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Schoenberg's George-Lieder: The Relationship between Text and Music in Light of Some Expressionist Tendencies
Heinz J. Dill

According to Schoenberg, the song cycle Das Buch der hängenden Gärten (Opus 15, 1908), which is based on poems by Stefan George, occupied a unique position in the composer's works. In the program notes written for the premiere of these songs, Schoenberg stated: "In the 'George-Lieder' I have succeeded for the first time in approaching an ideal of expression and form that has been in my mind for years. Until now I lacked the strength and confidence to realize this ideal. Now that I have definitely entered upon this course, I am aware that I have gone beyond the limits of traditional aesthetics."1 Apart from the obvious reference to the beginning of so-called atonal music, a fact which has received ample attention in musicological scholarship, this statement also implied a new aesthetics of songwriting. Focusing particularly on the relationship between text and music, my article will deal with some of the aesthetic principles underlying these songs.2

Whenever Schoenberg refers in his writings to this relationship, he expresses ideas that are unorthodox if compared with 18th- and 19th-century principles of songwriting. In his essay "Das Verhältnis zum Text" (1912), for instance, he asserts that his musical interpretation of some songs by Schubert, well known to him except for the texts, did not have to be altered in the least after he discovered what was actually happening in the underlying poems. He claims, furthermore, that he was also quite unconcerned about the happenings in the poems he himself set to music. In both cases he had immediately and fully understood the essence, or what he calls the "real content" (wirklicher Inhalt) of the poems, without having undertaken an analysis of them.3

Schoenberg defended this concern with the real content of a work of art, while ignoring the particulars (the "surface layer of meaning"—die Oberfläche der Wortgedanken) of the underlying text, by arguing that the work of art is similar to any complete organism and that it therefore reveals its truest and innermost essence in every detail. If one hears a line of a poem or a measure of a musical composition, he said, one is able to grasp its totality.4 Furthermore, the composer wanted to break with the view that the literal meaning or the ideas of a poem should be recognizably mirrored in the music. He therefore rejected the "conventional" parallelism between poem and music, in which situation tempo and intensity of a particular passage or section of the text must be reflected in the music. Of greater interest and importance to him was the organic development of purely musical themes, as a consequence of which a tender thought could be rendered by a vehement
musical expression (one might speak here of a nonmimetic character of the music in the song). Probing into the real content of a poem enabled him, he argued, to arrive at a relationship between text and music which, if not closer, was at least as close as the conventional one.5 Thus it can be said that whenever he set a text to music he "formed everything so much from within that the music is fully justified even if one does not know the 'program'. Everything in this case, as is the case with all great works of art, is expressive art.6"

Such an attitude toward the text-music problem explains Schoenberg's somewhat radical view that a composer approaches a text in a disinterested or neutral manner (he was thinking here, of course, of the "surface layer" of the text), and that "those singers are most satisfactory who sing it [the text] in as pleasing a manner as a well-understood 'Doremi.'"7 This statement has to be understood in light of Schoenberg's intentions to create music which is as free as possible from all extramusical connections and ideas. (Schoenberg disparages the "conventional" musical language "which composes and thinks for everyone"—eine Sprache, die für jeden dichtet und denkt.8) With the Doremi he refers to songs which first and foremost should be sound phenomena. Hand in hand with this goes the statement that he had completely heard and comprehended Schubert's songs (including, of course, the underlying texts) and George's poetry as sound phenomena only; analysis and synthesis, he said, could not have resulted in a more exact or better understanding of the poem or song.9

One must therefore conclude that it is the sound aspect of a poem, especially the "first words,"10 that serves, so to speak, as the initial point of contact with the "real content." Or, in the words of Kandinsky, the coeditor of Der Blaue Reiter (in which Schoenberg's "Das Verhältnis zum Text" appeared):

A work of art consists of two elements: the inner and the outer. The inner element . . . is the emotion in the soul of the artist. This emotion has the capacity to evoke a similar emotion in the observer . . . . Thus feeling is a bridge between the immaterial and the material (artist) and again between the material and the immaterial (observer).11

In other words, the emotion in the soul of the artist evokes a similar emotion in the observer through the so-called "material aspect" (i.e., "feeling") of a work of art. This term is taken from Hans Mersmann, according to whom words have not only an intellectual and communicative function; of equal importance is their elemental nature, which in poetry becomes a creative force through rhyme and through the musical flow of vowels. It is to the latter that the composer is especially susceptible.12 This is expressed in similar terms by Kandinsky, who states, "Form is the material expression of the abstract content,"13 and by Hermann Broch, who says that the "linguistic structure" (Spracharchitektonik) of a poem transforms both its "rational-communicative content" (rationale Mitteilung) and its "emotional
content" (gefühlsmäßiger Ur-Inhalt) and lifts them into a "sphere of totality" (Totalitätsphäre) which exists beyond the finite and the rational. This transformation becomes even clearer when the linguistic structure is subjected to a "musical structure" (musikalische Architekttonik). Yet a relationship between music and words could not exist if structural elements common to both did not form a bridge between the two. This means that a key factor in the composer's relationship to poetry is the musicality of poetry. Speaking, for instance, about Richard Dehmel's poetry, Schoenberg states that he primarily and initially approached it with his musical sense (Klang-Verstand), and only then was he able to penetrate the real content (here, Sinnen-Sinn). Schoenberg's pupil Webern, writing to the poetess Hildegard Jone, expresses a similar view:

And how well words lend themselves to perception by the ear. I mean: in my case more intensively than by the eye while reading! Then "connections and relationships resound!" And the idea appears before me in visible form. As you put it: "Then everything resounds . . . then radiance floods the ear. . . ."

"Idea" and "Sinnen-Sinn" (letter to Dehmel) are obviously the same as "real content."

To what extent does the concept "real content" determine or affect the relationship between text and music in the George-Lieder? The emphasis on "real content" could lead to a type of song in which a direct or obvious parallelism between text and music did not necessarily have to exist. As a matter of fact, the lack of this kind of parallelism is quite characteristic of the songs in this cycle, so much so that they seem, rather, to be constructed on the basis of a law of polar attraction between poem and music. For instance, the rich sonority of George's rhymed poetry has as a counterpart music that is almost austere in nature. Analogous to this is the rhythmic relationship between poetry and music: to the even and metric rhythm which supports the sonority of the poetic line is juxtaposed a declamatory rhythm, or a prose rhythm, as it were, so that George's strict verse (including the strophic patterns) seems to be transformed into prose.

The lack of parallelism may well be due to an attempt at redefining the partnership between poetry and music in a situation where new music and traditional verse have to be reconciled to each other. A frequent aspect of traditional verse is its lyrical quality, which is basic to many poems of 19th-century Lieder and, with certain modifications (e.g., stylization), to the ones in this cycle. In lyrical poetry the subject is usually in accord with the world surrounding it (object); form and content are inseparably and uniquely united; sound and rhythmic qualities tend to overshadow the semantic significance as well as the grammatical and logical functions of the words; both sound and rhythm set in motion a kind of evocative resonance. In other words, in the sphere of lyricism, which is, as it were, a magical sphere and one of illusion, all poetic elements are harmoniously united. And the 19th-century composer extended and related his music to this sphere by
unifying both text and music in it, whereas Schoenberg created music whose relationship to the text has to be defined primarily in terms of polarity.

Since traditional musical form is dependent on tonality, the dissolution of the latter would affect the former. Referring to this, Schoenberg stated that most of his works written during the period of transition from tonality to a new music were based on texts for the sake of unity and coherence. It may well be that George's poetry provided Schoenberg with a suitable basis for a new music because of its rigid structure, as well as its sonority and its strict rhythm. It is therefore possible to argue that George's poetry was selected because, as a strong structural core, it could function as the desired counterpart in the polar relationship between text and music. But the text does not hold or absorb the music; rather, the music dissolves it by a process in which structural strength of the text seems to be essential. In other words, Schoenberg needed something that was tightly structured in order to be able to dissolve and transform it, hence his predilection for George's poetry, the rhythm of which George himself described—by implication—as being rather more like ice than like water.

In conclusion, it can be stated that Schoenberg, although dealing with traditional poems, nevertheless applied unconventional techniques to them. The avoidance of mirroring the sound and rhythmic patterns of the poems in the musical structure indicates that he tended to neutralize the material aspect of art, thus showing in this work a trend typical of Expressionism, namely, that of dematerialization. Schoenberg himself had definite views on dematerialization. He expressed his antipathy toward the "animal warmth of music." Comparing poetry and music, he said of the former that it is still rooted in the material realm and thus is denied direct and pure expression; music, however, he implied, is free from such material shackles. The following statement by Adorno, although referring specifically to twelve-tone music, applies also to the music of the George-Lieder: "The structure [Stimmigkeit] of twelve-tone music cannot be directly 'heard'—that is the simplest name for its non-sensual aspect. All one perceives is strict adherence to a system . . . [Schoenberg] renounces the material aspect of art." The purpose of dematerialization could only be to lay bare and to make more visible the real content of art (another concept that is quite typical of Expressionism). In this process the music functions as an agent: it depoeticizes the text in the sense that it undermines the autonomy of poetic resonance, typical of lyrical poetry; the music also fragmentizes the text. Adorno has pointed to the fragmented structure of Schoenberg's music in which, as he says, the artist becomes dissociated from his creation and thereby freed from the grip of the material aspect of music. Fragmentation therefore leads to a liberation of that which is significant ("bedeutend") in art, i.e., the real content. Thus Schoenberg's music dematerializes, depoeticizes, fragmentizes, and transforms into prose a highly refined and lyrical text. It is in this respect that Schoenberg went beyond the limits of the traditional aesthetics of songwriting.
NOTES

1 Quoted in Egon Wellesz, Arnold Schönberg (Leipzig: Tal, 1921), p. 24. All translations in this article are by the author.


4 Ibid., p.32.

5 Ibid., pp. 31-32.

6 Wellesz, Schönberg, p. 81.


9 Ibid., p. 33.

10 Ibid., p. 32.


17 The definition of lyricism used here is based on Emil Staiger, Grundbegriffe der Poetik (Zurich: Atlantis, 1951), pp. 13-84.


20 Compare with Ehrenforth, Ausdruck und Form, p. 47.


24 Adorno, Philosophie der neuen Musik, pp. 113-18.


26 Adorno, Philosophie der neuen Musik, p. 113.

27 Compare with Ehrenforth, Ausdruck und Form, p. 137.
Mozart's String Quartet K. 465: The History of a Controversy

Julie Anne Vertrees

Mozart's string quartet in C major has been the subject of criticism and controversy since its composition in 1785. The debate has centered upon the opening measures of the introduction to the first movement, with the method and thrust of the argument shifting from one generation to the next. Despite the stature of the composer and the existence of a carefully written autograph, which indicates that only two changes were made as the introduction was copied,¹ Mozart's intentions have been questioned. Much of the discussion has revolved around possible errors of harmony and counterpoint and attempts to correct them. The following pages chronicle the time in which the introduction was controversial, although a detailed discussion of the respective analyses is beyond the scope of this article.

