historischen Kontext zu vergegenwärtigen. Und ihrem geschichtlichen Ort ist Bachs Kunst gerade dort dialektisch verbunden, wo sie sich von ihm in ihrer eigenen Qualität distanziert".

Das ist richtig beobachtet, zutreffend dargestellt, vortrefflich formuliert. Und doch macht es - wir wissen es alle - die größten Schwierigkeiten, solches Wissen beim Hören einzubringen, konkret in Hörerfahrung umzusetzen. Oder vom Hörer aus gedacht, der ein Kenner und Liebhaber aber kein Musikhistoriker ist: Wie ist solche Erkenntnis mit dem Kunstwerk, das man hört, nachzuvollziehen? Aus der Frage ergibt sich die Aufgabe, die Aufgabe einer, wie man vielleicht sagen könnte, p r a k t i s c h e n M u s i k - w i s s e n s c h a f t: Zusammen mit dem Praktiker muß der Musikwissenschaftler das historische Kunstwerk in ästhetische Gegenwart verwandeln, und diese Aufgabe ist nur am einzelnen Werk, konkret: im Vollzug von dessen Interpretation, und wie die erklingende Interpretation immer wieder neu zu lösen. Die Musikwissenschaft hat sich als interpretierende Wissenschaft am Einzelwerk zu bewähren.

Die Probe aufs Exempel sei gewagt: Im Anschluß an diese Veranstaltung stellen Gero Soergel, Stiftskirchenorganist in Tübingen, und ich "Überlegungen zu Musik und S p r a c h e" an, jedoch nicht anhand eines V o k a l-, sondern anhand eines I n s t r u m e n t a l-Satzes, nämlich der Toccata D-Dur (BWV 912), die wir gemeinsam interpretieren wollen.

Sie alle sind dazu herzlich eingeladen. Allerdings, ich muß Sie warnen: dieser Versuch einer Interpretation in Wort und Ton wird rund 60 Minuten dauern. Diese lange Dauer ist der Grund, der uns gezwungen hat, diesen eigentlichen Teil des Referats aus dem Rahmen des Symposiums hinauszustellen: er steht zeitlich wie sachlich zwischen Wissenschaft und Praxis - oder so gesagt, wie es der Sinn dieses Vortrags ist: er gehört zur Wissenschaft u n d zur Praxis - und braucht deshalb doppelt Zeit, was Sie bitte tolerieren wollen.

Anmerkung

1) Friedhelm Krummacher, Bach und die norddeutsche Orgeltoccata: Fragen und Überlegungen, in: BJ 71 (1985), S. 119-134.

Laurence Dreyfus

THE CAPELLMEISTER AND HIS AUDIENCE:
OBSERVATIONS ON 'ENLIGHTENED' RECEPTIONS OF BACH

When in 1739 Lorenz Mizler came to defend Johann Sebastian Bach in the midst of the Scheibe-Birnbaum controversy, he adopted a tone of apology. He writes:

If at times Herr Bach writes the inner parts more fully than other composers, he has taken as his model the music of twenty or twenty-five years ago. He can write otherwise, however, when he wishes to. Anyone who heard the music performed by the students at the Easter Fair in Leipzig last year ... which was composed by Capellmeister Bach, must admit that it was written entirely in accordance with the latest

taste and was approved by everyone. So well does the Capellmeister know how to suit himself to his listeners[1].

Although the music has been lost to this "Huldigungskantate", Bach probably composed this work in the same outwardly galant manner that characterizes other dedicatory pieces in this genre. What is still unclear are the assumptions underlying Mizler's text. For despite its dissent from Scheibe's unbecoming remarks, his argument accords perfectly with the same doctrines from which Scheibe had launched his famous attack. By agreeing that a composer should accommodate himself to his audience by subscribing to "the latest taste", Mizler makes it clear that he shared with Scheibe a prominent dogma of the early German Enlightenment – the belief in the rational progress of taste. The difference in views was merely a matter of emphasis. Whereas Scheibe asserted that Bach obscured the natural element in music by composing "in a bombastic and confused manner"[2], Mizler conceded that the full-voiced texture in Bach's works was old-fashioned – that is, implicitly regressive – but contested merely the implicit charge that Bach had not kept up with the latest taste. When he so desires – Mizler argued – the Capellmeister could certainly accommodate himself to his audience.

