Berlin*, 33, n. 70.
participation, and the role of music in engendering patriotic sentiment and action, were moving to the forefront of discourse, in response to the Revolutionary and Republican Wars with France.\textsuperscript{45}

Not many years after Friedrich II of Prussia had actively warred with Saxony, the people in these principalities began to formulate a common sense of German identity largely as a result of the external threat posed by Napoleon’s army. The closening of Prussia and Saxony and the emergence of a shared identity is readily demonstrated in the embrace of Carl Maria von Weber and the hailing of \textit{Der Freischütz} as a distinctly German opera. Indeed, the rise of German-language opera in the Romantic generation continued the promotion of a collective identity begun by Johann Gottfried Herder, Achim von Arnim and Clemens Brentano, and Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm based on language, folks songs, and folklore. Whereas popular performances as described above clearly mark the emergence of a nationalist sentiment, the embrace of this quest for a distinctive German identity within elite culture exhibits the extent of this movement’s influence on contemporary thought. The performance of Bach’s music fit comfortably within this project.

As with any populist movement, the definition of who and what represented Germans remained quite nebulous. In the case of the first choral performances of Bach’s music in Berlin, mutually beneficial arrangements seem to have abounded. Poelchau appears to have supported Spontini. Zelter supported Mendelssohn, though not without his own interests in mind, quickly agreeing to conduct a third performance of the \textit{St. Matthew Passion} in May of 1829 after his initially tepid backing of Mendelssohn’s project. A. B. Marx was very ready to promote Felix Mendelssohn’s ambitions over

Spontini’s. While Marx was willing to accede the importance of Italian and French antecedents of his favored composers, he was more willing to point to Bach as a noble forefather to Beethoven.

The effort to claim Bach by varying factions reflects the desire to establish tangible connections to an identifiably German past as a means of asserting one’s belonging. Perhaps it is obvious that Spontini, the Italian, and Mendelssohn and Marx stood to benefit from establishing this association. Marx’s support of the *St. Matthew Passion* performance may have stemmed, in part, from the precarious position of converted Jews in Prussia. As Jeffrey S. Sposato has written, “… baptism was a virtual Pandora’s box, filled with paradoxes and contradictions, the most demoralizing of which was surely the continued distrust Jews faced from the non-Jews who had originally called for their conversion.” Sposato describes Mendelssohn’s adaptation of the *St. Matthew Passion* as over-emphasizing the composition’s anti-Semitic character, essentially overcompensating for his well-known Jewish heritage. But, in a still stratified society with strong anti-reform aristocrats wielding powerful influence, Zelter, the guild-trained craftsman, also needed to affirm his standing not just in Prussian society and politics but also as a musician. If the significance of the question of inclusion in German society is in doubt, one need look no further than the history published in 1843 in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the Berlin Sing-Akademie, on which Zelter’s entire identity hinged. Half of the publication is nothing more than an alphabetical list of the membership of the Sing-Akademie from its inception in 1793, which lists each member’s

---

dates of participation and the titles of, primarily, the men. \(^{50}\)

Of course, the Bach performance tradition of the Berlin Sing-Akademie would continue, with performances of portions of the Mass in 1834, 1835, 1840, and 1850 conducted by Carl Friedrich Rungenhagen. Undoubtedly, Rungenhagen appreciated the need to affirm his alliance with the Sing-Akademie’s traditions and also the need to stake claim to Bach. Indeed, the appointment of Rungenhagen as Zelter’s successor as director of the Berlin Sing-Akademie has often been viewed as the product of anti-semitism directed toward Mendelssohn. However, as Zelter’s assistant and a musician twenty-one years Mendelssohn’s senior, it is at least plausible that the well-known and more experienced candidate seemed a more sound choice over the young and rather precocious Mendelssohn.

**Beyond Berlin**

As described above, Johann Nepomuk Schelble had already performed the largest amount of material from the Mass in B Minor with a performance of the entire *Credo* in 1828 and, in 1831, the first documented performance of the *Kyrie* and *Gloria*. Then in October of 1831, Schelble reprised the *Kyrie*, *Gloria*, and *Credo*. Schelble would remain the conductor most actively presenting substantial portions of the Mass in the 1830s, while at the same time A. W. Bach continued to present selected movements at the Marienkirche in Berlin. In addition to these performances, Schelble also directed a performance of the *St. Matthew Passion* in May of 1829 in a greatly altered form that enjoyed as much public enthusiasm as Mendelssohn’s performance just two months before. The Cäcilienverein would continue to present a fairly diverse selection of Bach’s music under Schelble and his successors. As with most others, they relied mostly on

---

\(^{50}\) Heinrich Lichtenstein, *Zur Geschichte der Sing-Akademie in Berlin* (Berlin: Trautwein, 1843).
compositions that had appeared in print as opposed to those that circulated in manuscript.

Friedrich Griepenkerl conducted a performance of several movements of the Mass in Braunschweig sometime after 1834. Griepenkerl had studied with Johann Nikolaus Forkel in Göttingen and had acquired a number of Bach manuscript from his teacher’s collection, which seems to have included a copy of the Mass [F22: unknown private collection].\(^{51}\) This performance would presumably have utilized the *Chorstimmen* published by Simrock in 1833 or 1834.

Felix Mendelssohn first performed material from the Mass in January of 1841, but he had been acquainted with the music since the 1820s, when we was presented a copy of the Mass in B Minor [F17: GB-Ob *MS. M. Deneke Mendelssohn c. 66/67*] copied by Johann Friedrich Rietz.\(^ {52}\) Significantly, by the time that he began to perform the Mass in the 1840s his approach to Bach’s music differed greatly from that seen in the 1820s with the *St. Matthew Passion*, which he altered substantially. In the case of the Mass and knowing of the presence of the partially autograph manuscript performing parts that Bach submitted to the Elector of Saxony in 1733, Mendelssohn compared his manuscript score and the Dresden parts in order to resolve the conflicting readings that became evident as he examined these materials.\(^ {53}\)

In addition to the known performances of the Mass, manuscript copies circulated among a number of musicians in a variety of locations who may have contemplated performances or even conducted performances that have eluded documentation by


scholars. All of these manuscripts of the Mass in B Minor circulated in Europe prior to Nägeli’s publication of the *Kyrie* and *Gloria* in 1833. A copy in the hand of Christian Benjamin Klein (1754-1825) [F12: D-BNms Ec 9.5], who served as cantor in Schmiedeberg in Silesia (present day Kowary, Poland) until his death in 1825 is preserved in Bonn: in 1829 Friedrich Wilhelm III donated Klein’s music collection of 544 manuscripts and 144 books on music to the university in Bonn at the request of Heinrich Carl Breidenstein.\(^{54}\) Klein’s copy of the Mass obviously must pre-date 1825 and is interesting as it contains the first version of the “*Et in unum Dominum*” in an appended vocal score, inverting the position of the two versions as found in the autograph manuscript. While Klein’s training and professional life was centered in Silesia, he traveled to visit Johann Adam Hiller in Leipzig and Carl Friedrich Zelter in Berlin.\(^{55}\) It is presumably through Zelter or Poelchau that Klein gained access to the Mass.\(^{56}\) Klein also appears to have had access to Bach manuscripts in the collection of Breitkopf & Härtel.\(^{57}\)

Similarly, Christian Wilhelm Fischer (1786-1859), a singer, conductor, and regisseur at the Hoftheater in Dresden, prepared a copy of the Mass in the early years of the nineteenth century [F13: D-DI Mus. 2405-D-14]. And, like Klein, Fischer appears to have had access to a score [X12?] belonging to the Berlin Sing-Akademie, as Fischer copied a simplified version of the bass line in measures 74 to 86 of the “*Et resurrexit*”


\(^{56}\) D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 88 had belonged to the Berlin Sing-Akademie in the early nineteenth century and served as the model for Klein’s copy of BWV 91 (D-BNms Ec 9.4).

\(^{57}\) Klein used the autograph of BWV 131 in the possession of Breitkopf & Härtel (now in a private collection in New York) as the model for his copy (D-BNms Ec 9.3).
that is typical of Zelter’s arrangements. The movements “Et incarnatus est” and “Crucifixus,” which were frequently performed in the 1830s as excerpts, are also labeled “Solo” in Fischer’s copy. Not surprisingly, the score contains entries in the Kyrie and Gloria indicating it was compared with the original manuscript performing parts that were held in the Saxon Royal Library in Dresden and suggesting its use in the preparation of the edition published by the Bach Gesellschaft in 1856.  

A copy of the St. Matthew Passion in Fischer’s hand survives and may have served as the basis for the performance of this composition in Dresden on March 31, 1833.

Johann Theodor Mosewius, director of the Singakademie in Breslau (present day Wroclaw, Poland), conducted a performance of the St. Matthew Passion in 1830 in advance of its publication in 1831 by the Berlin firm Schlesinger. Mosewius also possessed a manuscript score of the Mass [F20: PL-Wu RM 5943] that he likely had copied from the manuscript in Franz Hauser’s possession, as many of Mosewius’s other manuscripts were copied from models in Hauser’s collection. Despite the performing tradition that he developed in Breslau that included a wide array of composers as well as a number of larger compositions by J. S. Bach, scholars have not yet documented a performance of the Mass in B Minor conducted by Mosewius.