While visiting Vienna in 1785, Haydn heard the quartet performed and expressed his deep respect for Mozart's gifts as a composer.² Mozart returned the compliment by dedicating the set of quartets to Haydn; the first edition, published by Artaria in the same year, carries the dedication in Italian.³ Artaria's advertisement in the 17 September 1785 issue of the Wiener Zeitung (no. 75, 2191) is indicative of the status of Mozart's reputation: "Mozart's works call for no special praise, so that it should be quite superfluous to go into details; it need only be affirmed that here is a masterpiece."⁴ Franz Xaver Niemetschek, in his Leben des K. K. Kapellmeisters Wolfgang Gottlieb Mozart . . . (Prague, 1798/1808), praised the quartets as "... a treasure-house of the finest thoughts" and deserving of Haydn's acclaim.⁵

The controversy began when the Vienna correspondent for Carl Cramer's Magazin der Musik expressed his reservations in a report which appeared in the issue of 23 April 1787:

He is the most skillful and best keyboard scholar I have ever heard; the pity is only that he aims too high in his artful and truly beautiful compositions, in order to become a new creator, whereby it must be said that feeling and heart profit little; his new Quartets for 2 violins, viola and bass, which he has dedicated to Haydn, may well be called too highly seasoned—and whose palate can endure this for long? Forgive this simile from the cookery book. . . .⁶

A letter printed in the July 1789 issue was more enthusiastic:

... his six quartets for violins, viola and bass dedicated to Haydn confirm it once again that he has a decided leaning towards the difficult and the unusual. But then, what great and elevated ideas he has too, testifying to a bold spirit!⁷

The 11 September 1799 issue of the Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung (AmZ) reported two anecdotes about Mozart's "Haydn" quartets which have been
frequently quoted. According to that journal, the parts were returned to Artaria from Italy because of so many “errors,” and in Hungary Count Grassalkowich angrily tore up the parts after first accusing the players of making mistakes and then concluding that the parts were full of misprints.8

Giuseppe Sarti was apparently the first to scrutinize the introduction to K. 465 closely and to offer specific criticism. In a disparaging essay, probably written while he was Kapellmeister of the Russian court from 1784 to 1802, Sarti berated Mozart for composing cross-relations in the introduction to K. 465 and also in the development of the first movement of K. 421.9 When Sarti left Milan in 1784 to join the Russian court in St. Petersburg, he stopped in Vienna on his way. Mozart wrote his father on May 8th that “Sarti is expected here any day on his way through to Russia,” and on June 12th:

Tomorrow Herr Ployer, the agent, is giving a concert in the country at Döbling, where Fräulein Babette [Barbara Ployer] is playing her new concerto in G [K. 452] and I am performing the quintet [K. 453]; we are then playing together the grand sonata for two claviers [K. 448]. I am fetching Paisiello in my carriage, as I want him to hear both my pupil and my compositions. If Maestro Sarti had not had to leave Vienna today, he too would have come with me. Sarti is a good honest fellow! I have played a great deal to him and have composed variations on an air of his which pleased him exceedingly [K. 460].10

It is puzzling, then, that Sarti referred to Mozart in parentheses as one “whom I neither know nor wish to know;” and that, after lambasting the quartets, he concluded his essay by asking “... will any one be found to print such music?”11 As for cross-relations, Sarti recognized only two kinds—those that should be avoided and those that were intolerable. The first, Apotome, “... also called a minor semitone, or false unison, is the succession of two notes bearing the same literal name, as F, F♯; E, E♭,” and the second, Minimo, is “... an interval [enharmonic interval] taking the name of two contiguous degrees of the scale, the lower of which is ♭, the upper ♯; as D♯, E♭; F♯, G♭.” The latter created the worse effect when not concealed and, in fact, Sarti felt that “whoever is guilty of them [both kinds of cross-relations] must possess ears lined with iron.” Sarti referred vaguely to the “old masters” as his source of authority and claimed that while they were guided by sensitive ears, the “barbarians” of today compose “... passages which truly make us shudder.” His analysis, in an impatient, arrogant tone, is laced with snide references to Mozart as a mere pianoforte player with “spoilt ears,” incapable of distinguishing between E♭ and D♯12 (Ex. 1).

One can only speculate about Sarti’s reasons for attacking Mozart. According to Dieter Lehmann, the chamber music of Haydn and Mozart and Mozart’s operas (Die Zauberflöte in particular) were very popular among Russian music lovers in the late 18th century. Sarti perhaps resented Mozart’s
popularity and was able to vent his frustrations in letters and at court, where he could exert his influence upon the musical taste of its members.\textsuperscript{13}

According to the Am\textasciitilde;'s Milan correspondent, Dr. Peter Lichtenthal, Sarti's essay was suppressed by the Milanese composer and theorist Bonifacio Asioli. Lichtenthal briefly described the "Osservazioni critiche sopra un

\textbf{EXAMPLE 1*}
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* This example, with the author’s analytical markings added, is reproduced with the kind permission of Bärenreiter Verlag, Kassel, Basel, London, and Tours, publisher of Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, \textit{Neue Ausgabe sämtlicher Werke}, in association with the cities of Augsburg, Salzburg, and Vienna, under the direction of the International Mozarteum Foundation, series 8, group 20, part 1: string quartets, vol. 2 (BA 4530), p. 145, edited by Ludwig Finscher.
quartetto di Mozart” in a communication to the AmZ in 1824 and two years later published his Dizionario e bibliografia della musica (Milan, 1826), which contained an Italian translation of the AmZ communication (vol. 4, p. 481). It is interesting to note that the title specifies “un quartetto,” whereas the essay examines two quartets. (For a further discussion of this, see below.) In the AmZ article Lichtenthal revealed that Karl Mozart had read the essay and felt it to have been written in “einem grausamen [inhuman] Tone.” Asioli refused to grant Lichtenthal permission to publish the “Osservazioni,” but upon Asioli’s death in 1832 Lichtenthal secured a copy and printed excerpts, translated into German, in the 6 June 1832 issue of the AmZ.

In the meantime, a heated debate took place during the years 1829–32 between the Franco-Belgian critic and musicologist François-Joseph Fétis and an unknown correspondent writing in German under the pseudonym “A. C. Leduc.” Fétis took up where Sarti left off by offering an article in his own periodical, La Revue musicale (Rm). While conceding that beyond a small number of objectionable measures the quartet was truly a masterpiece, he described the introduction as “bizarre” and accused Mozart of taking “pleasure in tormenting a delicate ear.” After closely examining the harmony, he was struck by the ease with which he could eliminate such “objectionable” places by making minor changes, and in such a way that the introduction would conform to the rules of all schools of counterpoint. Fétis based his “corrections” on a rule in his 1821 Traité du contrepoint et de la fugue, which stated that in an imitation consisting of alternate entries at the fifth and fourth, there should always be a greater distance between the second and third entrances than between the first and second.

Not merely content to criticize with words, Fétis went on to present an “improved” version of the opening measures. He delayed the entrance of the first violin one beat in measure two, and in measures two and three he substituted the dotted-quarter-eighth figure for the quarter notes in the viola and violins, thereby delaying the lower neighbor tones and softening the dissonance (Ex. 2):

EXAMPLE 2

\[\text{EXAMPLE 2}\]
The peculiarities of the introduction may have first come to Fétis's attention when he read Lichtenthal’s communication of 1824 in the AmZ. Although he may have been advised by Luigi Cherubini, who at one time was a student of Sarti, Fétis’s references to Sarti and to the “Osservazioni” reflect a knowledge of only the limited information contained in the AmZ’s brief description. Fétis’s first impression was that Mozart could not possibly have composed so carelessly and that undoubtedly “some ignorant copyist” was at fault. However, a pilgrimage to London to consult the autograph convinced him that the cross-relations were carefully notated in Mozart’s own hand. In his closing remarks he rather half-heartedly agreed with Haydn that “. . . if Mozart wrote it so, he must have had his reasons for doing it.”

Fétis recorded the reaction of the Paris Conservatory community to his article on several occasions. In his second response to Leduc, Fétis claimed that Cherubini, Catel, Boieldieu, and Reicha would support his analysis. Ten years later he described their initial response:

The day the issue which contained this article appeared, the faculty met at the conservatory. Cherubini, Catel, Paër, Boieldieu, and Reicha, meeting one another there, spoke at length about the question that I had discussed [in the article], and, surprised at the simplicity of the solution which I supplied to the objections, they were astonished that it had taken so long to be discovered.

Finally, in 1884, Fétis revealed that there had been, in fact, considerable debate:

The affair caused some emotion at the Paris Conservatory, and during a meeting of the examination board which met at the same time, and when Cherubini, Boieldieu, Paër, Le Sueur, Reicha, Berton, and the author of the article met with one another, diverse opinions on this subject were debated. Le Sueur remained silent, but Boieldieu, Paër, and Berton condemned the harmonic progressions of the passage. Reicha undertook their defense, but Cherubini settled the question by exclaiming: “You don’t know what you’re saying; Fétis is right. His rule is that of the proper school: it condemns this passage.”

François Louis Perne, Fétis’s esteemed predecessor at the conservatory library, was the first to speak out in public against Fétis’s presumption to correct Mozart’s music as if it were merely a student exercise. In a letter to Fétis, written the week after Fétis’s article appeared and published in the following issue of Rm, Perne accused Fétis of unjustly reprimanding Mozart for employing the same modulations that were universally extolled in the works of Bach and Handel. He lashed out at Fétis’s bland conservatism and at composers who strove to be innovative yet lacked the courage to risk disapproval from the Old Guard.

Appended to Perne’s letter was an editorial rejoinder in which Fétis pointed out that ever since the quartet was published, amateurs and professionals alike had rebelled against the passage without knowing why.
Having perceived the underlying factors creating the bad effect, Fétis adjusted the imitation to improve the harmony according to the rules of counterpoint. He vehemently denied he had been pretentious, retorting, “Had I had the intention of correcting all that is shocking in the passage, I would have had a great deal to do.”

Alexandre Oulibicheff was singularly delighted with Fétis’s corrections, since:

... there probably is not a violinist who upon playing the A-natural of the second measure in the first violin, has not thought that [either] his comrades or himself were playing incorrectly; but this dissonance is in the composition, and it returns one step [lower] on a G in the sixth measure.

Oulibicheff—no longer thwarted by cross-relations and improper imitation—looked forward to playing the quartet secure in the belief that Fétis most probably had restored Mozart’s true intentions to the score.

“A. C. Leduc” entered the dispute with a lengthy polemic article in the AmZ, which appeared six months after Fétis’s first article. Leduc immediately took the offensive and derided Fétis for not taking into account the fact that Mozart had dedicated this and five other quartets to Haydn and therefore “... would not have permitted the smallest careless mistake which could have been criticized.” He defended Mozart’s right to exercise free will in composing but inferred that Mozart could have composed better harmony had he wanted to. Leduc then presented a revision of his own which retained Mozart’s sequence of entries (the A-natural in the first violin was shortened to conform with the melodic contour of the viola and second violin) but drastically altered the bass line and harmony—under the pretense of demonstrating what a travesty Fétis had committed (Ex. 3). Leduc’s un-stated assumption was that he could correct Mozart better than could Fétis.

The identity of A. C. Leduc was a well-kept secret. Undoubtedly a French name was chosen to gall Fétis as much as possible. As a group, the German
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authors who contributed articles to the controversy seemed reluctant to have their names connected with the dispute. Fétis confessed that the name A. C. Leduc was totally unfamiliar to him in his reply to Leduc's article, but eventually he became convinced that it had to be his rival, the Austrian musicologist Raphael-Georg Kiesewetter, an assumption he was to reiterate whenever possible; for their part, the Germans remained silent. The 19th-century music historian August Wilhelm Ambros did mention the dispute between Kiesewetter (who was his uncle) and Fétis over the Mozart quartet on at least two occasions but never actually made a connection between Kiesewetter and Leduc.

In 1826 both Kiesewetter and Fétis had entered the Royal Belgian Academy competition for historical essays. The topic was:

What merits have the Dutchmen, particularly of the 14th, 15th, and 16th centuries, acquired in the field of music composition? And to what extent could those Dutch musicians of the time who went to Italy have had an influence on the music schools that shortly afterwards arose there?

Kiesewetter won first prize and Fétis second, touching off a lifelong rivalry between the two. The competition was evidently difficult to judge because the secretary of the competition noted that:

Kiesewetter's essay presented a general study of the history of the music of the period under consideration, but Fétis supplied more precise details and was more thorough on a certain number of specific musicians, and both essays were published in a single volume.

In his documentary biography of Kiesewetter, Herfrid Kier produced letters from the former which indicate that Kiesewetter was not Leduc. In a letter of 27 March 1830 to Georg Pölchau, Kiesewetter declared that had the mysterious A. C. Leduc not published his article, he would have been compelled to vindicate Mozart himself. In July Fétis's second article appeared, and when by September Leduc had not responded, Kiesewetter became impatient enough to write an open letter (in the form of analysis and commentary) to the editor of the AmZ, Gottfried Wilhelm Fink, who finally published it as a supplement to the 27 July 1831 issue; Kiesewetter signed it "C. M. Balthaser." In it he declared that Mozart had outgrown student exercises long before he composed the quartet, and, unlike composers "today," he was unaccustomed to explaining his work according to theories he himself formulated. In another letter to Pölchau, dated 23 September 1832, Kiesewetter admitted having written the Balthaser article without mentioning the pseudonym itself. According to Kier the Balthaser article is listed in both Kiesewetter's "handschriftlichen Verzeichnis" and in the "Schriftumsverzeichnis" of his autobiography.

