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Welcome

I would like to extend a warm welcome to all the participants of the International Symposium: ‘Understanding Bach’s B-minor Mass’, which is being hosted here at the School of Music and Sonic Arts, Queen’s University, Belfast. We are delighted that you have travelled from near and far to join us for what promises to be one of the most significant events in our academic year.

This symposium has been organised in association with the Society of Musicology in Ireland and the Bach Network UK. It has been steered by a committee of six academics including two international Bach scholars from other institutions, namely Professor Robin A. Leaver who is Professor of Sacred Music at the Westminster Choir College of Rider University, New Jersey, USA, and the late Dr Anne Leahy who, until her death a few weeks ago, was a Lecturer in Academic Studies at DIT Conservatoire of Music and Drama, Ireland. As you will learn from my colleague Professor Yo Tomita who led the committee, Dr Leahy’s role was significant, and we hope that the success of this symposium will be a fitting tribute to her achievements.

I have no doubt you will have fruitful discussions in our School buildings during the symposium. I sincerely hope you will also have time to explore our attractive campus, in particular the exhibition specially staged at the Visitors’ Centre for this symposium, the stunningly beautiful countryside of the Antrim Coast and to experience the world-famous hospitality of people of the Province.

Professor Michael Alcorn
Head of School
School of Music and Sonic Arts
Queen’s University Belfast
Distinguished guests, colleagues and friends,

It is a great honour to welcome you to the School of Music and Sonic Arts at Queen’s University, Belfast. If this is your first visit to Belfast, you may have noticed that it is a thriving and forward-looking city. This is largely a result of the recent political progress in Northern Ireland, which would not have been possible without the citizens of the Province who have powerfully demonstrated their strong sense of social duty towards others. I am sure that you will enjoy your stay amongst these warm and hospitable people.

This symposium has its roots in a two-day event jointly organized by Professor Joshua Rifkin, Dr Anne Leahy and myself almost exactly two years ago. But the real preparation for this symposium did not actually begin until May 2006 when Dr Leahy and I discussed the idea in Leipzig. Together with Professor Robin A. Leaver, who most generously offered his energy, time, and all his expertise for this venture throughout, we formulated a detailed plan and began to consult with many colleagues for their ideas and opinions. We are particularly grateful to Professor Christoph Wolff who kindly accepted the invitation to be our keynote speaker at this symposium. We are also very grateful to the following distinguished scholars who agreed to produce papers that constitute the core of the holistic and systematic examinations of the B-minor Mass: Dr Ulrich Leisinger, Dr Szymon Paczkowski, Dr Hans-Joachim Schulze, Professor Tatiana Shabalina, Professor Ulrich Siegele, Professor George B. Stauffer, Dr Janice Stockigt, and Dr Uwe Wolf. We are also indebted to the following scholars: Professor John Butt and Professor Reinhard Strohm for accepting our invitation to chair sessions; Dr Jasmin Cameron, Dr Mary Dalton Greer, Professor Tadashi Isoyama, Dr Tanya Kevorkian, Dr Katharine Pardee, Mr Andrew Parrott, Dr Ruth Tatlow, and Professor Melvin Unger for accepting our invitation to present papers that fill important gaps in our knowledge of this celebrated musical work; Dr Uri Golomb, Dr Jan-Piet Knijff, Mr Anselm Hartinger, Dr Michael Maul, and Mr Paul Luongo for responding to the call for papers with highly original and important pieces of research; and Dr Barra Boydell, Dr Isabella van Elferen, Professor Paul Walker, Mr Daniel Boomhower, Professor Masaaki Suzuki, and Professor Christoph Wolff for agreeing to serve as respondents.

During the preparations for this event there have been many obstacles, but none was greater or more devastating than the news that my close colleague, Dr Leahy, had fallen seriously ill at the beginning of this year. To our great sadness, she lost her brave battle only a few weeks ago. It was her vision and passion that provided the momentum for both Professor Leaver and I to guide the course of this project. We miss her deeply. In our mind it is only fitting that the closing concert be dedicated to her memory and offered in thanksgiving for her life.
It would not have been possible to organize this symposium without the support of all my colleagues from the School of Music and Sonic Arts, in particular, Professor Michael Alcorn who allowed me to host this symposium here and provided the necessary budget, Dr Sarah McCleave, Professor Jan Smaczny and Professor Ian Woodfield who shared the organizational responsibilities, and Mrs Iris Mateer who helped with the administrative and secretarial duties. I am also very grateful to Mr Trevor Newsom, Director of Research and Regional Services, for providing additional financial support, and to Mr Graeme Farrow, Director of the Belfast Festival at Queen’s, who took on the closing concert as a joint event. I am also very grateful for a donation from Cantiunculae, which was raised at a concert held in May 2007: we used it to provide bursaries for young scholars from abroad who had little or no institutional support. I would also like to thank Mrs Norma Site, Mrs Kerry Bryson and Ms Shauna Hughes of the Development & Alumni Relations Office for their assistance in the organization of this concert. Finally, but not of least importance, I thank my students—Elise Crean, Alison Dunlop, Tanja Kovačević and Ian Mills—for their hard work, commitment and professionalism in every task, from the designing and editing of all the symposium publications to the management and running of events. I am very proud of them.

I sincerely hope that it will be a truly stimulating meeting for everyone.

Professor Yo Tomita  
Chair of the Organising Committee  
International Symposium: Understanding Bach’s B-minor Mass 
School of Music and Sonic Arts  
Queen’s University Belfast
## Schedule of Events

### Friday, 2 November 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Paper Titles</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration (School of Music Building) &amp; Visiting Exhibition (Visitors’ Centre)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome</td>
<td>Yo Tomita</td>
<td></td>
<td>15:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Session 1: Historical Background (1): seen from wider context</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Chair: George B. Stauffer)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 1</td>
<td>Tanya Kevorkian</td>
<td>Cultural Transfer, Cultural Competition, and Religious Diversity in Leipzig during the Baroque Era</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 2</td>
<td>Jasmin Cameron</td>
<td>Placing the ‘Et incarnatus’ and ‘Crucifixus’ in Context: Bach and the Panorama of the Baroque Mass Tradition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 3</td>
<td>Michael Maul</td>
<td>How relevant are Counts Sporck and Questenberg for the Genesis and Early Reception of the B-Minor Mass?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Christoph Wolff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dinner (18:00-20:00)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Session 2: Historical Background (2): seen through Bach’s contemporaries in Dresden</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Chair: George B. Stauffer)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 4</td>
<td>Szymon Paczkowski</td>
<td>On the Role and Meaning of the Polonaise in the Mass in B minor by Johann Sebastian Bachas Exemplified by the Aria ‘Quoniam tu solus sanctus’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 5</td>
<td>Janice B. Stockigt</td>
<td>Consideration of Bach’s <em>Kyrie e Gloria</em> BWV 232 within the Context of Dresden Catholic Mass Settings, 1729–1733</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Yo Tomita</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Saturday, 3 November 2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 3: Composition and Meaning (1): Aesthetics</th>
<th>09:30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Chair: Reinhard Strohm)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 6</td>
<td>Melvin Unger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 7</td>
<td>George B. Stauffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Paul Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coffee (11:10-11:30)**

Foyer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 4: Composition and Meaning (2): Proportion</th>
<th>11:30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Chair: Reinhard Strohm)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 8</td>
<td>Ruth Tatlow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>John Butt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lunch (13:00-14:00)**

Lecture Room

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 5: Theology</th>
<th>14:00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Chair: Robin A. Leaver)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 10</td>
<td>Mary Dalton Greer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 11</td>
<td>Robin A. Leaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Isabella van Elferen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tea (15:20-15:40)**

Foyer
### Session 6: Sources and Editions
(Chair: Ulrich Leisinger)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Tatiana Shabalina</td>
<td>Manuscript score No. 4500 in St. Petersburg: A New Source of the B-minor Mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Uwe Wolf</td>
<td>Many Problems, Different Solutions? Editing Bach’s B-Minor Mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Hans-Joachim Schulze</td>
<td>J.S. Bach’s Mass in B minor: Observations and Hypotheses with regard to Some Original Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Boomhower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Discussion</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Keynote Paper (Harty Room)
(Chair: Ian Woodfield)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18:00</td>
<td>Christoph Wolff</td>
<td>Past, Present, and Future--Perspectives on Bach’s B-minor Mass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Reception (Hosted by Society of Musicology in Ireland)
Lecture Room
(19:00-19:30)