In addition to the Breslau copy, a copy made in Vienna in about 1832 [F10: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 1208] likely used Hauser’s manuscript as a model. F10 offers very clear

58 NBA II/1 KB, 34-5.
59 D-DI Mus.2405-D-8; Geck, Wiederentdeckung, 117-125.
60 Applegate, Bach in Berlin, 43; Geck, Wiederentdeckung, 87-96.
61 Cf. PL-Wu RM 5915, which contains a copy of BWV 249 in the hand of “Schlottnig,” the model for which is a manuscript from Hauser’s collection (D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 1159/XIV, Faszikel I). Schlottnig also copied Mosewius’s score of the Mass in B Minor.
evidence of its origin, having been prepared by the Vienna copyist identified in Bach scholarship simply as Passer. Passer has been identified as the copyist of 26 manuscripts of Bach’s music, all of which are believed to have been made in the 1830s. This is, presumably, the musician and composer Aloys Wolfgang Passer, born in 1808 or 1809 in Salzburg, where he served as a singer and bassoonist at the Salzburg Cathedral until 1826. He then served as an assistant at the court library in Vienna, where his responsibilities included copying music.\(^{63}\)

The exact provenance of F10 has remained largely uninvestigated. Only its acquisition by the Berlin State Library in 1939 from an individual by the name of Kalthoff of Wiesbaden has been traced.\(^{64}\) However, in many of the other manuscripts of Bach’s music, Passer used as his model sources that belonged to Franz Hauser. Moreover, the Passer copies appear to have been uniformly commissioned by Joseph Fischhof (1804-1857). Thus, the model for F10 is more than likely the now lost manuscript known to have been in the possession of Franz Hauser [X5]. If F10 belonged to Fischhof it is curious that it was not included in the 1859 transfer of his collection to the Royal Library in Berlin, but the apparent centrality of this manuscript to the preparations of Julius Rietz’s 1856 edition for the Bach Gesellschaft may explain its absence from the materials acquired by the Berlin library. As Fischhof owned another copy of the Mass, it may be that he or Hauser facilitated a loan of F10 for Rietz’s use.\(^{65}\)

The manuscript is noteworthy as one of two examples (along with the “Forkel/Sievers”

---


\(^{64}\) The description in NBA is one follows NBA II/1 KB, 21.

\(^{65}\) F8: P 182 bears Fischhof’s name on its title page.
manuscript [F22)] which have the alto voice notated in the soprano clef and that specify the “Et incarnatus est” and “Crucifixus” movements for solo voice. Friedrich Smend, however, asserted that F10 can not be derived from “Forkel/Sievers” as many of the mistakes found in the latter manuscript are not present in F10. Instead, Smend proposes that a lost manuscript derived from Am B 3 and also used as the model for “Forkel/Sievers” served as the model for P 1208.\(^\text{66}\) In NBArev I, Uwe Wolf, following Smend, extrapolates the numerous corrections and entries in different hand may stem from comparison with an “Academieexemplar.”\(^\text{67}\) As outlines in Figure 5.1, if Zelter possessed the copy of the Mass that later came into the possession of Franz Commer, it may be that this manuscript [F9: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 1172] served as the original model for most the manuscript copies of the Mass linked with the Berlin Sing-Akademie.

**Figure 5.1: Nineteenth Century Manuscripts of Berlin Origin**

---

\(^{66}\) NBA II/1 KB, 33–4.

\(^{67}\) NBArev I, 295.
Frankfurt Sources

While Johann Nepomuk Schelble performed portions of the Mass more frequently and extensively than any of his contemporaries, he also appears to have had as much of an influence on the textual transmission of the Mass in B Minor as Zelter or Franz Hauser. As has been recently demonstrated, the manuscript copies of the Mass in St. Petersburg, Paris, and Halle all relied on Schelble’s score as their model (see Figure 5.2). As with the Bonn [F12: D-BNms Ec 9.5] and Dresden [F13: D-Dl Mus. 2405-D-14] copies based on a Berlin Sing-Akademie manuscript, and the Breslau [F20: PL-Wu RM 5943] and Vienna [F10: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 1208] scores based on Hauser’s manuscript, all of the copies relying on Schelble’s manuscript belonged to professional musicians. However, no traces have surfaced of performances relying on these scores.

Figure 5.2: Nineteenth Century Manuscripts of Frankfurt Origin

Of the manuscripts emanating from Frankfurt, the Paris score [F18: F-Pn D. 538] possesses the most well documented origin. At some point prior to late 1830, François-
Joseph Fétis, who was serving as the librarian of the Paris Conservatoire, had requested the assistance of Ferdinand Hiller in acquiring a copy of the Mass in B Minor. To fulfill this request, Hiller turned to Schelble, who had a calligraphic copy prepared from his manuscript score. Scheble’s copy also served as the model for a score now found in St. Petersburg [F21: RUS-SPk 4500], which was possibly used in the mid-nineteenth century for closed rehearsals of the Singakademie founded there in 1818 by the German conductor Heinrich Behling. Scheble’s copy appears to have served as the model for another copy prepared before 1831 in Frankfurt [F16: D-HAu Ms. 174] by Franz Xaver Gleichauf, a student of Schelble and copyist responsible for a number of items in the collection of the Cäcilien-Verein, including 44 Bach scores. Gleichauf also prepared a thematic catalog of Schelble’s compositions and a score of G. F. Handel’s oratorio Saul, which was performed by the Cäcilien-Verein on 23 October 1835. The provenance and, thus, the intended use of the Mass manuscript is unclear, though Gleichauf may have prepared it for his own use. Despite his relative obscurity today, a noteworthy array of German music publishers, including Nicolaus Simrock, Johann André, and C. F. Peters, commissioned Gleichauf to prepared piano reductions of music by Mozart, Beethoven, and Bach, including the Mass in A Major (BWV 234) published by Simrock in 1831 or 1832.

Making Bach Bourgeois

Through the Singakademien, J. S. Bach’s choral compositions became monuments reinforcing a popular conception of a German Protestant musical and

68 Shabalina, “Manuscript Score No. 4500,” 209.
69 Shabalina, 212.
71 Johann Sebastian Bach, Messe, no. 1 in A für vier Singstimmen mit Orchester Begleitung, Clavierauszug von X. Gleichauf [Plate no.] 2950 (Bonn: N. Simrock, 1831 or 32).
historical heritage. Growing numbers of the educated middle class participated in organizations throughout German states, such as choral associations, propounding the concepts of intellectual and social engagement underlying Bildung. Through these organizations individuals gained exposure to not only the practices of self-formation inherent in Bildung but also to the ideologies that advanced an imagined past as a means of substantiating political ambitions of the present.72 As individuals sought to strengthen German unity in the post-Napoleonic era and to harness the vitality of a social structure more open to talented individuals of non-noble lineage, a figure such as J. S. Bach proved particularly appealing. The complexity and scale of Bach’s music allowed for public spectacles that affirmed ideas of social harmony, individual attainment, and the virtue of discipline. While other historical composers, particularly G. F. Handel, enjoyed more frequent public exposure, the technical sophistication, greater difficulty, and staunchly Lutheran complexion of Bach’s music made it a more potent symbol of Germanness. And, in less predominantly Lutheran regions, the Mass in B Minor achieved many of the same goals. As a result, performances of Bach’s large sacred vocal music, in particular the St. Matthew Passion and portions of the Mass in B Minor, served as statements about both the attainment and the identity of the members of the choral associations presenting this music.

At the same time, even contemplating the performance of Bach’s music held significance. Exhibiting an appreciation for Bach’s music both in public performance and private collections reflected well on individuals who could no longer rely upon their

social position to define their identity and standing. We see in the copies of the Mass that circulated to Dresden, Halle, Bonn, Paris, and St. Petersburg an awareness of the importance of this composition in the body of Bach’s work as the composer gained increasing centrality in the canon of historical music. The musicians who acquired these manuscripts must have at least contemplated the possibility of and may even have rehearsed for public performances that either have left little trace in the historical record or proved beyond the capabilities of the resources available.

Not long before this, an individual’s music collection could balance practical use with intellectual curiosity, as seen with the collection of aristocrats such as Otto von Voß and Gottfried van Swieten. These men both regularly hosted musical performances in their homes featuring chamber and orchestral music and developed sizeable collections of sacred choral music that appear to have been amassed for more intimate study. By contrast, the markedly practical utility of Sara Levy’s music collection, focused almost exclusively on keyboard music, foreshadows the middle-class interests served by publishers like Nägeli and Schlesinger. Just as Levy’s social status resulted from the financial achievements of her father, as opposed to her family’s birth, the newly forming middle class had to demonstrate its attainment as a performative act. Levy’s association with the Berlin Sing-Akademie and Zelter’s dependence on this association as substantiation of his musical attainment stem from the same need for social legitimation.

Just a few years later it became possible for amateur and professional musicians alike to begin to acquire printed copies of the Mass and it became possible with the piano-vocal score to demonstrate attainment within a domestic sphere as well. The publication of Bach’s music in the early nineteenth century initially focused on the
composer’s keyboard music, with Breitkopf & Härtel, Hoffmeister, and Nägeli all producing editions.\textsuperscript{73} However, already in 1802 Breitkopf & Härtel had published a collection of six motets (BWV 225-229, Anh. 159), and by the 1830s a steady stream of editions of Bach’s sacred vocal music had begun to appear.\textsuperscript{74} In 1811 Nicolaus Simrock issued an edition of the \textit{Magnificat} in the version in E-flat (BWV 243a) and, as mentioned above, Nägeli announced his edition of the Mass in B Minor in 1818. In the late 1820s Simrock would publish editions of the Mass in A (BWV 234) and the Mass in G (BWV 236) exhibiting an apparent preference for Bach’s Latin liturgical music over his German sacred music. Unlike the motets, which had enjoyed continuing use in Leipzig in the eighteenth century and were routinely rehearsed at the Berlin Sing-Akademie from the 1790s, the bulk of Bach’s German sacred music really began to attract interest following Mendelssohn’s performance of the \textit{St. Matthew Passion} in 1829. In 1830 the Berlin publisher Schlesinger issued a full score and piano-vocal score of this Passion and Trautwein, another Berlin publisher, brought out an edition of the \textit{St. John Passion} (BWV 245) in 1831 both in score and piano reduction.\textsuperscript{75}

These publishers sought to capitalize on the growing number of amateurs seeking to participate in the cultural life of the educated middle class. The differentiation of the market for printed music becomes quickly apparent in the subscribers to Schlesinger’s edition of the \textit{St. Matthew Passion}, where those subscribed to the full score are listed alongside those receiving the piano score. There we see the professional musicians almost uniformly subscribing to the full score, while the amateurs are subscribed to the

\textsuperscript{74} \textit{Joh. Seb. Bach's Motetten in Partitur ...} (Leipzig: Bey Breitkopf & Härtel, 1802); RISM A/I: B 447.
\textsuperscript{75} RISM A/I: B 437 and B 438.
piano score. The piano score used in domestic performance allowed individuals to enact their social identity privately, in a family, or with guests. Further supporting domestic music-making, publishers also printed excerpts, such as Trautwein’s editions of a duet for two women and an aria with obbligato violin, both from the *St. John Passion*.