Kiesewetter often wrote anonymously or under a pseudonym, whereas Fétis always signed his own name. Unlike Fétis, who devoted his life to
musical endeavors, Kiesewetter divided his time between music and government service. Officially, he was a privy councillor ("Hofrath") in Vienna, and in 1843 he was made "Edler von Wiesenbrunn" by Kaiser Ferdinand. Leopold von Sonnleithner described Kiesewetter as "jovial, charming, humorous," and perhaps the combination of professional conscience and wit account for Kiesewetter's habit of concealing his identity when taking Féti against. At any rate, Féti soon saw Kiesewetter's presence behind every article bearing an unfamiliar signature. Ambros conjectured that "... were Féti to have had the misfortune on the way home to be assaulted and robbed on a lonely path by a tramp, he would have asked: Might that bandit have been perhaps Kiesewetter in disguise?"

When Kiesewetter died in 1850, a necrology by Aloys Fuchs appeared both in the Neue Zeitschrift für Musik (NZfM) and in the conglomerate periodical La Revue et Gazette musicale de Paris (R&GmP). Fuchs provided a list of Kiesewetter's works, which followed the biographical data and tributes. The German version included the Balthaser article, but when the necrology appeared in Paris, the first Leduc article had been substituted, no doubt by Féti. Kier contends that Féti made the switch and calls it "a malicious insinuation." In his articles written in the 1830s, Féti identified Leduc only as "... a German disguised by a pseudonym," but by 1850 he had apparently decided that Leduc was Kiesewetter and altered the necrology accordingly. This is confirmed by the second edition of volume 5 of Biographie universelle, published in 1863, which included an entry for A. C. Leduc, identifying him as one of Kiesewetter's pseudonyms. In 1884 Féti, recounting the controversy again, connected Kiesewetter with Leduc in a footnote of his Biographie universelle article on Gottfried Weber, who had entered the Mozart controversy in 1832. Despite Féti's emphatic endorsement, there is reason to doubt that Kiesewetter was Leduc.

Leduc (whoever he was) was more intent upon discrediting Féti than defending Mozart. Féti was at the distinct disadvantage of not knowing the identities of his assailants, whereas Leduc and Balthaser could capitalize on Féti's reputation as a conservatory pedant. Leduc depicted Féti as a preceptor, mechanically correcting Mozart's Schulbüche (bloopers) without concern for creativity or beauty. The Beethoven biographer Wilhelm von Lenz observed that Féti did not exempt anyone from the tyranny of "the rules," but by seeing what was unique as a violation of rules (albeit formulated after the fact), Féti restricted his ability to perceive why a composition such as this introduction was unique. "The Mozart text is somewhat piquant, but somewhat shocking it is not."

Balthaser expressed general dismay over the inadequacy of the harmony instruction at the Paris Conservatory and found it "... hardly the Athens of Counterpoint" that Féti seemed to imagine it. Leduc attributed at least part of Féti's lack of insight to the fact that "... Féti probably demonstrates with Rossini scores so often that his ear has become pampered and no longer
is accustomed to serious harmony.”51 In addition, as Balthaser pointed out, German ears had had the benefit of hearing Bach and Handel for the last century and therefore were not shocked by Mozart. Leduc’s attitude toward Fétiš was always condescending, and Leduc seemed to feel he possessed a close affinity to Mozart by virtue of nationality that would enable him to interpret and represent Mozart more accurately than Fétiš could: “We are convinced that had Mozart lived, Fétiš’s reproach would have caused [him] no anger.”52

What irked Leduc the most was not Fétiš’s treatment of Mozart but rather Fétiš’s misrepresentation of Leduc’s own remarks. Leduc’s arguments depended upon a meticulous rendition of the content and design of Fétiš’s articles; on the other hand, distortion and omission were Fétiš’s only weapons against Leduc. In his second article Leduc criticized Fétiš’s command of the German language and hastened to add that if Fétiš could not comprehend his carefully constructed logic, it was not Leduc’s fault.53 Leduc charged that since few Frenchmen read German periodicals, their perspective was prejudiced by Fétiš’s suppression and perversion of adverse criticism. In exasperation Leduc asked, “In what light would Fétiš appear before his public if I chose to publish my articles in the French language?”54

In contrast to Fétiš’s short expositions Leduc’s two articles are excessively long-winded and encumbered by a profusion of musical examples—an indication that he took the matter far more seriously than Fétiš had ever intended to do. In his second article Fétiš exploited the German penchant for extended rhetoric:

I will not present a long analysis of the meaning of Mozart’s composition because it is something which each is free to see as he wishes, and everyone knows the Germans make great use of this liberty. As the proportion of decadence of true knowledge in your school becomes more imminent, more importance tends to be placed upon aesthetics. . . . There are still skillful musicians in Germany, but they do not write much.55

It is ironic that Fétiš failed to realize that he himself was to no small degree responsible for the rise of music criticism in France.56 Both Balthaser and Leduc denied Fétiš’s accusations and attempted to turn the tables by comparing the state of German counterpoint with that in France and by casting further scorn upon Fétiš.

After Leduc’s second article, which appeared in two consecutive issues of the AmZ in February 1831, the feud between Fétiš and Leduc ground to a halt. Although Fétiš later reargued his position in a review57 and in his Biographie universelle, Leduc was never heard from again. He himself said he was necessarily created by Fétiš’s audacity: “Fecit indignatio versum!”58

In each of his articles Leduc offered clues to his identity. In the 24 February 1830 article he described himself as “ein Fremder” while employing the first person plural when speaking of Germany. Preceding the signature at the end of the article is: “Wien, im Jänner, 1830.”59 In the 9 February 1831
article Leduc gloated over Fétis's inability to identify him and offered another hint: "His opponent is indeed a novel [neuer] man, who has never before written with respect to music."60 However, it is difficult to accept this last clue on face value in light of Leduc's proven ability to put Fétis, a confessed music scholar and critic, on the defensive.

Perhaps he would have reappeared had the articulate Gottfried Weber not published the third edition of his Versuch einer geordneten Theorie der Tonsetzkunst in 1832, which included a section entitled "On a particularly remarkable passage in Mozart's Violin Quartet in C."61 This is the only composition discussed in such detail in the four-volume work, and, realizing the topical interest in the quartet, Weber republished the section separately in his own periodical, Cäcilia, in the same year.62 Five years later Johann Georg Kastner produced a French translation, entitled Essai d'un théorie systématique de la composition, and a year later, a synopsis in R&GmP.63 Fétis undoubtedly became familiar with Weber's treatise through Kastner's translation. The seven-year interim between the Fétis-Leduc altercation and Fétis's publication of a review of Weber's treatise, dealing specifically with the section on Mozart's quartet introduction,64 suggests he did not read Weber's treatise in German or the extracted article in Cäcilia. The further publication of two English translations, an American edition in 1841-42 by James Franklin Warner65 and an English one in 1851 by John Bishop,66 testifies to the popularity of Weber's third edition. It was Warner's intentional and unexplained omission of Weber's discussion and analysis of the introduction to K. 465 which prompted Bishop to reedit and emend the translation for publication in England.67

The flurry of literary activity surrounding Weber's new, expanded edition was an appropriate response to his comprehensive and objective analysis of the introduction. The latter appeared in conjunction with a larger discussion of modulation, although Weber had used the passage in the earlier editions

... as an example for the elucidation of this or that theoretical tenet, and consequently, for the most part, had fully analyzed whatever appeared peculiar or remarkable in these combinations of tones.

Before proceeding with the analysis, Weber presented a documented summary of the controversy, based upon the articles of Fétis, Perne, and Leduc. He agreed with Sarti and Fétis that the passage was "strange" but was the first to demonstrate why.

While discouraging his readers from expecting "... a judgment on the frequently disputed theoretical allowableness and irregularity of the passage in question," Weber attempted to examine the passage objectively from both grammatical and "rhetorical" perspectives. Feeling that the dissonance was not wrong, he claimed that such peculiar sounds "... must be employed for the sake of contrast." His irritation with Fetisian dogma was undisguised:
Once [and] for all, music is not a science endowed with mathematical deductions and completeness; it is not a system presenting us with absolute rules of permission or prohibition, the adoption of which can in all cases determine . . . the value or worthlessness, the accuracy or inaccuracy, the lawfulness or unlawfulness of this or that combination or succession of tones; and all the pretensions of those who have imagined they could found the theory of music on mathematics, and from such an assumed foundation deduce and establish absolute precepts, appear on the slightest examination as empty and ridiculous dreams. . . .

But even Weber dared to offer alternatives to Mozart's opening measures. After explaining how the succession of tones produces contradictory expectations and thus confuses the listener, Weber presented six alternatives to the opening measures (Ex. 4).

**EXAMPLE 4**

Furthermore, Weber accused Fétis of misapplying his own rule concerning the imitation and denounced the objections of Leduc as inappropriate.

In an attempt to offer a clever epilogue to the controversy, Weber sought to show that Mozart's passage *did* satisfy Fétis's rule. According to Weber, Fétis simply did not recognize where the imitation began between the second and third entries. Instead of comparing the distances between the entrances of the three upper voices as Fétis had, Weber focused on the dotted quarter-notes of measures three and four in the second and first violins and showed
that at that point they were one beat farther apart than the distance between the entrances of the viola and second violin (Ex. 5).

EXAMPLE 5

![Example 5](image)

Weber intended to include a more detailed discussion in a projected *Theory of Double Counterpoint*, which, however, he never completed.

Weber deemed Mozart's own "musically cultivated ear" the best judge of his work but admitted that he himself had reservations:

> As regards my own ear, I frankly confess that it does *not* receive pleasure from sounds like these;—on this subject I can freely speak as I think, and, in defiance of the silly and envious, dare even take up the haughty words and say: *I know what I like in my Mozart.*

It was to be expected that upon reading Weber, Fétis would feel compelled to justify his theories in public once again. He did so, of course, in his review of Kastner's translation. Fétis's tenacity led him to challenge Weber to a debate in the presence of a bipartisan jury. He offered to present a history of music theory and unlimited demonstrations proving the infallibility of the natural doctrine of tonality—all of this in the course of five or six sessions of two hours each—upon the request of Monsieur Weber. He ended his review by describing Weber's treatise as an "... excellent collection of analytic observations, [although] it is not a theory ..."—contrary to what the title implied.

As stated earlier, Lichtenthal published excerpts from the Sarti MS. in 1832, which were translated a second time into English and published in *The Harmonicon* in the same year. In the 1824 communication Lichtenthal referred to Sarti's *Streitschrift* as "Osservazioni critiche sopra un quartetto di Mozart." Other than a bibliographic description, the incipit of the introduction, and the closing line ("si può per far stonare i professori?") no details were given. In 1832 Lichtenthal published the excerpts under the title "Esame acustico fatto sopra due frammenti di Moazrt" but offered no explanation for the switch. The editor of *The Harmonicon* commented upon the title "Acoustical Examination of Two Fragments of Mozart" as follows:

107
The word acustico is here most improperly employed: the examination is into the practical effect of the passage in question, and does not concern the philosophical nature of the sounds introduced by the composer. The term esame is, unintentionally, very apt, for it signifies also a swarm of bees. The assailants of Mozart were not deficient in stings, though poor enough in honey; and their impotent attacks only caused his works to be sooner known and more widely circulated.

Instead of the Italian question the “Esame” concluded with a quotation in French from Rousseau: “de la musique à faire boucher ses oreilles.”

There is reason to believe that Lichtenthal fabricated the earlier title. Prior to the 1824 communication, no one had associated theoretical works with the successful opera composer and Kapellmeister. Neither the 1792 nor the 1812 edition of Gerber’s Lexicon der Tonkünstler mentions any essays, although several pages were devoted to Sarti’s career and compositions. The 1824 communication and the index to Lichtenthal’s Dizionario e bibliographia della musica (1826) list two theoretical works in manuscript: “Théorie de l’Harmonie simultanée et successive” and “Osservazioni critiche sopra un quartetto di Mozart.” Between 1824 and 1832 every article and book mentioning Sarti’s Mozart criticism spoke of the “Osservazioni” and usually quoted the closing line, thus indicating that their probable source was the 1824 communication rather than the manuscript itself. All books and articles written after the excerpts appeared referred to the “Esame.” In his preface to the excerpts Lichtenthal spoke of his vain attempts to see the manuscript while Asioli was alive, and Lichtenthal’s knowledge of what the manuscript actually contained was probably sketchy at best, which may account for the fact that the “Osservazioni” were allegedly only about one quartet.

The Harmonicon published the Sarti excerpts in English because “... the subject is interesting in a theoretical point of view and may induce some of our native artists to enter into a critical inquiry of the question at issue.” Unfortunately, The Harmonicon ceased publication the following year without having issued any rejoinders. The journal did, however, improve upon the typographical format of the article. In an apparent effort to make the analysis more concise, Lichtenthal had occasionally summarized Sarti instead of quoting him. Whereas the AmZ made no typographical distinction between Lichtenthal and Sarti, The Harmonicon set off the Sarti quotations in apostrophes.