### Conference Banquet
Great Hall
(19:30-22:00)
## Sunday 4 November 2007

### Session 7: Performance Issues

**Chair: John Butt**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Jan-Piet Knijff</td>
<td>Performing Bach’s B-Minor Mass: Some Notes by Heinrich Schenker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Uri Golomb</td>
<td>Intensity, Complexity and Musical Rhetoric in Performances of the B-minor Mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Andrew Parrott</td>
<td>Vocal Ripienists and the Mass in B Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Masaaki Suzuki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coffee (11:30-12:00)**

Foyer

### Public Q&A Session

Harty Room

**Lunch (13:00-14:00)**

Lecture Room

### Session 8: Reception History: Awakening and Reception

**Chair: Jan Smaczny**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ulrich Leisinger</td>
<td>Viennese Traditions of the Mass in B minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Anselm Hartinger</td>
<td>A ‘Fairly Correct Copy of the Mass’? Mendelssohn’s Score of the B-minor Mass as a Document of the Romantics’ View on Matters of Performance Practice and Source Criticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Robin A. Leaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tea (15:20-15:40)**

Foyer
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paper 21</td>
<td>Jan Smaczny (Prague)</td>
<td>Bach’s B-minor Mass: An Incarnation in Prague in the 1860s and its Consequences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 22</td>
<td>Tatiana Shabalina (Russia)</td>
<td>Reception History of the Mass in B Minor in Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 23</td>
<td>Paul Luongo (USA)</td>
<td>Theodore Thomas’s 1902 Performance of Bach’s Mass in B Minor: Working within the Grand American Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Barra Boydell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dinner (18:00-19:00)**

Great Hall

*Bus will leave for Clonard Monastery at 19:20 from the School of Music building*

- The Closing Concert
  - The Mass in B-minor (BWV 232)
  - The Dunedin Consort and Players
  - conducted by John Butt
  - Clonard Monastery, Belfast

**Party (22:30-0:00)**

Harty Room
Abstracts

Jasmin Cameron

Placing the ‘Et incarnatus’ and ‘Crucifixus’ in Context: Bach and the Panorama of the Baroque Mass Tradition

This paper aims to relate J.S. Bach’s settings of the ‘Et incarnatus’ and the ‘Crucifixus’ from the Credo of the Mass in B Minor to the longstanding traditions that existed at this time in connection with these sections of the Mass.

While the ‘Crucifixus’ and its relationship to Weinen, Klagen, Sorgen, Zagen BWV 12 has been discussed extensively, it has never been placed in context of the broader ‘Crucifixus’ tradition that was in existence at this time. These conventions are already evident in Mass settings from the late Renaissance (as in Palestrina) and early Baroque (as in Monteverdi). In the late Baroque, composers such as Vivaldi, Caldara, Lotti and Zelenka continued to set the ‘Crucifixus’ in a recognisably similar way, drawing on a range of established traditions. These topoi ranged from symbolic depiction to narrative illustration and on occasion included musical devices that provided an appropriate overall background to these settings. I will examine Weinen, Klagen, Sorgen, Zagen, and the ‘Crucifixus’, showing how, in the process of adapting his model, Bach acknowledges the time honoured traditions of setting the ‘Crucifixus’ text.

I will also relate the preceding movement to existing musical conventions. The ‘Et incarnatus’ was another section of text which, like the ‘Crucifixus’, clearly held appeal for many composers. By comparing Bach’s application of two ‘sets’ of established topoi, it will be possible to further strengthen the argument that Bach was indeed aware of accepted traditions of setting the Mass. This same evidence will also support the broader theories of existence of ‘Et incarnates’ and ‘Crucifixus’ topoi, that is traditions which were received and transmitted by a long line of composers, including J.S. Bach.


Mary Dalton Greer

Bach’s Calov Bible and his Quest for the Title of Royal Court Composer

In July 1733, Bach presented a set of performing parts for the Kyrie and Gloria of the B-minor Mass—the so-called Missa—together with a petition for the position of Royal Court Composer, to Friedrich Augustus, Elector of Saxony and King of Poland. ‘The award [three years later] of the prestigious title Electoral Saxon and Royal Polish Court Compoisseur, which…gave Bach the stamp of royal approval with the privileges of courtly affiliation and protection’, writes Christoph Wolff, ‘pleased him to a degree that cannot be overestimated’. While the bestowal of the title of Royal Composer undoubtedly enhanced Bach’s professional stature, striking parallels between his choice of wording in his petition and passages he
highlighted in his personal copy of Abraham Calov’s *Die heilige Bibel*, together with unusual indications in the autograph score of the B-minor Mass, and the fact that he went on to compose a complete Catholic Mass after the coveted title had been bestowed upon him, suggest that there is more to the story.

On the title page of each of the three volumes of his Calov Bible, Bach wrote his monogram and ‘1733’, the very year he presented the *Missa* and his petition to the Elector. Although we do not know for certain when he entered any of the annotations in his Bible, direct correspondences between numerous passages he marked concerning Offerings, Authority, Diligence and Compensation, and the phrasing of his letter to the Elector suggest that his close study of the Calov Bible had a direct bearing on Bach’s choice of words. Additional passages he highlighted concerning peace (‘Friede’) and unity (‘Einigkeit’) indicate that a possible motive for his presenting the *Missa*—the only liturgical piece besides the *Magnificat* that was suitable for performance in either a Protestant or Roman Catholic service—to the Catholic Elector was to underscore areas of commonality.

Further, the fact that Bach marked numerous passages pertaining to Asaph, King David’s divinely-appointed Capellmeister, suggests that he identified strongly with this figure who, like Bach, was a composer and a leading member of a clan of musicians who performed in religious services. The bestowing on Bach of the title of Royal Court Composer further strengthened the existing matrix of correspondences between Bach and the ancient Capellmeister.

I conclude that while the temporal end of acquiring the title of Court Composer and the royal protection it afforded was valuable in and of itself, Bach’s ultimate goal in composing the Mass and offering the Kyrie and Gloria to the Elector—the highest authority in the land—was to gain implicit assurance that he had found favor in the eyes of the Lord and hence was assured of his ultimate salvation. These findings also provide insights into other works Bach composed or revised in the 1730s and 1740s, including the *Magnificat*, the Christmas Oratorio, the four Kyrie-Gloria Masses, and the *Musical Offering*.

MARY DALTON GREER is Artistic Director of ‘Cantatas in Context’, a Bach cantata series in New York City and Cambridge, Massachusetts. Her publications include articles in *About Bach* (2008) and *Bach* (2003). She is Vice President of the American Bach Society and serves on the Editorial Board of the organization.

### Uri Golomb

**Intensity, Complexity and Musical Rhetoric in Performances of the B-minor Mass**

Recorded performances of the Mass in B minor can offer a fascinating case-study into expressiveness in Bach performance and reception: the attribution of emotional expression and/or extra-musical meaning to Bach’s music, and the degree and manner in which performers seek to bring these to light. There is a prominent tendency in Bach reception to separate musical symbolism from emotional expression, and to argue that the value of Bach’s music resides in its avoidance of expressive intensity. By contrast, there are also those who view the expressive power of Bach’s music as its greatest strength.

This spectrum of views is reflected in, and influenced by, major trends in Bach performance—one notable example being the growing prominence of a speech-like approach to musical performance, inspired by Baroque theories of musical rhetoric. Rhetorical performance is predicated on the idea that expressiveness in Baroque music arises from ‘small
Figures in the surface’, rather than ‘larger musical processes, such as the extended crescendo or the prolonged dissonance’ (David Schulenberg).

This discourse is reflected in changing approaches to expressivity in performance. In the middle of the twentieth century (and earlier), expressivo was associated (inter alia) with legato articulation and a wide dynamic range, applied across long stretches of music (‘the extended crescendo’). In Bach performance, sharper articulation was often associated with terraced dynamics, and employed by performers who believed that Bach’s music should be rendered with expressive restraint and austerity. With the emergence of rhetorically-inflected performances (starting with the work of Nikolaus Harnoncourt and Gustav Leonhardt), varied articulation gradually became a vehicle for expressive intensity. This was associated with a narrow dynamic range—yet also with localised dynamic inflections, tracing the contours of individual figures. Rhetorical performers do not necessarily endorse the either/or approach implicit in Schulenberg’s and similar formulations: many seek to project ‘small figures’ and ‘larger musical processes’ alike, using the former to underline the latter.

