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“You keep using that word. I do not think it means what you think it means.”

Inigo Montoya
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**Introduction**

On one fine June evening in 2011, it was my good fortune to attend a concert performance of Handel’s *Agrippina* (1709), at the Händel-Festspiele in Halle (Saale).\(^1\) I knew it to be good fortune for many reasons. Europa Galante, Fabio Biondi conducting as concertmaster, played Handel’s orchestral writing with verve and artfulness. The singers performed beautifully, in such a way as to convince the audience that their concert dress concealed all the passions, and machinations, of opera seria’s ancient Rome. Finally, one musical moment in particular impressed me so much that I interpreted it as concrete proof that I was on the right track for the topic of my dissertation, and left the concert performance in the highest of spirits.

To put this in context: in proposing my dissertation, I had decided that I wanted to write about the phenomenon of “obbligato.” I knew exactly what this phenomenon was, having experienced it many times: the flute in the mad scene from *Lucia di Lammermoor* setting students on a field trip all abuzz (though it could have been the stage blood); the bells that magicked up a significant other for Papageno in Bergman's *The Magic Flute* (would that it had worked in high school);\(^2\) the violin in “Erbarme dich” reducing an

---


audience of West Michigan Calvinists to abject tears (no small feat)\(^3\); and my own
playing the viola for “Es ist Vollbracht” in my first performance of the *St. John Passion*.\(^4\)
(We lacked a viola da gamba, and through equal parts pseudo-etymological wheedling
and pure luck, I got to play the obbligato instead of the cellist.)

“Obbligato,” to me, meant something particular happening between an instrument
and a voice, whether in a sinuous overlap of timbres in a highly controlled texture (in the
Bach arias), or in the instrument achieving something supernatural (in the *Magic Flute*) –
or with both happening simultaneously (in the Mad Scene.) My understanding of it was
informed by those early experiences of staged, and heard, music, and by many more. I
knew instinctively what it meant; I wanted to hear more of it: to study it, to quantify it,
and to understand how it was able to accomplish what it did, for me.

Thus, when I heard the aria “Voi che udite” unspool over a hushed audience in
that 2011 performance of *Agrippina*, I knew that I was experiencing something special.
Xavier Sabata as Ottone sang the lament with all the plangent feeling it demanded, and
with a particularly accurate intonation and control of tone. His entrance was prepared by
a minor second suspension between first violin and viola, blooming into harmony. The
rhythmic similarity between string instruments and voice surely explained some of the
unsettling effect of the oboe entrance, floating over the texture like a ghost.

Regardless of reason, this moment was so striking that I noted the gesture that
Biondi used in cuing the oboe (though I had to wait for the da capo.)

---

\(^3\) Johann Sebastian Bach, *Matthäus-Passion* BWV 244, Bach Collegium Japan cond. Masaaki
Suzuki (Grand Rapids, MI: Calvin College, April 11, 2003).

\(^4\) Johann Sebastian Bach, *Johannes-Passion*, BWV 245, New Haven Oratorio Choir and
Orchestra, cond. Mark Bailey (Trinity Episcopal Church, New Haven, CT: May 15, 2004).
Personal communications, Mark Bailey and Paul Berry, April 24, 2017.
right arm and hand, gave a flick of all the fingers out, and then, when the oboe had come in, moved to take up his bow again and rejoin the other violins.

I marked this gesture because, if the entrance of violins, voice, and oboe had caught my attention, a moment in the A section had riveted it. In that moment, oboe and voice sounded in complete isolation, playing and singing in parallel tenths and sixths, so perfectly matched in timbre that it was hard to tell which was which.

**Figure 1a: Agrippina, Act II Scene 5: “Voi che udite,” mm. 12-13. Reproduced with permission.**

Writing in 2017, I am pleased to see that a review of that performance confirmed another event that I had noted: applause broke out after the aria. An aspect of that applause did not make it into the review, though; namely, that it lasted until Fabio Biondi...
cued the principal oboe to stand and bow. When the oboist did so, inclining his head, the applause swelled. Xavier Sabata turned and clapped, too. At that moment, Emiliano Rodolfi, principal oboe,\(^6\) was marked as Sabata’s equal in every way. The applause lasted until he sat down again and the performance continued.

This was a perfect example of “obbligato,” in my mind: the sound of the performance of that aria and the reaction to it – both marking that something very special had happened. I went away from that concert, and from the Händel-Festspiele, convinced that I was on to something, and exceedingly excited to write about it.

Later that summer, when I examined the microfiche of Handel’s *Agrippina* autograph, I saw “Oboe” scrawled dramatically across the manuscript page, at the aria’s head. I did not see any sign of “obbligato.”

**Figure 1b** *Agrippina*, Act II Scene 5: “Voi che udite,” opening. Reproduced with permission.

No matter: I had other arias to listen to, and archives to consult. I would write a

---

\(^6\) Ms. Ines de Labra Jouin (Tour manager, Europa Galante), email message to author, March 21, 2017.
brief introduction containing an historical survey of “obbligato” (also explaining some of
the pesky variants I had already encountered,) and then I would proceed to the real work
of figuring out what made those particular interactions of voice and instrument so special.

That brief introduction became this dissertation.

Why did this happen? In short, those same variants indicate specific work
performed by “obligato terminology” (as I call it in this dissertation), within a wide range
of meanings. As I confirmed through analyses of music in manuscript, printed scores,
publishing materials, and primary and secondary literature of all sorts, certain meanings
of “obligato”\textsuperscript{7} are active at different points in musical history; in the history, in Western
culture, of people joining forces to musick. While certain meanings are activated by
different instruments and in different genres, those same meanings can work to indicate
the places of those instruments within an expected hierarchy, and even to create those
genres. All of this work, moreover, occurs side by side with the work of music critics,
music historians, and music theorists: all manner of writers participating in musicking,
and using the terminology in different ways.