Lichtenthal appended a postscript to his translation, which also appeared in the English version:

The whole thing smells of envy. Like every Italian maestro, who knows a little more than another Italian maestro, Sarti is inflated with pride and considers himself great and famous. Mozart’s memory was still alive in Milan, where he had created a brilliant era as a twelve- and fourteen-year-old opera composer, when those six quartets dedicated to J. Haydn arrived there and transported everyone into a totally new,
previously never suspected world. And in order to diminish the light of this great German genius, Sarti (then Kapellmeister at the Milan Cathedral) searched for so-called sunspots, [and] wrote down (they say for a Milanese lady), [in] a so-called "Esame acustico," those nineteen errors in thirty-six bars listed by him. As for the other thousands of heavenly bars in those six quartets—how did the Kapellmeister like them?80

(Lichtenthal erred in stating that Sarti wrote the essay while Kapellmeister at the Milan Cathedral, however, since Sarti left that position the year before the quartet was composed.)

In 1833 a series of unsigned articles on cross-relations appeared in the AmZ.81 They represented a thorough account of the evolution of the function of cross-relations as revealed in treatises from the Renaissance, Baroque, and Classical eras. The final article, entitled "Anhang: Ueber Sartis Streitschrift gegen Mozart," reveals the purpose of the series. By elaborately demonstrating how earlier composers and theorists resolved the problems of cross-relations, Sarti was cast in a ridiculous light: "One might think, upon reading this, that Sarti was about one hundred years too late. . . ." The author underscored the fallibility of Sarti's accusations by systematically taking each of the supposed errors in both quartets and showing with numerous musical examples why they would no longer be considered errors of counterpoint. Lichtenthal's excerpts of Sarti were quoted almost verbatim but were shuffled to suit the author's purposes.

The tone of this final article is reminiscent of the sarcastic and vindictive tone which characterized Lichtenthal's postscript. The anonymous author claimed that since consonant harmony makes no allowance for the interval between Eb and D#, the listener will perceive it as faulty intonation. Nature, we are told, ". . . bestowed such a sensitive ear upon Sarti that he could hear grass grow."82

There is reason to believe Lichtenthal may have written this series of articles. However, to entertain such a theory means one must take into account a further tantalizing piece of evidence: although the articles are unsigned and the index for 1832 lists them anonymously, the cumulative index of the AmZ lists them under A. C. Leduc. There is substantial evidence for the case that Lichtenthal was Leduc and the author of the cross-relations series.

Until 1810 Lichtenthal lived in Vienna, where he had become a friend of Mozart's widow and family83; this is confirmed by the intimate account of Karl Mozart's reaction to Sarti's criticism in the 1824 communication. Lichtenthal, a medical doctor by profession, took a life-long interest in music—especially that of Mozart: he published a short biography of Mozart84 and adapted Idomeneo for the Italian stage in 1843.85 His position as Milan correspondent for the AmZ could have enabled him to conceal his identity. His residence in Italy may explain how he could refer to himself as "ein Fremder" as well as a German; however, the first Leduc article was
dated "Vienna, January 1830," which would have meant Lichtenthal was visiting there, although no such trip can be documented. Part of Leduc's success in the confrontation with Fétis was due to his command of French and his knowledge of the compositions of the Renaissance masters. Lichtenthal demonstrated both capacities in his Estetica ossia Dottrina del bello e delle arti belle, published in 1831. Finally, with regard to the cross-relations series in particular, after impatiently seeking the opportunity to make the Sarti MS. public, Lichtenthal would hardly have contented himself with the brief commentary contained in his postscript.

The C-major string quartet has continued to capture the interest of theorists, historians, and critics. But the era in which theorists found it possible to suggest that Mozart did not know what he was doing and to "correct" his music has long since ended. Jacques Chailley has interpreted the introduction in terms of the Masonic rites in which Mozart had taken part exactly one month before the quartet was completed.

Heinrich Schenker discussed the introduction in several places in his Neue musikalische Theorien und Phantasien. In volume 1 of Harmonielehre he examined it with respect to mixtures of major and minor mode and concluded that

... the A-flat and the A approach each other so closely that the ear is tempted to hear them together, and it becomes difficult to make an immediate and clear distinction between the different functions of these two tones. This difficulty, as is well known, has drawn upon this quartet the misleading name "Dissonance Quartet." Schenker, speaking in 1906, referred to the quartet's nickname as if it were in common usage as it is today. This is curious since neither critics Sarti, Fétis, Perne, Leduc, Balthasar, and Ambros, Mozart biographer Jahn, nor theorists Weber, Riemann, and Schreyer ever referred to the quartet by that name. In volume 3, Der freie Satz, Schenker presented a schematic analysis, illustrating the large-scale motion. Like Schenker, Hugo Riemann, Johannes Schreyer, and Rudolf Gerber discussed K. 465 in terms of their own methods of analysis, but without questioning its propriety. Before presenting his own analysis Antoine-Elisée Cherbuliez summarized the other 20th-century interpretations in a 1931 congress report.

From their respective vantage points Lichtenthal, Weber, Lenz, Ernest Newman, Cherbuliez, and Deutsch narrated the controversy. Weber and Lenz, in particular, demonstrated remarkable insight, proximity in time and national biases notwithstanding. The articles by Weber, Cherbuliez, and Deutsch contain extensive, though not comprehensive, bibliographic material.

Ernest Newman's censure of the introduction is unique among 20th-century commentaries:

I am convinced that if it were put before us without any hint that it was by Mozart we should be pretty severe with it. I venture to say that this
introduction is not good Mozart, that it has an uncertainty about it—not so much harmonic as aesthetic—that we do not often find in him; that the men of his own day were conscious that it was not good Mozart; and that they were quite justified in saying so.

Newman was especially intrigued by the Sarti MS.; he noted that historians often coin clichés which distort the author's original meaning and in turn are taken up by younger historians. He expressed a desire to locate the MS. in order to reevaluate Sarti's role in the controversy and included the AmZ extract and commentary in his discussion:

Sarti is not attempting an aesthetic appreciation of the quartets as a whole; he is simply subjecting certain bars of them to a technical examination. And is not a good deal of his criticism justified from the technical point of view, especially of his period?

Newman concluded that "... Sarti turns out to have been mostly right and Mozart wrong."98

Unlike most of Mozart's compositions, the six quartets dedicated to Haydn were not tailored to a commission. Mozart described them in the dedication as "... the fruit of long and laborious endeavor." They reflect his experimentation with forms, dynamics, chromaticism, and dissonance. Mozart must have anticipated they would be misunderstood, and by entrusting them to his acclaimed colleague he hoped to insure their credibility. His pride in them is apparent when he calls them his "children": "... I flatter myself that this offspring will serve to afford me some solace one day." He entreated Haydn to "... look indulgently upon the defects which the partiality of a father's eye may have concealed from me. ..."94 Today, despite past onsloughts of criticism, analysis, and revision, the music retains its elusiveness and beauty.
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For many years the music of Johann Christian Bach, the youngest and favorite son of Johann Sebastian Bach, was eclipsed not only by the fame of his father and his contemporaries Mozart and Haydn but also by the renown of his two older half-brothers, Carl Philipp Emanuel and Wilhelm Friedemann. The dissertation of Beth Anna Mekota on "The Solo and Ensemble Keyboard Works of Johann Christian Bach" now gives evidence of increased interest in and knowledge of this composer's music. In addition to the 1967 second edition of Charles Sanford Terry's biography, with corrigenda and foreword by H. C. Robbins Landon,1 a dissertation on J. C. Bach's liturgical choral works was completed in 1969, and dissertations on his chamber music and his late keyboard concertos are now in progress.2

At the outset of her dissertation Dr. Mekota describes Johann Christian as the "most adventurous" and "cosmopolitan" of the eleven Bach sons, as well as "perhaps the most talented" (p. 1), and many other modern scholars of 18th-century Classicism support her viewpoint. H. C. Robbins Landon maintains that while C. P. E. and W. F. "occasionally had bursts of fantasy, even genius ... on the whole it is Johann Christian who is the better balanced composer."3 In material prepared for the New Oxford History of Music, Jan LaRue ranks him as "England's greatest symphonist" and puts him "in the select company of those who at times equalled Haydn and Mozart."4

Dr. Mekota's dissertation, organized into six main divisions (plus a conclusion, two appendices, and a bibliography), presents biographical information (chapter 1), a survey of the solo and ensemble keyboard literature (chapter 2), and detailed analyses of the music (chapters 3 through 6). Her primary purpose, as noted in the preface, is a stylistic examination of the music.

An investigation of the first two chapters affords us a look at Dr. Mekota's treatment of secondary sources. She acknowledges her debt to Charles Sanford Terry's John Christian Bach5 "for the greater portion of the material in Chapter I" (p. ii). Indeed, the forty-six pages of text represent essentially a summary of Terry's 169-page biographical section—and it seems a questionable practice to base approximately one-fifth of a dissertation on a readily available English source.

Throughout chapter 1 Dr. Mekota consistently cites the first rather than
the second edition of Terry’s biography (both appear in the bibliography). For the most part, this presents no problem, since the text of the second edition remains unaltered except for the addition of a foreword and corrigenda by Robbins Landon. At one point, however, Dr. Mekota’s information seems to be at variance with Terry’s text. Without direct reference to her sources, she states that “in 1754, after four years in Berlin, Johann Christian departed for Italy. The date of his departure, the manner in which he traveled and the purpose of his trip are unknown” (p. 6). Terry, on the other hand, offers considerations pointing to 1756 as a possible departure date rather than 1754 and furnishes a romantic motive for the later date.6 We can only conjecture then that Dr. Mekota’s source was Landon’s corrigenda to the second edition in which he summarizes Heinrich Miesner’s arguments for a 1754 departure date (pp. xxiv–xxv). Miesner’s viewpoint originally appeared in a review in 1934 of the first edition (not included in Dr. Mekota’s bibliography), consisting of seven pages of additions and corrections.7

In chapter 2 under the heading of “Bach’s Performance Media,” Dr. Mekota discusses the accompanied keyboard sonata, the most numerous species of published Classic sonatas. For those attempting to use the dissertation as a guide for further research into this major genre of the 18th-century, Dr. Mekota offers little help. Although the literature is meagre, a starting point is William S. Newman’s article “Concerning the Accompanied Clavier Sonata,”8 as well as two sections in his The Sonata in the Classic Era9 (pp. 98–105 deal with the genre in general, pp. 703–11, with the works of J. C. Bach in particular). Dr. Mekota cites pages 91 and 683 of the latter work (which make only passing references to the accompanied keyboard sonata) but neglects the two other more important sections. The accompanied keyboard sonata originated in the 18th century but soon declined when the great Classic composers started writing piano and violin sonatas in which each instrument was on an equal footing. In chapter 2 Dr. Mekota might have dealt with the origins of the form, as well as the question of why the violin remained subservient to the clavier for at least half a century, even though it had dominated during the basso continuo era.

According to Dr. Mekota, Bach composed forty-four duos for keyboard and accompanying instrument. However, the seven duos of the Italian period do not qualify as true accompanied keyboard sonatas (Newman includes them in his list of Bach’s works of this genre),10 because the musical materials allotted each instrument are so interlocked “that unlike its usual role in an ‘accompanied sonata,’ the violin here becomes an indispensable voice in the ensemble” (p. 106). The one sonata of this group that Dr. Mekota includes in the appendix tends to confirm her viewpoint, though not unequivocally. Although the violin shows an independence unusual for accompanied keyboard sonatas, the two parts are not truly equal.

In chapter 5 Dr. Mekota discusses in some detail the ways in which the optional instrument accompanies the clavier in thirty-four sonatas (employing either violin or flute) dating from the London years. She points out that
these duos were intended for wealthy dilettantes in the upper strata of society. For background material in this chapter she might have included the fact that C. P. E. Bach (with whom Christian studied for at least four years) published two sets of accompanied sonatas by subscription in 1776 and 1777 (W. 90/1–3 and 91/1–4). In a letter of 25 September 1775, C. P. E. wrote that the violin and cello parts could be left out of these seven “easy” sonatas.11

Chapters 3 to 5 include a stylistic study of Bach’s solo and ensemble keyboard works composed in Berlin (before 1754), Italy (1754–62), and London (1762–82). Each chapter is divided into sections on form, harmony, texture, melody, and rhythm. In the discussions covering form Dr. Mekota’s principal point is that “the emerging sonata form can be traced in the course of Bach’s keyboard composition” (unpaginated abstract preceding dissertation). Among transitional figures between the Baroque and Classic eras, Bach played a major role in the evolution of this form, as well as of the early Classic style in general.

