



FRIEDRICH SMEND'S EDITION OF THE B-MINOR MASS BY J. S. BACH

Author(s): Georg von Dadelsen, James A. Brokaw and II

Source: *Bach*, Vol. 20, No. 2 (SUMMER, 1989), pp. 49-74

Published by: Riemenschneider Bach Institute

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41640324>

Accessed: 17-08-2016 20:28 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Riemenschneider Bach Institute is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Bach*

FRIEDRICH SMEND'S EDITION OF THE B-MINOR MASS BY J. S. BACH

Georg von Dadelsen

Translated by James A. Brokaw, II

Only rarely had a musicological study been awaited with such interest as Friedrich Smend's edition of the Mass in B Minor in the *Neue Bach-Ausgabe*. The call for a new edition of Bach's works would have been justified by this effort if it had merely represented the culmination of two and one-half decades of continuous research, whose first, far-reaching results the editor published in the 1937 *Bach-Jahrbuch*.² But there was more: the rich significance of this work and the well-known scholarship of its editor seemed to ensure that crucial issues in recent Bach scholarship would be dealt with. Particularly pressing was the question of whether the same methods that revealed the need for a new chronology of Bach's works could also corroborate it. By this we mean, primarily, the source-critical methods of Philipp Spitta, upon which the majority of dates were once founded. Furthermore, the wide-ranging critical report promised to touch on numerous philological problems that affected editorial problems of Bach's music in general. What could be more desirable for the independent development of a new collected edition, still in its beginnings, than such a volume? The intensely provocative and illuminating effect that had been predicted has indeed occurred. Since the appearance of Smend's critical report, Bach scholarship has entered a period of flux unlike any since Philipp Spitta completed his fundamental biography of Bach eighty years ago.

The main obstacle to any critical investigation of the B-Minor Mass is due to the unique construction of its principal source. The autograph score, P180, is assembled from several component manuscripts (*Teil-Handschriften*); as Smend describes it, the manuscript is "not a unified whole." It is separated clearly into four parts by four title pages: *No. 1. Missa (Kyrie and Gloria)*; *No. 2. Symbolum Nicenum (Credo)*; *No. 3. Sanctus (without Osanna and Benedictus)*; *No. 4. Osanna/Benedictus/Agnus Dei et Dona nobis pacem*. This structure is significantly different from the five-part Roman Missal. The text is also different in two places from that of the Missal: it follows the language of the Vulgate, and that of the Latin Lutheran liturgy of the Saxon Electorate. There is no common title page, and nowhere is there found any indication that the contents of the manuscript, divided in four parts, are to be understood as a "Missa tota," or as a "Catholic Mass." The designation "High Mass in B Minor" originated only at the beginning of the nineteenth century.

Published in translation with the permission of the author. See End Note 1.

Those features that deviate from the Roman Missal were dealt with by earlier researchers. Philipp Spitta concerned himself with these questions in particular.³ But, it is clear that he understood the four parts, finally, in the sense of a complete Mass. For Smend, the features that deviate from the Missal are crucial. They convince him that the volume is in no way to be seen as a "complete Mass," but that it is the more or less accidental consolidation of four independent pieces written for the Leipzig church service. History of transmission and chronology, changing scoring, different manners of notation, and the independent further development of each single section, their uneven quality, the parody technique and key structure — all of these arguments lead Smend to the single conclusion, namely, that it would be "...not only an historical misunderstanding but also an artistic misapprehension to speak of a 'Mass in B Minor,' much less a 'High Mass,' and to perform all the movements from *Kyrie* to *Dona nobis pacem* one after the other."⁴ Only a superficial connection between the four sections can be recognized. The texts of the Latin Ordinary had persisted in Lutheran liturgy until well into the eighteenth century. Evidence for this is found in the *Leipziger Kirchenandachten* of 1694. Under the title *Cantica quaedam sacra veteris ecclesiae selectis, quae Dominicis et Festis diebus per totius anni curriculum in Templis Cathedralibus usitate cantari et adhuc retineri solent* are found the texts of the *Missa* (*Kyrie* and *Gloria*), *Symbolum Nicenum* (*Credo*), and of the *Sanctus*, and indeed in the language deviating from the Roman Missal that Bach follows. Smend asserts, then, that Bach's autograph score is simply a collection of these *Cantica quaedam*, an assortment of four independent works of Lutheran church music.

These new theses are presented and defended in the *Critical Report* with shrewd intelligence. It should be stated immediately that Bach research can be grateful to Smend for this great work. We wish to make this particularly clear at the outset, since we will present a view that differs at many points, particularly at crucial ones. Such conflicts arise precisely because of the greatness of the endeavor; it is one that entails great problems. Moreover, no completely indisputable explanation can be found for the most important problem, the nature of the four-part principal source. As a consequence of the incomplete transmission, the autograph's nature will, in our view, remain a subject of hypothesis. Thus, it is a principal service of the present edition to have exposed the problems of earlier attempts at explanation.

As startling as Smend's thesis may appear, he presents his proofs effectively. The criticism of his results as well as his methods has already begun. Hermann Keller⁵ and Walter Blankenburg⁶ represent the traditional view, that of the work's unity, with predominantly analytical and liturgical evidence. Without refuting Smend's conclusions on philological issues, both critiques attack several key points of Smend's argument. The present writer's research into the handwriting of Bach and that of his copyists⁷ puts him in a particularly good position to take up Smend's *Critical Report* again. On the basis of new knowledge of

handwriting, he has dealt with Smend's theses in various arenas.⁸ A series of problems that have already been discussed there need only be touched upon here. The present discussion has one particular purpose: to establish the new edition as a unity. Aside from the important discoveries and theses that Smend's *Critical Report* offers, text-critical questions — indeed, the foundations of the edition — will occupy us for the most part. The renewed investigation of the sources has led, finally, to several new findings.

The sources are designated according to the Smend *Critical Report*:

- A Complete autograph score, P180
- B Original parts for the *Missa* (*Kyrie* and *Gloria*): Bibl. Dresden, Mus. 2405 D21, Aut. 2.
- A1 Autograph score of the *Sanctus*, P13/1
- B2 Original parts for the *Sanctus*, St. 117.
- C Copy of the complete score: Am. B. 3
- D Three volumes comprising a copy of the complete score: P572 (*Missa*); P23 (*Symbolum Nicenum*), P14 (*Sanctus* to *Dona nobis pacem*).

Moreover, the following abbreviations are also used:

- KB* Critical report of the Smend Edition (*NBA* II/1)
- BG* *Johann Sebastian Bachs Werke*, published by the Bachgesellschaft.
- Dürr* Alfred Dürr, "Zur Chronologie der Leipziger Vokalwerke J. S. Bachs," *Bach-Jahrbuch* 1957, pp. 5-162.
- NBA* *Johann Sebastian Bach, Neue Ausgabe Sämtlicher Werke*, published by the Johann-Sebastian-Bach-Institut in Göttingen and the Bach-Archiv Leipzig.
- TBSt* *Tübinger Bach-Studien*, published by Walter Gerstenberg, Trossingen, 1957, ff. Volume 1: Georg von Dadelsen, *Bemerkungen zur Handschrift Johann Sebastian Bachs, seiner Familie und seines Kreises*, 1957. Volumes 2/3: Paul Kast, *Die Bachhandschriften der Berliner Staatsbibliothek*, 1958. Volumes 4/5: Georg von Dadelsen, *Beiträge zur Chronologie der Werke Johann Sebastian Bachs*, 1958.