This double stream present in the use of obligato terminology becomes especially
important in the twentieth century, with the vast amount of secondary literature written in
the field featuring the terminology used in a variety of ways. In turn, however, the
secondary literature using obligato brings me to one of the most vivid challenges (of
many) in analyzing it. The primary challenge was finding the terminology in the first

\textsuperscript{7} In this dissertation, I have chosen to use the spelling “obbligato” for the term as specifically
connected to the English-language nexus of meanings I describe in the introduction and
conclusion (\textit{pace} Boccherini, in chapter three.) “Obligato” I deploy while tracing the terminology
through certain music manuscripts of Sebastian Bach, through Beethoven’s correspondence, and
through various Breitkopf catalogues: through, in other words, the main body of this dissertation.
place. Though it has different meanings in different contexts, those moments of context are rare. Obligato terminology is not consistent in meaning; nor is it at all consistent in use. Its appearances are so far from ubiquitous that I have at times considered whether they are particular to music terminology specifically acquired by certain scholars, composers, or reviewers – individual people, in other words. Operating on such a small scale, can any conclusions be drawn?

It is worth considering whether the multiplicity of meaning connected to obligato terminology precludes its widespread use. Though that consideration is beyond the scope of this dissertation, my work operates on the following assumption: that, rare though this terminology might be in action, when it does appear, the instrument- and genre-specific work it undertakes is so interesting as to merit commentary.

Quantifying the concrete underpinnings of that inconsistency in meaning has been a second major challenge. Obligato terminology is differently inflected in different languages; for example, in English it is nominalized as often as it is treated adjectivally. There is also the challenge of considering what, if any, significance is accorded to the word for having an echo of Italian in English; for containing within itself a mark of some sort of “otherness.” In this dissertation, I work to situate the significance of these differences in language, as connected in particular to genre and genre status in music history. Having said that, a full understanding of the technical underpinnings of this term’s migrations from language to language awaits the work of an historical linguist.

The main challenge that I grapple with in this dissertation is the complication I faced when examining Handel’s *Agrippina* autograph, Sebastian Bach’s *Matthew Passion*
autograph, the autograph catalogue of Mozart – and then the Neue Bach Ausgabe critical apparatuses, the recent compendium of cantatas by Graupner, and even Series I and II of RISM: namely, that the twentieth and twenty-first century use of this terminology, especially in English, does not align in all places with how this terminology was used in practice in the eighteenth century. The ensuing scope of the project (considering where primary and secondary sources’ use of obligato terminology fell in a certain range of possible meanings (gradually coming into focus), all before using said sources in an argument) seemed insurmountable. It took careful consideration of this wide variety of both primary and secondary materials, discussion with mentors, and even performing music with friends, to help me realize that this was not as large a methodological problem as it had first appeared, to me.

For this dissertation neither prescribes nor proscribes. Individuals have used obligato terminology in many ways, some similar and some contradictory, for centuries. What I found, and find, most interesting about this entire history of use cannot be quantified simply by making a list of how individuals were wrong to deploy the terminology in the way(s) they did. Rather, the interest for me lies in examining what changes occurred to the frameworks within which the terminology functioned, in order for said terminology to accomplish the work those same individuals needed it to do.

I thus came to focus on narratives of music history and the material contexts of the terminology, and how narrative and material joining forces to inflect its work, without feeling the pressing need to produce a conclusive chart of all possible definitions. However, in exploring this history of obligato terminology’s use – in this musical
etymology – my goal has been to furnish myself with certain expectations of what work this terminology would be doing when I encountered it in a specific place. My ensuing goal is to make those expectations clear for the reader, so that you in turn may ascertain what work obligato is performing in a textbook on fugue, or a biography of Sebastian Bach, or a review of the local performance of “Lucia” – and, in so ascertaining, that you may understand the background of that work, specific to the terminology’s range of meanings in Western music history.

In my first chapter, I explore obligato terminology as used in certain cover pages, wrappers, frontispieces, and scores of Sebastian Bach. I move back to Zarlino for ideas of obligo rooted in compositional mastery, and then forward through Frescobaldi to examine its ensuing association with mastery of a particular instrument: specifically (through the dissemination northward of Frescobaldi and others, as well as through the teaching of Sweelinck), the organ with pedals of the North German fantastic skill. An analysis of Sebastian Bach’s use of obligato terminology in his working manuscripts leads me to conclude that he used obligato differently than his sons, Philipp Emanuel and Johann Christian, and differently than his first biographer, Johann Nikolaus Forkel. This difference is important to note, especially in Forkel’s case, because of the work obligato has done to communicate ideals of musical greatness in the edifice of Sebastian Bach biography.

In order to ascertain the reasons for this difference, in my second chapter I analyze this terminology as used in Vienna at the turn of the nineteenth century, in one specific letter by Ludwig van Beethoven. This is an important moment for musicology,
because an offhand remark of Beethoven’s, about his composing the Septet, op. 20 (his fancy of having been born with “obligates *accompagnement*”), Guido Adler interprets as a bedrock compositional principal of the *Wiener klassische Schule*. Adler points to a very specific moment of obligato terminology’s disappearance, in the material record of Beethoven’s published music, as the reason for his interpretation. I examine whether this disappearance ever took place completely, situating Beethoven’s aside to his publisher in the context of op. 20’s compositional and publication history.