Dr. Mekota describes the Berlin works as being “for the most part binary in form.” Some, however, “contain two tonal areas and hint at bi-thematicism, thus foreshadowing later sonata form” (Abstract). She attempts to fit the majority of the first movements of the Italian and London works into a “textbook” sonata, a variant of the “textbook” type, and a “classic” sonata. The “textbook” sonata she describes in part as having an exposition containing “two contrasting themes or groups of themes in two strongly established tonal areas” and the “classic” sonata as one in which “themes may not contrast sharply, but tonal areas are well-established” (p. 93). Although the author appears to derive her terminology from Leonard Ratner’s article “Harmonic Aspects of Classic Form,”12 she has somewhat diluted his emphasis on tonal contrast as the basic criterion. Ratner disagrees with what he terms the typical “textbook analysis” used by theorists during the past century, in which they “regarded classic sonata form as being constituted from two principal themes.” He proceeds to give convincing arguments that “bi-thematicism, thematic contrast, and well-defined areas of statement and development are not valid as basic formal criteria” (p. 160). Buttressed by quotations from Classical theorists, he shows that sonata form is essentially a structure based on key areas. Dr. Mekota herself states that many of the London keyboard works that she has classified as sonatas are at variance “with one or more aspects of sonata structure” as she describes it (p. 133).

Her discussions of melody, texture, rhythm, and harmony do not always maintain equal depths of critical analysis. The sections on texture, however, contain many valuable observations. For example, she maintains that “texture in Bach’s music serves primarily to delineate form. Each new musical thought, whether it be a principal theme or subordinate idea, is usually set forth in a sonority that contrasts with its surroundings” (p. 229). Her harmonic analyses are also extremely thorough, covering such items as harmonic relationships among movements, modulatory procedures, cadential
formulas, harmonic rhythm, use of pedal tones, and harmonic vocabulary. She makes the useful comment that, although consistent within a given movement, the harmonic rhythm of the Berlin period is "highly variable." In the Italian and London compositions the harmonic rhythm is more controlled, and changes often coincide with new structural subdivisions (p. 227).

On the other hand, her discussion of rhythm is incomplete. Here a point could be made for including harmonic rhythm under the sections on rhythm—especially since there is so little material on the subject. In fact, rhythm is not discussed for the Berlin works. One might note, for example, that the relatively undifferentiated rhythmic style of the Berlin compositions shows the influence of C. P. E. Bach and the Baroque background. Under the Italian works we find remarks such as: "Most of the rhythmic patterns . . . offer little that is distinctive for their time. Melodies rarely involve any figure more complicated than that of a dotted eighth and sixteenth" (p. 112). Yet without resorting to complex patterns, Bach is among the first to give rhythmic profile to the phrase.

A seeming contradiction also arises in Dr. Mekota's discussion of Bach's melodic structure; she points out that Bach is commonly considered to be "one of the first composers to place emphasis on contrast within a composition" (p. 229). At the same time, however, she concludes that "[his] melodies, although graceful and pleasing, are not often distinctive" (Abstract).

In appendix 1 under the chronological listing of works written in London between 1762-81, we see Sonata [in F], which comes from a collection of "Six Sonatas for the Piano-Forte composed by Bach, Benda, Gzaun [sic], Wageneil [sic], Hasse & Kernberger [sic]. London: Harrison, Cluse & Co., [1799]" (material in brackets added by Dr. Mekota). Apparently the names of the composers appear only on the last three sonatas of the collection. According to Dr. Mekota, "since these last three sonatas are by the last three above-named composers in the order in which they occur on the title page, it seems reasonable to assume a direct correspondence between the first three sonatas and the first three names on the title page" (p. 239). Most researchers in 18th-century music will find this a risky assumption, and the gross spelling errors in the title page scarcely inspire confidence.

Backtracking through the dissertation in search of fuller information, we find on page 50 that Dr. Mekota actually feels—contrary to the British-Union Catalogue—that the sonata was probably composed by C. P. E. Bach, since the other five composers appearing on the title page were men whom C. P. E. had known at the court of Frederick the Great. It is surprising to read, therefore, that "because of the uncertain attribution the sonata has been included in the study" (p. 50). Here the author might well have attempted to determine the correct composer by means of stylistic analysis, a resource entirely absent in her discussions of authenticity.

Turning to appendix 2, we find four compositions transcribed into modern
edition. The inclusion of these works is particularly valuable, since they exist only in manuscript or 18th-century editions and represent the three major periods of Bach's output.

One of the accomplishments of the dissertation is a chronology for the sonatas that places them in either the Berlin, Italian, or London periods. Also valuable is the charting of the evolution that occurred in Bach's style during these years, supported by well-chosen examples.

The most obvious unsolved problem of the dissertation is its lack of a critical musical evaluation of Bach's solo and ensemble keyboard works. Dr. Mekota's concluding statement—"... his compositional technique generally reflects practices current in his lifetime"—tells us little about his significance and contributions to the 18th century. The question of how his solo and ensemble keyboard works differ from those of, for example, his brother C. P. E. Bach, or numerous other contemporaries, remains unanswered. J. C. Bach's influence over Mozart receives only passing mention. Dr. Mekota notes that Mozart constructed concertos from Christian's Op. 5 sonatas at the age of nine, but we miss any reference to Edwin J. Simon's important article on the subject, "Sonata into Concerto: A Study of Mozart's First Seven Concertos."\(^{14}\) She might also have mentioned Mozart's letters in which he recommends Bach's sonatas to his sister in 1774 and speaks of using them for teaching purposes in Mannheim in 1778.\(^{15}\)

For one evaluation of J. C. Bach's music, we can turn to Jan LaRue, who points out that Bach's evolution of formulas as early as 1770 "to relate and control the heterogeneous elements of a new style was in itself a novel and notable accomplishment."\(^{16}\) Professor LaRue goes on to say that one of the composer's most important contributions lay in his coordination of all the elements "to a common task of expression," thus resembling and influencing Mozart.\(^{17}\) In addition to Bach's thematic contrast (Burney was the first to comment on this), he broadened the internal structures of the themes themselves by expanding their building blocks or modules. In opening themes in particular he "perfected a compound structure of fanfare balanced by a contrasting response."\(^{18}\)

It is hoped that future work on Johann Christian Bach and his solo and ensemble keyboard works, some of it perhaps to be carried out by Dr. Mekota herself, will broaden and deepen our understanding of his music along stylistic-analytical lines.

**NOTES**


2 Following is a list of Ph.D. dissertations, both completed and in progress: Edward O. D. Downes, "The Operas of J. C. Bach as a Reflection of the Dominant Trends in Opera Seria, 1750-1780" (Harvard University, 1958); Marie A. H. Vos, "The Liturgical Choral Works of Johann Christian Bach" (Washington University, 1969); Joseph A. White, Jr., "The Concerted Symphonies of Johann Christian Bach" (University of Michigan, 1958);
Delores J. Keahey, "The Chamber Music of Johann Christian Bach" (University of Texas); Oscar D. Yancey, Jr., "A Study of Style and Form in the Late Keyboard Concerti of Johann Christian Bach" (Indiana University).

3 Terry, Bach, p. xxiii.
5 London: Oxford University Press, 1929.
6 Terry, Bach, p. 13.
10 *The Sonata in the Classic Era*, pp. 704–05.
16 LaRue, "The Early Symphony."
18 LaRue, "The Early Symphony."


*Stanley A. Malinowski, Jr.*

Reinhard Keiser (1674–1739) is remembered today primarily for his operas, which number more than one hundred.2 Music historians have consigned him to a position secondary to that of Handel, who arrived in Hamburg in 1703 and enjoyed an immediate popularity with the opera audiences that eclipsed Keiser’s fame in that city. Nevertheless, as manager of the Hamburg opera house from 1696 to 1707, Keiser wrote and produced at least twenty-seven full-length operas and numerous shorter works, and many of them enjoyed great success on the stage.

Though not a consummate genius on the order of Bach and Handel, Keiser was an able composer. There was no lack of esteem for him by his contemporaries—Mattheson, Scheibe, Telemann, and Handel, to name but a few, have been quoted as admiring his work. Mattheson referred to him as “the foremost man of the world” and asked, “What kind of musical triumphal arch would it have been, in which Reinhard Keiser had no niche?”3 Handel, a master at taking other composers’ ideas and developing them in his own way, borrowed many times from Keiser’s operas.4 C. P. E. Bach acknowledged to Forkel the influence of Keiser upon his father as follows: “In his last years he esteemed highly: Fux, Caldara, Händel Kayser [sic], Hasse, both Grauns, Telemann, Zelenka, Benda, and, in general, everything that was worthy of esteem in Berlin and Dresden.”5

One of the most significant compliments that could be paid Keiser was made by J. S. Bach, who thought enough of the *St. Mark Passion* to copy it out and perform it himself, probably in Weimar and in Leipzig.6 Indeed, that the *St. Mark Passion* exists at all today is due in no small way to Bach, for it is only through performance material made by or for Bach that this work has survived.

The *St. Mark Passion* is the last of seven known Passion compositions by Keiser. Most of the earlier works are Passion oratorios, i.e., compositions on a specially written poetic libretto that take the form of an oratorio with recitatives, arias, choruses, and chorales. The *St. Mark Passion*, however, is an oratorio Passion, that is, a composition using a Biblical account of the Passion story as a text, but with the addition of arias, choruses, and chorales on poetic or non-Biblical texts (or occasionally texts from the Prophets, Psalms, etc., but not from the Gospels themselves).

Though not of the monumental proportions of Bach’s extant Passions,
Keiser's *St. Mark* is a substantial work. To the Biblical text are added ten arias and four chorale settings, which serve as commentary to appropriate passages of the Gospel. The *Passion* is scored for four-part chorus, soloists, two violins, two violas, and continuo. In addition, one aria has an oboe obbligato marked in the first violin part. In his dissertation on the work Donald Moe considers this a conservative orchestration in comparison with Keiser's opera orchestras (p. 112), and indeed it is. It was typical of Passions at that time, however, to employ a reduced orchestra; trumpets and drums, for example, were not used because they would add an inappropriate festivity to a solemn occasion. Strings formed the core of most Passion orchestras; they accompanied arias and the recitatives of Christ and doubled the voice parts in the chorales. In addition, flutes and oboes were used frequently in arias because their tonal colors suited well the mood of the Passion story. Of course, there is a possibility that winds doubled the violins for some arias, and that bassoons doubled the bass line. Dr. Moe deals only casually with these possibilities and makes no recommendations as to their use. It is not likely that Bach changed Keiser's orchestration, since he used flutes, oboes, and bassoons in his own Passions (1723 and 1729) and presumably would have had the same forces on hand in 1726.

The Deutsche Staatsbibliothek in East Berlin possesses two sets of parts for the Keiser *Passion,* one a complete set partially in Bach's hand, the other an incomplete set copied entirely by Bach. The Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz in West Berlin has in its possession a score of this work, with music in the hand of an unknown copyist and text underlaid in red ink by Bach. The parts alone were used by Dr. Moe in preparing his practical edition of the *St. Mark Passion.* Although he was aware of the existence of the score, at the time of his work this manuscript was in the process of being returned to Berlin, along with the remainder of the former possessions of the Prussian State Library, from temporary postwar storage in Marburg, and it was not possible to obtain a microfilm of it.

Discrepancies exist between the score and the parts in regard to the actual contents of the *Passion,* and these differences were noted by Richard Petzoldt in a prewar dissertation. What Dr. Moe has done is to prepare a practical edition that represents the *St. Mark Passion* as it exists in one source alone. In his presentation of the music as it stands in these parts, he has rendered a generally faithful edition which is marred by only a few minor errors and misreadings. A comparison (by this reviewer) of microfilms of both score and parts with the edition under study reveals that, in the case of questionable readings, Dr. Moe made his choice with discretion. By using instrumental and vocal parts that had actually been employed in performance, the editor had the advantage of finding minor corrections made in these parts by the players that might otherwise have gone unnoticed in the score. The editor makes note of his changes in a "List of Revisions" and a "List of Slurs Added by the Editor." This latter list might have been replaced by a more convenient editorial procedure, such as a
vertical slash through added slurs, which would have made it easier for the performer to distinguish Keiser from Moe.