1. The Critical Report

The most striking feature of this new edition is not so much the main thesis itself as the certainty with which Smend presents it and its position at the midpoint of the discussion. Smend's efforts to solidify the independence of the parts and to deny the overall coherence of the whole permeate the descriptions and argumentation of the critical report like a *Leitmottiv*. Even the valuable observations about Bach's parody technique, the important proof of borrowings, the numerous illuminating observations of compositional methods that altogether distinguish the writer's consummate authority on Bach's works — even all of these stand in service of the reigning purpose.

The volume is divided into two chief sections of roughly the same size: an "Historical Presentation" which deals with the history of transmission as well as the genesis and original purpose of the individual sections, and a "General" and "Special Source Description," most of which is devoted to the listing of readings. While these are admittedly indispensable, they often remain inconclusive.

The role of interpretation is unusually strong for a critical report, even if one considers that the historical section begins with an overview of the sources, and that it sets forth their numerous idiosyncracies. The fact that the interpretation of the sources is placed before their actual description may indicate the value the editor attaches to it. Interpretations outweigh the purely descriptive passages in significance. This can be an advantage to such a comprehensive work as long as the source description provides a secure foundation.

Therefore, let us begin with the sources. Their classification by Smend in the first chapter is fundamentally important. By clearly distinguishing two transmission lines — *Type P180* and *Type AmB 3* — and presenting their special features, Smend has displayed a rational order in the rich transmission for the first time and traced it to a few principal sources. In the evaluation and dating of these principal sources, however, we find views that occasionally differ from recent source studies. In view of the numerous proven results of the present critical report, we hope that our addenda will be well received and that it will be understood that we are restricted to the space offered and therefore abstain from reemphasizing the brilliant and unquestionable results of Smend's work, whose fundamental significance is immediately recognizable.

Source A (*KB* pp. 15, 78-84, 209-214)

1. According to Smend, the volume is divided into two partial manuscripts (*KB* pp. 78-82 and 209ff.), which, if one disregards the later-inserted title pages and leaf 58 (pp. 111/112), are comprised entirely of gatherings of two folios each (*KB*, p. 210). Our investigations, however, resulted in the following picture:

No 1: Title page + 7 gatherings of two folios each (pp. 1-56) + a single folio with an inserted leaf (pp. 57-62: the stump of the original counterpage remains); + 4 gatherings of two folios each (pp. 63-94) and 1 leaf (pp. 95/96).

No. 2: Title page + a gathering of four folios (pp. 97-110 and 113-114) with inserted leaf (pp. 111/112) + 2 gatherings of four folios (pp. 115-146) + a gathering of two folios (pp. 147-152b). The leaf, which we have paginated 152a/152b and which is ruled on one side but not written upon, was evidently misplaced during an earlier restoration of the volume; it was inserted after the *Sanctus*. It appears there in the 1924 Insel Verlag facsimile and was described in that position by Smend, as it actually belonged there (*KB*, p. 185). As the mirror image of the ink shows, it originally belonged at the close of the *Symbolum*, behind page 152. It was put back in its correct position during the most recent restoration of the manuscript during the 1930s. Apparently Bach prepared the leaf for the material appended to the *Symbolum* (*Duo voces Articula*); he was unable to estimate the required extra space exactly.

No. 3: Title page + a gathering of four folios (153-168).

No. 4: Title page + a gathering of three folios (pp. 169-180) and a gathering of two folios (pp. 181-188).

2. The watermarks of parts 2, 3, and 4⁹ do not come from the period from September 1731 to January 1733,¹⁰ but rather from Bach's last years of life.¹¹

3. The handwriting features also show that sections 2, 3, and 4 really originated only in Bach's last years, perhaps about 1748/49.¹² The orthographic differences from the first half of the volume (*KB*, pp. 78ff. and 210ff.), that is, from the manuscript of the *Missa* that originated in 1733, are to be explained by the difference in time, rather than by any original lack of connection between the partial manuscripts. In our view, the principal support thus collapses for Smend's stipulation that the two "volume halves" should be investigated separately (*KB*, pp. 84, 128).

4. Numbers 2, 3, and 4 were not written into an already bound volume (*KB*, pp. 79, 129); rather, each was scribed into loose gatherings just as No. 1 was. Indeed, as our investigation of paper gathering shows, each number was separate, beginning with a new gathering. Thus, the volume is comprised of four component manuscripts, not two. Furthermore, one may not conclude that Bach entered Nos. 2-4 into an already bound volume because he ruled the pages differently in No. 1 than in the rest of the volume (clefs and signatures at the center of the opening (*KB*, pp. 78, 210). This is simply a change in manner of notation. In later years, Bach spared himself the repetition of clefs and signatures at the middle of the page opening, even when beginning a new gathering. Had the gatherings been bound together before the music was written in, such differences in height of the staves as at pages 130-131 would have been unlikely to appear.

5. As the misplaced leaf is put back in its correct position, pages 152a/b, the thesis collapses that Bach at first wanted to include another composition after the *Sanctus* instead of the *Osanna* (KB, p. 185f. and p. 195). Moreover, the temporary misplacement of this leaf suggests that the volume was restored at least once in earlier times. It is also questionable whether the binding, discarded during the most recent restoration, was indeed the original binding. Indeed, there is no evidence whatsoever that the four component manuscripts were bound during Bach's lifetime; it is clear that the majority of Bach's manuscripts were bound only later. In the present case, Bach appears to have been content to keep the loose gatherings together in folded folios, on the front pages of which he wrote the title of each section. When the manuscript was bound at a later time, the superfluous back sides of the folders were discarded, while the front pages, with their titles, were retained.¹³

One further observation: the manuscript of the *Missa*, which originated in 1733, ends with a single leaf. Could not that leaf be the back side of an original folder, on whose front page were written the title and purpose of the composition? It would seem likely that any such title would have had no relevance to the later connection between the four parts and was, therefore, discarded.

With these suggestions it is not so much our intent to venture new hypotheses as to show that the volume, as it exists today, permits no definite conclusions to be made about its original features. Thus, in our view, the question cannot be answered whether a title page for the total manuscript ever existed. Nor do the earliest copies, Sources C and D, permit any solid conclusions, since they were made at least 15 to 18 years after Bach's death. More reliable observations about the manuscript's original condition could certainly have been made at the time of the last restoration than today, since in its disassembled state one could have investigated the manuscript itself and the old binding in all their details. But, unfortunately, this unique opportunity passed. Our goal will have been fulfilled if libraries have detailed descriptions made during future restorations of valuable sources.

6. In view of the structure of Source A, with its four component manuscripts, Bach's conventional inscription "*Fine SDG1*" at the close of Part Four takes on particular significance. A corresponding inscription is found only at the close of the first component manuscript (it is undisputed that the "*Missa*" originated as an independent work) but not at the close of the *Symbolum* or the *Sanctus*. Not even a simple *Fine* can be found at those places. In the context of other Bach manuscripts, one may, in our opinion, regard this inscription to be an indication of the connection between the four parts.

7. We will investigate the authenticity of the various layers of correction, according to which Smend dates later revisions of the *Missa* and the *Symbolum*, in connection with the sources C and D.

Source B (*KB*, pp. 15ff., 856-97, 120-123, 214-221)

1. These original parts for the *Missa*, presented to the Dresden court on July 27, 1733, provide the *Terminus ante quem non* for the origin of the first part of Source A (*KB*, pp. 85ff.).

2. Since they contain “more” than the score — the bassoon part, the figured organ part, the different readings for the two flutes, as well as countless articulation signs and other performance indications found only in this source — these parts are of great significance for textual criticism.

3. Together with the dedication, they provide the only evidence relevant to the question whether the *Missa* was performed at any time during Bach’s life.

