

are, unfortunately, not too clear. The excessive quotes from the two secondary sources cited earlier are perhaps the chief weakness in the study. It has caused the author to slip into some strange citations: Lucques for Lucca (p. 4), Lipsia for Leipzig (p. 21), Bibliothèque Nationale de Florence (p. 31, footnote 34), and so on.

Chapter 5 is devoted to an examination of 18 plates from the manuscript Vat. lat. 6082, a *missale plenum* from the 12th century. An index to this Gradual is found in Appendix A and the plates in Appendix B. The study is not a comprehensive analysis of each of the neumes and the various forms each neume takes in the manuscript but a select reference to some of the melodic differences between the Beneventan version on the plate and the Vatican Gradual. Occasional neumes of interest are pointed out. No attempt was made to compare this manuscript with the two Beneventan Graduals already published and indexed in Volumes 14 and 15 of the *Paléographie musicale*. Such a comparison, both with regard to contents and musical notation, would have added much to the dissertation.

Many of the plates in the Appendix are of interest in that they also contain examples of those manuscripts written in central Italy with non-Beneventan text but with a musical notation borrowed from the Beneventan. The importance of these manuscripts indicates a fertile area for subsequent studies.

REMBERT G. WEAKLAND, O.S.B. is coadjutor archabbot of St. Vincent Archabbey and chancellor of St. Vincent College.

Immanuel Willheim Johann Adolph Scheibe: German musical thought in transition

Ann Arbor: University Microfilms (UM order no. 63-5159), 1963. (299p., pos. film \$4.10; University of Illinois diss.)

Konrad Wolff

When composers double as writers, or vice versa, they usually create complications for posterity. Johann Friedrich Reichardt, for instance, is known to students of music history as one of the founders of the German lied and to students of literary history as the principal target

of Goethe and Schiller's satirical *Xenien*. Very rarely do the readers or even the authors of the one kind of history know about Reichardt's figuring in the other. It is therefore fortunate that the author of this dissertation on Scheibe (1708-1778), in addition to his musicological background, is schooled in German literature and in aesthetics. Scheibe was a respectable composer and a leading musical journalist. He also contributed much to the philosophy of the arts in general, both in Germany (where he grew up) and in Denmark (where he lived during the last thirty-eight years of his life). His best-known work, *Der Critische Musicus*, was originally conceived as a parallel to Johann Christoph Gottsched's *Versuch einer critischen Dichtkunst* of 1730. Gottsched, who was the most respected German author of the time and the leading authority on literature, had been Scheibe's teacher in Leipzig. His book was based on the so-called "rationalist" principles of 17th-century French drama. This was what Scheibe tried to translate into musical criticism, but with time, as Willheim demonstrates, he became increasingly less dependent on Gottsched's system.

To the music student of our time, Scheibe is mainly known for his "most unfortunate" (p. 240) controversy over the music of J.S. Bach. Scheibe accused him of an "overloaded (*schwülstig*) and confused style"¹ as well as an "excess of art." He also objected to Bach's custom of writing out embellishments in actual notes, which, Scheibe said, made the melody unintelligible besides depriving it of harmonic beauty. He concluded by judging that with all due respect for Bach's tremendous care and effort, his compositions were contrary both to Nature and to Reason.

Scheibe's attack created a sensation. While Bach himself did not reply, one of his admirers, J. Abraham Birnbaum, Leipzig professor of rhetoric, wrote a forceful defense. Further emphasis was given the battle by two famous musical authors, Mattheson and Mizler,² who opened their journals to Scheibe and Birnbaum, respectively, for the continuation of the fencing match.

The most unfortunate part of the quarrel was that Scheibe was prevented by the publicity of the affair from admitting that he had done Bach an injustice; however, in 1739 he did pay full tribute to the *Italian Concerto*.

It is hard to conceive how a good musician such as Scheibe could ever have been deaf to the values of Bach's music, considering that

¹His speaking of Bach as the "Lohenstein of music" shows Scheibe's dependence on Gottsched who used to say the same thing of all contemporary writers he disliked. Lohenstein was a "*schwülstig*" writer of the 17th century. Cf. Scherer-Walzel, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur*, (3d ed., Berlin, 1921), p. 309.