About the same time that Dr. Moe was completing his edition, a commercially published edition of the same piece appeared in Germany. Like Dr. Moe's work, this version is intended as a performance edition, although it also has notes on the sources and Revisionsbemerkungen, making it of use to the scholar as well as to the performer. The German editor acknowledges the parts as his preferred source and employs the selection and order of movements or "numbers" found there as the basis of his edition. Having checked details against the score, he has resolved conflicts where necessary. In general, this edition and Dr. Moe's agree in terms of the notes on all but the smallest details.

In judging the merits of the Moe edition as a "practical" one, the first consideration should be its "practicality," i.e., how suitable is it for the performer? (Although a set of instrumental parts was also prepared by the editor, these are not supplied with the print of the dissertation and hence are not under consideration.) To begin with a small but important detail, although the editor's "List of Revisions" refers to specific measure numbers, neither measure numbers nor rehearsal letters appear in the edition. This is an inconvenience not only to the performer but also to one studying the music. It is only a minor inconvenience to have to pencil in such numbers when examining the music on one's own, but in a performance situation the lack of easily seen and located points of reference could cause the loss of much valuable rehearsal time.

The St. Mark Passion is eminently worthy of performance today, and to enhance the suitability of his edition for modern American groups, Dr. Moe has provided an English translation of the entire Passion. The merits of performance in the original language can be debated at length, but there can be little doubt that an English version of a work such as the St. Mark Passion will put it within the grasp of many groups that might otherwise hesitate to attempt a performance in the original German. Mattheson considered Keiser a master in the setting of words to music: "I believe assuredly that in the time he flourished, there was no composer who . . . had set words to music so richly, naturally, flowingly, attractively, or (above all) so distinctly, understandably, and eloquently." In weighing the merits of this practical edition of the St. Mark Passion, then, one important factor must be the appropriateness and singability of the English version.

It is also obvious that this edition is intended chiefly for performance in English because the table of contents lists pieces only by their English incipits—another inconvenience to anyone other than the performer. The musical examples cited in the "historical account" volume are also given with only English translations underlaid. This is a lamentable tradition that Dr. Moe inherits from a long line of English commentators on the Passion in general. Unless one happens to be familiar with the particular edition and translation used by the author, one must do some hunting to
find the passage in question. When translations depart from a literal rendering of the text, as they often do, one can become hopelessly lost—although this latter problem is not severe in Dr. Moe’s edition.

The recitatives have been translated with the help of the King James and German versions of the Bible. The editor’s goal is “to maintain good accentuation of the English words while at the same time retaining the character and shape of Keiser’s line” (p. x). Usually he succeeds, but a few specific passages raise disturbing questions.

Example 1, below, shows that the editor has chosen the reading of the King James version over that of the German; he substitutes the phrase “with the palms of their hands” for the words “ins Angesicht.” Not only does this give a different shade of meaning to the phrase, but it also creates a particularly awkward moment at the cadential figure. Instead of following the syllabic accent of the word “Angesicht,” the figure gives undue prominence to the word “palms.” In following the shape of Keiser’s phrase, the editor has created an instance of weak word accentuation.

EXAMPLE 1*
(No. 12, mm. 1–2)

* In the edition, only one staff is used, with opposing stems and cue-size notes for the alternate version. For the sake of comparison, the English version has been placed here on a separate staff.

Example 2 offers a similar point at which King James is favored over Luther. The German “Und er hub an zu weinen,” translates simply as, “And he began to weep,” and indeed this version would seem to fit the music fairly well. Yet by trying to accommodate the traditional English version, “And when he thought thereon, he wept,” the editor destroys the simple

EXAMPLE 2
(No. 14, mm. 11–12)

When he thought of this, he began to weep.
beauty of Keiser's phrase. By using ten syllables instead of seven, he has had to add extra notes. In the first part of the phrase, there is not much difficulty, but in the second part the extra syllables get in the way of the cadence and shift the emphasis from "weep" to "began". Not only is the accentuation poor, but the falling fourth, so characteristically used as a motive of weeping or sighing, is robbed of all its pictorialism.

The third example is a bit different—it points out a translation that is outright clumsy. "Sepulchre" is the word given in King James, but the monosyllable "tomb" would certainly do as well. The word order of the phrase "which was from a great rock hewn" is certainly not good English, even in poetic usage, and the break in the next phrase after "unto" only further befuddles the mind of the listener.

EXAMPLE 3:
(No. 46, mm. 4–8)

Evangelist

Und legte ihn in ein Grab, das war in einem

And laid him in a sepulchre, which was from a

Fel- sen ge-hauen, und wäl- zet einem Stein

great rock hewn, and rolled a stone unto the

vor des Grabes Tür.

door of the sepul-chre.

It appears, then, that the editor prefers to fit the King James translation to the music of Keiser rather than to attempt an appropriate rendering of what Keiser has written. This makes little sense from a scholarly or practical
point of view. To alter the music deliberately in order to accommodate an entirely different text from the one the composer had in mind is a distortion of the purposes of an editor. This is not editing—it is more like arranging and should be acknowledged as such.

Problems such as these create perhaps the weakest link in Dr. Moe’s edition; however, there are compensations in the treatment of the arias, choruses, and chorales. The editor’s procedure with regard to the arias was to create a literal translation first and then to work out a rhymed metrical version that fits the music, a sound practice with historical precedent. He succeeds for the most part in choosing words that sing well and fit the musical notes closely without departing from the meaning of the original text.

Dr. Moe occasionally decides that a particular line is overly sentimental or excessive and alters it. For example, he finds the following lines offensive because of their implied anti-Semitism: “So wirst du Adams Schauergichten/Und Gosens Zwiebelspeise gram.” He substitutes the lines, “Reject the lust that flesh engenders, O child of earth in Christ reborn” (No. 28, pp. 107–15). This phrase may sing well, but it distorts what the composer intended. Keiser was not embarrassed by such Pietistic poetry; he welcomed it, as evidenced by the praise (quoted by Dr. Moe himself on p. 101) which Keiser lavished upon Brockes for his famous Passion poem Der für die Sünden der Welt gemarterte und sterbende Jesu.

For the chorales the editor has used standard translations from sources such as the Lutheran hymnal in the case of all but one, for which he could not find a translation. So long as the standard translations are reasonably accurate (and these are), this practice is commendable. In addition to simplifying the editions the selection of such a translation is an advantage to the congregation, which can then sing a familiar set of words to a familiar tune when one presents the Passion as it was originally sung, i.e., with the congregation participating in the chorales.

The editor’s continuo realization is adequate for anyone not inclined to use his own for performance. However, in the recitatives one may question the use of a slanted or broken line to separate the common V-I cadential chords from the cadential figure in the voice part, in order to indicate that these chords are to be performed after the voice has sung its line. If the editor goes this far in aiding the one performer, why not also add ossia appoggiaturas at cadences for the singers? Dr. Moe cites Donington: “There are few rules so unambiguous as this rule concerning appoggiaturas in recitative, and its consistent application is very strongly to be recommended” (p. xvi). Yet after acknowledging that most feminine cadences on a falling fourth in the St. Mark Passion have the appoggiatura written out, Dr. Moe gives a few examples from Telemann of other types of cadences and turns the problem back to the performer with the words, “It is recommended that the singer apply these general principles” (p. xv). The question of ornamentation is covered in one paragraph. After brief references
to C. P. E. Bach and Donington, the editor states: "Trills and ornaments have not been written into this edition by the editor, but the performer is again urged to apply these principles" (p. xvi). Again the performer is left to his own discretion, supplied only with inadequate generalizations and anachronistic sources that he may not understand how to interpret.

One may well ask what a performing edition prepared by a scholar should be. The problems of transcribing notes from 18th-century manuscript sources are minimal; any musicologist should be able to handle such a problem, but this is more in the line of homework, not the substance of scholarly research. One expects that a scholar well versed in matters of 18th-century performance practice will share the knowledge he has gained from his experience by suggesting appropriate details throughout his edition; the performer may then choose to follow them or not at his own discretion. Yet to ignore these problems entirely, or worse, to leave them completely in the hands of the performer, is to suggest that the editor, despite his supposed expertise, knows no more about such things than the casual performer. To imply that the performer can instantly become an expert in 18th-century practice by reading a few lines from Donington is an indefensible position for a musicologist to take.

In addition to the edition, Dr. Moe has provided a volume of historical background on Passion composition up to the time of Keiser. His bibliography is somewhat general in nature—witness works such as Grout's History of Western Music and Reese's Music in the Renaissance—and overlooks a few important works, such as Otto Kade's Die ältere Passionskomposition bis zum Jahre 1631. In reading through this account one gets the distinct impression that Dr. Moe has done little besides quote from secondary sources. It is not even a matter of collecting microfilms of original material; his text does not show much indication that he studied seriously even the available printed editions of early Passions to any degree. Consider the following paragraphs (pp. 20–22):

One of the last German responsorial Passions is the St. Mark Passion by Ambrosius Beber, which appeared between 1610 and 1620.* This Passion uses two choruses—a five-voiced chorus for the turbæ and introductory and closing choruses, and a small choir of soloists who sing the parts of the soliloquents.** The voicing for the various persons is dependent on what is being said as well as on who is speaking. For example, characters who do harm by their words to Jesus have an AT voicing, and those who do direct harm to Jesus have an ATB voicing. The words of Christ are always SATB. This voicing is used only two other times: when Pilate gives serious consideration to Jesus as "King of the Jews," and when the centurion says, "Truly he is the Son of God."***

The evangelist's part has historical value because it represents a transition from the traditional Protestant responsorial Passion to the freely composed type. This is shown in two important characteristics: (1) the Passion tone surpasses earlier and contemporary works in
"rhythmic differentiation" and shows the beginning of monodic declamation, and (2) it deviates completely from the traditional F tonality.****


These sentences constitute Dr. Moe's discussion of the Beber Passion. The content is accurate, but his methods are subject to question. For example, is it necessary to credit someone for making the simple observation that the composer has used two choruses in a work? Might not the author have noted this fact himself by examining the score?

This volume of historical background does not go beyond what is already known about the history of Passion composition up to the time of Keiser. It reads well and represents its sources accurately, but is it an original contribution to scholarly knowledge? As literature it can hardly compare with Basil Smallman's *The Background of Passion Music*, one of Dr. Moe's chief sources and still the best treatment of the subject, despite its brevity.

What exactly has been accomplished by Dr. Moe's edition of the *St. Mark Passion*? It is not a scholarly edition, nor does it pretend to be. It is not a practical edition, either, for it lets the performer down when he most needs help and leaves him alone to face the important questions related to the performance of an early 18th-century oratorio. One is left with a simple diplomatic rendering of the work, to which is added an English translation of limited musical or historical value. For most performers, the Schroeder edition is more suitable because it offers more help. For those who would like an edition with an English translation, an adequate one remains to be prepared.

**NOTES**

1 The reviewer is grateful to Professors Neal Zaslaw and Donald Jay Grout for their thoughtful comments and suggestions concerning this review.
2 See the report by Mary Peckham on the "First American Performance of Reinhard Keiser's *Cresus*," *Current Musicology* 6 (1968): 81-83.
Reinhard Keiser (1674–1739) is remembered today primarily for his operas, which number more than one hundred. Music historians have consigned him to a position secondary to that of Handel, who arrived in Hamburg in 1703 and enjoyed an immediate popularity with the opera audiences that eclipsed Keiser’s fame in that city. Nevertheless, as manager of the Hamburg opera house from 1696 to 1707, Keiser wrote and produced at least twenty-seven full-length operas and numerous shorter works, and many of them enjoyed great success on the stage.

Though not a consummate genius on the order of Bach and Handel, Keiser was an able composer. There was no lack of esteem for him by his contemporaries—Mattheson, Scheibe, Telemann, and Handel, to name but a few, have been quoted as admiring his work. Mattheson referred to him as “the foremost man of the world” and asked, “What kind of musical triumphal arch would it have been, in which Reinhard Keiser had no niche?” Handel, a master at taking other composers’ ideas and developing them in his own way, borrowed many times from Keiser’s operas. C. P. E. Bach acknowledged to Forkel the influence of Keiser upon his father as follows: “In his last years he esteemed highly: Fux, Caldara, Händel Kayser [sic], Hasse, both Grauns, Telemann, Zelenka, Benda, and, in general, everything that was worthy of esteem in Berlin and Dresden.”

One of the most significant compliments that could be paid Keiser was made by J. S. Bach, who thought enough of the St. Mark Passion to copy it out and perform it himself, probably in Weimar and in Leipzig. Indeed, that the St. Mark Passion exists at all today is due in no small way to Bach, for it is only through performance material made by or for Bach that this work has survived.