4. The *Critical Report* provides fundamental and illuminating discoveries for the first point. For the second and third points, the identification of scribes and the interdependence of parts is important. We here provide several corrections and elaborations to the *Critical Report*, pages 214 following:

Title page:	It seems entirely possible that the decorative script in the dedication, title, and scoring are autograph (with, of course, the exception of the later emendation to the violins).
Oboe I:	Anonymous 20: pages 1-4, eighth line, penultimate measure. Autograph: rest of part, as well as revision of the non-autograph part. The performance indications were added, and the false accidentals corrected that were mistakenly included when transposing the <i>Oboe d’amore</i> part by the interval of the third.
Oboe II:	Anonymous 20: pages 1-3. Autograph: rest of part, as well as revision of the non-autograph part.
Violin Ib:	Except for the autograph part-specification, completely in the hand of Wilhelm Friedemann Bach. Traces of autograph revision are not to be found in the photocopy available to us.
Soprano I:	Philipp Emanuel Bach: pages 1-8. Autograph: page 9.
Soprano II:	Philipp Emanuel Bach: pages 1-7, line 7, measure 2 (whether the corrections are in part in the hand of J. S. Bach cannot, in our view, be determined). Autograph: rest of page 7.

- Violoncello:** Except for the autograph part-specification and the autograph revision, written by Anna Magdalena Bach.
- Basso Continuo:** Anonymous 20: part designation, movement titles, and musical text on pages 1-10.
Autograph: pages 11 and 12, as well as figures and revision of the non-autographic part.

On the basis of the collection of the parts B, and particularly because of the continuo part's singular handwriting (in Smend's view), and also his view that the continuo part was copied from the cello part, Smend concludes:

...that Bach did not present the Parts B to the Dresden court for the purpose of any performance of the work in Dresden, nor did Bach even write them out with such a goal in mind; rather, Bach in fact produced them for his own use, so that the *Missa* was performed in Leipzig before July 27, 1733 (*KB*, p. 122).

But in our opinion, the following considerations dispute this:

a) Based upon the collection of parts (*KB*, p. 21), Smend concludes that the parts were at first complete, that they included the usual duplicates, and that Bach gave away from this once complete collection "only so much that the complete work was represented"; that he kept, for example, the duplicate part for the second violin. But this is only one of many possible explanations for the nature of the Dresden parts. Why should Bach be protective of the parts when the favor of the elector was at issue? And, if it were indeed his intent to retain as many parts as possible, why did he not choose the option suggested by Smend himself, namely, to have the violin solo from the *Laudamus te* copied (it fills only a single page) and to include it with the first *ripieno* violin? Why aren't the retained parts transmitted with the score, as is usual with duplicate parts? One must also consider the scoring of Dresden church music. How many violins were available there? Did performers sit or stand? (In the latter case three players could have used a single part.) In short, Smend's hypotheses must at least be supported by further argument. Unfortunately, both observations that he draws upon have proven to be misleading.

b) There is, in fact, no evidence for the notion that Bach had the figured continuo part (in chamber-tone, in contrast to Leipzig practice) written out only later and that it replaced an earlier part written in choir-tone, "which would have made the piece unplayable in Dresden." (*KB*, p. 121). The part's handwriting in no way sets it apart from the rest of the parts; indeed, the handwriting corresponds completely to the two oboe parts written out by Anonymous 20.

c) Finally, a comparison of the parts with one another and with the score shows that the figured continuo part cannot be a copy of the cello part (as Smend maintains, *KB*, p. 96, 121). If one is in fact copied from the other — and there is some evidence of this — then the relation can only be reversed.¹⁴ By all appearances, the continuo part goes directly back to the score.¹⁵ With this, the most important support collapses for the thesis that the Dresden parts go back to an original collection prepared for Leipzig. Nevertheless, it cannot be stated with certainty that the parts were written out expressly for presentation; the figured continuo part in question could indeed have belonged to the Leipzig material as a continuo duplicate. But the parts were in all probability intended for Dresden. Other details are in keeping with such a purpose: the exceptionally calligraphic nature of the parts, and the figured continuo part, which, with its interpolated performance cues, has all the appearance of a conductor's part. Also, the scribes who participated in this project seem to suggest a more personal context. Why should Bach prepare the parts for the city's official church music with only the help of his wife and sons, eschewing the services of copyists 8, 10, 11 who are otherwise known from this period? The evidence weighs in favor of the view that the parts were prepared for the express purpose of presentation to Dresden. At the same time, the question [as to] whether Bach envisioned a performance of the work in Dresden must remain open.

d) The only remaining argument in favor of the thesis that a performance in Leipzig preceded the presentation of the parts to Dresden is the form of the verb in the dedicatory title on the folder:

Gegen Sr. Konigl. Hoheit und Churfürstl. Durchl. zu Sachsen
bezeigte mit inliegender *Missa* . . . seine unterthänigste Devotion
der Autor Joh. Seb. Bach (*KB*, p. 122)

But is “bezeigte” truly the indicative of the past tense, as Smend maintains? Could it not just as easily be the conjunctive courtesy form? So far as we can see, Bach uses verb tense in his letters and testimonies with care, and clearly distinguishes between imperfect as narrative form (*Erzählform*) and the perfect tense as the form of the completed past. Had Bach meant to underscore the age of his “evidence of devotion,” he would probably have used the perfect tense, if not the pluperfect. Thus, we cannot draw such a wide-ranging conclusion simply from the form of the verb, as Smend does. His discussion of the commentary that Bach sent to the Dresden court together with the parts also provokes a certain mistrust of his interpretation of the dedication title. Although the letter is much more expansive than the dedication, it contains no indication of an earlier performance. Indeed, it contains the clear request for permission to write church music for the Dresden court, and *Catholic* church music at that. Unfortunately, one must refer to the old *BG* or Spitta II, (pp. 518ff.) for this interesting document, which the *NBA* neglects to reprint.

With this new evaluation of Source B, the arguments that Smend advances for the parts' use in Leipzig as opposed to Dresden lose much of their force. Perhaps a close investigation of the figured continuo part could at least decide the question of the intended use of the surviving performance materials. Does the use of accidentals in the figures offer any evidence that the part was derived from a part in choir-tone? That would clearly be an argument for Smend's thesis! Or do the position of the figures and the autograph additions to the non-autograph portion suggest that the part was prepared as an *Organo* part as well? In this context an autograph addition in the first *Kyrie* becomes significant. The second half of measure 24, left out by the copyist, needed to be interpolated. The position of the interpolated half-measure clearly shows that it was inserted during the process of figuring the part, after the preceding notes were already figured, but before the following notes had received their figures. The cello part, which probably goes back to the continuo part, has the correct text at this point. Finally — should any question remain [as to] whether the cello part was copied directly from this continuo part — the nature of this correction suggests that the continuo part was indeed conceived as an organ part and that it was not used (unfigured) by the cello at a Leipzig performance. It is highly improbable that the omitted half-measure would not have been immediately noticed and corrected in rehearsal.

Sources A1 and B1 (*KB*, pp. 16, 166-173, 221-227)

Smend derives the *terminus ante quem non* for the inclusion of the *Sanctus* in P180 (Christmas 1736) from this original copy of the *Sanctus* and the accompanying parts. Clearly, this date is in need of correction.¹⁸ The arguments based upon the mistaken date become quite fragile, the notion of a lack of connection among the four numbers of P180, above all.

The investigation of the parts B1 shows particularly clearly how ill-defined the picture of J. S. Bach's handwriting was when Smend's critical report was written. The handwriting features that are discussed as being autograph on page 16 and pages 223 following, actually belong to no fewer than five different copyists, until now unknown. Except for several additions made during revision, which could just as well be in the hand of Anonymous 1, the extensive collection, comprised of 22 parts, is non-autograph throughout. We provide here corrections to the claims in Smend, (pp. 223-227); the various copyists are identified in order of their appearance (C1, C2, etc.).