At the same time, the publishers also produced printed choral parts for the Passions, Masses, and cantatas. In examining the dates of performances of individual compositions, one quickly recognizes that choral associations readily welcomed new music by Bach into their repertory as published performing materials became available. For instance, Simrock’s published scores, piano-vocal scores, and performing parts of a number of cantatas (BWV 101-106), which appeared in 1830 most likely were used when the Cäcilian-Verein in Frankfurt performed these cantatas beginning in 1833. Likewise, a piano-vocal score and choral parts of the Mass in B Minor appeared in 1833, making possible performances in Braunschweig, Leipzig, and Berlin: the Berlin Sing-Akademie’s first public performance of material from the Mass took place on February 2, 1834. The availability of published choral parts at this point suggests a new dynamic between the public and private worlds of the Sing-Akademie. Whereas previously the Sing-Akademie had only rehearsed the Mass privately, presumably relying at least to some extent on the manuscript parts of the *Credo* from Poelchau’s collection, the availability of a published edition of the Mass made it easier to perform this music publicly. More significantly, if Bach’s music was now more readily available to the public, then perhaps the Sing-Akademie also saw it as necessary to assert its claim on this music.

---

76 [Link](http://www.mdz-nbn-resolving.de/urn/resolver.pl?urn=urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb11131610-4)
78 *Intelligenz-Blatt zur allgemeinen musikalischen Zeitung* VI (July 1833): 23.
What we see in the course of the first decades of the nineteenth century is an emergence of a middle class in German urban centers that relied upon cultural participation and consumption in defining its membership and a collective identity. The formation of choral societies depended upon the desire or need of individuals to assert their place within a meritocracy built on the foundation of an educated middle class. Participation in a Sing-Akademie served as a means of substantiating a person’s social and even moral legitimacy. These choral societies also became sites for the negotiation of the scope of the community and the appropriate manner of appreciating music. The performance of the movements from Bach’s *Credo* by the opera chorus under the direction of Spontini came in for criticism as inadequate musically because the practices appropriate to public operatic performance were deemed inappropriate to music that the Berlin Sing-Akademie had previously assigned to serious, cloistered veneration in Carl Friedrich Zelter’s private rehearsal. Moreover, A. B. Marx cited Spontini’s foreign perspective as evidence for his inability to appreciate the most holy of Bach’s music. Instead, Marx readily touted Mendelssohn’s performances of the *St. Matthew Passion* as a more faithful representation of the German master’s music. But, the consequences of the policing of the legitimate membership in the German middle class’s social institutions may also have resulted in Mendelssohn’s exclusion based on his family’s Jewish heritage.

Mendelssohn’s ability to successfully establish himself outside of Berlin relied in no small part on the rapid growth in the foundations of the German middle class. Individuals had begun to replicate their public activities in the more intimate settings of their homes and, as music became commodified in printed editions, consumer habits
aided individuals in forming and reinforcing social identities. The mass spectacle of the 1829 St. Matthew Passion performance demonstrates one way in which this new consumer culture manifested itself, but the stability and routine of the Gewandhaus concerts that Mendelssohn came to direct in Leipzig serves as demonstration of the formalization of middle class musical consumerism. Cultural participation only became more important for individuals from even more diverse social and economic backgrounds that began to populate the ranks of the Bildungsbürgertum and that swelled the ranks of choral associations throughout German lands. The Bildungsbürgertum became the market for the editions of Bach’s music that began to appear with increasing frequency as the nineteenth century progressed. While it took years for a market to materialize in support of Nägeli’s ambitious full-score edition of the Mass, the piano-vocal score and choral parts for the Mass appear to have found ready consumers already in 1833. These materials enabled an increasing number of performances and continued to expand the interest in Bach’s music. Thus, by 1850 Breitkopf & Härtel could readily support the ambitions of the university and conservatory professors who founded the Bach Gesellschaft with the intention of producing a monumental edition of all of Bach’s music, including a new edition of the Mass in B Minor.

---

Chapter 6: Editing

In 1856 the Bach Gesellschaft issued the sixth annual installment (the “sechster Jahrgang”) in its edition of the complete works of Johann Sebastian Bach, which contained the Mass in B Minor. The Bach Gesellschaft had first planned to initiate its entire project in 1851 with a new edition of the Mass in B minor. However, as the directors of the society wrote to its membership in a prefatory statement to the edition of the Mass dated December 3, 1856, the hope of beginning their complete edition of Bach’s works with the Mass failed because the editors remained unable to gain access to the autograph manuscript score. They observed that they had access to authentic materials for the Kyrie, Gloria, and Sanctus, but lacked the same for the remaining movements. The directors of the society then outlined the lengths to which they went to obtain access to the autograph score of the Mass in order to maintain the same standards established in the preceding volumes of the Bach Gesellschaft’s edition. Finally, after having already begun the process of engraving the plates for their edition of the Mass, the autograph score became available. However, at that point it was determined that the already available autograph materials and the reliability of the secondary sources would prove sufficient to produce an edition of the Mass. Presumably little would undermine the decision to proceed with the edition already prepared and the directors assured their members that supplements or corrections would be issued as necessary.¹

The directors of the Bach Gesellschaft delegated the task of editing the Mass to Julius Rietz (1812-1877), who had served as the director of the Leipzig Opera and Singakademie since 1847, taught at the Leipzig Conservatory, and would succeed Niels

¹ “An die Mitglieder der Bachgesellschaft. Die Ausgabe der H moll Messe betreffend,” BG 6, unpaginated; reprinted in NBA II/1 KB, 62-64.
Gade as director of the Gewandhaus Orchestra. A cellist, conductor, and composer, Rietz came from a family of musicians, which included his brother, the violinist and close friend of Mendelssohn, Eduard Rietz (1802-1832), and his father, the Prussian court violinist Johann Friedrich Rietz (d. 1828), who prepared manuscript copies of several Bach compositions that belonged to Mendelssohn, including Mendelssohn’s Mass in B Minor manuscript [F17: GB-Ob MS. M. Deneke Mendelssohn c. 66/67]. Beginning in 1834 Julius served as Mendelssohn’s assistant and primary conductor of the opera in Düsseldorf and later as the city’s music director. He would succeed Otto Jahn as the secretary of the Bach Gesellschaft, serving in that capacity from 1855 to 1860, at which point he became the music director of Dresden. In addition to editing the Mass in B Minor, he prepared the edition of the St. Matthew Passion for the Bach Gesellschaft, the edition of Handel’s Susanna for the Deutsche Händel-Gesellschaft, editions of Haydn symphonies for Breitkopf & Härtel, editions of Mozart operas, and oversaw the Mendelssohn edition published by Breitkopf & Härtel between 1874 and 1877.²

To prepare his edition of the Mass, Rietz relied upon a variety of sources, many of which would have been considered secondary sources had the autograph manuscript score been available. Indeed, numerous sources for the Mass were already available to the Bach Gesellschaft, including Nägeli’s edition of the full score published in two volumes in 1833 and 1845, numerous manuscripts of the full score, and a variety of autograph materials. As stated in the preface to the edition, Rietz drew on the mostly autograph manuscript parts of the Missa in the Saxon Royal Library in Dresden [B2: D-

the autograph score and original parts of the *Sanctus* from Georg Poelchau’s collection in the Prussian Royal Library since 1841 [B3: D-B *Mus. ms. Bach P* 13, *Faszikel 1*, and B4: D-B *Mus. ms. Bach St* 117], and several manuscript copies of the full score. In the latter category, Rietz mentions just three manuscripts in the Prussian Royal Library, despite the presence of an even larger number of pertinent sources already in that collection. At that time the Prussian Royal Library holdings from Poelchau’s collection included the manuscript performing parts from Hamburg for the *Symbolum Nicenum*, a separate Hamburg copy of the score of the *Symbolum Nicenum*, another Hamburg copy of the *Symbolum Nicenum* to which Poelchau had added copies of the *Missa* and the remaining movements of the complete Mass beginning with the *Sanctus* which he had commissioned in Berlin, the second complete score from Poelchau’s collection, and a copy of the complete score donated by the Voß family in 1851, not to mention the scores of the *Symbolum Nicenum* and the *Sanctus* and remaining movements from the Voß collection that had formed two volumes of the earliest copy of the Mass. Rietz also mentions a score held by the Berlin Sing-Akademie, possibly copied by Carl Friedrich Zelter. Rietz also relied upon the copy from J. P. Kirnberger’s collection, to which he had compared his copy of the Nägeli edition of the Mass, which claimed on its title page that it had been prepared from the autograph

---

3 Designated source “A” in *BG* 6, XIV-XVI.
4 Designated collectively as source “B” in *BG* 6, XVII.
5 Designated collectively as source “C” in *BG* 6, XVII-XVIII.
6 E1: D-B *Mus. ms. Bach St* 118 (alter Bestand).
11 F6 and F7: D-B *Mus. ms Bach P* 11-12.
15 Presumably one of the two lost scores from the Sing-Akademie, *NBArev* 1 source X12.
manuscript. Rietz and the director’s of the Bach Gesellschaft consequently felt optimistic that they could proceed without access to the autograph manuscript.

Unmentioned by Rietz in his preface are two further manuscripts on which he relied in his work with the Mass. As these manuscripts date from the 1820s and 1832, they most likely simply served as points of reference, but annotations in both demonstrate the efforts Rietz took to compare sources. The first of the later manuscripts is the full score prepared by a Dresden copyist, Christian Wilhelm Fischer, that reflects a comparison of the score to the original manuscript performing parts held in the Saxon Royal Library. A second manuscript score prepared in Vienna by Aloys Wolfgang Passer in 1832 contains numerous layers of annotations documenting engagement over possibly twenty years, including comparison to numerous related documents such as a copy held by the Berlin Sing Akademie, the autograph manuscript materials for the D Major Sanctus, and Nägeli’s edition.