In this paper, I will attempt to demonstrate these developments through two contrasting case-studies: the ‘Crucifixus’, often viewed as the most intense movement in the Mass—and the ‘Et in unum dominum’, often portrayed as richly symbolic yet expressively neutral. Performers sometimes narrow this gap, either by injecting greater intensity into the ‘Et in unum’ or (in rarer cases) by treating the ‘Crucifixus’ in an ostensibly ‘objective’ fashion.

Rhetorical performance contributed substantially to the projection of affective variety in the ‘Et in unum’. Modern-instrument performances in 1950–1980 usually treated this movement in a strict, uniform manner. Even those conductors who attempted a more expressively varied treatment (most notably Eugen Jochum) did so primarily through changes in tempo, dynamics and timbre; they drew little or no attention to individual figures and motifs. ‘Rhetorical’ performers, on the other hand, were able to suggest a subtle expressive narrative in this movement (usually from an incisive, light-hearted beginning to a broader, more lyrical conclusion) by underlining the development of its opening motif and the introduction of other rhythmic and melodic figures later in the movement. The starkest realization of this approach can be found in Thomas Hengelbrock’s rendition, yet other performers (e.g., Andrew Parrott, Nikolaus Harnoncourt, Philippe Herreweghe, Frans Brüggen) also adopt differing articulations to accentuate the emergence of specific figures and to emphasize changes in other parameters (e.g., the darker harmonies towards the end of the movement).

The ‘Crucifixus’, too, was treated in terms of Unity of Affect by most modern-instrument performers in 1950–1980: even the more ‘romantic’ post-war conductors (e.g., Eugen Jochum, Hermann Scherchen) did not differentiate between the movement’s sections (one notable exception, however, was Karl Richter). The advent of HIP approaches widened the interpretive range. In several performances of the ‘Crucifixus’ (e.g., Harnoncourt 1986, Harry Christophers, Thomas Hengelbrock, Konrad Junghänel, Jeffrey Thomas), greater attention to texture, to the independent shaping of individual parts, resulted in a clearer realization of the contrasts between the movement’s homophonic and polyphonic sections, as well as underlining clashes between strands in the texture. Such performances arguably lend support and aural realization to the view that Bach’s polyphony contains internal clashes and discords.

Performances of both movements therefore reflect the changing attitude towards performative expression which emerged, inter alia, from rhetorical ideals of performance. These ideals inspired a more dialogic mode of performance, emphasizing both textural complexity in specific moments and thematic variety across the length of the movement. The result undermines the notion of unity of affect: through a focus on local details, performers revealed more vividly the affective variety, and the patterns of tension and resolution, in each movement.
Anselm Hartinger

A ‘fairly correct copy of the mass’?
Mendelssohn’s score of the B-minor Mass as a document of the Romantics’ view on matters of performance practice and source criticism

Whereas today the B-minor Mass clearly occupies one of the most prominent positions in the international Bach repertoire, in the nineteenth century—despite the high esteem it enjoyed—it was generally overshadowed by the St Matthew Passion. In fact, neither the growing attention paid to Bach nor the large number of historically oriented concert series’ initially had much effect upon the reception of this ‘greatest musical work of all times and peoples’ (Nägeli).

The reasons for this remarkable neglect, which so far have never been the subject of systematic study, can only be sought through a careful and objective examination of the characteristic repertoires of the time and the particular interests of musicians and musical institutions concerned with Bach. The analysis and interpretation of specific editorial and performance projects therefore presupposes some general thoughts on the potential locality of this latently ‘displaced’ work in the altered musical landscape of the nineteenth century.

The extraordinary difficulties in the practical realization of Bach’s musical text were always a significant obstacle in preventing the acceptance of this particular work among audiences and performers alike. Since the ‘great mass’ is a veritable compendium of almost every style, technique, and instrumentation employed by the mature Bach, this work also focuses every possible problem regarding performance practice that the nineteenth century had with Bach. In this respect the two volumes of Mendelssohn’s personal score of the work represent a unique and extraordinarily valuable source, for it allows us to reconstruct the way in which the leading Bachian of his time approached this piece. Here we can examine the numerous problems his contemporaries had with performing Bach’s music, and trace their more or less stylistically adequate solutions—solutions that have shaped the performance tradition of this work for many years. At the same time, Mendelssohn’s annotations and corrections, which are the result of at least two partial performances and a collation of the original parts at Dresden, reveal the outlines of a typology of how Bach’s scores were treated in the early days of source criticism. Aiming at a critically revised ‘Originaltext’ and readily adjusting it to fit practical demands were not necessarily seen as conflicting postulates. Rather, these constituted complementary and equally justified strategies in the attempt to approach the remote figure of Bach in this epoch that was so crucial for the transmission of his oeuvre.
The B-minor Mass was premiered in Japan in 1931. The complete work was divided into two concerts and all of the performers were Japanese. Incidentally, this performance preceded the premieres of Bach’s St Matthew and St John Passions, which were conducted by Klaus Pringsheim in 1939 and 1943 respectively. The premiere of the B-minor Mass was epochal. This is apparent in contemporary reviews: one reported, ‘I was so shocked that I thought it was a dream, as I was under the impression that I would not be able to hear this piece [in Japan] for another 50 years’. As a matter of fact, the school which premiered the B-minor Mass, The Tokyo Koto Gakuin (a newly-formed, privately-funded Music School, now the Kunitachi College of Music), exploited this premiere to overcome an internal division by getting the entire school to be involved in the performance. Unfortunately, their performance received strong criticism for the lack of understanding of performance styles.

Prior to this, in 1890, around the time when Western Music was systematically introduced to Japan, The Tokyo Ongaku Gakko (the first public institution to teach music in Japan) premiered the ‘Crucifixus’. With the exception of performances of selected Chorales, this was the first performance of Bach’s sacred vocal music in Japan. According to Terschak’s report, it ‘achieved much more than expected’. Yet such a historical fact does not mean that the B-minor Mass played an important role in the reception of Bach’s music in Japan. Indeed, the reception of this work has remained deeply problematic in the Japanese musical world.

One can point out three features in the Japanese reception of Bach’s music, which began in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Firstly, from the beginning Bach was recognized through cursory studies as the acme in the history of Western music. In such studies, the Well-Tempered Clavier was frequently used to demonstrate his outstanding achievements. Secondly, it was the intelligentsia from the Protestant community who supported the Bach reception and stimulated reverence for the composer. They constantly emphasized the element of ‘Bach’s religiosity’ but showed no empathy to the liturgical text in Latin. For this reason, there was a tendency in the early Bach literature and the history of music to discuss the St Matthew Passion in great length but make only passing reference to the B-minor Mass. Thirdly, while the ideology of the work was pursued from the beginning, there were few opportunities or means to appreciate the work as ‘sound’. It therefore seemed inevitable that the musical structure of the B-minor Mass would be received with difficulty.

Yet, within about a decade of its premiere, there emerged some descriptions of the work that praised its serene construction and recognized its essence as the combination of a Catholic appearance and a Protestant spirit. After the Pacific War, Yoshio Nomura was the first to recognize that the essence of the B-minor Mass lay in its ‘universality’, describing this in his own words (1964). In his detailed research of 1985 Yoshitake Kobayashi argued that the work had ‘ecumenical intent’, a view which was then widely accepted. Even so, the concept of ‘universality’ is still difficult for ordinary Japanese people to comprehend. This paper will discuss whether our Mass, with its peculiar concept, can overcome the disparities that exist not only between the denominations within Christianity but also those between Christianity and other religions. In so doing, we can begin to reconsider the ‘parody’ problem.
Tanya Kevorkian

Cultural Transfer, Cultural Competition, and Religious Diversity in Leipzig during the Baroque Era

Bach’s B-minor Mass inspires us to inquire about the extent of contact in Leipzig between Lutherans and other religious groups in the Baroque era. This paper examines two themes: the presence of religious minorities in Leipzig, and cultural transfer. Looking at all of the minorities represented in the city, including Calvinists, Jews, and others as well as Roman Catholics, helps flesh out the confessional context in which Bach lived. Scholars such as George Stauffer have successfully revised the old view of Leipzig as a backwater, and have established that the city was a center of trade, manufacture, and cultural dynamism. Building on such work, as well as on recent theories of cultural transfer in the early modern period, this paper utilizes archival material such as consistory records and a Leipzig city council census of minority religious groups to bring new specificity and nuance to the question of how individuals in Leipzig during the high Baroque interacted with a variety of cultural influences. The broad range of interactions and influences in and beyond music, which included everyday life, sculpture, and artisanal life as well as music, and often extended beyond what the clergy and secular authorities formally approved, help make J.S. Bach’s composition of a mass very understandable.