Trumpets 1 and 2:	C1
Trumpet 3:	C1 (up to the part scribed by C2 and crossed out)
Timpani:	C1; C2 (from "Pleni" onward)
Oboes 1, 2, 3:	C1
Violin 1:	C3 (up to the entry on page 2 above; either autograph of C7)
Violin 1a:	C4 (up to measure 126); C5
Violin 2:	C6 (lines 1-3); C7
Violin 2a:	C4
Viola:	C1
Sopranos 1 and 2:	C8
Soprano 3:	C8 (up to the middle of line 8); C1 (rest of the page); C7 (page 2)
Alto, Tenor, Bass:	C8 (page 1); C7 (page 2)
Basso Continuo:	C9
Basso Continuo a:	C10
Basso Continuo b:	C4
Basso Continuo c:	C11 (up to line 8); C7

The majority of these copyists' handwriting are already known to us from other part materials. Thus we have solid evidence for the time of origin of the parts in question. Here is a concordance list of Tübingen and Dürr's nomenclature:

Tübingen	Dürr
C1: Anon. 2	Chief copyist C
C2: Perhaps Wilhelm Friedemann Bach	
C3: Anon. 21	Anon. IIIh
C4: Anon. 27	Anon. II f
C5: Anon. 28	Anon. II g
C7: Anon. 1	Chief copyist B
C9: Anon. 12	Anon. Vr
C10: Anon. 22	Anon. IIIj

The handwriting features of Anonymous 27 and 28 point to the turn of 1724; Anonymous 1, 2, 21, and 22 point to the period from the end of 1726 into 1727, perhaps 1728. Finally, Anonymous 12 appears only in the last years of Bach's life. When one considers the results of paper study, and, moreover, evidence gained from the watermark of the score A1 as well as direct and indirect connections between this score and *BWV* 133 and 249a, it becomes clear that the two sources for the *Sanctus* are comprised of three groups that originated at different times:

1. *End of 1724*: The Score A1 (Watermark: leaf a: half moon; leaf b: empty); three parts from B1: Vio. 1a, Vio. 2a, Bc b. (Watermark as in A1, scribes: Anonymous 27 and 28). According to a note on the score A1, Bach probably loaned the other parts to Count Sporck. They obviously were not given back.¹⁷

2. *End of 1726 to 1727, perhaps also 1728*: The other parts from B1, with the exception of the continuo part, called Bc by Smend.¹⁸ Apparently they were prepared for a repeat performance to replace those that had been loaned out.

3. The continuo part in the hand of Anonymous 12, called Bc by Smend, comes from the last years of Bach's life. Although it is scarcely older, and probably younger, than the fair copy of the *Sanctus* in Score A (P180), it corresponds to the readings in Score A1 and of the other continuo parts in B1, without following the corrections in the fair-copy score. Even after the new score was prepared, then, the *Sanctus* was performed using the older materials. Smend's thesis thus stands confirmed that the *Sanctus* score in A "stands in no direct connection to Bach's musical practice" (KB, p. 177). But in contradistinction to Smend's conclusions, we see in this an argument in favor of the work's unity. For clearly, the work as it stands in A is part of an abstract sequence that had nothing to do with any musical performance, an abstract sequence that joins the *Sanctus* with the preceding *Symbolum* and the following movements from the *Osanna* to the *Dona nobis pacem*.¹⁹

Sources C and D (pp. 16f., 22, 115-119, 126f., 152-162, 186, 196, 227-230)

Smend regards these as being contemporary copies, prepared under Bach's supervision. The first, he maintains, is a copy by Kirnberger, prepared during his Leipzig apprenticeship in 1739-1741. Smend even believes he has found autograph corrections in the second copy (prepared by an unknown scribe), which would give this copy the authority of a final authentic version. Smend thereby establishes his *termini* for the assembling of the score A (P180), as well as later authentic arrangements and repeat performances of individual parts of the work.

Unfortunately, earlier conclusions as to the origins of both sources have proven to be misleading. They were based, in the first case, on the name "Kirnberger" [appearing] on the title page, and, in the second case, on an older note in the catalog of the Berlin State Library. Source C is in fact not in Kirnberger's hand at all, but in the hand of a copyist in Kirnberger's employ at the Berlin Amalien Library: Anonymous 402,²⁰ whose numerous copies, so far as they are known to us, began to appear during the 1760s and 1770s. Paper type and the features of the handwriting also associate the source with the majority of the manuscripts prepared for the Amalien Library between 1760 and 1770. Source D comes from an unknown copyist in Berlin from the C. P. E. Bach circle: Anonymous 300. In numerous manuscripts, he appears together with the Berlin musician S. Hering.²¹ His work period also falls for the most part

during the 1760s and 1780s. That he may have worked under Johann Sebastian Bach in Leipzig is improbable and can hardly be established on the basis of the corrections in the first half of the manuscript. In our view, they can in no way be in the hand of the cantor of St. Thomas.²²

With this new evaluation of sources C and D, the *terminus* for the assembling of the partial manuscripts of A, 1738-39, vanishes. Moreover, the arguments upon which Smend based his theses of independent arrangements and performances of separate parts of the work (with the exception of the changes made in connection with the *Gloria*, Cantata, BWV 191) are proved unworkable. These theses were strong arguments against the unity of the work.²³

The new evaluation of the sources affects the textual criticism as well. The omission in Source D of the newly texted *Duo voces Articuli 2* must be understood as a simplification by the copyist. The form of the *Symbolum* with the new text of *Et in unum*, designated as "intermediate version" by Smend (KB, p. 161), must be regarded as the final version. It belongs in the main musical text, and the material now in the main text belongs in the appendix. Otherwise, in accordance with Smend's aesthetic arguments (KB, pp. 152ff.), the choral version of the *Et incarnatus* would have to be omitted as well. But there is more: all of the later changes in score A, whose authenticity seemed at first to have been established by the sources C and D, must now be regarded as posthumous. The majority of the numerous corrections, regarded as autograph by the *Critical Report*, do not, in all probability, come from the hand of J. S. Bach. For the most part, they probably go back to Philipp Emanuel. In Smend's view, one of the main problems of earlier editions is that the corrections entered by Philipp Emanuel, in connection with his Hamburg performance of the *Symbolum* in 1786, were never eliminated (KB, p. 75ff.). But the new edition eliminates only a part of the posthumous changes — the "Hamburg" layer. The edition adopts the numerous changes that were entered between Bach's death and the preparation of sources C and D. These corrections are scarcely different in character from the "Hamburg" layer.

Thus the investigation of the principal sources A, B, A1, B1, C, and D leads us to findings that deviate significantly from those of Smend. How strongly the new evaluation of the sources corrects Smend's view of the origin and further development of the work can best be seen by referring to Tables I and II (KB, pp. 191-196), in which Smend summarizes the results of his source evaluation. The majority of the dates and processes given there is now, as we suggest, untenable or at least questionable.

But Smend's classification of secondary sources and his ordering of lost sources (KB, pp. 17-54)²⁴ remain of fundamental importance. Similarly, the second chapter, which investigates the history of early prints up to the two BG editions of 1856 (V. 6) and 1857 (V. 6a), yields significant conclusions. Furthermore, the two introductory chapters contain a wealth of material concerning the Bach Renaissance. The main goal of this discussion,

nevertheless, is to show how the four independent parts of Score A (according to Smend's view of the transmission) came ultimately to be seen as a total work in the sense of a "Catholic Mass."