I think it is fair to say that historians find this dichotomy of "progress" vs. "tradition" both palatable and convenient. It seems almost natural to ask: Was Bach a traditionalist or in some ways a "progressive"? But we might ask another question: do we not favor this dichotomy because it reinforces our own 'enlightened' view of style history which we narrate as the succession of changing tastes? Whereas we dismiss the optimism of the early German Enlightenment with its naive belief in progress, we happily embrace the equally Enlightened position that, to render a historical account of Bach, we must measure his "style" against a yardstick of progress. On the one hand, this "progress syndrome" has certain advantages for historiography: it doubtless captures a crucial moment in the history of ideas which crystallized in the Scheibe-Birnbaum dispute. Yet one might also consider how this historical debate itself, like all receptions, caused the first serious misreading of J.S. Bach.

To explore the consequences of this misreading, I would like to turn to a seemingly "enlightened" publication by J.S. Bach – the second part of the "Clavierübung" – in order to suggest that the preoccupation with progress – whether in the music criticism of the 1730s or in the historiography of the 1980s – has yet to grasp the complex ways in which Bach responded to his contemporaries. Scheibe himself, as is well-known, wrote approvingly of the "Italian Concerto", the opening work in this volume of the "Clavierübung". He writes:

Who is there who will not admit that this keyboard concerto is to be regarded as a perfect model of a well-designed concerto for one instrument? But at the present time we shall be able to name as yet very few or practically no concertos of such excellent qualities and such well-designed execution. It would take as great a master of music as Mr. Bach ... to provide us with such a piece in this mode – a piece which deserves emulation by all our great composers and which will be imitated in vain by foreigners[3].

One typical response to this passage, given the "progress syndrome", is to applaud Scheibe for his good taste: How wonderful that even the shortsighted critic must recant and recognize the greatness of the "Italian Concerto"! But perhaps Scheibe's adulation ought rather to arouse our suspicion. How, we may ask, can he honestly have approved of this piece? To answer this question by appealing to psychology – Scheibe atoning for

his guilty conscience - is clearly inadequate. To begin with, Scheibe had chosen the words of his original critique very carefully. Words such as "schwülstig" and "verworren" are not merely loose critical terms but figure as key aesthetic categories in Scheibe's discourse on style. For Scheibe, the bombastic style constitutes a particular aberration of high style. It occurs, for example, when too many ornaments obscure the natural melody or when a series of dissonances confounds an orderly harmonic process. It also emerges when the composer writes out the improvised graces ordinarily supplied by the tasteful performer. Since each of Scheibe's elaborations on the bombastic style echo the very same charges raised in his previous attack, it becomes evident that he was thinking of none other than J.S. Bach[4].

If Scheibe condemned the bombastic style for overspecifying melodic decoration, it is hard to believe that he found favour with the slow movement of the "Italian Concerto". With its highly unnatural adaptation of a now-outdated Corellian adagio genre, the serpentine subject of this second movement obscures any recognition of an underlying natural melody and positively forbids any further ornamentation. According to Scheibe's standards, it must be judged quintessentially bombastic.

What was it, then, in the "Italian Concerto" that occasioned Scheibe's endorsement? Clearly it was the tendency toward homophony, slower harmonic rhythm and fashionable short phrases in the opening movement which kindled his enthusiasm. These were, after all, the features that coincided with his notion of "the latest taste". But even here, the critic's enthusiasm may have been only partially sincere. For one thing, he could easily have pointed to passages which could, according to his standards, be labeled bombastic or confused. Scheibe arrived at his positive assessment, one might say, at the price of wearing certain critical blinders. In short, he exploited the opportunity to flatter Bach in order to advance his own stylistic program which the "Italian Concerto" superficially seemed to support. Far from an apology for his previous views, Scheibe construed his selective praise as a ploy to advance the cause of progress.