Passer has been identified as the copyist of 26 manuscripts of Bach’s music, all of which are believed to have been made in the 1830s and appear to have been uniformly commissioned by Joseph Fischhof (1804-1857). Thus, the model for this manuscript is more than likely the now lost manuscript known to have been in the possession of Franz Hauser, from whom Fischhof gained access to many compositions by Bach. If this manuscript belonged to Fischhof it is curious that it was not included in the 1859 transfer of his collection to the Prussian Royal Library in Berlin. However, the apparent centrality of this manuscript to the preparations of Rietz’s 1856 edition for the Bach Gesellschaft
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16 D2: D-B Am. B. 3.
17 F13: D-Dl Mus.2405-D-14; NBA II/1 KB, 34-5.
18 F10: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 1208.
19 NBArev 1, source X5.
may explain its absence from the materials acquired by the Berlin library. As another manuscript score of the Mass bears Fischhof’s name on its title page, it may be that Fischhof or Hauser facilitated the copying of a new manuscript for Rietz’s use.\textsuperscript{20} Among layers of corrections and entries in this manuscript one stems from comparison with an “\textit{Academieexemplar}.”\textsuperscript{21} Another layer of pencil annotations throughout the score reflects readings in “\textit{Typus Am B 3}” manuscripts as well as Nägeli’s edition, while entries in red ink appear in the \textit{Sanctus} and reflect comparison with the original manuscript materials for the early version of that movement. Given this, Friedrich Smend concludes that the later entries make clear that this manuscript served as the engraver’s model for the second half of the Bach-Gesellschaft edition.\textsuperscript{22} The Dresden score may have served as the engraver’s model for the \textit{Missa}.

The manner in which Rietz collated sources demonstrates a good deal of ingenuity, in no small part because the relationship of the various materials found in the composite Mass remained unclear if not completely obscure. Other than the dating of the \textit{Missa} based on the letter of dedication from July 27, 1733, Rietz does not propose a date for the composition of the Mass, but does recognize that Bach incorporated previously composed music into the new composition.\textsuperscript{23} Moreover, Rietz proposes that Bach appears to have not set out to compose a complete setting of the Roman Mass Ordinary, but rather that he was able to draw together music he had composed for other purposes in assembling a complete Mass.\textsuperscript{24} He cites the \textit{Christmas Oratorio} (BWV 248), which had been published by the Bach Gesellschaft in 1855, as an example of the extent and nature

\textsuperscript{20} F8: D-B \textit{Mus. ms. Bach P 182}; the lost “\textit{Akademieexemplar}” is designated in \textit{NBArev} 1 as source X12.
\textsuperscript{21} \textit{NBArev} 1, 295.
\textsuperscript{22} \textit{NBA II/1}, KB, 21 and 33-34.
\textsuperscript{23} \textit{BG} 6, XIV.
\textsuperscript{24} \textit{BG} 6, XIII-XIV.
of Bach’s parody practice, but expresses some perplexity over the dismantling and reassembling of music for various purposes. In all, Rietz demonstrates a well-formed and fairly rigorous editorial method intended to produce a whole that was greater than the sum of its parts.

However, the inability to consult the autograph score proved problematic. This situation was precipitated by the anxieties of Hans Georg Nägeli’s son Hermann, who inherited the autograph score of the Mass and who continued his father’s music publishing business in Zürich. Like his father, Hermann Nägeli presumed that his ownership of the autograph manuscript conveyed with it publishing rights. By withholding the manuscript from the Bach Gesellschaft he sought to protect the market for the edition of the full score of the Mass that his father began in 1833 and that he finished in 1845. At the same time, Nägeli suffered from financial constraints that ultimately led him to sell the manuscript in 1855 to Arnold Wehner, an individual Nägeli thought was acting on behalf of the royal court in Hannover. However, Wehner was acting on behalf of the Friedrich Chrysander, who subsequently lent the manuscript to the Bach Gesellschaft before donating it to Prussian Royal Library.

Already in 1857 the directors of the Bach Gesellschaft found it necessary to issue revisions to their edition of the Mass because of the readings in the autograph score, which made clear that the edition Nägeli had published, and on which Rietz had relied, contained numerous readings based not on the autograph but on another manuscript score in Nägeli’s possession. As seen with the manuscript of the Mass prepared for Johann Nepomuk Schelble, the Nägelis appear to have owned not only the autograph score of the

\[25\] BG 6, XIV.
\[26\] Friedrich Smend, NBA II/1 KB, 58-73.
entire Mass but also a copyist manuscript of at least the Missa. As Rietz noted, the Nägeli edition conforms in large measure to the readings found in D2 [D-B Am. B. 3], but Rietz and his colleagues in the Bach Gesellschaft were surprised to see that the autograph contained significantly different readings. This suggests that, despite their claim of having prepared their edition from the autograph score, the Nägelis relied upon their second manuscript of the Mass as a model for their edition.

Learning this, the Bach Gesellschaft quickly sought to prepare a corrected edition to supplant the already issued volume containing the Mass. The revision consisted of several clarifications of readings, primarily in the Gloria outlined in the preface and a complete re-printing of the Symbolum Nicenum, the Sanctus, the “Osanna,” “Benedictus,” “Agnus Dei,” and “Dona nobis pacem.” However, Rietz appears to have applied only a superficial and inconsistent revision process to his original version. Thus, neither the original volume nor its replacement transmit an accurate reading of the Mass. While some of the plates for the replacement volume were newly engraved and others corrected, it may well have been that the cost of a comprehensively re-engraved edition was prohibitive. Alternatively, Rietz may have been unable to invest the time into unraveling the discrepancies between his edition, the sources he had originally utilized, and the autograph score. At the same time, Rietz may have appreciated that his sources more clearly conveyed the original version of the Symbolum Nicenum prior to the intervention of C. P. E. Bach in the autograph score. The result was an edition that conveyed readings
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27 F14: D-F Mus Hs 145; see chapter 5 above. The other manuscript of the Missa is likely F23, now in the possession of a private collector in New York. It is clear that H. G. Nägeli relied on this manuscript as the model for his edition, as the printed score follows the readings on the copyist manuscript as opposed to the autograph. F24, a source last known to be in the collection of Alan Tyson but dispersed in the 1980s, is the companion volume of this two-volume manuscript and begins with the Symbolum Nicenum and continues to the end of the Mass. This volume must not have been in Nägeli’s possession, as Schelble relied on the autograph score loaned to him by Nägeli for the preparation of his copy and since the readings in the edition published by Hermann Nägeli in 1845 contains the readings from the autograph.
from a variety of inadequately differentiated sources that stood in stark contrast to the aims of the Bach Gesellschaft’s ambitions.

**The Bach Gesellschaft**

As mentioned above, the Bach Gesellschaft had sought to begin its edition of Bach’s complete works with the Mass in B Minor, but the inability to consult the autograph score confounded the philological principles to which the society sought to adhere. Yet, the directors of the Bach Gesellschaft conflated their intellectual ambitions with societal ambitions that would also confound the objectivity which they professed. In the introduction to the first volume of their edition, the directors of the society expressed their conception of the edition as a “debt of honor” that would glorify one of the greatest and most profound masters produced by the German people, whose might lies at the heart of German music. This echoed the sentiments already expressed by Johann Nikolaus Forkel in his 1802 biography of Bach, who himself saw an authoritative edition of Bach’s music to be of greatest national importance. Subsequently Forkel became closely involved with Hoffmeister & Kühnel’s *Oeuvres complètes de Jean Sebastian Bach*, an edition of Bach’s keyboard music, and was extremely particular about the accuracy of the music presented in the edition. Hans Georg Nägeli placed a similar
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29 [Preface], *Johann Sebastian Bach’s Werke* 1, lii; “Eine Ausgabe seiner sämtlichen Werke … ist eine Ehenschuld der Nation … so dass sie ein Denkmal sei der Verehrung, die das deutsche Volk einem seiner grössten und tiefsten Meister zollt, allein in würdiger Weise durch die vereinigten Kräfte derer, welchen die echte Kunst deutscher Musik am Herzen liegt, ausgeführt werden kann.”
30 See chapter 4, above; NBR, 419.
emphasis on the importance of publishing Bach’s music, but with a more universalist tone. In his subscription announcement for the edition he planned of Mass in B Minor printed in 1818, Nägeli proclaimed the composition to be “the greatest musical work of times and all nations.”\(^{32}\) This, of course, came from an individual established in Zurich at a safe distance from the upheaval of the Napoleonic wars and the anxieties of many in Germany over a fragmented nation. Beginning at the midpoint of a century already rocked by populist revolutions and conservative reaction, the pronouncements of the Bach Gesellschaft and the ambitions they expressed must been seen in the context of German states and the German people searching for a cohesive identity and effective polity.

On the first page of the July 26, 1850 edition of the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* and the July 31, 1850 edition of the *Neue Berliner Musikzeitung* and elsewhere, an august assemblage of musicians throughout Germany announced the foundation of a “Bach-Gesellschaft.”

On the 28th of July 1750 Johann Sebastian Bach died in Leipzig. The return of this day after one hundred years prompts an exhortation to all admirers of true, genuine German music to build a monument to the great man that would be worthy of them and the nation. Through completeness and critical attention to the requirements of science and art with regard to an edition of his works will fulfill this most purely. The undersigned, who have endeavored to promote this enterprise with all their might, give to the admirer of the great master the following principles, according to which they intend to bring it into existence.

The task is to publish in a common edition all of Joh. Seb. Bach’s works which, through secure transmission and critical investigation, are shown to stem from him. For each the foundation will be laid on, where possible, the autograph or the printed edition overseen by the composer, and where not, the best available source, in order that they are presented in what is authenticated through critically

depicted transmission to be the true form of the composition. Any arbitrary changes, omissions and additions will be excluded.\textsuperscript{33}

The announcement was signed with the names:

Dr. Baumgart in Breslau  
C. F. Becker, Organist in Leipzig  
Breitkopf & Härtel in Leipzig  
Prof. S. W. Dehn, Custos der Königli. Bibliothek in Berlin  
M. Hauptmann, Musikdirector in Leipzig  
Fr. Hauser, Dir. des Conservat. in München  
Dr. Hilgenfeldt in Hamburg  
Otto Jahn, Prof. in Leipzig  
August Kahlert, Professor in Breslau  
Dr. Ed. Krüger, Direct. in Emden  
A. B. Marx, Prof. in Berlin  
J. Moscheles, Prof. in Leipzig  
Mosewius, Musikdirector in Breslau  
J. Rietz, Capellmeister in Leipzig  
Rungenhagen, Dir. der Singacad. in Berlin  
C. H. Schede, Regierungsr. in Marienwerder  
Dr. R. Schumann in Dresden  
Dr. L. Spohr, Capellm. in Cassel  
Frh. G. v. Tucher, Oberappellationsrath. in Neuburg  
C. v. Winterfeld, Geh. Obertribunalrath. in Berlin

In the first volume of the resulting edition, which appeared in December of 1851, the names of Ferdinand David, Joseph Fischhof, and Franz Liszt were added to the list of the


founding members of the Bach Gesellschaft. This list of the proponents of the edition offers invaluable insight into the intellectual foundations of the undertaking.