That same publication history was intimately tied with “music publication practices” of the eighteenth century. In my third chapter, I undertake an analysis of obligato terminology as it appears in the Breitkopf catalogue corpus. In cataloguing the work that the terminology does to inscribe instrumental hierarchies and to communicate genre expectations, I locate one source of obligato’s multiplicity of meaning in the collision of two material types of music – engraved vs. manuscript – in Breitkopf’s printed, thematic *Catalogo* and *Supplementi*. In this way, I demonstrate that this multiplicity not only indicates the dispersal of the accompanied sonata genre from French locales, and not only indicates changing expectations connected to keyboard practice, but also, finally, shows how Breitkopf communicated these expectations as connected to specific instruments by his genres choices in his catalogues.

The oscillation between “Trio” and “Sonata” described in the third chapter explains the terminology “turnabout” that I bring up at the end of my first chapter. The use of obligato both to inscribe instrumental hierarchies and to indicate genre, explored in the third chapter, informs a more nuanced understanding of Adler’s formulation of
obligate Akkompagnement. But within these changes and this work, how can the use of “obbligato” that first sparked my interest in this project – vocal-instrumental interactions in ornate Baroque arias, especially as commented upon in twentieth and twenty-first century secondary literature – best be situated?

My conclusion touches briefly on one last stream of obligato terminology, present since the benefit concert (as categorized by William Weber) of the eighteenth century. Aspects of a voice and an instrument interacting have always been present in this usage, whether by giving an instrumentalist a specific identity and stature within a concert program, or by making the leap into cataloguing practices connected to music as performed by a specific virtuoso in concert. This very practical aspect of this use (a specific person playing an instrument is embodied in the program) forms an inverse to the idea of récitatif obligé put forth by Rousseau, and to analyses of Baroque arias in secondary literature connected to Sebastian Bach. Both of these focus not so much on the person playing the instrument, as on the instrument itself: which, as it has important work to do, comes to life.
Chapter 1: Sebastian Bach's obligato terminology, in composition, performance, and working manuscripts

An opening axiom

As I embarked upon this dissertation, I rapidly realized that I faced a challenge when examining obligato terminology.

Table 1.1: Obligato terminology (basic).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terminology</th>
<th>Examples(^8)</th>
<th>Implication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>obbligato</td>
<td>Opera reviews, discussions with instructors, music cover pages in violin and piano music (tempo, cadenza indications)</td>
<td>obligatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. ad libitum</td>
<td></td>
<td>vs. free [lit. &quot;at one’s pleasure&quot;](^9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The challenge was: ask for a definition of the musical term “obligato”; receive a different answer from everyone asked. Perhaps I overstate it slightly (I’m fairly certain more than one organist talked about *obligato* organ pedal), but there certainly existed enough

---

\(^8\) These examples contributed to my understanding "obbligato" vs. "ad libitum" (before starting musicological study); I encountered them in my musical education, *passim*. Connected to that: there also exists a "Pirastro Obligato" brand of violin strings.

\(^9\) My thanks to Kenneth Bratt for the Latin.
difference in the definitions proferred by performers, musicologists, and more (to say nothing of the differences I found in primary and secondary literature) to hint that I might be facing an unexpected complication in my work.

So: ask for a definition of the musical term “obligato”; receive a different answer from everyone asked. What truth this axiom possesses lies in the multiple meanings acquired by the word during the past four hundred years. The varied definitions that presently circulate – an obligatory musical line, an optional one, a virtuosic one, a filigree or descant, the use of a specific instrument, the use of organ pedal, the interaction of solo instrument and solo voice – all convey this complex legacy. The variants are not confined to the modern era. Different uses of the term in manuscripts and documents connected to Johann Sebastian Bach and his circle demonstrate that, in the first half of the eighteenth century, that same term was malleable.

This chapter examines this flexibility. I will discuss two examples of obligato terminology found in the famous obituary for Johann Sebastian Bach, Johann Friedrich Agricola and C. P. E. Bach’s Nekrolog; examples referring to the art of composition and to pedal practice. I will also consider different dedications written by Sebastian, as well as additional uses of the term he would have known during his lifetime. I will finally explore how, in certain manuscripts intended for weekly use in cantata performances, obligato is used as a label for some instruments and not for others.

Examining the term in the workaday context of Sebastian Bach, with the sixth movement of BWV 199 as a case study, leads me to ask whether the later understandings,

and uses, of obligato in connection to these works may have been influenced by uses of the term circulating in print in the mid to late eighteenth century, and the early nineteenth. Coincidentally, this later use of obligato terminology appears in the Sebastian Bach reception almost from its very beginning, in the work of Bach’s first biographer, Johann Nikolaus Forkel. I will argue that our understanding of obligato terminology as connected to Sebastian Bach comes, in part, from the way that terminology was used in famous instances of early reception of his life and music, Forkel’s biography among them. In order to elucidate this argument fully, though, it is first necessary to understand how Sebastian Bach used obligato in his manuscripts, and the other ways of using it he would have known.