Nonetheless, Scheibe was surely aware that, in the outward style of the "Italian concerto", Bach had intended to accommodate himself to his audience. One irony of this accommodation is that this work - despite its sophisticated attempt to reconcile galant taste with the rigors of the concerto genre - represents a somewhat bland, even schematic application of the principles which spark Bach's concerto oeuvre elsewhere. If the "Clavierübung", Part II, contains a great B a c h concerto, it isn't found in the "Italian Concerto". Rather, it appears in the modest work concluding the b-minor Overture entitled "Echo", the most superficially galant work in the collection. (This movement is given in its entirety in Example 1a.)

Since the outward size, shape and even style of this unassuming character piece signal the genre of the 'galanterie', it is easy to mistake the complex character of the "Echo". Philipp Spitta, for example, saw in it only "a dance form which exhibits no definite type"[5]. As for a critical evaluation of the piece, he found the echo effects "especially charming because the phrases are not repeated exactly". Yet Spitta also expressed some disappointment with the "Echo", noting that here, as in other movements comprising the "Französische Ouvertüre", there remains "a popular character not proper to real keyboard partitas"[6]. Just like Scheibe, Spitta formed his judgment on the basis of stylistic appearances. Despite his ideological hostility to 'Enlightenment', Spitta too fell victim to the progress syndrome.

What Spitta missed lay behind the playful stylistic exterior. For despite the surface 'galanterie', the generic mode of the Echo is severely concertolike, representing nothing less than a catalog of Bach's ritornello procedures. One might even coin

the term the 'Galanteriestück auf Concertenart' to capture the extraordinary world in-
habited by the "Echo". To grasp the fascinating relation between generic foreground and
modal background, the inner workings of the "Echo" need to be explored in some detail.

To say that Bach casts the Echo in the generic mode of a concerto does not only mean
that the forte and piano markings signal the tutti and solo forces in the concerto
grosso. Unlike his contemporaries, Bach early on had consigned the tutti-solo distinc-
tion to the decoration of the work rather than its invention. Instead, what motivates
Bach's concerto oeuvre is a more abstract principle – the presence, absence and re-
casting of a ritornello. Far from an identity determined merely by asking who is play-
ing it, Bach's ritornellos have shapes structured by characteristic harmonic conven-
tions.

Wilhelm Fischer, in coining the terms 'Vordersatz', 'Fortspinnung' and 'Epilog',
insightfully captured the organization of the leading generic sub-type among Bach's
ritornellos[7]. But whereas Fischer emphasized the melodic and motivic characteristics of
the ritornello, it is easily shown that each segment actually displays a more regular
harmonic profile, in which the three segments contribute to a complete, tonally closed
invention[8]. The 'Vordersatz' (V) defines the tonic chord by reference to its dominant.
H o w it accomplishes this – broken arpeggios, scale figures, a succession of short
motives – is therefore subordinate to w h e t h e r it does so by clearly evident
triads in root position moving from the tonic to the dominant. The 'Fortspinnung' (F),
on the other hand, is premised on the absence of either a defined tonic or an authentic
cadence resolving the tonic. It therefore displays either conventional voice-leading
sequences (such as 10-7-10-7, 5-6-5-6 or 10-10-10) or more random contrapuntal motion
but delays, through linear means, a strong tonal articulation. The 'Epilog' (E), on the
other hand, presents the formal cadence in the tonic closing on the first scale step in
the upper voice. By contrast, the solo sections are identified not so much by
contrasting "themes" as by the absence of ritornello segments. Understood in this way,
Bach's concertos can be seen to stand apart from the narrative, chronological form im-
portant to the later Viennese sonata. The number of ritornellos, the order of the tonal
stations, the motivic relations between tutti and solo themes are therefore not really
structural issues of this genre. Instead, much more like a fugue, the composer exploits
to the fullest the properties of an "ideal ritornello" which underlies a particular
work.