Leipzig was unusual among the major German trade centers in having no resident religious minorities from the end of the sixteenth century to about 1700. While members of many religious groups visited during the trade fairs, they were not allowed to stay. Calvinists were ejected after a massacre in the 1590s; Jews had been expelled in the later middle ages; and there was no Catholic community by 1600. Saxony as a whole was also dominated almost completely by Lutherans, more so than any other major territory was by one religious group. The conversion of August the Strong and, more broadly, his absolutist goal of breaking local governments’ and clerics’ control over religious policy, led to the emergence of small groups of Calvinists, Jews, and Catholics around and after 1700.

Leipzig became more culturally and intellectually diverse from the 1680’s in other ways as well, in a process often fraught with conflict. Secular cultural offerings increased in the form of coffee houses, the opera, and pleasure gardens; Pietists battled the Orthodox establishment beginning in 1688, and developed a small community; and Cartesian and other Enlightened philosophies arrived.

Beyond these developments, there was a wide range of cultural contact and transfer, which occurred with far less conflict. During the trade fairs, Leipzig became one of the most cosmopolitan cities in Europe. Throughout the year, residents read widely, beyond texts prescribed by the Lutheran clergy. Many people returned to the city after visiting lands near and far, and they surely related stories and brought with them items from their travels. Cultural transfer was especially extensive in the arts, with sculptors, dancing masters, language masters, painters, musicians, and their works passing through or settling down. Many German musicians, including Bach, complained of the technical demands placed on them by the influence of French, Italian, and other styles, but also boasted of their skills in those styles. Not least, the Latin language, and liturgical settings of the Magnificat, the Kyrie, and the Gloria had never ceased being part of the church repertoire in Leipzig. In this context, Bach’s composition of a mass seems not at all surprising.
Jan-Piet Knijff

Performing Bach’s B-minor Mass: Some Notes by Heinrich Schenker

On 27 October 1926, Heinrich Schenker—widely regarded as the most influential music theorist of the twentieth century—attended a performance in Vienna of Bach’s B-minor Mass by the Berlin Singakademie conducted by Georg Schumann. The next day, Schenker recorded some of his thoughts on the performance in a review-essay, the manuscript of which is now part of the Oster Collection at the New York Public Library. The Oster Collection also contains some voice-leading graphs by Schenker of excerpts from the Mass. The essay was apparently intended as an aide de mémoire for Schenker’s projected book on performance (as is evident from the earmark ‘Vortrag’), but neither the essay nor the graphs have ever been published.

Although Schenker discussed aspects from the B-minor Mass in Kontrapunkt (1910) and later in Der freie Satz (1935), the 1926 essay and graphs are by far his largest contribution to the study of the work. They shed important light on Schenker’s ideas on performance in general and Bach performance in particular. Some of these ideas are confirmed by Schenker’s comments on Bach interpretations of other noted performers, such as Pablo Casals, Wilhelm Furtwängler, and Karl Straube. Schenker’s ideas on dynamics in Bach—in which dynamics (including crescendo and diminuendo) are based on aspects of harmony and voice leading—are found not only in the review-essay but also in his published essay on Bach’s Sonata in C Major for Violin Solo in Das Meisterwerk in der Musik I (1925). Although Schenker may later have abandoned the idea of a specific dynamic structure being suggested by the music itself (as Charles Burkhardt has suggested), it was clearly an important characteristic of his musical thinking in the mid-1920s.

While some of Schenker’s criticisms concern only the performance he witnessed in Vienna, many of his remarks about tempo, dynamics, structure, and balance can be as helpful to understanding the B-minor Mass today as they might have been in the 1920s.

Robin A. Leaver

How ‘Catholic’ is Bach’s ‘Lutheran’ Mass?

In the Verzeichniß des Musikalischen Nachlasses des verstorbenen Capellmeisters Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach, published in Hamburg in 1790, the works of his father owned by C.P.E. Bach are listed in detail. Under the heading ‘Singstücke’ the four sections of the B-minor Mass are collected together under the heading ‘Die große catholische Messe’.
The first part of this paper examines the possible meanings of this statement against the background of the Lutheran-Catholic tensions of the Saxon court in Dresden in the second half of the seventeenth century, and the first decades of the eighteenth century. The situation was to a large extent brought about by the significant numbers of Italian Catholic musicians in the Elector’s Kapelle, and the confessional tensions intensified after 1697 when Elector August the Strong converted to Roman Catholicism in order to secure the Polish crown as Augustus II. Confessional conflict continued in the early years of the following century. In 1708 Saxon Lutherans were affronted when their ruler converted the former opera house in Dresden into a Catholic church, and in 1717 the Elector-King attempted to minimize the effect of the celebrations of the bicentenary of the Lutheran Reformation. These antithetical sensitivities were still active sixteen years later when the Lutheran Bach presented the Kyrie and Gloria (BWV 2321) to the Catholic Elector-King, Augustus III, who had recently acceded as the dual ruler on the death of his father in February 1733. Although in one sense BWV 2321 was a Lutheran Missa, there was no problem regarding its use in a celebration of a Catholic Mass in the Dresden court chapel.

Towards the end of his life Bach created what we know as the B-minor Mass by bringing together settings of all of the five parts of the Ordinary of the Mass, apparently reflecting more of Catholic rather than Lutheran tradition. Thus the second part of this paper examines the significance of this ‘große catholische Messe’ against the background of the Lutheran understanding of the Ordinary of the Mass as expounded by, for example, Michael Praetorius, who uses Catholic sources to explain the details of the Lutheran understanding of the Mass in the first volume of his Syntagma musicum.

ROBIN A. LEAVER is Professor of Sacred Music in Westminster Choir College, Rider University, and Visiting Professor of Graduate Studies at the Juilliard School, New York. He is a past president of the American Bach Society, editor of Contextual Bach Studies, and author of Luther’s Liturgical Music: Principles and Implications (Eerdmans, 2007).

Ulrich Leisinger

Viennese Traditions of the Mass in B Minor

From the early 1800s Bach’s B-minor Mass was easily accessible for connoisseurs in Vienna. Copies are documented in sales catalogues (Johann Traeg, 1804) and private collections (Joseph Haydn). The early history of the B-minor Mass remained entirely in the dark, however, since the oldest known copy (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach P 11) stems from the time around 1800.

The copy from Joseph Haydn’s music library plays a crucial role in the reception history of the mass in Vienna. After the composer’s death the manuscript became part of the Esterházy collection and was long believed to have been lost. It survived World War II hidden in a chimney of Eisenstadt castle and has never since been studied by Bach scholars. It comes as a great surprise that this copy is among the earliest sources for the mass: the manuscript originated in Berlin and can securely be dated to the time around 1770; it is closely related to the copy in the Amalienbibliothek and thus to an early and authorized transmission (via C.P.E. Bach and Kirnberger). It shall be shown that the manuscript is very likely to have belonged to Gottfried van Swieten, the Austrian Ambassador to the Prussian Court, before it came into Haydn’s hands.

It is commonly known that van Swieten, who settled in Vienna in 1777, initiated Mozart to the music of Johann Sebastian Bach and in the light of the statement ‘that he gave me all the
works of Handel and Sebastian Bach to take home with me’ (Mozart’s letter to his sister, 24 April 1782) we must conclude that Mozart was able to study in detail Bach’s mass, a work of unprecedented scope and complexity, shortly before he started working on his Mass in C Minor K. 427.

The discovery of the Eisenstadt score therefore provides an entirely new basis for exploring the astonishing similarities between two of the most demanding mass compositions of the eighteenth century. These go far beyond the use of a five-part ‘chorus’ with two sopranos for the Kyrie and an eight-part double chorus for the Osanna. Bachian (and Handelian) traits can also be observed e.g. in Mozart’s Duett ‘Domine Deus’, and the ‘Jesu Christe’ chorus with the subsequent ‘Cum Sancto Spiritu’ fugue. The most striking example is arguably Mozart’s ‘Qui tollis’ which seems to have been derived from Bach’s ‘Crucifixus’. Reports by Friedrich Rochlitz and Maximilian Stadler about Mozart’s indebtedness to Handel (and Bach) make it obvious that allusions to Baroque masters in his operas and church music were regarded as deliberate stylistic choices by the composer.