The signatories to the announcement fit broadly into the categories of composers, performers, and authors. The names of the composers remain the most familiar today: Franz Liszt, Robert Schumann, and Louis Spohr. Adolph Bernhard Marx might also be appropriately included in this list as might Ignaz Moscheles and Moritz Hauptmann, though these men remain best-known today as critic, pianist, and Thomaskantor, respectively. Felix Mendelssohn would certainly have been among the leaders of this enterprise, had he not died less than three years earlier at the age of 38. The performers include Carl Ferdinand Becker, Ferdinand David, Joseph Fischhof, Moritz Hauptmann, Franz Hauser, Ignaz Moscheles, Johann Theodor Mosewius, Julius Rietz, and Carl Friedrich Rungenhagen. The authors, among them scholars and critics, include Expedit Baumgart, Christian Bunsen, Siegfried Wilhelm Dehn, Carl Hilgenfeldt, Otto Jahn, August Kahlert, Eduard Krüger, Carl Hermann Schede, Gottlieb von Tucher, and Carl von Winterfeld. This list of proponents of the Bach Gesellschaft and its complete edition of Bach’s music reveals the thinking that underpinned this project. Besides the composers and performers, among whom are found many of the leaders of German musical life of the mid-nineteenth-century, the authors include many of the individuals who would establish what they regarded as a scientific foundation for music history: a Musikwissenschaft.

Musicology at this time remained an amorphous discipline practiced by individuals trained and usually working in other fields. Writing about music circulated
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34 Moritz Hauptmann et al., [Preface], Johann Sebastian Bach’s Werke 1 (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1851), iii.
primarily in specialized newspapers, such as the *Berliner Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung*, *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, *Rheinische Musik-Zeitung für Kunstfreunde und Künstler*, and *Signale für die musikalische Welt*, all of which ran the announcement about the founding of the Bach Gesellschaft. Many of the individuals named in the announcement wrote for these publications. The appearance of the announcement in the *Allgemeine Zeitung* (where it seems to have appeared as a paid advertisement) and *Die Grenzboten: Zeitschrift für Politik und Literatur* reflects both the interest in music within the educated classes and the significant number of art enthusiasts in the ranks of the civil service. The high-ranking officials serving in the Prussian government involved in the founding of the Bach Gesellschaft included Bunsen, Schede, Tucher, and Winterfeld, all of whom also maintained active scholarly pursuits.

Individually, the musicians had demonstrated in various ways an increasing inclination toward historical music, often as a means of legitimating their standing as performers and composers. The attention paid to historical music by the Sing-Akademien in Berlin, Frankfurt, Breslau, and elsewhere exhibits quite clearly the orientation of the *Bildungsbürgertum* toward a past that could be appropriated for contemporary self-representation. The inclusion of Carl Rungenhagen of the Berliner Sing-Akademie and Johann Mosewius of the Breslauer Sing-Akademie among the signatories to the Bach Gesellschaft announcement affirmed not just the prominence of these two men as musicians, but equally reflected the ambition of the choral associations’ members to be associated with an esteemed musical tradition as well as a monumental scholarly enterprise. Of course, Felix Mendelssohn and A. B. Marx had already tapped into those
interests with the 1829 performance of the St. Matthew Passion in Berlin.\textsuperscript{35} Mendelssohn would continue to perform historical music, historicizing music, such as Louis Spohr’s “Historical” Symphony, Op. 116, and would compose in historically inflected styles, particularly in his oratorios Paulus, Op. 36 and Elijah, Op. 70. Robert Schumann, though perhaps less closely associated with Bach as compared to Mendelssohn, also actively performed and promoted the eighteenth-century composer’s music.\textsuperscript{36}

The other musicians involved in the founding of the Bach Gesellschaft were, perhaps, more intimately linked with the Bach legacy. The singer Franz Hauser (1794-1870), who in 1850 served as the director of the conservatory in Munich, owned the largest private collection of Bach manuscripts at that time (the collections of Georg Poelchau and Otto von Voß had been subsumed into the Prussian Royal Library beginning in the 1840s). More closely linked to Bach, though, were the musicians in Leipzig. Julius Rietz served on the faculty of the Leipzig conservatory and directed the Gewandhaus Orchestra. As mentioned above, he would also edit the Mass in B Minor and the St. Matthew Passion for the Bach-Gesellschaft edition.\textsuperscript{37} Ignaz Moscheles (1794-1870) had come to Leipzig in 1846 upon Mendelssohn’s invitation to teach at the conservatory, following a celebrated career throughout Europe as pianist and composer.\textsuperscript{38} C. F. Becker (1804-1877) served as the organist at the Nicholaikirche, one of the two main churches in Leipzig and, consequently, one of the primary venues in which Bach’s

cantatas and Passions had been performed originally. He also wrote for the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* and taught at the Leipzig conservatory.\(^3^9\)

Moritz Hauptmann (1792-1868) came to Leipzig in 1842 to fill the position of Kantor once held by J. S. Bach. Hauptmann had previously served as a violinist in the court orchestra in Kassel and established a reputation as a theorist and composer. He would also join the conservatory faculty in Leipzig.\(^4^0\) Given the large volume of Bach manuscripts in the Prussian Royal Library, Siegfried Dehn (1799-1858), the custodian of the music collection would have represented an important figure in the shaping of the Bach-Gesellschaft’s editorial undertaking.\(^4^1\) However, in 1849 Dehn had assumed editorship of C. F. Peter’s edition of Bach’s instrumental music following the death of Friedrich Griepenkerl, who had continued the project begun under Carl Czerny’s editorship.\(^4^2\) While Hauptmann aided C. F. Peters in preparing a new edition of Bach’s Inventions and Joseph Fischhof, Franz Hauser, A. B. Marx, and Louis Spohr all had business relations with Peters, Dehn could only commit to working on the choral works for the Bach Gesellschaft’s edition being published by Peter’s rival Breitkopf & Härtel.\(^4^3\) Even then, following a critique of the Bach Gesellschaft’s third volume written by one of


Dehn’s students and disagreements that arose between Dehn and Wilhelm Rust, the relationship between Dehn and the society soured quickly.  

As made clear in their first volume, the idea of a monumental edition of Bach’s music served practical ends and cultural ambitions simultaneously, both for musicians and for scholars. For musicians, the publication of Bach’s music in new, reliable editions would have proven quite beneficial given only the odd assortment of editions of the composer’s music that had appeared in the preceding fifty years. New editions would have made purchase of known repertory much easier, considering that individuals still continued in the mid-nineteenth century to resort to commissioning manuscript copies of much of Bach’s music. Likewise, the new complete edition offered the promise of a vast body of unknown repertory. For performers, composers, and teachers, this body of music must have represented a seemingly endless fount of historical inspiration.

Simultaneously, a growing corps of philologists and historians at various German universities supplied their countrymen with tangible affirmation of their history. As already seen with individual collectors and members of choral associations, by the end of the first quarter of the nineteenth-century a pronounced nostalgia for an idealized German past had taken root in the educated middle and upper classes. Monumental editions of historical material fed this nostalgia and offered the promise of a connection to the past that had been severed during the Napoleonic wars and occupation of German lands. The embrace of the Bach Gesellschaft’s goal by philologists informs not only our understanding of the place of music in the emerging conception of a German past but also our appreciation of the methodological outlook to which the Bach Gesellschaft ascribed.

Music Philology and German Identity

The ambitions of the Bach Gesellschaft bear close resemblance to those of other scholars feeding a frenzied popular interest in history. As James J. Sheehan notes about the legal historian Karl Eichhorn (1781-1854):

Surrounded by the devastation caused by foreign conquest and overwhelmed by the rapidity and scale of change, Eichhorn believed “it was more important than ever to turn our attention to the past and become acquainted with the spirit of our former condition.” Like [Johann Gottlieb] Fichte [1762-1814] and so many other patriots, he wanted Germans to recognize their common past in the unbroken chain of law and language which joined them to their ancestors as well to one another. Thus, while Eichhorn’s approach was rigorously empirical, his respect for evidence obvious, and his research methods critical, his ultimate goal was to discover the true nature of the Volk…  

In this period, an historical consciousness emerged without precedent. The completion of the Cologne Cathedral and the embrace of Gothic architecture as a German tradition became unifying interests. Similarly, museums and local historical societies formed and advanced projects aimed at identifying a past that could be made tangible for present day concerns.

At the same time the modern university was taking shape around the idea of systematic, empirical research. In law, religion, classics, history, and art, scholars embraced archival and source-critical methods in producing factually verifiable historical tracts. The turn toward a documentable past followed a long trend beginning at least in

---


47 Broadly treated in Susan A. Crane, Collecting and Historical Consciousness in Early Nineteenth-century Germany (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000); for a fascinating case study examining the formation and substantiation of national identity see J. Laurence Hare, Excavating Nations: Archaeology, Museums, and the German-Danish Borderlands (Toronto: University of Toronto Press 2015).
the eighteenth century of states seeking to consolidate power through closer command of information about populations and resources. Such efforts relied on the rationality increasingly professed among scholars and imparted to students. The demand by states for rationalized bureaucracies to manage their affairs led to the emergence of an educated class formed independent of social rank that sought to legitimate itself through cultural pursuits. Yet, the conquest of German states by outside forces and the struggles of domestic rulers to centralize authority subverted confidence in the continuous march of progress and undermined the traditional institutions and values for which many Germans had become nostalgic.