**Obligato as obligatory voice: Zarlino, obilo, and the history of fugue**

In the *Nekrolog*, C.P.E. and Agricola use obligato terminology first and foremost to indicate compositional skill. Greatness in this aspect of music-making frames the entire obituary. Agricola and C. P. E. Bach begin by presenting an inventiveness, thoroughness, and ambition in composition as a Bach family heritage: with the achievement of Johann Christoph Bach as an example.\(^\text{11}\)

---

\(^\text{11}\) Sebastian Bach’s first cousin once removed, as well as uncle to Maria Barbara Bach, was organist at Eisenach until his death in 1703. See Christoph Wolff, *Johann Sebastian Bach: the Learned Musician* [herafter JSB] (New York: W.W. Norton, 2000), 28-29. Wolff points out that Christoph Bach is given particular prominence in the genealogy as well as the obituary. In the former, C.P.E. Bach adds to entry No. 13: “This is the great and expressive composer” (“Dies ist der große und ausdrückende Componist”) – a reinforcement of the original 1735 version: “He was a profound composer” (“War ein profonder Componist.”) See *The New Bach Reader*
His writing was, so far as the taste of his day permitted, *galant* and singing as well as remarkably polyphonous. … [The] second point is borne out just as remarkably by a church piece composed by him for 22 obbligato voices [*mit 22 obligaten Stimmen*], without the slightest violence to the purest harmony, as by the fact that both on the organ and on the clavier he never played in fewer than five real parts [*niemahls mit wenieger als fünf nothwendigen Stimmen gespielet hat.*] 

Sebastian’s improvisation for Frederick the Great forms a bookend to Johann Christoph’s achievement.

Hereupon His Majesty demanded to hear a fugue with six obbligato voices [*mit sechs obligaten Stimmen*], which command he also fulfilled, to the astonishment of the King and the musicians there present, using a theme of his own. 

An anecdote of Gottfried van Swieten, written in a letter of 26 July 1774, reveals the encounter’s persistence in the mind of one of the participants. Van Swieten writes that,

He [Frederick the Great] spoke to me … of a great organist named Bach [Wilhelm Friedemann.] [Those] who knew his father claim that he, in turn, was even greater. The King is of this opinion, and to prove it to me he sang aloud a chromatic fugue subject that he had given this old Bach, who on the spot had made of it a fugue in four parts, then in five parts, and finally in eight parts [*une Fugue à 4 puis à 5, puis enfin à huit voix obligés.*]

These uses of the term, *obligaten Stimmen* and *voix obligés*, separated by twenty years, are linked more than anecdotally. The context for both is the tradition of contrapuntal

---

12 The different vocabulary for *obligaten Stimmen* and *nothwendigen Stimmen* will be mentioned later in this dissertation. Agricola and C.P.E. Bach, “Nekrolog.” This excerpt tr. in *NBR*, 298 (no. 306); *BD* Vol. III, ed. Hans Joachim Schulze (Kassel: Bärenreiter Verlag, 1972), 80-81 (no. 666).
mastery that goes back to the third book of Zarlino’s *Istitutioni Harmoniche*.\(^{15}\) In his chapter 51, on “Fugue, or Consequences,” Zarlino defines two different types of fugues: “strict (*legate*) and free (*sciolte*).”\(^{16}\) Commenting on this definition, in his work on theories of fugue, Paul Walker observes that “Zarlino was the first to distinguish between the [Italian] words *fuga* and *imitation,*” and in turn “harked back to Tinctoris’s original definition of *fuge* as the ‘sameness (in several respects) of the voice parts’ and made ‘sameness’ (or ‘identicalness’) of the voice parts in rhythm and intervals the essential characteristic of his own fugue.”\(^{17}\) Thus, the idea of a fugue “lasting from beginning to end of the piece,” Zarlino calls *fuga legate*, “bound or tied fugue.”\(^{18}\) By contrast, constraints on exact repetition are considerably relaxed in what Zarlino names *fuga sciolte*: a work that “does not entail such obligations [*oblighi*].”\(^{19}\) Furthermore:

> [T]he composer is not bound [*non è obligato*] here to reproduce note values or rests exactly, or to adhere to other similar details, but may exercise his own judgment [*che più le piace.*]\(^{20}\)

---


\(^{19}\) Tr. Marco and Palisca, *AC/IH*, 127; Zarlino, *IH*, 213.

\(^{20}\) Tr. Marco and Palisca, *AC/IH*, 127; Zarlino, *IH*, 213: “Et in cotesto modo di comporre, il Compositore non è obligato di osservare la equalità delle figure, & di porre le Pause simili, ne osservare altri simili accidenti; ma può far quello, che più le piace.”
Besides “oblighi” and “non è obligato” in chapter 51, Zarlino uses the phrase “con obligo” in his chapter 55, to indicate a challenge composers may work to meet:

Musicians occasionally force themselves [si sogliono obligare] to keep using one [melodic] passage, varying the harmony. This is called making counterpoint ‘with a set condition’ [con obligo] and the repetitions are called pertinacie. One who wishes to constrain himself in this way need only select a theme or passage and begin to write counterpoints upon this subject.\(^{21}\)

Finally, in chapter 63, and after working through numerous types of two-voice counterpoint, Zarlino writes of how the composer may set three voices, “with certain conditions [con qualche obligo]” if desired. This method, he writes, is “beautiful … artful, and … apt when properly composed.”\(^{22}\) It bears mentioning, as Zarlino does, that the result of so complex a setting may sound less pleasing than simpler pieces. However, he concludes that, through it, a composer may “demonstrate his ingenuity and quickness of thought.”\(^{23}\) This display of talent reinforces Zarlino’s remark after the introduction of con obligo and the pertinacie: “The difficult done well is far more to be praised than what is easily done well.”\(^{24}\)

In the first half of the 17\(^{\text{th}}\) century, as if to take up this challenge, several

---

\(^{21}\) Tr. Marco and Palisca, \textit{AC/IH}, 156; Zarlino, \textit{IH}, 228: “Et perche alle uolte li Musici si sogliono obligare di fare il contrapunto, usando sempre un passaggio, variando però il concento; il qual modo è detto Far contrapunto con obligo; & tali repliche, o passaggi si chiamano Pertinacie; però quando alcuno si vorrà obligare ad una cosa simile, piglierà un Thema, o passaggio, & incomincierà a fare il contrapunto sopra il proposto soggetto.”