Paul Luongo

Theodore Thomas’s 1902 Performance of Bach’s Mass in B Minor: Working within the Grand American Festival

Over the course of his career, orchestral conductor Theodore Thomas became one of the most influential figures in nineteenth century American musical culture. As with many career conductors from the nineteenth century, Thomas has faded into the background of American history. Despite this current obscurity, he was revered at the time of his death as a leader of American music. Condolences from individuals such as Felix Weingartner, Arthur Nikisch, William Mason, and Richard Strauss contextually affirm his historical prominence. Strauss best summarized Thomas’s realm of influence in his condolences when he wrote, ‘What Thomas signified for musical development in America is universally known. What we Germans owe him shall be held in everlasting remembrance’.

Thomas is best known today for his role in the founding of the Chicago Symphony Orchestra, but this was only a small part of his involvement in the musical development of the United States. Also important was Thomas’s role in bringing the music of Johann Sebastian Bach to America. Through Thomas’s zeal to introduce Bach’s music, he conducted twelve premieres between 1865 and 1887. These works included a cantata, a magnificat, one of the Brandenburg concertos, multiple suites, and the premiere of sections of the B-minor Mass in 1886. Further establishing Thomas’s concern for the music of Bach is the fact that he was among only twelve individual American subscribers to the first volume of the Bach Gesellschaft edition. Thomas’s interest in Bach’s music intersects with his involvement in the Cincinnati Musical Festival, a biennial event considered by contemporaries to be one of his greatest achievements. This concert series is a paradigmatic example of the grand American festival, an influential nineteenth century performance tradition.

Thomas’s 1902 festival performance of Bach’s B-minor Mass was not the American premiere, but it best demonstrates the conflict inherent in reconciling large festival performance forces with those implied by the composition. While some of the larger
contemporary European performances of this work used ‘only’ a 250-voice choir, for this 1902 performance Thomas used approximately a 500-voice choir and 129-piece orchestra. These performance forces were vital for any concert in the Cincinnati Music Hall. Built in 1878, this massive venue was the musical pride of the city, and Thomas was keenly aware of its importance in maintaining support from the city and financial success at the festival. For this reason, the conductor adapted works to suit the vast dimensions of the hall and the large chorus that performed there.

The B-minor Mass held a place of special significance for Thomas, prompting the conductor to calculate carefully any adaptations for its performance during the festival. Fortunately, the score from his 1902 performance has been preserved and is currently in the Midwest archives of the Newberry Library in Chicago. This score is particularly useful for the wealth of information it provides about specific aspects of the 1902 performance. Theodore Thomas spent two years preparing the work, meticulously writing out in full every ornament, and every change to the instrumentation and orchestration. Despite these changes, Thomas believed that he presented the work in a respectful manner while also maintaining the spirit of the composer.

Performance practice issues in Bach’s B-minor Mass have received considerable attention in recent years. In light of the trend towards smaller performance forces (in some cases extremely small) and examinations of the possible size of Bach’s own choir and orchestra, it is interesting to examine a performance tradition that pursued an opposite aesthetic. Knowledge of specific performance conditions before the recording age is often vague and speculative. This score, however, is exceptional in providing a glimpse of the actual performance without consultation of any recording.

Throughout his career Thomas developed firm views about his own musical ideal, but he also understood the significance of the American public in furthering his art. The score to his 1902 performance of Bach’s Mass in B minor demonstrates the conductor’s ability to balance his own musical priorities with those of the American public. Out of this compromise came a performance tradition that responded to the American aesthetic in a way that only an American could.

PAUL LUONGO is currently pursuing doctoral studies in Historical Musicology at The Florida State University, where he also received Master’s Degrees in Orchestral Conducting and Historical Musicology. His primary research interests include Theodore Thomas and the orchestra in nineteenth century America.

Michael Maul

How Relevant are Counts Sporck and Questenberg for the Genesis and Early Reception of the B-minor Mass?

When reflecting on the early reception of Bach’s B-minor Mass, those areas of the German Reich which were committed to the Catholic denomination, especially the Kingdom of Bohemia and the Margravate of Moravia, will be of particular interest to the researcher.

As we know from Bach’s note on the score of the Sanctus BWV 232/III—‘NB. Die Parteyen sind in Böhmen bey Graff Sporck’—the Bohemian Count Franz Anton von Sporck borrowed the original parts from Bach in the 1720s and likely organized performances of this work in his residence in Kukks. Apart from Sporck, Bach was in touch with another Catholic nobleman, Johann Adam von Questenberg. In 1981 Alois Plichta proved that Bach and the Moravian Count, who resided in Jaromice near the city of Brno, had been in contact.
However, this fact has hardly been considered so far. A correspondence between a student of the University of Leipzig and Questenberg, dated April 1749, indicates that the Moravian Count obviously contacted Bach at that time. Unfortunately, this letter has come down to us without any particular details about Questenberg’s request. The Count was a passionate lutenist and an opera lover so he might have asked Bach to send him some instrumental music. Interestingly enough, the mysterious letter was written just when Bach was working on the completion of his B-minor Mass—a fact that led Christoph Wolff to assume that Questenberg might even have been the initiator of this project. This would easily provide an explanation as to why a Protestant Cantor of St. Thomas’ in Leipzig would create such a large-scale work that was only suitable for a Catholic service.

For a long time, important records referring to Questenberg and Sporck were kept behind a locked door, which made research on the Counts’ musical activities extremely difficult. During the course of a project run by the Bach-Archiv Leipzig which focuses on the systematic and large-scale exploration of archives relevant to the life and work of Bach, I began to reappraise this ‘Grauzone in Bachs Biographie’ (C. Wolff) as a result of the discovery and analysis of records referring to both Questenberg and Sporck in several archives in the Czech Republic. The large amount of records found in Bohemia and Moravia provide unknown and detailed information not only about the capacity and standard of the Dukes’ orchestras but also about the musical preferences of Sporck and Questenberg. Eventually, the exploration of the Counts’ biographies will lead to a better understanding of the origins of their connection to Bach.

MICHAEL MAUL works at the Bach-Archiv Leipzig and is also a Lecturer at the University of Leipzig. In 2004 he published the oldest surviving manuscript of a German opera and in May 2005 he discovered the aria ‘Alles mit Gott und nichts ohn’ ihn’ (BWV 1127).

Szymon Paczkowski

On the Role and Meaning of the Polonaise in the Mass in B minor by Johann Sebastian Bach as Exemplified by the Aria ‘Quoniam tu solus sanctus’

It seems to be clear as to why Bach composed the Kyrie and Gloria (entitled Missa in Bach’s MS) from his Mass in B minor. In 1733 Bach sent the Dresden court the performing parts of the Missa along with his application for the title of Court Composer of the King of Poland and Elector of Saxony. Thus, the Missa which was given to the Elector of Saxony, Friedrich August II (who later became King August III of Poland), was intended as proof of Bach’s impeccable credentials for the title.

The Mass in B minor displays many similarities with analogous works composed in the first half of the eighteenth century for Dresden’s Hofkirche. Considering its addressee (the Elector of Saxony and King of Poland), this particular Bach work should be viewed in the context of the specific style of sacred music then prevalent in Dresden. Among other things, Dresden’s stylistic conventions involved the inclusion in sacred music of secular elements that were mainly associated with the ceremony of the Dresden court, such as a dance like the polonaise and even hunting music. At the time of the Polish-Saxon union (1697–1763), the polonaise was seen in Dresden (and in Saxony as a whole) initially as a musical symbol of the Polish crown, then of royal majesty in general, and finally of the power and might of the Lord of Hosts. This metaphorical use of the polonaise can frequently be found in the rich repertoire of both of Dresden’s court churches (Catholic and Lutheran). Polonaises can be identified in
the masses of Heinichen, Zelenka and other Dresden composers. The characteristic polonaise rhythms can also be found in two movements of the Mass in B minor: the aria ‘Quoniam tu solus sanctus’ and the chorus ‘Et resurrexit’. By comparing the Mass in B minor with selected Dresden masses from the first half of the eighteenth century we can establish that the use of the polonaise in the Mass in B minor was one of Bach’s ways of alluding to the Dresden model of mass composition. A realization of this fact allows us to gain a better understanding of the composer’s intentions and aims in his Mass in B minor from a hitherto overlooked scholarly viewpoint.