Smend has convincingly described the second phase of this development, whereby Bach's Mass came to be seen as similar to the Roman Mass. But is the point of departure so clear? Are there really unequivocal indications that the four parts of Source A, for example, were understood by Bach's sons to be independent works? Smend's main arguments — that the *Necrology* lacks any citation relating exclusively to a *Missa tota*, and that Philipp Emanuel Bach performed the *Symbolum* independently in 1786 — these arguments seem equivocal. We have dealt with the first case in TBSt 4/5, pages 151 following; here we need only refer to that discussion. The second case remains, the independent performance of the *Symbolum* in 1786. The program book survives and is reprinted in the *Critical Report*, page 39. It includes, in addition to Bach's *Credo*, Handel's *Halleluja* and the aria, *Ich weiss, dass mein Erlöser lebt*, among other things. Both are independent numbers, and neither carries any indication that it is part of the *Messiah*! As is well known, it was usual, in the early period of the concert hall tradition, to excerpt parts of larger works and to perform them as independent compositions. No great importance was assigned to the philological accuracy of completeness of either program titles or the labeling of performance materials. Smend (*KB*, p. 42) then states:

What the title of the program sheet does not disclose is to be seen in P22 and St 118 [the score and parts prepared for this performance]: C. P. E. Bach regarded this setting of the *Symbolum* as an independent composition.

In our view, nothing more is to be gleaned from the two sources than is already apparent in the program book. The larger context, from which the *Credo* was taken, is not mentioned. And why should it be? The concert was a benefit concert; the profit went to the Medical Institute for the Poor. Philipp Emanuel Bach, then, certainly did not regain his expenses. But he could replace one part of his ancillary expenses. So he had his scribe Michel copy not only the parts, but also the score. That was not necessary, since he could have conducted the piece from the autograph (if he needed to refer to a score at all). But the copy of the score complemented the collection of parts, completing the "performance material" for the work, which he could lend out for an appropriate fee. And this "performance material" was naturally more valuable if it contained a complete work, not a section of a larger one. Thus, there was no reason to take any particular note of the larger context of the piece in the score's title.

This interpretation of the sources is made within the context of a review and is not meant to be ultimately definitive. But perhaps it shows the dangers that the philological method is faced with where the sources offer no unequivocal evidence. The art of interpretation can find its escape easily; argument can be mounted against argument. Thus: Philipp Emanuel found it necessary in his

Hamburg performance to preface the *Credo* with an instrumental introduction. Since it had been separated from its context in the Mass, it needed a special introduction. One might explain this procedure, then, as an argument for the unity of the work. Smend, nevertheless, argues differently:

In the Leipzig church service the organ 'preludized' before the principal musical work. Thus the Hamburg composer wrote an instrumental introduction, in which he imitated the two opening lines of "Allein Gott in die Höh sei Ehr' after the manner of Pachelbel, thus touching on musical as well as churchly tradition.

An argument, then, for the independence of the *Symbolum*.

These remarks on the description of sources may suffice. They do not touch on the numerous discoveries of "borrowings" and of Bach's method of arranging in general, which, in our view, comprise the particular value of the new edition.²⁶ Rather, they deal with chronology and the evaluation of sources and, moreover, the question of contemporary performances.²⁸ It scarcely needs to be mentioned at this point that, in light of the new dates and connections, the independence of the various individual parts — in particular the "Cantica hypothesis" (*KB*, pp. 189-191) — is only scarcely supportable. We need only refer to our discussions in TBSt 4/5, (pages 153ff.) and in the *Festbuch des 35. deutschen Bachfestes*.²⁷ The four-part structure of the autograph score — Smend's weightiest argument against the unity of the work — is to be explained by the work's genesis itself. The *Missa* and *Sanctus*, already present, were complemented by the newly composed *Symbolum* and the movements from *Osanna* to *Dona nobis pacem*. However, we must emphasize that the incomplete transmission of Bach's performing materials prevents any indisputable conclusion as to the purpose of the autograph score. Thus Smend's main thesis may be seen as a personal expression in the realm of aesthetics and interpretation. Whether it serves well as the foundation of a critical edition seems to us questionable.

In our view, interpretative and stylistic research will be most valuable if it considers the Mass compositions of Bach's middle German contemporaries, in particular those of Heinichen, Zelenka, and Hasse, as well as their Italian and Viennese models. Bach's Mass may not have been so isolated in its time as has been thought until now. The parody of the *Gratias* by the *Dona nobis*,²⁸ the dual tonality B minor/D major are difficult to explain in light of Bach's other works. However, such devices appear to be general formal principles in Catholic Mass compositions circa 1730-1750. Moreover, the work's overall structure, its disposition of arias and choruses, the fugal and concerto-like sections all appear to point to the Mass compositions of the Neapolitan school.

[2.] The Musical Text

1. Our remarks up to now have concerned the *Critical Report*. Its breadth and the significance of the theses put forward in it make it the principal object of

interest. Nevertheless, the editor saw his principal task as preparing a truly authentic musical text. This did not mean simply avoiding the mistakes of older editions, which mostly go back to *BG* 6 and 6a, and which, in turn, represent composites of early and late versions, and inauthentic revisions in source B, as well as Sources C and A (after the Hamburg revision; *KB*, pp. 66-67). Above all, it meant fulfilling the new philological demands of making the edition as authentic a reflection of the sources as possible. This is a particular difficulty for the present work, since the sources for the four parts differ considerably. The existing original manuscripts include: 1. *Missa*: score and parts. 2. *Symbolum*: score. 3. *Sanctus*: score, as well as score and parts of the early version of twenty years before. 4. *Osanna to Dona nobis*: the score.

It would have seemed appropriate to choose the most detailed texts from among these; to consult the rich performance indications in part materials where available; and, for the parodies in the *Gloria* and in the second and fourth sections, to consult the surviving sources of the models as well as those of the parodies. Here again, Smend goes his own way concerning fundamental considerations (see pp. 205-207 of the *Critical Report*). The decision with direct consequences concerns the relation between score and parts. It is stated [as follows]:

Editions of the works of Bach up to now have followed the following rule: the edition shall, wherever possible, offer everything that appears in autograph or original sources; where variants occur it is the rule to give precedence to the reading in the part.

Nevertheless, if we may summarize: (a) in Smend's view, the parts contained many directions that were meant only for individual musicians; and (b) even though they contained more than the score, the parts seemed carelessly written-out overall and contained innumerable contradictions, especially where the placement of slurs was concerned. Therefore, Smend decided, "insofar as it seemed possible, to hold fast to the account of the autograph score." Should the parts deviate from that, the variants would be identified in the *Critical Report*, though in extreme cases only in a restricted selection. In only one case does Smend grant fundamental precedence to the parts over the score — in the question of dynamic indications (*KB*, p. 207).

2. These are clear principles, which appear to have a good deal to be said in their favor, particularly in view of the different transmissions of the individual Mass sections. Therefore let us test the viability of these principles in one example, the first *Kyrie*, and compare Sources A and B with the musical text of the *NBA*.

Doubts arise upon first glance. The bassoon is contained in B, but not in A. The *NBA*, naturally, must consult the bassoon part. It also cannot omit the figures for the continuo, which are to be found only in B. And finally the *NBA* must follow the flutes' independent text in B, rather than simply notate them with the oboes *colla parte* as in A. For these four of the fourteen parts, we must give precedence to B, because the parts are found only incomplete in A, or not at all. Now, if one takes the score to be the sole source for the text of the other ten parts,

which also are found in B, the only result can be an inconsistent replica of the score, particularly where articulation is concerned. For although only B can be definitive for the one, only A can be fundamental for the other, if the editor is to take his decision seriously.