²Although he devotes a whole chapter to Mizler (69ff.), Willheim does not mention the significant fact that Gottsched contributed articles on music(!) to Mizler's journal. This may have been one of the reasons for Scheibe's dislike of Mizler and for his gradual estrangement from Gottsched.

during Scheibe's student years in Leipzig he had heard the master himself play. Willheim investigates the personal relations between Bach and Scheibe thoroughly and arrives at the convincing conclusion that there was no personal feud (as some Bach biographers believe). Nevertheless, it is quite possible that the young man, not being of a most generous disposition (a defect he shared with all the writers of his time), either consciously or unconsciously tried to get even with the one member of the older generation with whom he could never hope to compete.

Willheim is objective enough to sympathize with Scheibe's criticism that Bach wrote too unvocally. Even if true, to blame Bach on this account is as narrowminded a reproach as the opposite one by Nägeli who some eighty years later blamed Mozart for writing too vocally. To understand the problem one must remember that instrumental music, to which this criticism principally relates, was just then coming into its own. The great Lessing explained in 1767³ that an instrumental composer must be much more than a composer of vocal music and must always be prepared to give his best, since no text can come to his aid and fill the gaps in the expressive quality of the music.

Willheim regards Scheibe's initial aesthetic approach as deriving from Gottsched, that is, as essentially French. In a slightly oversimplified outline (20ff.) he describes the French style in music as vocal and expressive, centering on adagio pieces, in contrast to the Italian style of sensuous and lyric instrumental music in which the accent is on the allegro type. French music is characterized as rationalist—with reference to Cartesianism rather than the Enlightenment (p. 51)—and Italian music, as unphilosophical. Then Willheim shows that Scheibe gradually added the new idea of the century, Nature, to Gottsched's standards of French classical drama.⁴ To Scheibe, the element of Nature in music was Melody (p. 100), whereas Harmony represented the Art of illuminating the melody and nothing more; when he blames Bach for showing "too much art," he is referring to the fact that in Bach's music the harmony follows its own laws.

Later, in the chapter on rhetoric (p. 157), Willheim incidentally refers to Bach's occasional habit of expressing a variety of emotions throughout a cantata text by presenting the same melody in various figurations. However, this was just one of Bach's numerous ways of uniting the different parts of the same composition. Quite as frequently, he proceeds by harmonic means. The *Second Partita* is marked by the cyclic use of the dominant ninth chord and the *Goldberg Variations*, by the identity of the harmonic progressions and the harmonic rhythm without any help from melodic motifs.⁵

³Cf. the review of Voltaire's *Semiramis* in *Lessings Werke*, Georg Witowski, ed. *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* 5:12-17, (Leipzig, 1911).

⁴Cf. Pope (1711): "First follow Nature . . . at once the source, and end, and test of Art."

⁵Certain authors have seen a melodic motif in the bass line. This is not so; the aria is homophonic, and the bass is just a bass.

For this, Schiebe had no ear, though he was not insensitive to harmony as a means of expression. Willheim prints in the Appendix a recitative from Scheibe's cantata, *Ariadne*, which shows an amazing pre-romantic use of tritone progressions and dissonances.⁶ The appreciation of harmonic logic as a thing of beauty (as for instance in the works of Corelli and Vivaldi) was beyond his comprehension; here, expected harmonic progressions are judiciously mixed with mild surprises, and the result resembles one of Horace's or Cicero's well-shaped sentences. Bach added individual expression to this system by using dissonances and alterations whenever required, but he did not abandon the grammar of directed harmony for the sake of expressiveness as did Scheibe in his recitative.

Willheim neglects this aspect, and we should have liked more help from him from a strictly musical viewpoint. He does give us an interesting exposé of how Scheibe, by underlining melodic inspiration as a primary source of composing, in fact transcended the *Affektenlehre*. This is followed by a discussion of rhetorical figures, ways of writing (*Schreibarten*), national styles and types of music.

Willheim's report on Scheibe's doctrine of rhetoric is, on the whole, one of the best parts of the dissertation. Differently from Mattheson,⁷ Scheibe speaks of rhetoric only for the presentation of single phrases and not for the organization of a composition as a whole. In addition to strictly rhetorical figures, he also mentions three musical ones: *transitus*, *syncopatio*, and *ligatura*.