Andrew Parrott

Vocal Ripienists and the Mass in B minor

Despite its apparent lack of an early performance history, the Mass in B minor offers exceptionally fertile ground for an exploration of J.S. Bach’s expectations of choral performance in his own time. Its sixteen (or eighteen) choral movements constitute a distinctly higher proportion of the work than those of any of his other large-scale vocal-instrumental compositions.

Drawing on musical, iconographical, and documentary sources, my previous published work on the nature of Bach’s vocal choir (mostly recently in the 2003 German edition of The Essential Bach Choir) has focused on the composer’s practice in Leipzig, viewed from a number of perspectives: the institutional background, the repertories performed, the functions of concertists and ripienists, the performance materials and their use, Bach’s extant ripieno writing, the 1730 Entwurf, the availability of additional performers, conventional instrument/singer ratios, and questions of balance between vocal and instrumental forces. Here, differing understandings and subsequent scholarly commentary on each of these topics and on each strand of argument are in turn carefully examined, alongside newly introduced evidence, including items from the writings of Kuhnau, Mattheson and Zelter and from the documentation of practice in Wittenberg, Hamburg and other German towns.

The implications of the accumulated evidence on the roles of vocal concertists and ripienists are then systematically explored in the context of each chorus within the Mass in B minor. Does this ‘great’ work perhaps offer any suggestion that Bach might have wished to transcend the performing conditions of his own time with the aid of exceptionally large vocal forces? While I have previously restricted myself almost wholly to historical discussion of the subject, my own and others’ practical experience adds a further useful dimension, drawing on more than twenty-five years of performing the Mass in B minor (and other Bach choral works) on the principles discussed.

Andrew Parrott is a graduate of Oxford University. He is known world wide as the conductor of the Taverner Choir, Consort and Players with whom he has recorded some of Bach’s most well-known works including the B-minor Mass, Magnificat, St John Passion, and Easter Oratorio.
Katharine Pardee

The Mass in B Minor in Nineteenth-Century England

This paper will explore the performance and reception of the B-minor Mass in nineteenth-century England, contrasting it with that of the St Matthew Passion. The first performances of both have been detailed before (most recently by Basil Keen, The Bach Choir, 1876–1928, unpublished PhD dissertation, University of London, 2006). At first glance, there seem to be many similarities in reception: excerpts of both had been featured several times over the years in concerts, with a noticeable and ongoing lack of success; in both cases, choirs were eventually formed with the express purpose of giving the first performances of each work in its ‘entirety’; substantial cuts were deemed necessary to make each more palatable to the audience; and the performances reflected nineteenth-century practices, beginning with orchestras with modern instruments, and large choirs.

The differences in the reception of the two works however were significant, and stem only partly from the twenty years that separated their introductions. Acceptance of the St Matthew in England was a long and slow process, and necessitated turning it into something of an English oratorio—not only with English words, but also with performing conventions usually associated with Messiah. As a contemporary writer said, it was ‘the highest class of sacred music [and] a powerful agent in religious worship’, and was perhaps most effectively presented in a service, with a sermon in the middle, people participating in the singing of its chorales, and standing in reverence for the Passion Chorale. In contrast, perhaps ironically so, the B-minor Mass found its home immediately in the concert hall. It was not a work in which people could actively participate by singing along; it was not easily adaptable to a standard Anglican service; and it was not easy to fit into an oratorio mould.

By the turn of the twentieth century, both works were standards in the repertoire of English choirs, and both had, to some degree, been co-opted as English works. I propose to show how Bach was shaped in both these works to reflect ‘Englishness’, and how perhaps ‘Englishness’ was in turn shaped by Bach.

Hans-Joachim Schulze

Tracing the sources of the B-minor Mass before 1800

The original sources of the Missa (BWV 232) show title pages whose scorings are incomplete (autograph score, Berlin P 180) or even wrong (Dresden, dedicatory set of performing parts). An attempt is made to explain these curiosities by hypotheses which may shed some light on the origin of the sources mentioned above as well as on their internal chronology.
Tatiana Shabalina

Manuscript score No. 4500 in St. Petersburg:
A new source of the B-minor Mass

In his article ‘Friedrich Smend’s edition of the B-minor Mass by J.S. Bach’, Georg von Dadelsen points out that ‘the investigation of the principal sources A, B, A1, B1, C, and D leads us to findings that deviate significantly from those of Smend ... But Smend’s classification of secondary sources and his ordering of lost sources (KB, pp. 17–54) remain of fundamental importance’. However, new research of the sources not mentioned in the Neue Bach-Ausgabe shows that there is a hitherto neglected branch of the source tradition of BWV 232. Among these sources is a manuscript score of the B-minor Mass which is preserved at the Research Music Library in St. Petersburg State Conservatoire «Rimsky-Korsakov», shelfmark No. 4500. It was mentioned briefly in Ludmilla A. Fedorowskaja’s article published in volume 76 of the Bach-Jahrbuch (1990), but has not yet been studied by the researchers and editors of any recent editions including the Neue-Bach-Ausgabe and Joshua Rifkin’s Breitkopf edition of 2006. The manuscript contains the Symbolum Nicenum, Sanctus, Osanna, Benedictus, Agnus Dei and Dona nobis pacem. The general title given to the volume is ‘Missa in h moll / II’. Although there are no owners’ notes, dated signatures, or stamps in the whole manuscript that suggest its origin and previous ownership, all its peculiarities point to the period from the end of the eighteenth to the beginning of the nineteenth century. The present paper contains a detailed description of this manuscript, including its size, watermarks, peculiarities of the musical script, and examines its correlation with the other manuscript sources of BWV 232.

A comparison between J.S. Bach’s autograph score Mus. ms. Bach P 180 and No. 4500 reveals many common features, which suggest that No. 4500 was either copied directly from P 180 or from the Berlin circle of sources which are very closely associated with the autograph P 180. It is pointed out that No. 4500 contains mistakes and variant readings in those places that are unclear or ambiguous in P 180. Some of them (especially those where the autograph is not now in good condition) can be taken into consideration in modern editions. Further, it is demonstrated that No. 4500 mainly reflects J.S. Bach’s autograph with all the corrections inserted by C.P.E. Bach and others. However, a number of readings in No. 4500 represent the text of P 180 ante correcturam. In connection with these cases, the problem of differentiating secondary sources by studying various corrections in P 180 that were reflected in these manuscripts is discussed.

A comparison between No. 4500 and the other secondary sources of BWV 232 (Am.B.3, P 23, P 14, St 118, P 1212, P 22, P 7, Halle Ms. 174, Warsaw manuscript RM 5943, and the score of the Symbolum Nicenum from the private collection of Michael D’Andrea) demonstrates that the St. Petersburg copy has a majority of features in common with the Halle manuscript Ms. 174 (a score of the Symbolum Nicenum — Dona nobis pacem made by the copyist Franz Xaver Gleichauf in the first half of the nineteenth century, nowadays kept in the library of the Martin-Luther-Universität, Institut für Musikwissenschaft in Halle). The most significant common errors and variant readings from both manuscripts (No. 4500 and Ms. 174) are given in the paper. On this basis, it is concluded that the St. Petersburg score and the Halle manuscript form a ‘new’ group of sources which have not been accounted in the Neue Bach-Ausgabe and are an essential addition to the stemma of extant sources of BWV 232. In the last part of the paper it is shown that the value of No. 4500, besides many other features, lies in the fact that, unlike many other sources, it contains several corrected variant readings of the text of P 180.
Despite the fact that the St. Petersburg copy is a secondary source of relatively late origin, it must be studied by the editors of future critical editions of the B-minor Mass, as well as by scholars who investigate the work’s dissemination across Europe.

Reception History of the Mass in B minor in Russia

Although the reception of J.S. Bach’s music in Russia began more than 250 years ago, the reception history of the Mass in B minor is not so long. Moreover, this work had a very difficult path in Russian concert life in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, a path that turned out to be much more complicated than those of Bach’s instrumental works or his Matthew and John Passions.

The most significant stages in this history are connected with the Russian composers Mikhail Ivanovich Glinka (1804–1857) and Nikolaj Andrejevich Rimsky-Korsakov (1844–1908). Glinka became one of the first significant Russian composers to display a special interest in J.S. Bach’s works with the Mass in B minor forming the centre of his interests. I present statements of Russian musicologists, as well as fragments from Glinka’s letters connected with the Mass and his understanding of the work. By contrast, Rimskij-Korsakov’s attitude to Bach’s works was not simple and some of his statements shed light as to why only fragments of the Mass were performed in Russia during the nineteenth century. It is peculiar that the ‘Crucifixus’ from the Mass in B minor was especially revered by Russian composers and became one of the most beloved and frequently performed fragments of this masterpiece during the early periods of its reception history in Russia. Surely this choice was not accidental but rather was rooted in the specific perception of Bach’s vocal works in nineteenth century Russia.