\(^{22}\) Tr. Marco and Palisca, \textit{AC/IH}, 215; Zarlino, \textit{IH}, 256: “Delli Contrapunti a Tre voci, che si fanno con qualche obligo. … Il qual modo … è bello, & ingegnoso; & torna molto commodo, maßimamente quando è compost con debiti modi.”

\(^{23}\) Tr. Marco and Palisca, \textit{AC/IH}, 220; Zarlino, \textit{IH}, 258: “[Ma] si bene alle volte, quando li tornerà in proposito; per mostrare la vivacità del suo ingegno, & la prontezza del suo intelletto …”

\(^{24}\) Tr. Marco and Palisca, \textit{AC/IH}, 158; Zarlino, \textit{IH}, 228: “Percioche quella cosa, che si fa bene nel difficile, è molta più da lodare, che non è quella, che è fatta bene senza alcuna difficoltà.”
composers made a virtuosic show of working with obblighi. One of the earliest examples is Soriano’s one hundred and ten “canoni et obblighi” on the hymn Ave Maris Stella, which in turn inspired both a collection of resolutions, written by the Italian theorist Lodovico Zacconi in 1625, and another volume of “canoni, obblighi, et sonate” on the same chant, by Del Buono in 1641. The composer in this group with whom Sebastian would have been perhaps the most familiar was Girolamo Frescobaldi, who included obblighi in his published output. The two in his Fiori musicali serve as excellent examples of this phenomenon. A note on the Recercar per l’Elevazione of the Missa degli Apostoli

---

25 For a discussion of these and other works in the same style, see Sergio Durante, “On Artificioso Compositions at the time of Frescobaldi,” Frescobaldi Studies, ed. Alexander Silbiger (Durham: Duke Univ. Press, 1987), 193-217; see Table I, 196-98, for a composition list. Obblighi and canoni thus exist alongside each other in this time period, exemplars of the genre of musical puzzle-solving. This genre, with a history stretching back through the Renaissance, would of course find an adherent in Sebastian, one hundred years after the efforts of two composers in particular: Zacconi and Del Buono. See the scholarship of Denis Collins, especially, “Music Terminology in the Canonic Works of Bach: an Historical Context,” Bach, Vol. 26, No. 1/2 (Spring-Summer, 1995 Fall-Winter 1995), 91-101.


reads: “con obligo del basso come apare” (“with a basso obligo as appears”); likewise, the Recercar dopo il Credo of the Missa della Madonna requests a performance “con obligo di cantare la quinta parte senza tocarla” (“with the obligo to sing the quinta part without playing it.”)  

Sebastian possessed a copy of the Fiori musicali dated 1714; whether or not he included the obligo indications is not known, since the copy is lost. Nor is it known whether or not he saw the German use, Oblighen, as appears in Reincken’s addition to Sweelinck’s purported Regeln. Certainly, the non-descriptive form (obligo or Oblighen) does not appear, that I can find, in any manuscripts or prints of Sebastian’s. If Bach had used it in this form, one might expect to find it in the frontmatter to the Musicalisches Opfer; of course, one does not. The famous canon descriptions in the Musicalisches Opfer have a counterpart in Frescobaldi’s “intendami chi può m’intend’io” (“Understand me, who can, as long as I understand myself”) given after the “con obligo di cantare …”

---

28 Tr. my own. Girolamo Frescobaldi, Fiori musicali di diverse compositioni (Venice: Alessandro Vincenti, 1635); Facsimile reproduction, notes by Philippe Lescat. (Courlay, France: Éditions J. M. Fuzeau, 1994), 61 [Recercar con obligo del basso], 84 [Recercar con obligo del cantare].

29 Wolff, JSB, 126-27.

direction.\textsuperscript{31} The mystery solved, in other words, by the one who can realize the \emph{obligo} correctly. But though Bach wrote canons and other works with mottos, he did not use \emph{Oblighen} in connection to them.

Rather, one consistently finds the descriptive usage (\emph{obligaten}, or \emph{obligater}, or \emph{obligates}) in Sebastian’s manuscripts. For example, the terminology used to describe the achievements of Johann Christoph and Sebastian has its parallel in the 1723 title page of the \textit{Inventions and Sinfonias}, BWV 772-801.

\textbf{Upright Instruction}

wherein the lovers of the clavier, and especially those desirous of learning, are shown a clear way not alone \textsuperscript{(1)} to learn to play clearly in two voices [\textit{mit 2 Stimmen}] but also, after further progress, \textsuperscript{(2)} to deal correctly and well with three \emph{obligato} parts [\textit{mit dreyen obligaten Partien}]; furthermore, at the same time not alone to have good \textit{inventions} but to develop the same well and, above all, to arrive at a \textit{singing} style in playing and at the same time to acquire a strong foretaste of \textit{composition}.\textsuperscript{32}

The three “obligaten Partien” of the sinfonias are labeled thus here; nowhere is such a label to be found in the precursor to some of the sinfonias: certain fantasias in the \textit{Clavier-Büchlein}.\textsuperscript{33} That voices\slash\textit{Stimmen} and parts\slash\textit{Partien} are synonymous in this case may be seen by Sebastian’s note at the end of the Inventions: “Sequentur adhuc 15


\textsuperscript{32} Tr. \textit{NBR}, 97 (no. 92); Neumann and Schulze, \textit{BD} I, 220-21 (no. 153).