Scheibe's distinction between three different styles (*Schreibarten*) contains a few original points. He recognizes (129ff.), first of all, the *elevated* style (splendorous music appropriate for festive occasions or grand subjects), then the *intermediate* style (meaningful, pleasant, and flowing, but also intelligent)⁸ and finally the *low* style which has its rightful place in the pastoral *Schäferspiel* (of which later Goethe produced several examples). Willheim then deals with the traditional genres (*Gattungen*) of music as described by Scheibe, whom he justly blames for neglecting the chamber style. In the account of national styles, Willheim, without much support in Scheibe's writings,

⁶It always seems to me that German music was fully ready for Romanticism by 1750, when the eruption of Classicism halted this evolution for a great number of years. Figures like C.P.E. Bach and Scheibe, who combined artistic and literary productions, resemble Berlioz and Schumann in this respect, and are in contrast to Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven and Schubert.

⁷Cf. Hans Lenneberg's translation of much of *Der vollkommene Capellmeister* (not quoted by Willheim) in *Journal of Music Theory* 2:47-84, 193-236 (1958).

⁸"exceedingly clear, lively, fluent, and yet perspicacious," in Willheim's rendering.

classifies the *Polonaise* or *Polacca*⁹ as part of Polish music. By 1720 this dance had, in fact, become as international as the minuet. In this chapter, I missed a reference to Georg Muffat's epoch-making *Florilegium* of 1696-97.

The most progressive part of Scheibe's theories, and the climax of Willheim's dissertation, occurs in the section dealing with operatic recitatives. In this field Scheibe was several steps ahead of everybody else. It is entirely possible that Gluck—who may have met Scheibe in Copenhagen in 1747 (p. 203)—was influenced by Scheibe's concepts. (It would be a worthwhile task to compare Scheibe and Gluck's operatic ideas in detail.) The highest possible compliment was paid to Scheibe's views in 1767 when Lessing quoted them extensively in his review of Voltaire's *Semiramis* (p. 208).

Willheim's book is solid and informative as far as it goes. There are some editorial flaws in it, from typographical errors and unintended repetitions (one sentence appears twice, on pages 199 and 200) to mistranslations. Most of the essential passages from Scheibe's writings are fully quoted in German and then translated. Willheim translates "sie [die Natur] zu erhalten, ja so gar in bessern Stand zu setzen" by "to support it, to improve it," whereas it really means "to preserve it, and even repair it." (p. 101). On p. 95 he quotes Scheibe's assertion that symphonies must be judged by the fire of their invention and that it may happen that a composer, by force of trying to match the different parts skillfully, deprives himself of his spontaneous spark. "Man intersuche also nur, . . . ob alle Sätze gehörig mit einander übereinstimmen, und ob dahero den Komponisten vielleicht das Feuer verlassen hat." This means: "All that is necessary is to find out . . . whether the different movements hang together properly, and whether, *for this reason* (my italics), the fire has perhaps deserted the composer." "Dahero" can not mean anything else but an emphatic "for this reason." It is not correctly rendered in Willheim's translation: "One must observe . . . whether all movements are properly in agreement with one another, and whether the composer, perchance, has lost his fire in subsequent movements." There is no justification at all for adding the last three words, since the fire can have deserted the composer right in the beginning by force of his trying to make all movements "hang together properly." "Bewegungen," used by Scheibe as a technical term in two continuous sentences, is translated once by "movements" and once by "emotions" (p. 96). To use "motions" or "moving forces" both times would have preserved the thought expressed in the original German.

Shortcomings in the organization of the book disturb the reader. While respecting Willheim's reason for relegating the Bach controversy to the very end, I still think that it should have come at least

⁹Willheim (p. 148) speaks of the *Polacca* in the *First Brandenburg Concerto*, but Bach's name for the section in question was *Poloinesse*. Willheim does not mention the more typical *Polonaise* from Bach's *Sixth French Suite*.

before the discussion of opera (after Chapter VII), and perhaps even earlier. When I reached p. 100 ("When Scheibe attacked Bach for failing to keep music natural, or for an excess of art, Bach's friend and protagonist Magister Abraham Birnbaum rushed to his defense"), I felt that I had to turn at once to the concluding chapter and read that whole story first.