This contradiction is, finally, only one of the reasons why the principle of giving the score precedence over the parts is highly questionable. Bach entered the majority of performance indications only in the parts. These include directions as to articulation, ornaments, tempo, and dynamics; they are, in our view, of interest not only to the individual performer but also to the user of the score, either for study or performance. In applying dynamic indications, Smend immediately departs from his principle and follows the parts. Why not for tempo indications? At the beginning of the first *Kyrie*, for example, we miss the usual *Adagio*. It is found only in the parts, not in the score. But the new edition adopts the performance direction *un poco piano* in the violins and violas only five measures later from the very same parts; and in other ways, as we shall see, Smend follows the parts far more than the score, in these first measures. His exception in the case of tempo indications is prompted by his view that these indications were relevant only for individual performers.

Smend finds justification for this view (*KB*, p. 206) in the case of the *Qui tollis*. In Smend's view, the *Lente* placed there by earlier editions gave the false impression that the movement was to be performed at a slower tempo than the preceding *Domine Deus*. Now, we are not sure whether Bach means a slower tempo with the *Lente*, which he writes above the parts entering in the *Qui tollis* in B, or whether he only wanted to counteract the impression of quickened tempo accompanying the transition to the 3/4 meter. But we would like to assume that this indication is just as relevant for the user of the score as for the performer of the individual part. Does the impression of the score really become deceptive with this addition? Or, to put the matter differently, is it really unequivocal without the addition? Does the lack of a tempo indication at a change of meter inevitably indicate that the quarter-note motion of the preceding movement is to be continued without change? And, even if doubts persist about this case, the addition of an *Adagio* at the beginning of the first *Kyrie* could scarcely be misinterpreted.

But this is not the only argument against the view that tempo indications which appear in parts alone should be ignored by a new edition of the score. This view presumes that Bach's scores had the same purpose as the printed scores in our critical complete editions — in other words, that they were prepared so that the work of art could be studied and conducted in its authentic form. However, insofar as the scores were not fair copies, they had a completely different purpose. They were, in the first place, composition scores. In their rough, often sketchy manner of notation, they were similar in many ways to the old *Tabula compositoria*. Also, scores were used by copyists in preparing the parts, which then had to be revised by the composer. That is to say, the parts were not only corrected, but fully realized, and their detail made precise. In this way the principal purpose of the score was fulfilled. It is to be assumed that the

score also served the composer as an aid in studying and conducting the music. But the score was not indispensable for these tasks. If Bach presented the Dresden court with the parts of his *Missa* but not the score, if he lent Count Sporck the parts of his *Sanctus*, if he had only the parts printed of his Mühlhausen cantata *Gott ist mein König*, he followed general custom in all of these cases. For [during] the seventeenth century and much of the eighteenth century as well, the score was necessary neither for the performance nor for the study of musical works, however richly scored. Indeed, since the parts contain a large part of the performance indications, the independent parts for several instruments, and, above all, the figures for the continuo, the “complete” picture of the work emanates primarily from the parts. The score contains, comparatively, only the skeleton. Should a new edition really give only this skeleton in the main text and reproduce the complete work only in the accompanying *Critical Report*? The answer to this question, for the music of Bach in any case, is self-evident.²⁹ We must not be led to view the parts as being a transmission source of the second rank because the parts are often written hastily or because they contain contradictions and therefore, in some cases, yield precedence to the readings of the score.

3. Smend bases his decision to give primacy to the score upon contradictions within the parts, particularly as regards articulation. Therefore, let us see how far the new edition follows the score and to what extent its indications are consistent. Of the fifteen slurs that Smend places in measures 1-4 of the first *Kyrie*, Score A contains only nine while B contains 13. He adds one [slur] by analogy (*Oboe d'amore* I, measure 2); and he omits one in A (Soprano II, measure 3, sixth eighth-note); he also omits two that appear only in B (viola, measure 4, first eighth-note; tenor, measure 2, first quarter-note). In the *Adagio* introduction the new edition follows B much more than A, but not exclusively, as we shall see. The original sources can be reconstructed only approximately from the *Critical Report*. The lack of a slur in B is not mentioned (*Oboe d'amore* II, measure 2). The second violin, measure 4 reads the same in B as in A. The different reading in the *Critical Report* should be deleted.

At the beginning of the *Largo*, A was clearly given more weight. Nevertheless there are slurs that appear only in B (for example, in Violin II, measure 506 and above the second quarter of measure 8). But why are these alone adopted from B and not the slurs above the third and fourth quarters of measure 7 [also] found in B? Why not the slurs in Violin I, measure 8, second half, and measure 9, sixth and seventh eighth-notes, or, moreover, Flute II, measure 9, sixth to eighth sixteenth-notes? The new edition places two slurs in measure 14 of the *Oboe d'amore* II that are found neither in A nor in B, without mention of this fact in the *Critical Report*; the edition omits the corresponding slurs in the *colla parta* Flute II, which are notated in B but not in A. There is a trill in Violin II, measure 17 in the new edition. It is found in Source B, along with the accompanying slur. Why are the slurs two bars earlier in B included but not the trills found with them? Why is the corresponding ornament omitted in Violin I, measure 16, penultimate eighth-note? We will stop here and come back to the question of articulation later, in connection with the *Cum Sancto Spiritu*. But

it is clear from this brief survey that the new edition follows neither A nor B; nor, can it be said, in any fundamental sense, to represent an assembly of the most complete possible text from the two sources.

4. Several remarks on other movements should be added. On page 254 of the *Critical Report* it is mentioned that, in the second *Kyrie*, the edition does not adopt those slurs in the instrumental parts that are taken from the vocal parts — even though they are cited in the *Critical Report*. But the actual edition contradicts this, as one can see in measures 25-27 and 47-48.

In establishing the text of the *Gloria* (the *Et in terra*, the *Domine Deus*, and the *Cum Sancto Spiritu*) the later parody, Cantata 191 (P 1145), should have been consulted. Several mistakes precipitated by corrections in A could then have been avoided. For example, the last reading in A of the *Cum Sancto Spiritu*, basso continuo, measures 90-91, is confirmed by P1145; it is a clear improvement over the original reading, adopted by the *NBA*.³⁰

In the flute part of the *Domine Deus* Bach wrote a Lombard rhythm instead of simple sixteenths: thirty-second — dotted sixteenth — thirty-second — dotted sixteenth, and so forth; naturally, this manner of performance applies to the other corresponding sixteenth-note figures of this movement. This performance direction, already the subject of a dispute between Rietz (*BG* 6, p. XX) and Spitta (*Bach* II, p. 350), is passed over by the new edition.

Occasionally one has the impression that the editor may have had only inadequate photocopies of Source B at his disposal. This would probably best explain why dynamic indications written in light ink were overlooked, such as that in Violin II in the *Qui sedes* (mm. 5, 23, and 35). Moreover, we would expect an *a tempo* indication (distinguished as an editorial addition) in this movement at the last eighth-note in measure 74.

In the *Quoniam*, the original notation of the French horn at the octave was mistakenly adopted. More recently, the “Kleinen Paritur-Ausgabe” of Bärenreiter Verlag has corrected this oversight by placing an “8” below the treble clef.