A glance at the voice-leading underlying the proposed ideal ritornello for the
"Echo" in Example 1b reveals a remarkably regular segmentation of the ritornello
functions. Both segments of the 'Vordersatz', as can be seen, independently establish
the tonic. The 'Fortspinnung', beginning with a usual intervallic succession, sets up
the typical move to the dominant seventh, which, in the 'Epilog', proceeds conventio-
nally to the cadence. The ritornello segments, moreover, stand out in bold relief when
compared to the voice-leading of the solo episodes. As shown in Example 1c, they
neither reproduce the ritornello functions nor, for that matter, even repeat
themselves, this despite the outward motivic unity the display. Interestingly, the
charming echo effects which Spitta noted first in his stylistic analysis occur in these
solo episodes – S_2 and S_4. Unlike the strict reformulations found in the ritornello
segmentation, these passages play no structural role in the piece as a whole.

What is so fascinating about this movement is that, despite its brevity, it manages
to display virtually every ritornello function as rigorously as any Bach concerto one
could cite. Through the grid of Ritornello occurrences represented in Table 1, one can
establish this work's concerto-like credentials.

First, the ritornello can be said to segment, which is to say that the ritornello displays its functional subdivisions. The appearance of a partial ritornello, moreover, entails certain logical consequences. For example, R_3 beginning in m. 26 presents only the 'Fortspinnung' and 'Epilog', thus functioning as a resolution to the preceding material. Indeed, this confers a pseudo-'Vordersatz'-like status on the previous solo episode, S_2, beginning in bar 22. Note, however, that S_2 can never replace the real 'Vordersatz' because it lacks the definition of the tonic.

Next, the ritornello can be said to decorate. This term signifies the processes that alter surface identities but adhere to the underlying harmonic structure. Examples of this function abound in the "Echo". Consider, for instance, the final statement of the 'Vordersatz' in m. 62. Here the intervallic inversion of the voices causes the ritornello "subject" to migrate to the tenor part over an ornamental dominant pedal. The change is decorative rather than structural, for since the shape of the piece would not change if we substituted the earlier version of the 'Vordersatz' for this decorated one. Similarly, metric and rhythmic variants also play a role in this function. Consider next the decorated 'Epilog' of R_2 in mm. 20-22 represented in Example 1b. Here the four-bar length in the ideal ritornello is compressed into three bars without altering the voice-leading. In each case of decoration one can always substitute the ideal form for the surface variant to test for grammatical equivalence. By these subtle semantic shifts, Bach's concertos are able to dramatize the opposition between surface features and the deeper tonal order.

In a special form of the function "decorate" called "orchestrate", the composer deploys piano and forte markings so as signify tutti/solo distinctions which imaginatively mask the underlying polarity between ritornello and (solo) episode. The "Echo" includes a plethora of such markings. Sometimes the composer orchestrates solo sections as "tuttis", such as in the forte markings in mm. 5 through 12, while at other times he orchestrates a ritornello segment as a "solo setting", as in mm. 13 through 16 when the 'Vordersatz' of R_2 is marked piano.

The ritornellos in the "Echo" also display a wide array of segments transposed into significant keys, here presenting segments in five different tonal regions as shown in the column labeled "Key" in Table 1. The sequential order of the arrayed key areas is, of course, far from haphazard and reflects the usual hierarchy of scale steps. However, it is revealing to stress the essential lack of a preordained harmonic plan for each transposition of the tonal array.

Related to the array function is an important process called "modeswitch", which translates major ritornellos into the minor and minor ritornellos into the major. Modeswitch then checks for syntactic errors and rejects segments it has rendered ungrammatical. Here, as Table 1 shows, the 'Vordersatz' segments lend themselves to modal translation and are so used in R_4 and R_6. Translation of the 'Fortspinnung' into the major, on the other hand, caused an incorrect doubling in a diminished chord, a voice-leading error which rendered it unusable.

In a more subtle process, the ritornello principle in the Echo also researches hidden relations between segments already transposed by the array and translated by modeswitch. This occurs in R_4 and R_5 as well as in R_6 and R_7. Consider bars 45 through 54 comprising R_6 and R_7. At first glance, this passage seems to comprise a modulating ritornello, that is, a ungrammatical departure dictated by a new harmonic goal. Upon closer inspection, however, the fourteen measures reveal that the composer has coupled two ritornello segments arrayed in different keys. The coupling is far from accidental but proceeds from a felicitous coincidence of voice-leading at the end of (V_2) in bar

48. Consider here Example ld. As the reduction shows, the 'Vordersatz' in G major connects seamlessly to the 'Fortspinnung' in E minor through an intervallic ascent of a tenth. The function that researches the compatibility of unusual segmentations also works hand in hand with modeswitch: after rejecting an ungrammatical 'Fortspinnung' in major, Bach researched an alternate link to a permissible 'Fortspinnung' in minor. He found it by coupling the 'Vordersatz' in the submediant with the 'Fortspinnung' in the subdominant.