The last decade of the eighteenth and the first decade of the nineteenth century saw the rationalization of historical methods that developed in the wake of the Enlightenment. However, in the following decades universalizing theories of history gave way to parochial ambitions to identify and validate the roots of national identities. Significant historiographic accomplishments accrued at a quickening pace, but increasingly these projects sought to legitimate conceptions of contemporary society through the construction of historical precedent. Perhaps the clearest affirmation of the anti-liberal implications of these intellectual trends is found in Friedrich Wilhelm IV of Prussia’s efforts to assemble leading scholars in Berlin to lend evidence and credibility to

48 The literature on German universities is extensive, but the major trends are summarized in Sheehan, Germany History, 237-40, 515-20, and 807-9. On “The Triumph of History,” see Sheehan, 542-55.
the conception of an organic nation from whom the legitimacy of the king’s authority emerges.\textsuperscript{52} The effort to move the editorial offices of the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* from Hanover to Berlin offers some sense of the importance of philology in substantiating this interpretation of the German past, despite the initial support for the *Monumenta* from the liberal, reform-oriented Prussian statesman Karl von Stein.\textsuperscript{53}

The increasing emphasis on the national importance of Bach by his advocates, some — but not all — of whom were trained in and practiced philology, reflects broader intellectual trends in Germany. Indeed, the balance between academically trained philologists and amateur musical enthusiasts is also indicative of the range of interest and engagement with the past among educated Germans of the mid-nineteenth century. Among the founding members of the Bach Gesellschaft several individuals came to prominence as a result of writings produced out of avocational interest in music. Others exhibited deep affinities for Lutheran hymnody and theology. Several had studied and taught classical philology. Most were productive writers and some were prolific.

Carl Hilgenfeldt and Carl Hermann Schede are curious examples, in that both were civil servants whose legacy rests on singular writings. Hilgenfeldt served as a jurist in Hamburg and published a biography of J. S. Bach in 1850 to mark the hundredth anniversary of the composer’s death.\textsuperscript{54} He did not contribute in any sustained fashion to any of the number of musical publications that had sprung up in Germany, and his

\textsuperscript{52} For an expansive accounting of this project, see Toews, *Becoming Historical: Cultural Reformation and Public Memory in Early Nineteenth-Century Berlin* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).


biography of Bach traces the footsteps of Forkel rather closely. Hilgenfeldt’s study mainly appropriated Bach’s music in the contemporary effort to renew Lutheran church music.\textsuperscript{55} Similarly, Schede served as a government official in Marienwerder in East Prussia (now Kwidzyn, Poland). His contribution to German letters appears to be limited to a polemic regarding episcopal authority in the Lutheran church.\textsuperscript{56}

Among the amateur music historians, several actively promoted Lutheran church music through their writings. Gottlieb Freiherr von Tucher (1798-1877) came from the prominent aristocratic line of Tucher von Simmelsdorf and spent his career in government service in Nuremberg, Neuberg, and Munich.\textsuperscript{57} His main contribution to music was a collection of sixteenth and seventeenth century Protestant hymns.\textsuperscript{58} As a result of his passionate interest in this music, Tucher maintained an active correspondence with many of the individuals that would found the Bach Gesellschaft and his social status would lend the editorial undertaking credibility among the German elite.

Carl von Winterfeld (1784-1852), who served as a judge in Breslau beginning in 1816 and in Berlin from 1832, had studied law at the University of Halle. Following a trip to Italy in 1812, Winterfeld published studies and collections of the music of Palestrina, Gabrieli, and their contemporaries.\textsuperscript{59} He subsequently focused his attention on

\textsuperscript{55} Hilgenfeldt is hardly mentioned in the musical literature, with the exception of Michael Heinemann’s entry in \textit{Das Bach-Lexikon}, edited by Heinemann, et al. (Laaber: Laaber-Verlag, 2000), 258-59, where his death date is given as “after 1852.”


\textsuperscript{57} Johannes Zahn, “Tucher, Gottlieb Freiherr von,” \textit{Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie} 38 (1894), pp. 767-770.

\textsuperscript{58} Gottlieb Tucher von Simmelsdorf, \textit{Schatz des Evangelischen Kirchengesangs im ersten Jahrhundert der Reformation} (Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1848).

\textsuperscript{59} Carl Winterfeld, \textit{Johannes Pierluigi von Palestrina} (Breslau: G.P. Aderholz, 1832); Winterfeld, \textit{Johannes Gabrieli und sein Zeitalter} (Berlin: Schlesinger, 1834).
Lutheran church music.\textsuperscript{60} He maintained an active correspondence with Eduard Krüger (1807-1885), who represents a distinct hybrid between musician and philologist.\textsuperscript{61}

Krüger completed the doctorate in ancient philology at Göttingen with a dissertation on musical instruments during the age of Pindar.\textsuperscript{62} He subsequently wrote a book on metrics in ancient and modern languages, applying a model of thought in which comparative analysis of language could identify cultural continuities across centuries.\textsuperscript{63}

Having continued his studies in Berlin with Hegel, he brought to his linguistic research the idea of the progress of the “world spirit” through successive peoples and nations toward higher states of consciousness. In 1832 Krüger had established himself in the East Friesland town of Emden, where he taught and eventually became Rektor at the Gymnasium. He continued his linguistic studies with a volume on Plattdeutsch, and assumed the directorship of the choral association.\textsuperscript{64} In that role he promoted, in particular, the oratorios of Handel. He also contributed to the \textit{Neue Zeitschrift für Musik}, corresponded regularly with Robert Schumann, and wrote several volumes on Protestant music and music theory.\textsuperscript{65}

Like Krüger, Expedit Baumgart (1817-1871) took his formal training in philosophy at the University of Breslau and wrote a dissertation on the ancient Roman


\textsuperscript{62} Krüger, \textit{De Musicis Graecorum Organis circa Pindari Tempora Florentibus} (Göttingen: Dietrich, 1830).

\textsuperscript{63} Krüger, \textit{Grundriß der Metrik antiker und moderner Sprachen} (Emden: Fr. Rakebrand, 1838).

\textsuperscript{64} Krüger, \textit{Uebersicht der heutigen Plattdeutschen Sprache (besonders in Emden)} (Emden: H. Woortman Jgr., 1843).

historian Quintus Fabius Picture. He taught at the Institut für Kirchenmusik in Breslau as well as at the Royal Gymnasium there. Subsequently he wrote on Bach and Handel, on musical practice in ancient Greece, and he prepared an edition of the keyboard music of C. P. E. Bach.\textsuperscript{66} Another Breslau musical amateur, August Kahlert (1807-1864) had studied first in Breslau and then in Berlin. He returned to Breslau to teach at the university. He wrote on the Silesian contribution to German literature,\textsuperscript{67} a Hegelian study of aesthetics,\textsuperscript{68} a short work on the 17th century poet Johannes Scheffler, also known as Angelus Silesius,\textsuperscript{69} and corresponded with Louis Spohr.\textsuperscript{70} He also contributed articles on music to the \textit{Schlesische Zeitung}, the \textit{Neue Zeitschrift für Musik}, and the \textit{Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung}.\textsuperscript{71}

Otto Jahn (1813-1869) stands as the most accomplished of the scholars associated with the Bach Gesellschaft, not only as a writer on music but even more so in his home discipline of classical philology and archaeology. Born and raised in Kiel, he studied at the university there, as well as in Leipzig and Berlin. He would teach at the university in Greifswald before becoming director of the archaeological museum in Leipzig in 1847, from which he was dismissed in 1850 along with the famous historian Theodor Mommsen for their involvement in political activities in 1848-9. Jahn became professor of philology and archaeology in Bonn in 1855.\textsuperscript{72} Jahn’s biography of Mozart, published

\begin{itemize}
  \item\textsuperscript{66} Hermann Palm, “Baumgart, Expedit,” \textit{Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie} 2 (1875), 157-58.
  \item\textsuperscript{67} Baumgart, \textit{Schlesiens Antheil an deutscher Poesie: Ein Beitrag zur Literaturgeschichte} (Breslau: Schulz, 1835).
  \item\textsuperscript{68} Baumgart, \textit{System der Aesthetik} (Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1846).
  \item\textsuperscript{69} Baumgart, \textit{Angelus Silesius: Eine Literar-historische Untersuchung} (Breslau: A. Gosohorsky, 1853).
  \item\textsuperscript{70} Spohr-Briefe, accessed on 3 December 2016 (http://www.spoehr-briefe.de/index.php?id=35&m=32).
\end{itemize}
in 1856–9 and revised in 1867, matched Giuseppe Biani’s 1828 biography of Palestrina and Winterfeld’s 1834 biography of Giovanni Gabrieli in scale and ambition and surpassed these in sophistication.\(^{73}\) Moreover, his productivity as a classicist outstripped any scholar working on music at the time.\(^{74}\) His involvement in the Bach Gesellschaft gave the project intellectual and methodological authority. Nevertheless, his biography of Mozart reflects the inclination, also seen in the composer biographies written by Hilgenfeldt and Winterfeld, to uncritically position the subject as a creative genius producing autonomous artworks.

Not surprisingly, the Bach Gesellschaft established itself in Leipzig, where the composer had spent the majority of his career, where a number of the founders worked, and where music had come to represent a major component of the city’s influential publishing industry. Breitkopf & Härtel would produce the edition and would replicate the idea of a complete edition with series dedicated to Handel,\(^{75}\) Beethoven,\(^{76}\) Palestrina,\(^{77}\) Mozart,\(^{78}\) Schubert,\(^{79}\) and Schütz.\(^{80}\) A substantial and noteworthy number of individuals from the eastern periphery of Prussia, most notably in Breslau as well as in Marienwerder in East Prussia, participated in the founding of the Bach Gesellschaft. In Breslau this included Theodor Mosewius, Expedit Baumgart, and August Kahlert, who

---


\(^{74}\) See the bibliography in the *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*.

\(^{75}\) George Friedrich Händels Werke: *Auszabe der Deutschen Händelgesellschaft*, edited by Friedrich Chrystals of Leipzig and Bergedorf bei Hamburg: Deutsche Händelgesellschaft, 1858–1894.

\(^{76}\) *Ludwig van Beethovens Werke: Vollständige kritisch durchgesehene überall berechtigte Ausgabe* (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1862-65).