This descriptive use of obligato may stem in part from a blurring of the terminology that began as soon as theorists began drawing off Zarlino. This phenomenon is understandable, since the Italian obligare/obbligare, from which obligo is drawn, and legare share as a source the Latin ligâre (to tie, to bind), though ob + ligâre indicates a more specifically legal use of the verb. From this similarity, and from the proximity of the terms in Zarlino’s treatise, it would a simple step to use an adjective derived from obligare rather than legare. Thus, in his 1595 Dialogo, Pietro Pontio published his own rules for counterpoint, changing the terminology: fuga legate into fuga obligata and sciolta into non obligata o sciolta.

Paul Walker points out that Pontio, along with his student Scipione Cerreto, “kept the essence of Zarlino’s original definitions” of fugue, but divided it into the two different understandings of the counterpoint involved: 1) repetition sustained through the piece, and 2) the same “only for part, not all, of the piece.” Obligato as a descriptor was not ubiquitous, however: in

---

34 NBA V/3 KB 15. See also D-B Mus. Ms. Bach P 1067: http://digital.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/werkansicht/?PPN=PPN816856265, for both the title page and the direction on 31 (BWV 786). The possible inkblot on the “c” of “adhuc” is particularly striking. In the interest of preserving space in this chapter, most images may be viewed via stable links to sources compiled by Bach Digital, albeit digitized by the Staatsbibliothek, the Royal Library of Copenhagen, etc.

35 Collins points out: “This classification system [fuga vs. imitatione, each qualified by legata or sciolta] led to difficulties and some confusion among late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century theorists …. Consequently, a plethora of terms were used to describe every aspect of imitative composition.” Collins, “Musical Terminology,” 92.

36 Dante Olivieri, Dizionario Etimologico Italiano, 2nd ed. (Milan: Casa Editrice Ceschina, 1961), 391-92. Olivieri indicates that from ligâre springs not only obligare and the French oblier, but also, relating to ties or binds: ligamen (Lat.), lien (Fr.), ligatura (It.) and ligature (Fr.), religio (Lat.), and more. See, however, Manlio Cortelazzo and Paolo Zolli, Dizionario etimologico della lingua italiana, vol. 3 (Bologna: Zanichelli, 1983), 660 for legare and vol. 4 (1985) 817 for obbligare.

37 Walker, Theories of Fugue, 60.
his *Della pratica musica* of 1601, Cerreto turned the terms into *fuga con obligo* and *senz’obligo o sciolta*. This blurring of terminology occurs in subsequent generations. One of the later examples is that of Marpurg, writing in his 1753 *Abhandlung von der Fuge*:

The true fugue is of two sorts:

(A) A strict fugue, *fuga obligata*, is one in which no other material than the subject is treated throughout … When such a strict fugue is worked out at length, and all kinds of other artifices (made possible by the many kinds of imitation, double counterpoint, and change of key) are introduced in it, such a piece is called by the Italian name of *Ricercare* or *Ricercata* – an art fugue, a master fugue. Such is the nature of most of the fugues by the late Capellmeister Bach.

Marpurg contrasts *fuga obligata* with “free fugue, *fuga libera, solute, sciolta*”: the type, he writes, composed by Handel.

**Obligato as descriptor: the organ’s pedals and keyboards**

In common with Marpurg’s later usage, in the fair copy of BWV 772-801, *obligaten Partien* and *vocibus obligatis* refer to the idea that these parts/voices are ordered, constrained or regulated; but not to the idea, as Zarlino’s *legate* would have it, that they are kept in strict canon. Unlike Marpurg’s use, the term as used in this fair copy, and indeed, in other manuscripts of Sebastian, refers to things *within* the piece or genre:

---

38 Walker, *Theories of Fugue*, 60.
to voices, parts, specific instruments, and specific parts of instruments; rather than to the piece or the genre itself, that which the things help create. In other words, this use edges closer to *obligo* in spirit. An *obligo* is a discrete component, or a separate rule, that creates a piece through its being followed strictly. *Obligato* as a descriptor, as used by Sebastian, adds a quality to a discrete component of a piece, rather than describing a genre itself. Though this difference may seem minute, its ramifications pertaining to Sebastian’s use of the term are important. For via that use, different hierarchies within the physical components of a single instrument, the organ, and within larger groups of instruments and voices, are made manifest.

As an illustration of the single-instrument hierarchical point, consider an appearance of *obligato* as descriptor in another title page. Wolff argues that the fair copy of BWV 772-801 was one of three collections (the other two being *The Well-Tempered Clavier* and the *Orgel-Büchlein*) that Sebastian intended to use to “[impress] the authorities in Leipzig”: via, “in particular, the carefully coordinated phraseology of [the] title pages.”

There is no use of obligato in the title page of *The Well-Tempered Clavier*; however, it appears in that of the *Orgel-Büchlein*.

**Little Organ Book**

(with 48 realized chorales)

In which a beginner at the organ is given instruction in developing a *chorale* in many divers ways, and at the same time in acquiring facility in the study of the pedal since in the chorales contained therein the pedal is treated as wholly *obbligato* [das *Pedal* gantz *obligat* tractiret wird].

---


41 Tr. *NBR*, 80 (no. 69); Neumann and Schulze, *BD* I, 214 (no. 148).
This connection of obligato terminology to the organ pedal appears in the Nekrolog as well. C.P.E. Bach and Agricola list among “the unpublished works … (5) A lot of free preludes, fugues, and similar pieces for organ, with obbligato pedal. (6) Six trios for the organ with obbligato pedal [mit dem obligaten Pedale].”42 The anecdotes of Sebastian’s virtuosity on the pedal are as striking as they are well-known; the focus here is where the terminology is used in connection to this part of the instrument.