The staggering ingenuity of the "Echo" embraces several ironies. Chief among these is that it represents a much better Bach concerto than does the opening movement of the "Italian Concerto". This latter movement, despite its size and form pointing to a real concerto movement, does not exploit the ritornello segments as do Bach's most advanced works in this genre. For example, as Table 2 shows, the ritornello formations in this movement of the Italian Concerto are strikingly more primitive than those of the "Echo". With its two identical framing ritornellos, the piece seems positively disinterested in exploring the substance and sense of its segmentation. Only the 'Epilog' undergoes a modeswitch in R_2, so that the conventional recasting of the given materials through varied segmentations, decorations, and orchestrations never takes place. The lengthy Ritornello itself evokes some aspects of the concerto style of Bach's younger contemporaries, such as Graun, Hasse, and even Scheibe himself, who repressed the ability of music to rethink its own materials under the slogan of "natural melody". Bach manages, however, to supersede his enlightened colleagues in his elegant pseudo-Ritornellos - those related by motivic resemblance rather than harmonic identity - passages that substitute for the conventionally strict reformulations of the given material. Because the passages wield control over the secondary harmonic processes, the movement avoids a common galant fault of tonal redundancy.

Yet the question remains: Why did Bach lavish so much attention on a demure character piece at the end of the "Französische Ouvertüre"? On the one hand, as the most intensive demonstration of the ritornello principle in the "Clavierübung", the "Echo" manages to summon forth the struggle and reconciliation between competing forces in a manner wholly appropriate to the conclusion of a musical volume devoted to a bi-national tug-of-war. Indeed, the "b-minor Suite" might even be seen as a secret palindrome to the "Italian Concerto" by concealing within the fugue of its French ovevture a fugal-ritornello piece usually found in concerto third movements and concluding in the "Echo" with materials comprising a first movement of a concerto. However one assess the "Echo", its character must be distinguished from a true galant character piece such as the "Badinerie" from the B-minor orchestral suite or even from a mock concerto playing merely on dynamic contrast such as in the Prelude to the E-major partita for violin.

Yet Bach's "Echo" can also serve as a musical rebuttal to Scheibe's aesthetics with a conviction that Abraham Birnbaum or Lorenz Mizler could never have mustered. For not only does it confound the rationalist dichotomies of nature vs. art, logic vs. superstition, truth vs. confusion, or taste vs. technique: It suggests that the categories of progress vs. tradition mistake the profound ways in which Bach confronted the world around him. It suggests, further, that music need not submit to a supposedly scientific criticism which arrogantly separates episteme - rational knowledge - from doxa - unverified opinion. Finally, it suggests that a historical understanding of Bach must not favor one particular reception merely beause it was contemporary with the composer. If the progress syndrome misconstrues Bach, it is perhaps because Bach's works are poorly served by a historiography based on the progress of style. If we wish to rescue one

important remnant of Enlightenment thought – the elimination of bias from the world – we might begin by questioning the progress syndrome and looking elsewhere for historical knowledge.

Notes

1) "Wenn aber Herr Bach manchmahl die Mittelstimmen vollstimmiger setzet als andere, so hat er sich nach den Zeiten der Musik vor 20 und 25 Jahren gerichtet. Er kan es aber auch anders machen, wenn er will. Wer die Musik gehöret, so in der Oster Messe zu Leipzig vergangengen Jahres ... von der studierenden Jugend aufgeführet, vom Herrn Capellmeister Bach aber componieret worden, der wird gestehen müssen, daß sie vollkommen nach dem neuesten Geschmack eingerichtet gewesen, und von iedermann gebillichet worden. So wohl weiß der Herr Capellmeister sich nach seinen Zuhörern zu richten." Lorenz Mizler, Musikalische Bibliothek ... Sechster Teil (Leipzig 1738), p. 43f., cited in Bach-Dokumente, hrsg. vom Bach-Archiv Leipzig, Bd. II, Fremdschriftliche und gedruckte Dokumente zur Lebensgeschichte Johann Sebastian Bachs 1685-1750, vorgelegt und erläutert von Werner Neumann und Hans-Joachim Schulze, Kassel etc. und Leipzig 1969, S. 336.