The St. Mark Passion is the last of seven known Passion compositions by Keiser. Most of the earlier works are Passion oratorios, i.e., compositions on a specially written poetic libretto that take the form of an oratorio with recitatives, arias, choruses, and chorales. The St. Mark Passion, however, is an oratorio Passion, that is, a composition using a Biblical account of the Passion story as a text, but with the addition of arias, choruses, and chorales on poetic or non-Biblical texts (or occasionally texts from the Prophets, Psalms, etc., but not from the Gospels themselves).

Though not of the monumental proportions of Bach’s extant Passions,
Keiser's *St. Mark* is a substantial work. To the Biblical text are added ten arias and four chorale settings, which serve as commentary to appropriate passages of the Gospel. The *Passion* is scored for four-part chorus, soloists, two violins, two violas, and continuo. In addition, one aria has an oboe obbligato marked in the first violin part. In his dissertation on the work Donald Moe considers this a conservative orchestration in comparison with Keiser's opera orchestras (p. 112), and indeed it is. It was typical of Passions at that time, however, to employ a reduced orchestra; trumpets and drums, for example, were not used because they would add an inappropriate festivity to a solemn occasion. Strings formed the core of most Passion orchestras; they accompanied arias and the recitatives of Christ and doubled the voice parts in the chorales. In addition, flutes and oboes were used frequently in arias because their tonal colors suited well the mood of the *Passion* story. Of course, there is a possibility that winds doubled the violins for some arias, and that bassoons doubled the bass line. Dr. Moe deals only casually with these possibilities and makes no recommendations as to their use. It is not likely that Bach changed Keiser's orchestration, since he used flutes, oboes, and bassoons in his own Passions (1723 and 1729) and presumably would have had the same forces on hand in 1726.

The Deutsche Staatsbibliothek in East Berlin possesses two sets of parts for the Keiser *Passion*,7 one a complete set partially in Bach's hand, the other an incomplete set copied entirely by Bach. The Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz in West Berlin has in its possession a score of this work,8 with music in the hand of an unknown copyist and text underlaid in red ink by Bach. The parts alone were used by Dr. Moe in preparing his practical edition of the *St. Mark Passion*. Although he was aware of the existence of the score, at the time of his work this manuscript was in the process of being returned to Berlin, along with the remainder of the former possessions of the Prussian State Library, from temporary postwar storage in Marburg, and it was not possible to obtain a microfilm of it.

Discrepancies exist between the score and the parts in regard to the actual contents of the *Passion*, and these differences were noted by Richard Petzoldt in a prewar dissertation.9 What Dr. Moe has done is to prepare a practical edition that represents the *St. Mark Passion* as it exists in one source alone. In his presentation of the music as it stands in these parts, he has rendered a generally faithful edition which is marred by only a few minor errors and misreadings. A comparison (by this reviewer) of microfilms of both score and parts with the edition under study reveals that, in the case of questionable readings, Dr. Moe made his choice with discretion. By using instrumental and vocal parts that had actually been employed in performance, the editor had the advantage of finding minor corrections made in these parts by the players that might otherwise have gone unnoticed in the score. The editor makes note of his changes in a "List of Revisions" and a "List of Slurs Added by the Editor." This latter list might have been replaced by a more convenient editorial procedure, such as a
vertical slash through added slurs, which would have made it easier for the performer to distinguish Keiser from Moe.

About the same time that Dr. Moe was completing his edition, a commercially published edition of the same piece appeared in Germany. Like Dr. Moe’s work, this version is intended as a performance edition, although it also has notes on the sources and Revisionsbemerkungen, making it of use to the scholar as well as to the performer. The German editor acknowledges the parts as his preferred source and employs the selection and order of movements or “numbers” found there as the basis of his edition. Having checked details against the score, he has resolved conflicts where necessary. In general, this edition and Dr. Moe’s agree in terms of the notes on all but the smallest details.

In judging the merits of the Moe edition as a “practical” one, the first consideration should be its “practicality,” i.e., how suitable is it for the performer? (Although a set of instrumental parts was also prepared by the editor, these are not supplied with the print of the dissertation and hence are not under consideration.) To begin with a small but important detail, although the editor’s “List of Revisions” refers to specific measure numbers, neither measure numbers nor rehearsal letters appear in the edition. This is an inconvenience not only to the performer but also to one studying the music. It is only a minor inconvenience to have to pencil in such numbers when examining the music on one’s own, but in a performance situation the lack of easily seen and located points of reference could cause the loss of much valuable rehearsal time.

The St. Mark Passion is eminently worthy of performance today, and to enhance the suitability of his edition for modern American groups, Dr. Moe has provided an English translation of the entire Passion. The merits of performance in the original language can be debated at length, but there can be little doubt that an English version of a work such as the St. Mark Passion will put it within the grasp of many groups that might otherwise hesitate to attempt a performance in the original German. Mattheson considered Keiser a master in the setting of words to music: “I believe assuredly that in the time he flourished, there was no composer who ... had set words to music so richly, naturally, flowingly, attractively, or (above all) so distinctly, understandably, and eloquently.” In weighing the merits of this practical edition of the St. Mark Passion, then, one important factor must be the appropriateness and singability of the English version.

It is also obvious that this edition is intended chiefly for performance in English because the table of contents lists pieces only by their English incipits—another inconvenience to anyone other than the performer. The musical examples cited in the “historical account” volume are also given with only English translations underlaid. This is a lamentable tradition that Dr. Moe inherits from a long line of English commentators on the Passion in general. Unless one happens to be familiar with the particular edition and translation used by the author, one must do some hunting to
find the passage in question. When translations depart from a literal rendering of the text, as they often do, one can become hopelessly lost—although this latter problem is not severe in Dr. Moe's edition.

The recitatives have been translated with the help of the King James and German versions of the Bible. The editor's goal is "to maintain good accentuation of the English words while at the same time retaining the character and shape of Keiser's line" (p. x). Usually he succeeds, but a few specific passages raise disturbing questions.

Example 1, below, shows that the editor has chosen the reading of the King James version over that of the German; he substitutes the phrase "with the palms of their hands" for the words "ins Angesicht." Not only does this give a different shade of meaning to the phrase, but it also creates a particularly awkward moment at the cadential figure. Instead of following the syllabic accent of the word "Angesicht," the figure gives undue prominence to the word "palms." In following the shape of Keiser's phrase, the editor has created an instance of weak word accentuation.

EXAMPLE 1*
(No. 12, mm. 1–2)

Evangelist

And the servants did strike him with the palms of their hands;

*In the edition, only one staff is used, with opposing stems and cue-size notes for the alternate version. For the sake of comparison, the English version has been placed here on a separate staff.

Example 2 offers a similar point at which King James is favored over Luther. The German "Und er hub an zu weinen," translates simply as, "And he began to weep," and indeed this version would seem to fit the music fairly well. Yet by trying to accommodate the traditional English version, "And when he thought thereon, he wept," the editor destroys the simple

EXAMPLE 2
(No. 14, mm. 11–12)

Evangelist

When he thought of this, he began to weep.
beauty of Keiser's phrase. By using ten syllables instead of seven, he has had to add extra notes. In the first part of the phrase, there is not much difficulty, but in the second part the extra syllables get in the way of the cadence and shift the emphasis from "weep" to "began". Not only is the accentuation poor, but the falling fourth, so characteristically used as a motive of weeping or sighing, is robbed of all its pictorialism.

The third example is a bit different—it points out a translation that is outright clumsy. "Sepulchre" is the word given in King James, but the monosyllable "tomb" would certainly do as well. The word order of the phrase "which was from a great rock hewn" is certainly not good English, even in poetic usage, and the break in the next phrase after "unto" only further befuddles the mind of the listener.

EXAMPLE 3:
(No. 46, mm. 4–8)

Evangelist

Und legte ihn in ein Grab, das war in einen

And laid him in a sepulchre, which was from a

Felsen gehauen, und wälzet einen Stein

great rock hewn, and rolled a stone unto the

vor des Grabes Tür.
doors of the sepulchre.

It appears, then, that the editor prefers to fit the King James translation to the music of Keiser rather than to attempt an appropriate rendering of what Keiser has written. This makes little sense from a scholarly or practical
point of view. To alter the music deliberately in order to accommodate an entirely different text from the one the composer had in mind is a distortion of the purposes of an editor. This is not editing—it is more like arranging and should be acknowledged as such.

Problems such as these create perhaps the weakest link in Dr. Moe's edition; however, there are compensations in the treatment of the arias, choruses, and chorales. The editor's procedure with regard to the arias was to create a literal translation first and then to work out a rhymed metrical version that fits the music, a sound practice with historical precedent. He succeeds for the most part in choosing words that sing well and fit the musical notes closely without departing from the meaning of the original text.

Dr. Moe occasionally decides that a particular line is overly sentimental or excessive and alters it. For example, he finds the following lines offensive because of their implied anti-Semitism: "So wirst du Adams Schaugerichten/ Und Gosens Zwiebelspeise gram." He substitutes the lines, "Reject the lust that flesh engenders, O child of earth in Christ reborn" (No. 28, pp. 107-15). This phrase may sing well, but it distorts what the composer intended. Keiser was not embarrassed by such Pietistic poetry; he welcomed it, as evidenced by the praise (quoted by Dr. Moe himself on p. 101) which Keiser lavished upon Brockes for his famous Passion poem Der für die Sünden der Welt gemarterte und sterbende Jesu.

For the chorales the editor has used standard translations from sources such as the Lutheran hymnal in the case of all but one, for which he could not find a translation. So long as the standard translations are reasonably accurate (and these are), this practice is commendable. In addition to simplifying the editions the selection of such a translation is an advantage to the congregation, which can then sing a familiar set of words to a familiar tune when one presents the Passion as it was originally sung, i.e., with the congregation participating in the chorales.

The editor's continuo realization is adequate for anyone not inclined to use his own for performance. However, in the recitatives one may question the use of a slanted or broken line to separate the common V-I cadential chords from the cadential figure in the voice part, in order to indicate that these chords are to be performed after the voice has sung its line. If the editor goes this far in aiding the one performer, why not also add appoggiaturas at cadences for the singers? Dr. Moe cites Donington: "There are few rules so unambiguous as this rule concerning appoggiaturas in recitative, and its consistent application is very strongly to be recommended" (p. xvi). Yet after acknowledging that most feminine cadences on a falling fourth in the St. Mark Passion have the appoggiatura written out, Dr. Moe gives a few examples from Telemann of other types of cadences and turns the problem back to the performer with the words, "It is recommended that the singer apply these general principles" (p. xv). The question of ornamentation is covered in one paragraph. After brief references
to C. P. E. Bach and Donington, the editor states: "Trills and ornaments have not been written into this edition by the editor, but the performer is again urged to apply these principles" (p. xvi). Again the performer is left to his own discretion, supplied only with inadequate generalizations and anachronistic sources that he may not understand how to interpret.

One may well ask what a performing edition prepared by a scholar should be. The problems of transcribing notes from 18th-century manuscript sources are minimal; any musicologist should be able to handle such a problem, but this is more in the line of homework, not the substance of scholarly research. One expects that a scholar well versed in matters of 18th-century performance practice will share the knowledge he has gained from his experience by suggesting appropriate details throughout his edition; the performer may then choose to follow them or not at his own discretion. Yet to ignore these problems entirely, or worse, to leave them completely in the hands of the performer, is to suggest that the editor, despite his supposed expertise, knows no more about such things than the casual performer. To imply that the performer can instantly become an expert in 18th-century practice by reading a few lines from Donington is an indefensible position for a musicologist to take.