5. Let us now return to the differences that appear in the parts proceeding from Source B. In deciding for the score and against the parts, Smend expressly calls attention to the inconsistent slurs that appear in the parts for the *Cum Sancto Spiritu*, (mm. 21ff.). On page 219 of the *Critical Report* he compares various placements of slurs in the opening measures of A and B to one another. But the articulation cited in A needs correction. There, A has slurs above sixteenth notes, exactly as does B: the 3rd to the 4th, the 5th to the 6th, the 7th to the 8th and — if one wishes to make sense of the stroke-like mark above the last quarter measure — the 9th to the 12th. In Violin I the two slurs above the last quarter run together in the middle. Since Bach often “breaks” longer slurs in this fashion, it is unclear whether he meant two slurs or only one. But even if one proceeds from this original text, one recognizes that articulation signs in A are scarcely less consistent than in B. But the inconsistency of B was the editor’s main reason for deciding in favor of A. In practice, the new edition deviates from this decision as well. On page 320 it states:

In this and similar situations...the report does not include variants. The edition uses readings in A in the oboes and strings, and readings in B in the flutes.

The second part of this comment is probably to be understood as a general principle. Thus, the first slur in Flute I, measure 21, is supplied by the editor according to his judgment. The same goes for the slurs in Violin I, measure 24, and in Flute II and Oboe II, measures 25 following. In several cases the editor conflates the articulation; in other, similar cases he ignores it. The result is a musical text that is scarcely less inconsistent than that of the parts B and, nevertheless, retains their poor qualities, so that it corresponds to none of the sources, and does not allow reconstruction of the original slur placement, even with the help of the *Critical Report*. Thus, in nearly every case, the scholar must consult the sources themselves for confirmation. And the performer is scarcely in any better condition. Since he cannot know how the inconsistent slur placement in the new edition was established, he is led to believe that it represents Bach's express intention. He will perhaps interpret the contradictory placement of slurs as being for some special effect and have his musicians oppose one another's articulation patterns bizarrely. Since the performance material remains true to this text — certainly against Smend's wishes — such a misapprehension is very possible.

On page 206 of the *Critical Report*, Smend inveighs against the predilection of earlier editors to "distill" from the mulifarious, contradictory articulation patterns of Bach parts "a normal type of slur placement and to extend it to all parts in the printed score." Clearly people have occasionally gone too far in such conflation. But these excesses of consistency do not, in our view, relieve the editor of the task of distinguishing the intentional from the random in Bach's articulation. If the relationships among the various parts can be clarified, useful findings can generally be obtained. But even where that is not possible, the editor, in our opinion, should have to decide upon an unequivocal text.

6. This applies not only to articulation, but also to the notes themselves. Here, the new edition is substantially improved compared to the old. The chief question is to what extent the editor may deviate from the original in rendering an exact text. Obvious errors in the source should be corrected without comment. But may one do the same with incorrect progressions, that is, parallel octaves and fifths and other grammatical mistakes that Bach obviously overlooked? Bach himself generally corrected such errors later upon checking and revising his work. And if Philipp Emanuel's corrections in Source A frequently break up forbidden parallel movements, the son is proceeding just as his father did. In general, we would therefore adopt such corrections by Philipp Emanuel in the new edition. But, even he overlooked some things. For example, in the *Et incarnatus est*, the bass in measure 11, second quarter should read "g-sharp," (corresponding to the basso continuo) so that the octave with the alto would be avoided, as well as the doubling of the leading tone.

A later owner of the score, perhaps Nägeli, marked obvious errors and omissions in the text (as well as some passages mistaken for errors) with crosses above or below the score system. This is the purpose of the "horizontal crosses," to which Smend draws attention on page 97 of the *Critical Report*, and whose locations he lists individually on pages 212 following.³¹ It is clear from several cases that they do not come from Johann Sebastian Bach and probably not from Philipp Emanuel either. So also either Bach or his son would surely have entered the missing rest in the continuo at the beginning of the *Dona nobis*, rather than marking the place with a cross.

Another example: the "c-sharp" in the *Gloria* in the second violin, measure 59, third eighth-note is clearly a careless error. Although this note appears in Source B as well as in the score of the *Gloria* of Cantata, BWV 191, it is nevertheless incorrect. The major seventh on a weak beat, with its irregular upward resolution, makes no sense here. The *Bachgesellschaft* edition (Volume 6) ventures d" without comment, and Dürr follows this in his new edition of Cantata 191 (NBA I/2).

7. The figuring of the basso continuo in the first section, the *Missa*, offers particular problems. Figured continuo parts are lacking for the other sections. Bach obviously supplied the figures from memory, without consistently consulting the score for comparison. This may explain why the figures contain numerous conflicts with the parts as notated in the score.³² There are numerous borderline cases, whose readings are not necessarily wrong, but which are also not unequivocally correct. Such cases will probably be resolved only on the basis of a comprehensive knowledge of Bach's method of figuring. The editors of the cantatas certainly have the experience necessary; this brief mention about these small though numerous inaccuracies is sufficient. Naturally, they should be corrected as soon as possible in performing editions.

Errors in earlier editions that resulted from misunderstandings of the original figuring are easy to correct. Here the new edition has removed many errors. We here give further corrections, without claiming comprehensiveness:

First *Kyrie*, m. 38, last eighth-note: lower number 2 (not 3)

m. 74, fifth sixteenth-note: 7

sixth sixteenth-note: 6 (instead of diminished 7 on the third eighth-note)

Christe, m. 7, last eighth-note: 3 (not 7)

m. 18, sharp missing in front of last eighth-note

m. 33, sixth to eighth eighth-notes: suspension dash

Second *Kyrie*, m. 37, second half: raised 2 (not 4)

m. 55, second quarter: suspension dash

Et in terra pax, m. 7, third quarter: another lowered 2

m. 49, 6. -8. eighth: suspension dash

Quoniam, m. 29, 4. -6. eighths: suspension dash

m. 80, 2. eighth: only 7 (the natural sign beneath is to be read as a correction "h" for the bass part)

Cum Sancto Spiritu, m. 23, third eighth-note: only 5 (the 6 above should be stricken)

In making these detailed comments on the musical text, we have also touched on general questions of editorial technique, the relation between the parts and the score, the adoption or correction of "authentic" inaccuracies, and questions of articulation and of figuring. In a critical edition, we expect a logical text that is free from inner contradiction. For the placement of slurs, that means that *colla-parte* and parallel parts within the same instrumental group should be similarly articulated. This does not mean that it is always necessary to extend the articulation of one section to its parallels elsewhere, or even that the same pattern must be transferred to all repetitions of a given figure. But passages that are played simultaneously should also make sense in the score. If this demand for logic in notation seems contradictory to the uncalculated, "pre-objective" nature of Baroque art works, then it poses a fundamental question to the meaning of our critical editions. Only facsimile publications should preserve the arbitrariness of the sources, since publishing lends to the arbitrary the appearance of intention. If an edition preserves the arbitrary nevertheless, it falsifies the artwork far more strongly than does a "logical" text that is free of inner contradiction.

This brings up the further question of the extent of the variant list. The old philological stipulation holds that one should be able to reconstruct the source with the aid of the "critical apparatus." If this principle is to be taken seriously, really important indications may be obscured by extensive peripheral detail. Furthermore, such lists of detail should be as free as possible from typographical errors and careless mistakes. In some cases it may be advantageous to omit such lists altogether, or at least to restrict them to the "most essential." Thus one consciously gives up the principle that one should be able to reconstruct a source from a *Critical Report* when photographs are readily available.

This obtains insofar as the sources of the whole are concerned. But the owner of a complete edition wants more precise information regarding the numerous specialized questions that arise while studying a work. Can one really suggest to him that he buy microfilms of the sources to go with the critical edition? As long as we do not create critical reports in the form of source reproductions with commentary, the editor will not be able to avoid long lists of apparently peripheral detail. Ultimately, he has no way of knowing beforehand what kinds of information others, particularly future users of his edition, may need.