2) "durch ein schwülstiges und verworrenes Wesen"

3) "Wer wird aber auch nicht so fort zugestehen, daß dieses Clavierconcert als ein vollkommenes Muster eines wohleingerichteten einstimmigen Concerts anzusehen ist? Allein, wir werden auch noch zur Zeit sehr wenige, oder gar keine Concerten von so vortrefflichen Eigenschaften, und von einer so wohlgeordneten Ausarbeitung aufweisen können. Ein so großer Meister der Musik, als Herr Bach ist ... mußte es auch seyn, uns in dieser Setzart ein solches Stück zu liefern, welches den Nacheifer aller unserer großen Componisten verdienet, von den Ausländern aber nur vergebens wird nachgeahmet werden." Johann Adolph Scheibe, Critischer Musikus (December 22, 1739; Leipzig 1745), pp. 637-638.

4) A later passage confirms the suspicion that Scheibe was thinking of none other than J.S. Bach: "Das sind nun die herrlichen Eigenschaften der schwülstigen Schreibart in die sich auch wohl große Meister der Musik verliebet haben, welche uns sonst die trefflichsten Muster einer guten, ja einer wahren hohen Schreibart geben könnten, wenn sie ihre Geschicklichkeit und Kenntnis der Musik mit einer vernünftigen Beurtheilung folgen ... und überhaupt mehr die Natur ... als der Kunst ... folgen wollten." Scheibe, p. 134. 3 September 1737. "These are the leading characteristics of the bombastic style, with which even great masters of music have fallen in love, (those) who otherwise could give us the most excellent models of a good or even truly high style if they would join reasonable judgement to their skill and knowledge of music and follow nature rather than art."

5) Spitta, Johann Sebastian Bach, 2 vols., Leipzig 1873, 1880, vol. II, p. 646.

6) Philipp Spitta, vol. II, p. 646. He excludes only "the impassioned Sarabande" from this criticism.

7) Wilhelm Fischer, Zur Entwicklung des Wiener klassischen Stils, in: Studien zur Musikwissenschaft 3 (1915), pp. 24-84.

8) For a more extensive discussion of Bach's ritornello procedures, see the author's "J.S. Bach's Concerto Ritornellos and the Question of Invention", in: MQ 71 (1985), pp. 327-358.

Example 1a: "Echo" from BWV 831

Example 1b

DECORATE [E] = [E♯]

Example 1c

S_1 (mm. 5–12) S_2 (mm. 22–25)

S_3 (mm. 37–44) S_4 (mm. 54–62)

Example 1d

MODESWITCH [V₁₋₂]
ARRAY [V₁₋₂] in VI

DECORATE [V₂] = [V₂#]   ARRAY [F-E#] in IV

Table I

Ritornello Formations in the "Echo"

Ritornello	Key	Mode	Measures	Segments
R₁	I	minor	1-4	(V₁ V₂)
R₂	V	minor	13-22	(V₁ V₂* F-E*)
R₃	V	minor	26-32	(F'-E)
R₄	III	MAJOR	33-34	(V₁
R₅	IV	minor	35-36	V₂)
R₆	VI	MAJOR	45-48	(V₁ V₂*
R₇	IV	minor	49-54	F-E*)
R₈	I	minor	62-72	(V₁*V₂ F-E)

Table II

Ritornello Formations in BWV 971/1
(Italian Concerto, movement 1)

Ritornello	Key	Mode	Measures	Segments
R₁	I	MAJOR	1-30	V F E
R₂	VI	minor	73-90	V F E
R₃	I	MAJOR	163-192	V F E