In addition to the edition, Dr. Moe has provided a volume of historical background on Passion composition up to the time of Keiser. His bibliography is somewhat general in nature—witnes works such as Grout's History of Western Music and Reese's Music in the Renaissance—and overlooks a few important works, such as Otto Kade's Die ältere Passionskomposition bis zum Jahre 1631. In reading through this account one gets the distinct impression that Dr. Moe has done little besides quote from secondary sources. It is not even a matter of collecting microfilms of original material; his text does not show much indication that he studied seriously even the available printed editions of early Passions to any degree. Consider the following paragraphs (pp. 20–22):

One of the last German responsorial Passions is the St. Mark Passion by Ambrosius Beber, which appeared between 1610 and 1620.* This Passion uses two choruses—a five-voiced chorus for the *turbae* and introductory and closing choruses, and a small choir of soloists who sing the parts of the soliloquents. The voicing for the various persons is dependent on what is being said as well as on who is speaking. For example, characters who do harm by their words to Jesus have an AT voicing, and those who do direct harm to Jesus have an ATB voicing. The words of Christ are always SATB. This voicing is used only two other times: when Pilate gives serious consideration to Jesus as "King of the Jews," and when the centurion says, "Truly he is the Son of God."***

The evangelist's part has historical value because it represents a transition from the traditional Protestant responsorial Passion to the freely composed type. This is shown in two important characteristics: (1) the Passion tone surpasses earlier and contemporary works in
“rhythmic differentiation” and shows the beginning of monodic declamation, and (2) it deviates completely from the traditional F tonality.****

** Simone Wallon, “Vorwort,” Ibid., iii.

These sentences constitute Dr. Moe’s discussion of the Beber Passion. The content is accurate, but his methods are subject to question. For example, is it necessary to credit someone for making the simple observation that the composer has used two choruses in a work? Might not the author have noted this fact himself by examining the score? This volume of historical background does not go beyond what is already known about the history of Passion composition up to the time of Keiser. It reads well and represents its sources accurately, but is it an original contribution to scholarly knowledge? As literature it can hardly compare with Basil Smallman’s The Background of Passion Music,15 one of Dr. Moe’s chief sources and still the best treatment of the subject, despite its brevity.

What exactly has been accomplished by Dr. Moe’s edition of the St. Mark Passion? It is not a scholarly edition, nor does it pretend to be. It is not a practical edition, either, for it lets the performer down when he most needs help and leaves him alone to face the important questions related to the performance of an early 18th-century oratorio. One is left with a simple diplomatic rendering of the work, to which is added an English translation of limited musical or historical value. For most performers, the Schroeder edition is more suitable because it offers more help. For those who would like an edition with an English translation, an adequate one remains to be prepared.

NOTES

1 The reviewer is grateful to Professors Neal Zaslaw and Donald Jay Grout for their thoughtful comments and suggestions concerning this review.
It is known that the St. Mark Passion was performed in Leipzig on 19 April 1726 (compare with the Bach-Dokumente, ed. Werner Neumann and Hans-Joachim Schulze [Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1969], p. 141). Dr. Moe also cites Spitta's opinion that one set of parts for this Passion dates from Bach's Weimar period (ca. 1717) on the basis of watermarks and handwriting (vol. 1, p. 110). But he neglects the more recent research of Georg Dadelsen (Beiträge zur Chronologie der Werke Johann Sebastian Bachs, Tübinger Bach-Studien, vols. 4/5 [Trossingen: Hohner, 1958], pp. 73–74), which suggests that Bach performed the St. Mark Passion on Good Friday of 1713 or earlier. See also Alfred Dürr, "Zu den verschollenen Passionen Bachs," Bach-Jahrbuch 38 (1949/50): 88ff.

7 Berlin, Deutsches Staatsbibliothek, Sign.: Mus. ms. 11471.
8 Berlin, Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Sign.: Mus. ms. 11471.
12 Translated as "That you may bear a grudge against Adam's showfeast and Goshen's onion-food."
14 Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1893.
Margaret Hee-Leng Tan—*The Free Music of Percy Grainger*

David S. Josephson

[Ed. Note: This is the third in a series of writings conceived by Professor Josephson as an essay in bibliography, seeking to provide the foundation for a thorough and broadly-based study of the life and work of Percy Grainger. The first essay, “Percy Grainger: Country Gardens and Other Curses,” is in *Current Musicology* 15 (1973): 56–63. The second, a review of Thomas Carl Slattery’s 1967 dissertation on the wind music of Grainger, is in *Current Musicology* 16 (1973): 79–91.

During the interval between the writing of the present review and its publication, Dr. Tan’s thesis appeared in print as “Free Music of Percy Grainger,” *Recorded Sound* (The Journal of the British Institute of Recorded Sound) 45–46 (January–April 1972): 21–38. For the convenience of the reader, references below are given first to the appropriate page or pages in the thesis, then to those in the published article. Aside from the transformation of two long quotations from Grainger and Burnett Cross in the thesis into articles printed under the authors’ names in the same issue of *Recorded Sound* (and so identified by the reviewer), the two guises of Dr. Tan’s essay are virtually identical.]

Margaret Hee-Leng Tan’s dissertation on Percy Grainger’s “Free Music” is the second American doctoral thesis to have taken the composer’s music as its subject. Its aim is “to enable Grainger to be viewed in a historical perspective befitting his many daring and original accomplishments” (p. 2; *Recorded Sound* [RS], p. 21). Her essay is divided into four chapters, a “selected bibliography,” and an appendix of musical examples.¹ The first chapter (“Introduction”) offers the reader the mandatory biographical sketch. The second deals with the principles of “Free Music.” The third compares Grainger’s experimental writings with those of some of his contemporaries. The fourth chapter—the bulk of this brief dissertation—elaborates on certain early experimental compositions and on a few of the machines through which Grainger attempted, toward the end of his life, to put his ideas into practice.

Dr. Tan’s essay is the third to deal with the “Free Music,” following the fine contributions on this thorny subject by Richard Franko Goldman and Ivor Dorum.² All three writers delve into the early Graingeriana that throws light on the later experiments, so that some overlapping of material is unavoidable. Dr. Tan is the first author, however, to include in the list of seminal early works the *Train Music* (1900–01) and *Random Round* (1912–14) and to discuss one of the important late machines, the “Estey reeds tone-tool” of 1952. Of especial value are long extracts from important writings by Grainger that are not otherwise easily accessible: namely, extracts from the
Australian radio lectures of 1934–35 (pp. 11–12; RS, p. 24), from a statement on “Free Music” found at the Grainger Museum in Melbourne (pp. 13–14; Percy Aldridge Grainger, “Free Music,” RS, p. 16), and from a remark on the first Hill-Song in typescript at White Plains (pp. 39–44; RS, pp. 31–33). The description and set of drawings of the last “Free Music” machine contributed by Burnett Cross (pp. 60–61, figs. 1–4; Cross, “Grainger Free Music Machine,” RS, pp. 17–21) are especially fascinating. Cross worked closely with Grainger during the 1950’s in devising these marvelous electrical mechanisms, and he describes their complicated operations with admirable clarity.

But the borrowings do not end here. There are extensive quotations from Grainger’s article on “The Impress of Personality in Unwritten Music” as well as from Goldman’s article and other readily available writings by Grainger’s contemporaries. The frequency and length of these borrowings is unwarranted, and they often interrupt an argument rather than illustrate or give point to it. In fact, in the second and fourth chapters—the very two that bear directly on the subject of “Free Music”—these quotations account for far more of the material than does the original writing. One’s consequent suspicion that the author has not mastered her subject is all but confirmed by the unhappy evidence of massive and unacknowledged borrowings from other writers. Whole sections of Goldman’s article appear without citation—their origins hidden by the juggling of Goldman’s sentences, with ensuing damage to the logic of his argument—as do passages from the chapter on Grainger in Roger Covell’s Australia’s Music (pp. 8–10, 19–20, 25–26, 47–48, 50, and 63—or RS, pp. 23–24, 26, 27–28, 34, 35, and 37—including appropriations from Goldman; pp. 26 and 37—or RS, pp. 28 and 31—from Covell). Significantly, it is in the opening paragraphs of the three main chapters, which set the tone and direction of the thesis, that the bulk of the wholesale borrowing occurs. The very core of Dr. Tan’s argument—the setting forth of the principles of “Free Music”—is lifted almost entirely from Goldman. One is astonished that this matter escaped the notice of the persons responsible at Juilliard. They ought to have examined at least the Goldman essay: it did appear, after all, in their own house organ, The Julliard Review, and Dr. Tan cited it properly several times in her dissertation.

In lesser matters as well, symptoms of poor scholarship cast shadows on the enterprise, from the minutiae of citations to the sweep of whole arguments. On the most basic level the evidence is unequivocal. No footnote is given for the extended quotation from Grainger’s Australian lectures, or for a statement by the composer on folk song (p. 24; RS, p. 27). On occasion, a citation is given that is of no practical value to the reader: for example, “from the typescript of an unpublished lecture, delivered on a [lecture] tour of Australia in the 1930’s” (p. 29n; RS, p. 28n). Where is that typescript? At other times we are given uncited information for which we must trust Dr. Tan alone: thus, “in 1935, [Grainger] transcribed for tuneful percussion some Balinese religious ceremonial music” (p. 30; RS, p. 29)—no title, no location
of manuscript, no musical example. Perhaps the information is correct, but we have reason to be skeptical. In the introduction Dr. Tan arouses our wonder when she states that

it was through Grainger's folksong recording activities, using an Edison cylinder phonograph, that Bartók was introduced to the method and came to collect several thousand folk tunes with Kodály in this manner in Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Rumania during the first decade of this century (p. 3; RS, p. 22).

An astounding fact, if correct, for which Grainger has never been given credit. The assertion is based on a letter from Storm Bull written in 1967—some thirty years after Bull had studied with Bartók—concerning a matter that had occurred some thirty years earlier still. Furthermore, Bull mentions Bartók's reference to an article written by Grainger just after the turn of the century "in which Percy had described his folk-music research in Haiti." Grainger wrote no such article, nor to my knowledge did he ever visit Haiti or collect its music. Perhaps Bartók was referring to the article on Lincolnshire folk songs,7 which appeared, however, one or two years after the publication of the first Bartók—Kodály collection of Twenty Hungarian Folksongs. But Bull's error here throws doubt on his entire statement quoted by Dr. Tan. His declaration of Bartók's debt to Grainger is highly suspect, and in the absence of corroborating evidence it certainly cannot bear the weight of her assertion as quoted above.

The biographical sketch which ends the introduction, dependent wholly upon secondary sources, contains no such surprises. Neither does it offer any new information, aside from its gratuitous absorption of Delius into the English folk-song movement (p. 5; RS, p. 22), and from its one contribution to the Grainger mythology, namely, that he returned to the collecting of English folk song in the years following the First World War (p. 6; RS, p. 22).

Concerning the "Free Music" itself, this thesis does shed some valuable light. In the second chapter Grainger's own writings bring considerable weight to bear on the subject, and Dr. Tan demonstrates the connection between Grainger's early experiences with non-Western musics and the development of his experimental ideas. If the comparative arguments of the third chapter—which attempt to relate Grainger's work to that of Cowell, Ives, Harry Partch, and Varese—promise more than they manage to deliver, they are nevertheless interesting in their broad focus. The fourth chapter follows Grainger from his early sea and hill songs through the Random Round to the mechanisms of his colleagues—the player piano, the Theremin, and Arthur Fickenscher's Polytone—and finally to Grainger's own machines. It was an absorbing and noble quest, all the more affecting in that Grainger did not live to reach its end. But Dr. Tan's treatment of it is disappointing. She passes over his preliminary investigations of the Aeolian organ with perforated rolls and explores only four of the later machines that Grainger and Cross built. Of these four, furthermore, the explanations for only two come
from her own pen; those for the other two are taken from Goldman and Cross. Most disappointing of all, Dr. Tan fails to convey the sense of adventure and improvisation that lay behind these machines. There was whimsy here and a wonderfully alert musical fantasy, which must be captured in any discussion of the "Free Music." Ivor Dorum succeeds admirably in this respect and has the good sense to pluck meaning from Grainger's seemingly capricious names: "'Hills and Dales' Air-Blown-Reeds Tone Tool," "Clothesline Side-ridge No. 1," "'Kangaroo-Pouch' Method of Synchronizing and Playing Eight Oscillators." But Dr. Tan has not read Dorum (nor, for that matter, Slattery), as her brief bibliography attests.

* * * * *

To have to review once again a major work on Grainger so unfavorably brings no joy. But the two dissertations that have been examined in the pages of this journal are among the longest essays on his life and work; and disappointment in them is only increased by the fear that their sheer size will mark them as central documents in future Grainger scholarship. A fascinating composer has been interred too long in a rubble of misconceptions and prejudices; and work of poor scholarship, no matter how fine its intentions, will simply delay and render more difficult the enormous task of restoring Grainger's accomplishments to the light they richly deserve.

NOTES

1 Copies are available upon application to the Grainger Library Society, 7 Cromwell Place, White Plains, New York. The copy I have used for this review lacks the appendix of musical examples.


3 Not 1933, as Dr. Tan states.


6 The passages are similar to, but not identical with, passages from Music: A Commonsense View of All Types ([Melbourne]: Australian Broadcasting Commission, 1934), pp. 11-13, cited in Current Musicology 16 (1973): 89.
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