The first known complete performance of the B-minor Mass in Russia took place in the concert season of 1910/1911 and was connected with the activity of the Moscow Symphonic Capella conducted by Vjacheslav Aleksandrovich Bulychev (1872–1959). The performance of the Mass in its entirety was a great event in Russian cultural life. However, according to critical reviews in newspapers and journals, the quality of this first performance was quite far from perfection. The critics noted ‘distortions’ of the work, such as the performance of all of the solo movements by a massed choir, ‘the cacophony of the second Kyrie and strange freedom of rhythm of many-many N. N. of the Mass’. The imperfections of the next performances of the Mass (a year later by the Moscow Symphonic Capella and in 1914 within the series of Bach concerts of Sergej Kusevitskij) again dominated the critical reviews. On the basis of such reviews, as well as statements of Russian composers and musicologists, I try to demonstrate that the ‘colossal’ dimensions and ‘extreme’ difficulties of the Mass performance are the main reasons why it took so long for the work to be accepted in the concert life in Russia. Today, it remains at the pinnacle of the canon for Russian musicians and music lovers.

It is significant that religious differences were never an obstacle in the understanding and performing of Bach’s Mass in Russia. On the contrary, the B-minor Mass was always regarded by Russian musicians as ‘mounting’ over Catholic or Lutheran interpretations. This idea was already expressed in one of the first Russian works dedicated to the Mass and is apparent in many other works in Russian literature, including the most recent ones. The idea of the ‘uni-versality’ of the Mass, which has been so sharply discussed in Bach research in recent decades, seems to be close to ‘Russian thought about Bach’, at least since the middle of the nineteenth century. The problem of ‘why the Lutheran Bach wrote die große catholische Messe’ was not a ‘drama’ for Russian Bach lovers of that time. This work was understood by them as standing beyond different denominations. Although the way of the Mass in Russian
concert life was initially problematic (and its first public performances here took place much later than those in other countries), the view of this piece as ‘the greatest musical art-work of all times and for all people’ in the spirit of some universal religion was typical for ‘Russian thought about Bach’ in all the times of its history. This is consistent with the view of Hans Georg Nägeli, Johann Nepomuk Schelble and other pioneers of Bach research in the nineteenth century, as well as with the modern conception of unity and integration as ‘an essential feature of Bach’s compositional activity’.

TATIANA SHABALINA is a Professor at the St. Petersburg State Conservatoire «Rimsky Korsakov» and is one of the leading specialists of Bach research in Russia. Her recent publications have included several editions of Bach’s works and she is currently preparing a catalogue of Bach sources in Russian archives and libraries.

Ulrich Siegele

Some Observations on the Formal Design of Bach’s B-minor Mass

To musicians of today (and to musicologists as well), it seems a strange notion that a fixed number of bars is directly equivalent to a fixed duration of time irrespective of metre and tempo. But that’s just the procedure Lorenz Mizler recommends in 1754 to a composer of church music for controlling the extent of a work. Indeed, the actual correlative values given prove to be retrospective and have to be altered with regard to Bach, for in his work 162 bars correspond to 7½ minutes as a rule, the total of 162 being subdivided into six units of 27. The bar numbers relate to groups of pieces rather than to each individual piece. The resulting sums reveal their import when split into their components. These are the basic value and its modifications, i.e. large structural and small pragmatic ones. On the one hand, the basic values tend towards round numbers in the general computation of time (e.g. 90, 45 or 30 minutes); on the other hand, the modifications grant the practicability of this procedure as a working tool in design, in so far as they allow reaction to compositional or even practical needs. Eventually the averages, particularly of the basic values, but sometimes of the structural modifications too, hint at standard values of the single pieces making up the sums. Following the investigation of this issue in collections containing preludes and fugues, suites and sonatas, the present paper is going to examine the B-minor Mass, thereby combining the aspect of formal design with the aspect of key structure.

ULRICH SIEGELE is Professor Emeritus of Musicology at Tübingen University, Germany. His early work in Bach studies concerned Bach’s activity as a transcriber and reviser of his own music. He has contributed detailed musical analyses of works by Bach as well as political and social studies of Bach’s age and career.

Jan Smaczny

Bach’s B-minor Mass: An Incarnation in Prague in the 1860s and its Consequences

Attention concerning concert life in Prague in the mid nineteenth century has tended to focus on contemporary novelties in the repertoire; between 1840 and 1870, in particular, music by Berlioz, Liszt, Schumann and Wagner. Recent research, however, has revealed that the
repertoire being performed included a considerable amount of music from before 1800. In fact, in common with much of the rest of Europe, there is clear indication of an enduring interest in earlier repertoires and, in relation to certain works, a remarkably sustained performing tradition. Nevertheless, there is, in the gradually improving climate for performance in Prague in the middle years of the nineteenth century, a pervasive enthusiasm, often backed by scholarly interest, for the revival of works from earlier centuries.

The repertoire performed ranged broadly from as early as the music of the Hussite religious reformers and the works of Oswald von Wolkenstein to Hasse and Cimarosa. In terms of concert statistics, however, J.S. Bach was by far the most frequently performed of pre-Classical composers (Handel is the runner up). The Prague Organ School, founded in 1830 in order to improve standards in church music performance some two generations after the abolition of the Jesuit Order which had done much to maintain musical excellence in the Czech lands, was something of a nexus for Bach performance. Alongside this were the efforts of the Cecilia Society which gave many performances of Baroque music including the Credo of the B-minor Mass (1863).

This paper will focus on the ‘early music scene’ in Prague in the mid nineteenth century, the work of the Cecilia Society and their sources for Bach performance and, slipping sideways, the very direct impact that Bach’s music had on the performers who took part in these concerts, including Antonin Dvorak.

George B. Stauffer

The Symbolon Nicenum of the B-minor Mass and Bach’s Late Choral Ideal

The Symbolon Nicenum stands apart from the other sections of the B-minor Mass in a number of important ways. Composed in the last years of Bach’s life, it displays an unusually high degree of unity, structural balance, and drama. It also points to a new vocal aesthetic for the composer, one in which chorus writing takes precedence over arias. After Bach’s death, the Symbolon Nicenum, in particular, was championed by Bach’s sons, students, and early followers, with the result that it was disseminated widely as an independent piece. In 1772 C.P.E. Bach apparently presented a copy of the Symbolon to the visiting Charles Burney, who seems to have carried it back to England and later praised it as ‘one of the most clear, correct, and masterful [Credos] I have ever seen’. In Germany the piece was cited by Kirnberger and Agricola in published discussions of compositional techniques.

The Symbolon Nicenum also became the first section of the B-minor Mass to be performed publicly after Bach’s death, first in 1786 by C.P.E. Bach in Hamburg and then in 1828 by Schellble in Frankfurt and Spontini in Berlin. When Beethoven attempted unsuccessfully to obtain a copy of the B-minor Mass in 1810 from Breitkopf & Härtel, he specifically quoted the ground bass from the Symbolon’s ‘Crucifixus’ movement, ‘which it is said to contain’.

These posthumous traditions, springing initially from Bach’s inner circle, suggest that the composer may have viewed the Symbolon Nicenum with special favor and wished the piece to be performed as a separate work—a practice worthy of emulation today.
Janice B. Stockigt

Consideration of Bach’s *Kyrie e Gloria* BWV 232 within the context of Dresden Catholic Mass settings, 1729–1733

Bach’s offering in 1733 to the Elector of Saxony of a ‘Messa’ (*Kyrie e Gloria*) will be viewed within the context of a group of works held under the title ‘Musica di Chiesa di Varii Autori’ in contemporary catalogues of the Dresden court.

Examples of Kyrie and Gloria settings composed and/or revised by Jan Dismas Zelenka for performance in the Catholic court church of Dresden 1729–1733 will then be examined, with particular attention given to large-scale structures and tonal relationships, duration of performance, musical styles, solo vocal and choral writing and the role given to each voice including comparisons of ranges and tessitura, instrumentation and instrumental writing, arrangement of the basso continuo section, and vocal and instrumental techniques.