It is also confusing to the reader that Willheim is frequently at odds with chronology. In the Introduction, he immediately starts out with Kant, goes back to Thomasius, follows this by discussing first Gottsched and his generation, then Lessing (in the 1760's), and *then* speaks of the Scheibe of 1730. There are similarly confusing presentations to be found throughout the dissertation, for instance, in the (otherwise excellent) brief history of rhetoric during which Aristotle, Opitz (1624), Quintilian, and Burmeister (1606) are mentioned in this order.

My knowledge of the literature is not extensive enough to enable me to give a list of works which Willheim ought to have consulted, but it is certainly a serious matter that he did not incorporate in his research the excellent and thorough study of Scheibe by Max Graf in *Composer and Critic*, (W.W. Norton, 1947), pp. 77-85. Since Willheim's dissertation was written, a new and important study of Johann Friedrich Reichardt by Werner Salmen (Atlantis Verlag, 1963) merits investigation, for the two musician-journalists had much in common, including the curious habit of contributing to their own journals pseudonymous letters on controversial subjects.

On general aesthetics Willheim's sources are largely second- or even third-hand. I particularly object to the extensive use he makes of Windelband's philosophy textbook of 1891 which, despite the many editions it subsequently received, has always largely remained a collection of the philosophical blind spots of German academic intelligentsia in Wilhelmine times. Willheim is not personally close enough to the great men of whom he speaks. He pairs Lessing and Winckelmann (p. 16) and Moses Mendelssohn and Reichardt (p. 88) as though they were friends and/or equals. Preferring modern textbooks to contemporary sources, he writes with a regrettable lack of color. In describing the Swiss aestheticians of the middle of the century, for instance, he relies almost exclusively on Cassirer (p. 15). How much inner truth, lucidity, and fire could have been gathered for this chapter from Goethe's detailed exposé of their theories, as well as of their personalities, in the seventh book of *Dichtung und Wahrheit!* And how refreshingly does Goethe describe his visit with old Gottsched in Leipzig!

This leads me to the most serious defect of the dissertation: Scheibe does not come alive in it. We do not learn what he looked like or what his personal habits were. We are not informed that he was married for the last thirty-nine years of his life. We learn about his character only incidentally; yet his character plays a big role in explaining some of his actions, just as in the case of Reichardt. Willheim, for instance, uncritically swallows Scheibe's account of how he founded *Der Critische Musicus* together with Telemann who figured as a silent partner of sorts. But this account, for which there is no supporting evidence

whatever, was only written after Telemann's death! Can we trust Scheibe? Ruhnke (*Hans Albrecht in Memoriam*, Bärenreiter, 1962) doubts it seriously. Or take the fact that Scheibe, at the end of his life, enrolled as a Freemason, a fact which Willheim does not even mention. His collection of melodies to Freemason songs (1776) became very popular (the title page is reproduced in *MGG* 4:893). Was he sincere, or was it just another cultural fashion he thought he had to adopt? In any case, we ought to know more about Scheibe's religious beliefs. In his youth Leipzig was a battleground between the pietists and the antipietists (to which Bach belonged); this would presumably also throw additional light on some of Scheibe's aesthetic and ethical utterances.¹⁰

More than anything, we should like to know Scheibe better as a composer. Willheim discusses the recitative given in the Appendix with thoroughness and sensitivity, but there is much more to know about this man whose *oeuvre* C.F.D. Schubart said contained "quite a few works having a claim to immortality. Few composers knew how to write recitatives in so masterly a fashion; his arias too are full of lovely passages, and his choruses full-sounding and strong."

According to the article on Scheibe in *MGG* (by Caroline Bergner and Hans Gunter Hoke), three flute sonatas, other cantatas, and "songs for piano" (?) by Scheibe are in existence. If and when Willheim's dissertation is published—and I hope it will be—every interested reader will be grateful if the author were to include the maximum of available information on these works as well as an analysis of their character, style, and form. The artistic creations by theorists and critics, apart from their potential intrinsic value, constitute a most important test of the theories and criticisms voiced by their authors. To quote Pope once more: "Let such teach others who themselves excel."

¹⁰The religious element is also neglected in Willheim's resumé of French aesthetics. Malebranche's objections to art expressing passions, for instance, belong to the most important ideas of the time; yet Willheim fails to include them.