\(^{80}\) *Heinrich Schütz: Sämtliche Werke*, edited by Philipp Spitta, et al. (1885-1927).
were joined by Carl Hermann Schede in Marienwerder. This enthusiasm for Bach and the German musical past reflects efforts to influence the contested identity of Prussia’s eastern provinces which encompassed diverse populations.\textsuperscript{81} Moreover, Prussia had been seeking since the Congress of Vienna in 1815 to assume the mantle of leadership among German states and had increasingly sought as a part of this project to establish a German cultural identity closely aligned with Prussian institutions.\textsuperscript{82}

While the figure of Leopold von Ranke represents the enormous influence the burgeoning discipline of history achieved by the mid-nineteenth century in Prussian politics and in everyday German life, Carl Bunsen (1791-1860) remains perhaps less prominent today but unquestionably wielded significant influence in the cultural politics of Prussia.\textsuperscript{83} Though Bunsen did not write on music, his participation in the founding of the Bach Gesellschaft should be recognized as a clear marker of the ideology informing the society’s ambitions. A student of the historian Barthold Georg Niebuhr, Bunsen followed Niebuhr to Rome where the latter held an ambassadorial post to the Vatican. During his time in Rome, Bunsen joined the diplomatic mission to the Vatican while continuing to construct “… a definitive reconstruction of the universal history of mankind, from its origins in the archaic cultures of North Africa and the Middle East to its present efflorescence in the Germanic cultures of northern Europe.”\textsuperscript{84} Like many of his contemporaries, Bunsen pursued his interests through an idiosyncratic blend of philology and archaeology. Bunsen would continue to serve as a Prussian diplomat for the remainder of his career, propelled in large part by his commitment and contributions to

\textsuperscript{82} Toews, Becoming Historical.
\textsuperscript{83} Toews, Becoming Historical, 372-418.
\textsuperscript{84} Toews, Becoming Historical, 69.
the religious projects envisioned by Friedrich Wilhelm III and the even broader cultural projects of Friedrich Wilhelm IV. As John Edward Toews describes:

Frederick William IV began his reign [in 1840] with an agenda for a cultural “reformation” that would negate the threat of political “revolution.” At the core of this agenda was what he and his intellectual allies described as the “historical principle,” the implications of which resonated far beyond the squabbles between members of the Hegelian School and the Historical School at the university [in Berlin]. The new course in Prussian cultural politics represented a programmatic attempt to redefine membership in various communities — religious, ethnic, ethical, and political — as historical identifications, that is, in terms of the subjective identification of individuals with a shared past or public memory.\(^8\)

Toews later writes that: “... Frederick William IV called [cultural figures] to Berlin to provide historical justification, aesthetic symbolization, and public language for his vision of an ethical community of Prusso-Germans nurtured, disciplined, and bound together by its revitalized relationship to the patriarchal God of the apostolic Christian church.”\(^8\) As a close advisor to Friedrich Wilhelm IV, Bunsen not only saw himself as contributing to this project, but also worked to bring eminent individuals to Berlin and situate others already there in order to position Prussia as the cultural leader of the German people. Two of the most notable recruits for this project proved to advance the king’s goals far less than hoped, but the presence of the philosopher and theologian Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling at the university and the stationing of Felix Mendelssohn as “Kapellmeister” exhibits the focus on religion and corporate ritual in this conception of social renewal. While many of the other founders give a clear indication of the breadth of the Bach Gesellschaft’s cultural ambitions, Bunsen’s participation in the founding of the society leaves little question that he and his collaborators saw in Bach’s music a means of affirming a Lutheran musical heritage of wide ranging significance that

\(^{85}\) Toews, xv.

\(^{86}\) Toews, 207.
needed to be secured and monumentalized in a massive scholarly edition of the composer’s complete works. Curiously, while Bunsen is listed among the subscribers to the Bach Gesellschaft edition in its first volume published in 1851, when the Mass in B Minor appeared in 1856 he is listed neither among the directors nor among the subscribers to the edition.

The Musical Text and the Concept of Authority

The erosion of and nostalgia for the traditional institutions of German life, and the authority of Herrschaft inherent in these institutions, came to hold a central place in the intellectual life of educated Germans of the nineteenth-century. In the musical world this manifested itself in the demise of nearly all components of professional music making in the old regime, including the diminishing role of music in the life of courts and the church as well as the weakening of guilds throughout German life. The rise of public concerts and of musical associations reoriented the focus of practicing musicians, but the establishment of music as an intellectual concern took most of the nineteenth-century to realize. Carl Friedrich Zelter’s desire to see music established alongside Prussia’s scientific academies resulted not in a scholarly institution but an amateur performing society. While Zelter was able to obtain a modicum of cultural influence in Prussia as a result, his focus remained on practical matters such as the training of church musicians, reflecting perhaps his own background as a guild-trained master craftsman as opposed to a university educated bureaucrat.

Indeed, as the institutions of German musical life adapted to new social and political realities, the focus remained largely on practical matters. Johann Nikolaus Forkel’s role at the university in Göttingen is as anomalous as it was amorphous. He
contributed greatly to the musical life of the institution and exposed numerous future officials to music, but his scholarly endeavors remained an isolated moment in the university’s history until the appointment of Eduard Krüger decades later. By contrast, Zelter’s focus on the training of church musicians and music teachers resulted in the establishment of practical institutes in Königsberg (now Kaliningrad) in 1814, Breslau (now Wrocław) in 1815, and Berlin in 1822. Several of his own students would further advance the role of the Sing-Akademie in German life and the model of formal musical training. His assistant director at the Sing-Akademie Carl Rungenhagen and his student Eduard Grell would lead that institution until 1876. Another student, August Wilhelm Bach would assume leadership of the Königliches Institut für Kirchenmusik following Zelter’s death in 1832, and both he and Grell taught composition at the Akademie der Künste. His student Adolf Bernhard Marx gave lectures on music at the University of Berlin and succeeded Zelter as the university’s music director. Though Felix Mendelssohn, also a student of Zelter, did not directly contribute to the furtherance of the institutions his teacher had founded, the establishment of the Leipzig Conservatory in 1843 marks the arrival of rationalized, systematic professional training in music. All of these men played pivotal roles in the promotion of the music of Johann Sebastian Bach.

Textual criticism remained peripheral if not entirely excluded from the training of musicians. Rather, it fell to musicians and musical enthusiasts trained in the newly emerging scholarly disciplines of legal history, classics, and linguistics to establish a mandate for securing historical musical texts according to scientific standards. However,

much of the actual editorial work fell to practicing musicians such as Julius Rietz and, for the bulk of the Bach Gesellschaft, the organist Wilhelm Rust.\(^8\) The thick contextual histories that informed textual scholarship in classical philology did not exist for music. Carl Hilgenfeldt’s biography of J. S. Bach first appeared as a supplement to concert programs marking the hundredth anniversary of the composer’s death and contributed little new knowledge about the composer’s output not to mention the circumstances in which he worked. C. H. Bitter’s two-volume biography of Bach published in 1865 and expanded to four volumes in 1881 raised the level of sophistication in the historical discussion of the composer.\(^9\) However, it was not until Philipp Spitta’s biography of Bach was published in two volumes in 1873 and 1880 that the standards of philology had firmly taken root in musical scholarship.\(^9\) Not coincidentally, Spitta joined Friedrich Chrysander and Guido Adler in founding the first scholarly journal on music, the *Vierteljahrschrift für Musikwissenschaft*, in 1885, following the short-lived existence of Chrysander’s *Jahrbuch für musikalische Wissenschaft* which appeared in 1863 and 1867.\(^9\)

However, when Julius Rietz undertook the editing of the Mass in B Minor, significant details of Bach’s creative activity still remained unknown. Moritz Hauptmann, the editor of the first volume of the Bach Gesellschaft’s edition containing ten cantatas, wrote in the volume’s preface: “Historical proof about the date of composition for these
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cantatas is completely lacking, as in general with S. Bach’s works there is established only in a few individual cases anything reliable in this respect. His manuscripts always bear their S. D. G.; but we find a date on none. Just as infrequently do contemporary references provide information.”\textsuperscript{92} Rietz rightly observed that Bach compiled the Mass from music that, at least to some extent, he had composed previously for other purposes. He also recognized that the Missa, securely dated to 1733, stood as a discrete composition like Bach’s other Kyrie-Gloria settings and that those settings also largely consisted of previously composed music. Rietz likewise proposed that Bach compiled the remaining portions of the complete setting of the Mass at a later date, but beyond this he had little information on which to premise any conclusions. Nonetheless, Rietz affirms the goal of representing the final will of the composer (“der letzte Wille des Autors”) and argues that the Mass must have been compiled after the cantatas from which he borrowed had been completed, as “a composer would not so readily … disassemble a great work and employ the fragments for less important, indeed occasional purposes; in fact the opposite is easily imaginable and often enough, particularly with Bach, is the case.”\textsuperscript{93}

Rietz’s broad assumptions about the Mass have proven to be fairly accurate. However, this line of thought would lead to much more complex theories about the logic behind Bach’s reuse of music.\textsuperscript{94} And important counterexamples exist, including the cantata \textit{Gloria in excelsis} (BWV 191) drawn from Bach’s Missa (BWV 232\textsuperscript{I}) and, more

\textsuperscript{92} \textit{BG} 1, XIV: “An historischen Nachweisungen über die Entstehungszeit dieser Cantaten fehlt es leider gänzlich; wie überhaupt von S. Bach’s Werken nur in wenig einzelnen Fällen etwas zuverlässiges in dieser Hinsicht zu ermitteln seine wird. Seine Manuscripte tragen allezeit ihr S. D. G.; ein Datum finden wir aber auf keinem. Eben so wenig geben gleichzeitig Nachrichten Aufschlüsse darüber.”

\textsuperscript{93} \textit{BG} 6, p. XIV: “Ein Autor wird nicht so leicht ein grösseres Werk … zerstückeln und die Bruchstücke für weniger erhebliche, ja für Gelegenheitszwecke verwenden, indess das Gegenteil leicht denkbar und oft genug, namentlich bei Bach, dagewesen ist.”

importantly, the funeral music for Prince Leopold of Cöthen *Klagt, Kinder, klagt es aller Welt* (BWV 244a), drawn largely from the *St. Matthew Passion* (BWV 244). The complexity of the parody relationships between the funeral cantata and the Passion are still not fully documented, and the compositional history of the Passion itself only came into focus in the 1960s and 70s.\(^{95}\) Even in his sophisticated consideration of Bach’s life and historical circumstances, Philipp Spitta incorrectly dated many of Bach’s cantatas and consequently advanced an image of Bach becoming increasingly pious over time.\(^{96}\)

Friedrich Smend, whose edition of the Mass in B Minor for the *Neue Bach Ausgabe* was intended to be a capstone to a distinguished career and long engagement with this composition, adopted the assumptions made about the nature and implications of the composer’s strongly held Lutheran faith. From this Smend advances the argument that the Mass is not a unified whole (“eine einheitliche Größe”), but rather a collection of Lutheran liturgical compositions that coincidentally comprised a complete setting of the Roman Ordinary.\(^{97}\) Even more problematic was Smend’s inaccurate dating of D1 [D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 572/23/14] and D2 [D-B Am. B. 3] to the 1740s and his argument that these represented intermediate stages in Bach’s composition of the Mass.\(^{98}\) Only as a result of groundbreaking research published in the 1950s did it become clear how incorrect Spitta’s and Smend’s assumptions had been.\(^ {99}\) Georg von Dadelsen ever so delicately undertook the thankless task of exposing the grievous mistakes of Smend, a
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\(^{96}\) See Spitta, *Johann Sebastian Bach*, vol. 2.