Aspects of Bach’s composition will be related to the delineation of certain texts to determine how he complied with or disregarded Dresden practices. Using lists of musicians employed at the Dresden court between 1729 and 1733, speculation will be made about which singers Bach might have had in mind when he composed and compiled the ‘Messa’ for Dresden in 1733.

Ruth Tatlow

Parallel Proportions, Final Revisions and the Status of the Manuscript P180

When creating an instrumental collection Bach frequently grouped together works he had composed earlier, adding and deleting bars and new movements as the collection took shape. As the recently-published theory of proportional parallelism shows, there is a very special numerical characteristic common to all of the instrumental collections that Bach published or left in fair copy: all of them have several levels of 1:1 or 1:2 proportions formed by the number of bars. Since these proportions are usually absent in Bach’s composing scores, it can be deduced that Bach created parallel proportions at the final stages of revising and perfecting a collection.

The B-minor Mass can be considered a collection insofar as it comprises multiple movements, and four parts. The manuscript of the B-minor Mass, P 180, however, is neither in fair copy, nor was it published in Bach’s life-time, and thus, according to the new theory, one would not expect to find parallel 1:1 or 1:2 proportions in it. On the other hand, the revisions Bach made to P 180 are so extensive and some made so late in his life, it has to be
asked whether Bach considered the score to be the equivalent of a fair copy, in spite of its unpolished calligraphy. Using the principles of proportional parallelism, this paper will examine the bar structure of the 1733 Missa and the 1749 B-minor Mass to see what light the results can shed on the status of the score. At its simplest, a lack of proportions will show that Bach had not finished revising the numerical structure; and conversely, the presence of several levels of proportion will demonstrate unequivocally that Bach considered the work numerically perfect, and ready to publish.

RUTH TATLOW is an Associate Professor at the University of Stockholm. Following the success of her first book, Bach and the Riddle of the Number Alphabet, her research has focused on the use of numbers in compositional theory and practice. She is a co-founder of Bach Network UK, editor of Understanding Bach and is currently preparing a major critical work on numerical processes in Bach’s music.

Melvin P. Unger

Chiastic Reflection in the B-minor Mass: Lament’s Paradoxical Mirror

In the form of Bach’s Mass in B minor as we know it today, the ‘Crucifixus’ serves as the architectonic center of the Credo (Symbolum) and, in a sense, of the mass as a whole, since it is equidistant from the repeated movements that give the work a cyclical unity—the ‘Gratias’ and ‘Dona nobis’. Before Bach decided to write a new movement for the text of the ‘Et incarnatus’, the center point of the Credo had fallen at the beginning of ‘Et resurrexit’, a point that is marked—for whatever reason—with a melodic palindrome of thirteen notes. That the perfect symmetry of this arching line is not coincidental is clear from the fact that the soprano parts cross unnecessarily—more normal voice leading is employed when the melodic gesture is repeated later in the movement.

Various theories as to Bach’s reason for changing the structure of the Symbolum have been proposed. Most persuasive is the proposal that Bach wished to make the credal statement concerning Christ’s crucifixion central, and to produce a pivot movement for a structure that was already chiastic. We know that Bach often used chiastic forms to portray Luther’s theologia crucis, which stressed the inverted order of God’s revelation. Well-known examples include the St John Passion (with its central chorale) and the motet Jesu, meine Freude (with its central fugue). Similarly, Cantata 75, Bach’s debut cantata in Leipzig, which deals specifically with theologia crucis, presents a doubly chiastic structure in which two central recitatives (movements 4 & 11) present the inversion principle explicitly.

Bach’s decision to move the ‘Crucifixus’ into the architectonic center of the Credo may also have been spurred by the theological connections between the ‘Confiteor’ (the last newly composed movement in the Symbolum) and the ‘Crucifixus’. Indeed he may have made the decision while in the process of writing the ‘Confiteor’. We may further conjecture that, to strengthen the allusion to the theologia crucis, he incorporated a transposed inversion of the descending chromatic tetrachord (used as a bass ostinato in the ‘Crucifixus’) at the end of the ‘Et incarnatus’.

A look at the cantata from which the music for the ‘Crucifixus’ was taken—BWV 12—provides insight into Bach’s use of the theologia crucis for musical invention. Perhaps even more illuminating is Bach’s use of melodic inversion to express the relationship between cross and crown in the riddle canon, BWV 1077, which he presented to a theology student in 1747, shortly before compiling the Mass in B minor. It goes without saying that no movement in Bach’s B-minor Mass depicts the abasement of cross-bearing more clearly than the ‘Crucifixus’, with its descending chromatic tetrachord. But if Bach was indeed thinking of the
theologia crucis when he adjusted the architecture of the Symbolum, where is the corresponding anabasis representing glorification? Most immediately, we may find it in the ascending chromatic tetrachord at the end of the ‘Et incarnatus’ and in the ascending lines of ‘Et resurrexit’. However, in the overall structure of the mass, the movements most striking for their rising lines are the only two in which Bach chose to use the same music: the ‘Gratias’ and the ‘Dona nobis’. Did Bach intentionally decide to counterbalance the key musical feature of the ‘Crucifixus’ (the descending chromatic tetrachord) with the rising lines (diatonic fourths) of these outer framing movements?

It would be overreaching to suggest that rising melodic fourths (chromatic or diatonic) held a fixed symbolic meaning for Bach. A study of the use of chromatic fourths in Bach’s other works reveals a variety of textual connections. Nevertheless, Bach’s previously expressed interest in Luther’s distinction between the theologia gloria and the theologia crucis, and the correlation in the mass between the combination of descending chromatic fourths and ascending fourths on texts that relate to these theological concepts suggest that Bach was making allusion to them. From this perspective it seems likely that as Bach neared completion of the mass he decided to repeat the music of the ‘Gloria’ in order to create an architecturally large-scale allusion to the theologia crucis. His earlier decision to compose a new movement for the ‘Et incarnatus’ (thereby pushing the ‘Crucifixus’ into the pivot spot in the Symbolum) ensured that the two identical movements would be equidistant from the ‘Crucifixus’, the heart of it all. By these adjustments he was able to use formal chiasm and melodic inversion as apt symbols for the theologia crucis.

MELVIN UNGER is Director of the Riemenschneider Bach Institute at Baldwin-Wallace College in Berea, Ohio, USA. A choral conductor by profession, he has published four books on Bach and his era. Works in preparation include Stölzel’s ‘German Te Deum’ (A-R Editions) and Historical Dictionary of Choral Music (Scarecrow Press).

Uwe Wolf

Many problems; different solutions? Editing Bach’s Mass in B minor

The editing history of Bach’s B-minor Mass is one of problems. The first edition (Hans Georg Nägeli, Part I 1833, Part II 1845) and the edition in the BG (Julius Rietz, 1856 and 1857, ‘Zweite Hälfte, Neue Redaktion’) were fraught with problems, while the edition in the NBA (Friedrich Smend, 1954) has been the object of brisk controversies and strong criticism from the outset. However, it is only in the last ten years that there have been new editorial approaches to Bach’s B-minor Mass, namely the editions by Christoph Wolff (1997) and Joshua Rifkin (2006) as well as an edition of the early version (Uwe Wolf, 2005). Some other editions are in preparation.

Whereas the early editions had to deal with a lack of interest (Nägeli) and unavailable sources (BG), modern editions have to cope not only with methodical and editorial problems but also with Smend’s fundamentally problematic evaluation of the work itself.

There are two types of problems. First of all, editors are confronted with the issue of how the sources of the early versions, particularly the Dresden performing parts, should be used. Is one allowed to use the additional information that is only presented in the parts of the early version? Or, is one allowed to ignore the information that is only found in these parts when editing the B-minor Mass? Is it at least possible to do so?

The other main difficulties result from the reception of Bach’s B-minor Mass. The Credo was performed by C.P.E. Bach in Hamburg in 1786 but he revised his father’s autograph
score during preparations for this performance. Discerning his additions in Bach’s autograph is only possible with the utmost care and effort. Sometimes C.P.E. has even scratched out the original text; in such cases Bach’s original text can only be reconstructed by referring to early copies of J.S. Bach’s autograph.

How have editors dealt with this situation? Are there any alternative approaches? This paper will examine these questions by using selected examples.

UWE WOLF worked at the Johann-Sebastian-Bach-Institut in Göttingen from 1991 to 2003, and from 2004 at the Bach-Archiv Leipzig. His long list of publications includes five volumes of the Neue Bach-Ausgabe. He is currently working on the revised edition of the B-minor Mass.
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