An examination of the source manuscripts for the organ preludes, as defined by George Stauffer, reveals an interesting aspect of obligat as describing the organ pedals.43 Namely: as far as descriptors are concerned, Pedaliter, con Pedale, con Pedale obligato, and all their variants, appear interchangeable.44 In Stauffer’s Appendix I, one may trace terminological variance both across different manuscripts and within individual manuscripts.45 For example, in the autograph of the Prelude & Fugue in b, BWV 544, the indication “Präludium pro Organo cum pedale obligato” may be seen on the title page, but “Praeludium in Organo pleno, pedale” as the Überschrift.46 J. P. Kellner’s copy

42 Tr. NBR, 304 (no. 306). Schulze, BD III, 85 (no. 666).
44 Robert L. Marshall writes of the dual nature of this indication; namely, that: “(as Forkel argued) Bach must have regarded the pedals as an ‘essential’ part of the organ. But … also … that organists of the time expected to be informed (or forewarned) whether an organ composition contained an obbligato pedal part. Otherwise such phrases would be tautological.” Robert L. Marshall, “Organ or ‘Klavier’? Instrumental Prescriptions in the Sources of Bach’s Keyboard Works,” J.S. Bach as Organist, eds. George Stauffer and Earnest May (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986), 216.
45 Stauffer, The Organ Preludes, 209-32.
reproduces this phrasing almost exactly\textsuperscript{47}; other copies range from only “Preludio” to “Preludio e Fuga per L’Organo” to “Praeludium.”\textsuperscript{48}

What may seem almost too obvious to point out is that obligato or a variant never attaches to the hands. \textit{Manualiter} as a term indicates sufficiency of the hands on the organ, without use of the pedals\textsuperscript{49}; it does not interchange with an obligato descriptor along the lines of \textit{cum manuole obligato}, \textit{man. oblig};, etc., in the way that \textit{pedaliter} does with its obligato variants.\textsuperscript{50} In this genre, then, obligato could describe the \textit{Stimmen} or \textit{Partien} within a work for hands only, along the lines of the indication in the BWV 772-801 title page, but not indicate that manuals are required in the face of their potential absence, since playing with both hands on a keyboard instrument is, and was, absolutely normative.\textsuperscript{51}

\textbf{Obligato defined, and in print, in the early eighteenth century}

Concentrating on \textit{obligato}’s appearances in Sebastian’s title pages, compositions for organ, and obituary, can lead us to overlook the fact that the terminology was used in

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{47} BWV 544. Berlin, SPK P 891. Stauffer, \textit{The Organ Preludes}, 219; Kilian, \textit{NBA} IV/5 and 6, \textit{KB} vol. 1, 87 (B 66). \url{http://digital.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/werkansicht/?PPN=PPN780670698&PHYSID=PHYS_0001}
\item \textsuperscript{48} Stauffer, \textit{The Organ Preludes}, 219
\item \textsuperscript{50} For the actual appearances of \textit{manualiter} or a variant, see Marshall, “Organ or ‘Klavier’?”: Table 1, 217-20; Table 2, 222-23; and Table 3, 226.
\item \textsuperscript{51} \textit{pace} Ravel. Also, Sebastian does use “à 2 Clav.”, alongside a pedal indication, to indicate two manuals; thus as “a synonym for the (full-sized) organ.” See Marshall, “Organ or ‘Klavier’?”; 221.
\end{itemize}
printed music at the outset of the eighteenth century. Sébastien de Brossard wrote his

*Dictionnaire de la Musique* at the very beginning of the 18th century; it went through
six editions in fewer than ten years. He defines *obligato* as follows:

**OBLIGATO.** fem. *Obligata*. plur. *Obligati & Obligate*. An Italian adjective that
signifies OBLIGATORY and conveys the same thing as *necessario, concertante*,
etc. Thus:


*Con Fagotto obligato*. With an *obligatory Bassoon*.

*Con Viola obligata*. With an *obligatory Basse Viol [sic]*, etc.

Often it signifies as well *constraint* or *restraint* within certain boundaries or
limits, or subject to certain laws that one often self-imposes for some design or
some expression, etc. In this sense one says *Contrapunto obligato, Fuga obligata*,
etc. See, *LEGATO*.

Brossard continues with a reference to Zarlino’s concept of *contrapunto con obligo*.

It is in the same sense that one says that a Basso-Continuo is obligatory or
constrained, when it is confined to a certain number of measures that one repeats
continually, as in the *Chaconnes*; or as well when it is obliged to follow always a
certain movement, or only to play certain notes, etc.

Writing a generation later, German music theorist (and Bach cousin) Johann Gottfried
Walther referenced Brossard’s work for his own *Musikalisches Lexicon oder
Musikalische Bibliothek*. Walther’s definition of “obligato” duplicates Brossard’s

---

54 Brossard, *Dictionnaire*, 84.
55 Brossard, *Dictionnaire*, 84.
almost word for word. However, after reproducing the examples given by Brossard, Walther adds, “When, namely, no stated voice may be left out in the execution or otherwise, but must necessarily be played.”

Brossard’s identification of the term with *necessario* and *concertante* is born out by two famous examples: Vivaldi’s Op. 3, *L’Estro armonico*, published in 1711, and Corelli’s Op. 6, published posthumously in 1714. This collection proved the most popular of its kind in the eighteenth century; numerous reprints attest to the fact. The Corelli contains the usage in its title: “Concerti grossi con duoi violini e violoncello di concertino obligato …” It is only after this usage in 1714 that “obligato” or a variant appears in the title pages of his printed works; whether in reprints of the Op. 6 first edition or in arrangements of other opuses.