\(^{97}\) *NB.4* II/1, KB, 78-84 and 188-90.

\(^{98}\) *NB.4* II/1, KB, 85ff.

scholar much his senior. In the wake of the conclusions presented by Dadelsen and Alfred Dürr, major reinterpretations of Bach’s life and religiosity have ensued, but at least in the case of Friedrich Blume this seems to have served as much to support his own interest in a willfully secular conception of Bach.

The musical and textual complexity of Bach’s Mass in B Minor has prompted perpetual reconsiderations. Nevertheless, as this study has sought to demonstrate, the textual and interpretive fluidity of this composition has also allowed for the continual re-appropriation of Bach’s Mass in service of individuals’ intellectual, social, and political agendas. This is particularly evident in the Bach Gesellschaft’s efforts to produce an edition of the Mass. The goal of initiating their edition with this monumental and confessionally multivalent composition demonstrated in part an appeal to all segments of German society, even while Bach already spoke most powerfully to German Protestants. Despite this desire, the multiplicity of readings found in their sources — further complicated by their inability to access the autograph score — reflected the complexity of bringing order to history and reinforced the very anxiety about the fragility of historical sources that the founders of the Bach Gesellschaft were seeking to assuage through their project. It is no coincidence that at the very time that Germans were seeking to negotiate a national identity within the welter of distinct German states, the Bach
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Gesellschaft sought to bring order to material of diverse and not-fully-comprehended origins. As is evident in the many sources transmitting Bach’s Mass in B Minor dating from before the Bach Gesellschaft’s edition appeared in 1856, there are — when thinking of the Mass as both a textual and social document — nearly as many different Masses in B Minor as there are sources. The textual complexity of Bach’s Mass in B Minor is demonstrated by the fact that a reliable edition of the composition did not appear until 1997, and thorough scholarly editions did not appear until the 2000s. However, the illiberal implications of imposing a singular reading on this music are chilling and would contradict the reality of the sources and the diversity of musical experiences that they document. Fortunately, the contradictions inherent in J. S. Bach’s own autograph score, containing copying and compositional errors as well as C. P. E. Bach’s revisions, nearly ensures that no uncontested authority will prevail.

Conclusion

In 1954, the same year that the first volumes of the *Neue Bach Ausgabe* appeared, Bärenreiter-Verlag published an essay “Über die Herausgabe von Urtexten” in *Musica*, the firm’s “Monatschrift für alle Gebiete des Musiklebens.” Begun in 1947, the editors of *Musica* referred to it as a newborn, disavowing the disaster of the Nazi era in which all aspects of life and music had been brought under the dictates of the Party program.¹ Speaking of Urtext editions, Günter Henle praised the return in recent decades to the ideas of truthfulness and reverence that advanced the intentions of the composer after the emotional exuberance and growing individualism of Romanticism.² Following years as a music enthusiast and collector, Henle himself had established in 1948 an eponymous music publishing firm that has since become renowned for its adherence to this editorial ambition.³ The founder of Bärenreiter, Karl Vötterle, also expressed some of the logic informing the continued dedication to the publication of collected editions of composers’ music. In his 1956 article “Die Stunde der Gesamtausgabe” in *Musica*, Vötterle wrote:

> The war largely decimated not only holdings of rare, old collected editions, but above all also the sources. Among these one finds a large number of older sources — among them Bach’s manuscripts — in wretched condition, threatened with decay, and one is inclined to state: it is not only the hour of the collected edition, but rather in many respects even the final hour in which a collected edition on the whole can be undertaken.⁴
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Vötterle saw this as a project of both national and pan-national interest, reminding one of both Johann Nikolaus Forkel’s and Philipp Spitta’s desire to use nationality as a means of contextualizing Bach, and Bach as a means of promoting nationalism.⁵

Yet, like those individuals reeling from the upheavals of industrialization and war in the nineteenth century, Henle and Vötterle clearly express a nostalgia for a lost past in the wake of more recent cataclysms. For Vötterle, this nostalgia stretched back to the Weimar era, when he founded his firm to publish folksongs for the youth movement (Wandervogel).⁶ In its flights from urbanized towns and industrialized cities into the woods and hills to celebrate nature and community through campfires and songs, the youth movement manifested a broader alienation from the social processes that had brought about such rapid change in German life.⁷ Max Weber had diagnosed the anxiety over the “disenchantment of the world” expressed in such revival movements. As Daniel K. L. Chua notes, “Modern humanity no longer submits itself to the spell of superstition and the sacred rituals of power, but has demystified its existence through the calculations of science and the bureaucratic apparatus of state.”⁸

The like-minded agendas of the organ revival movement, the Lutheran liturgical revival movement, and the early music movement also accrued in Bärenreiter’s publishing activities in the 1920s and would give rise to musical editions, avocational
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literature, and scholarly books. With this expanded purview musicologists joined the
ranks of Bärenreiter’s authors and editors. Given the alignment of the anxieties
expressed within these movements with the grievances expressed by Adolf Hitler and the
National Socialist party, it comes as no surprise that Bärenreiter- Verlag fell into line with
cultural policies promulgated by the Nazi government. Nevertheless, and as with most
ordinary Germans, Vötterle and his co-workers suffered during the war and saw their
anxieties exploited and cultural ambitions corrupted, even while those very same
anxieties and ambitions gave license to Hitler. Thus, it is just as wrong to blythely lump
all forms of twentieth-century German nostalgia and illiberalism into one category as it is
to squeeze all nineteenth-century German nationalists into a single mold. Yet, as
Pamela Potter has argued persuasively, despite the dramatic political disruptions
experienced in Germany in the first half of the twentieth century, the cultural concerns
exhibited in the work of musicologists remained remarkably stable from the early years
of the century, through the Weimar era, into the National Socialist period, and still in the
post-war years. Bärenreiter’s publishing activities affirm that observation. As seen in
the statements from the 1950s by Vötterle and Henle, music publishers and musicologists
resorted to familiar interests and established agenda in the post-war years: Bärenreiter
responded to the horrors of the immediate past by initiating a plan to publish the
complete works of J. S. Bach.

9 Cf. Pamela Potter, Most German of the Arts: Musicology and Society from the Weimar Republic to the
10 Cf. Sven Hiemke, “‘Folgerichtiges Weiterschreiten’: Der Bärenreiter-Verlag im ‘Dritten Riech,’” in
Musik-Kultur heute, 160-70; broader consideration of this issue is treated in Peter Fritzsche, Germans Into
12 Potter, Most German of the Arts, 235ff.
Also writing in the 1950s and speaking largely to the burgeoning interest in performing early music on original instruments, Theodor Adorno remarked critically on the “resurrected culture … [resulting in a] conception of Bach [that] draws all those who, having lost either their ability to believe or the desire for self-determination, go in search of authority, obsessed by the notion of how nice it would be to be secure.” But already in the 1930s Walter Benjamin had remarked on the rise of a nostalgic art culture in the age of art’s technological reproducibility. Through the process of mechanical reproduction, art objects lost their aura and became objects not of contemplation but of consumption. However, Benjamin is particularly perceptive about the circumstances that gave rise to this situation and the simultaneous consequences:

The increasing proletarianization of modern man and the increasing formation of masses are two sides of the same process. Fascism attempts to organize the newly proletarianized masses while leaving intact the property relations which they strive to abolish. It sees its salvation in granting expression to the masses — but on no account of granting them rights. The masses have a right to changed property relations; fascism seeks to give them expression in keeping these relations unchanged.

Fascism betrayed the loyalties of the musical revival movements, leaving in place the very same cultural hierarchy that they had sought to dismantle. But, this suggests that the members of the revival movements were truly invested in change as opposed to merely seeking to wallow in nostalgia.

As Carl Dahlhaus observed, “… one should not confuse or equate historical insight … with that vague sense of temporal remoteness that often pervades and tempers our perception of early music. A sense of nostalgia may possibly kindle an interest in
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history; but it can … [also] hinder this interest by making further refinements …
[resulting from new] knowledge appear not just unnecessary but even harmful.”

The veneration of the work of art in its original state seeks to undo the ravages of time, to deny the contingencies that informed its creation, and to ignore differences among its audience. Speaking about Adorno, Rose Rosengard Subotnik, wrote:

... antiquarian preservation vitiates the value offered by history, and is thus intrinsically anti-historical. Thus a scientific critical edition is not to be valued beyond its ability to preserve a vision of structural integrity. Certainly it is not to be valued for its ability to preserve, much less to elevate into a state of inviolability, the contingencies of every decision made by a contingently existing individual.

Alternatively, Subotnik’s reading of deconstruction proposes that the original meaning of a composition can not be recaptured, the text of a composition is continuously redefined over the course of history, and that an expanse opens up between the original intent and the perception of all subsequent auditors.

In this study I have sought to demonstrate the gap that exists between the Mass in B Minor as composed and the Mass as experienced by every subsequent individual over time. In doing this I have sought primarily to demonstrate the instability of the text of the Mass and, in fact, most all historical music as conveyed in notated musical texts. Offering legitimacy to all of the notated objects that transmit the Mass in B Minor allows those objects to serve as documents of the Mass of their own time and place of origin and also adds new value to the study of the provenance of each manuscript, not just the

15 Carl Dahlhaus, *Foundations of Music History*, translated by J. B. Robinson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 5; ellipses and insertions have been added for clarity.
autograph materials. Moreover, it wrests the music from the control of antiquarianism and recognizes the music as always being reborn in each new copy and performance.
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