Most importantly, debate does not stop with a new edition of a work; actually, it should be just beginning. The heaviest demand upon the editor, it seems to us, is to conduct a complete study and nevertheless maintain that it is only a beginning. In view of the numerous vital questions, how can he withhold his own hypotheses and restrict himself to offering the future user a broad and precise foundation for further

research? How can he resist attempting to base the description of sources upon his own interpretation, even though he knows that material description is itself a narrow, subjective interpretation? Therein lie the latent problems of critical editions in general. The present volume is particularly affected by them, because, at the time it was written, Spitta's chronology and the traditional evaluations of Sources C and D still appeared to be reliable. But Smend's conclusions did not need to be clothed in the raiment of hypothesis; they could have been advanced as plausible suggestions. We must recognize that the research into the philological problems that made a new edition of Bach's works necessary was not yet completed. The recent studies of chronology, of scribe identification, indeed, of the techniques for editing Bach's works in general had not yet been completed. We see this problem clearly today. But it first appeared in the context of editorial studies.

The first editors in a complete edition must always do the work of pioneers. They lay the foundation for further work, and they know that their volumes will be the first to be in need of revision. And yet scholarship may profit more from the problems of these volumes than from later, routine ones. Thus the value of the new edition of the B-Minor Mass will be preserved in spite of any criticism — and, indeed, not simply on the strength of the response it has provoked. This attempt to delve into the problems of Bach scholarship in the context of a single work is without comparison. Music philology is itself an art, one that offers the master high satisfaction, the satisfaction with which the human spirit sets about probing the wonder of musical works of art. The works of Friedrich Smend are magnificent examples of this; they serve as catalysts, not so much for the editorial facet of our discipline, but far more for its speculative side.

END NOTES

¹ This article was first published as "Friedrich Smends Ausgabe der h-moll-Messe von J. S. Bach" in *Die Musikforschung* 12 (1959): 315-335.

² Friedrich Smend, "Bachs h-moll-Messe: Entstehung, Überlieferung, Bedeutung," *Bach-Jahrbuch* 1937, pp. 1-58.

³ Philipp Spitta, *Johann Sebastian Bach*, 2 vols, 8th unaltered edition, (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1979), II: 518-544.

⁴ Es sei "nicht nur ein historisches Missverständnis, sondern auch ein künstlerischer Fehlgriff... von einer 'Messe in h-moll' oder gar von einer 'Hohen Messe' zu sprechen und die Sätze vom 'Kyrie' bis zum 'Dona' hintereinander aufzuführen." Smend, *KB*, p. 188.

⁵ Hermann Keller, "Gibt es eine h-moll Messe von Bach," *Musik und Kirche* (1957): 81-87.

⁶ Walter Blankenburg, "'Sogenannte h-moll-Messe' oder nach wie vor 'h-moll-Messe?'" *Musik und Kirche* (1957): 87-94.

⁷ Georg von Dadelsen, *Bemerkungen zur Handschrift Johann Sebastian Bachs, seiner Familie und seines Kreises* (Trossingen: Hohner Verlag, 1957), pp. 1-23.

⁸ See especially *Beiträge zur Chronologie der Werke Johann Sebastian Bachs* (Trossingen: Hohner Verlag, 1958), pp. 143-156.

⁹ Leaf a: heraldic lily, between chains; Leaf b: monogram similar to VO, between chains.

¹⁰ *KB*, pp. 78 and 163ff.; the papers compared there cannot be dated, according to recent research; and they are different from these in the position of the watermark "auf Steg."

¹¹ Cf. TBSt 4/5, p. 133, Mark Y, and Dürr, p. 144.

¹² Cf. TBSt 4/5, pp. 17 and 146ff.

¹³ It is striking that the title pages show ink marks from the following pages, but not those preceding; and, above all, that those preceding show no mark at all from the thickly inked title pages. These observations as to the quadripartite structure of the manuscript and the original storage of the single parts in the separate folders confirm Arnold Schering's view (*Bach-Jahrbuch* 1936, 22), attacked by Smend (*KB*, pp. 87ff.).

¹⁴ The following passages prove that the continuo part is closer to the score than to the cello part: *Christe*: measure 32: The false slur in BC, clearly suggested by the Score (A), is missing in the cello part; *second Kyrie*: BC follows the movement titles given in the score, while the cello part exchanges their positions. *Laudamus te*, measure 35, 4th quarter:

BC takes the unequivocal slur position from the score, while the cello part is ambiguous. *Qui tollis*: the continuous quarter-note motion in the cello part, which deviates from the BC, is corrected. *Quoniam*, m. 107, 4th 8: G in cello (wrong), A in BC and score (right).

¹⁵ That the cello part cannot go directly back to A is shown by a mistake in *Qui sedes*, m. 63, in the cello, as well as in the continuo. Both parts are corrected; but there are no such mistakes in the score.

¹⁶ Cf. TBSt 4/5, pp. 147-149; Dürr, pp. 77, 93.

¹⁷ Cf. TBSt 4/5, p. 148, and Dürr, pp. 77 and 93.

¹⁸ Watermarks: 1. Leaf a: empty; leaf b: crowned figure between twigs, ICF underneath; — 2. Double paper, embedded: great heraldic coat of arms of Schönburg and great crowned double-eagle with apple and sword; — 3. Singular marks. — Scribes: Anon. 1, 2, 21 and 22.

¹⁹ See TBSt 4/5, p. 155.

²⁰ Regarding Anonymous 402 and Anonymous 300 see TBSt 2/3, p. 139.

²¹ For example, in P 291 and P 329; further examples are to be found in St. 2, 27, 33b, 38, and 80, among others.

²² Moreover it seems to us — in contrast to Smend's claims for P. 22 among others — that the temporal relation between C and D remains most unclear. The priority of C is certain only for the *Symbolum*. With regard to the "Missa," D appears to be the earlier. Thus, several things seem to indicate that C and D were created alongside one another. Perhaps this is an indication that the separate parts of the score A (P180) were not yet bound at this time. Sources C and D can undoubtedly be dated more exactly with the help of paper and handwriting research. For internal and external reasons, we would consider the last part of C. P. E. Bach's Berlin period, around 1768-49, to be the most likely time of origin.

²³ Cf. *KB*, pp. 11, 186, pp. 195ff.

²⁴ One can make several insignificant additions to the copyists from TBSt 2/3, at least as regards the Berlin State Library. Here it will only be noted that the "Mater" of Vienna exemplars P 11/12, could only have been prepared in Vienna and not in Berlin, according to the watermark and the scribes; indeed, it was clearly in the possession of Baron von Swieten (cf. *KB*, pp. 48-52).

²⁵ See especially chapters V, X, and XV in the *KB*.

²⁶ Cf. TBSt 4/5, pp. 155ff.

²⁷ Stuttgart 1958, pp. 81ff.

²⁸ Cf. TBSt 4/5, pp. 152ff.

²⁹ We would like expressly to mention that the primacy of the parts over the score does not apply where the score already contains the complete image of the work; and that it further does not apply for that time and those works in which scoring and performance were generally freely decided — so that even original parts supplied only one manner of performance among other equally good ones. Thus it may be correct in the case of, for example, some works of the seventeenth century to give the score precedence over the parts or in any case to publish the score separately as a primary form of the work of art.

³⁰ For the last reading see *NBA* I/2, p. 228, mm. 96-97.

³¹ In some cases, the crosses refer to a false staff bracket.

³² For example: first *Kyrie*, m. 12, last eighth-note: lowest number 2 (instead of 3; corrected by the *NBA* without comment); m. 16, second number: 3 (instead of 8; also corrected without comment); m. 19: third eighth-note, lower number: 2 (instead of 3 with natural sign; not corrected by the *NBA*).