In the title, the “concertino obligato” is followed by the instruments of the

---

57 Walther, *ML*, 447. For a discussion of Walther’s entry for “fuga” (and his complete turnaround from Praetorius’ definitions to an array of other sources) see Walker, *Theories of Fugue*, 282-84.

58 “Wenn nemlich keine von jetztbesagten Stimmen bey der execution wegbleiben oder aussen gelassen warden kan, sondern nothwendig mitgenommen werden muß.” Walther, *ML*, 447. Could this imply performing a written part through to its end, as in the execution of a canon/fugue, rather than an instrumental directive? It is possible, but Walther’s dividing his definition into two sections implies that this addition connects with Brossard’s “*necessario concertante*,” reproduced by Walther in the first section along with the list of instrumental examples, rather than with Zarlino’s directives, to which Walther proceeds in the second section.


60 One wonders whether the publisher Étienne Roger put “obligato” on the title page of the Corelli as an indication of the uniqueness of the print – similar to the indication “tres exactement corrigée” which appears other Corelli releases, or to the portrait of the composer added to the Roger/Le Cène 1715 reprints of the first four opuses [*C 3678, C3715, C 3745, C3778*]. These indications could have been volleys in the publishing war between Roger, his Amsterdam rival Pierre Mortier, and John Walsh in London. See Samuel F. Pogue and Rudolf A. Rasch. "Roger, Estienne." *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. Oxford University Press, accessed February 1, 2015, http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/23665.
“concerto grosso ad arbitrio.” In this case, *obligato* emphasizes to the concertino/concerto grosso split, which already indicates the instrumental hierarchy within the pieces. This is a broader use of *obligato* as a descriptor than those previously examined.

What influence, if any, did the use and others like it have on Sebastian? For conclusive evidence exists that he saw the term used in this wider-ranging manner for a variety of stringed instruments: in the first edition of Vivaldi’s Opus 3, *L’Estro Armonico*. Sebastian arranged certain Vivaldi concertos from the first edition of Op. 3 and from manuscript versions of Op. 4 and Op. 7. If he had the music of Op. 3 in front of him, in parts, not score, as *per* the first edition, he would have seen the sub-title for every concerto, on each part.

---


### Table 1.2: Obligato terminology in Vivaldi, Op. 3, L’Estro Armonico.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Subtitle</th>
<th>Book # / pg #</th>
<th>Bach arr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concerto I</td>
<td>Con quattro Violini obligati.</td>
<td>1/2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto II</td>
<td>Con due Violini e Violoncello obligato.</td>
<td>1/6, 4, 4, 4*, 3*, 3*, 4, 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto III</td>
<td>Con Violino Solo obligato.</td>
<td>1/10, 8, 6, 6, 5, 6, 7</td>
<td>BWV 978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto IV</td>
<td>Con quattro Violini obligati.</td>
<td>1/13, 10, 8, 6, 6, 8, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto V</td>
<td>Con due Violini obligati.</td>
<td>1/16, 12, 10, 9, 8, 10, 11*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto VI</td>
<td>Con Violino Solo obligato.</td>
<td>1/20, 14, 12, 10, 10*, 12, 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto VII</td>
<td>Con quattro Violini e Violoncello obligato.</td>
<td>2/2, 2, 2*, 2*, 2, 2, 2, 2*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto VIII</td>
<td>Con due Violini obligati.</td>
<td>2/4, 4, 4, 4, 3, 4, 4</td>
<td>BWV 593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto IX</td>
<td>Con Violino Solo obligato.</td>
<td>2/8, 7, 7, 5, 6, 6</td>
<td>BWV 972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto X</td>
<td>Con quattro Violini e Violoncello obligato.</td>
<td>2/11*, 8, 8*, 8*, 6*, 6, 7*, 7</td>
<td>BWV 1065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto XI</td>
<td>Con due Violini e Violoncello obligato.</td>
<td>2/14*, 12*, 11*, 12, 8, 10, 10*</td>
<td>BWV 596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto XII</td>
<td>Con Violino Solo obligato.</td>
<td>2/18, 14, 12, 14, 10, 12, 12</td>
<td>BWV 976</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did this use affect Sebastian’s own labeling choices? Judging the instances of *obligato* connected to non-keyboard instruments in his autographs, as well as in other working

---

65 The page numbers are given for each part in the following order: Violino Primo, Violino Secondo, Violino Terzo, Violino Quarto, Alto Primo, Alto Secondo, Violoncello, Violone e Cembalo. I use * to indicate where the period in the subtitle is missing, or (in most instances in violin parts) obscured by the G-clef.

66 I include BWV 1065 for thoroughness; it is not in the same group as the other Vivaldi arrangements. Rather, Sebastian arranged this work for four harpsichords later in his life, during the Leipzig period. See Rudolf Eller and Karl Heller, *Konzerte für Drei und Vier Cembali*, NBA VII/6, *KB* (Kassel: Bärenreiter Verlag, 1976), 78-79 (A). See also D-B Mus. Ms. Bach St 378, http://www.bach-digital.de/receive/BachDigitalSource_source_00002563
manuscripts, the answer is a qualified “no.” Sebastian uses *obligato* for viola, violoncello, and bassoon in autographs (as well as for organ and cembalo), and for no instrument more. This is not to say that amongst these three instruments there is never the designation “solo” or “concertato,” and their variants. It is to say, though, that while “solo,” “concertato,” and variants appear amongst almost all the instruments Bach uses, “obligato” remains attached to organ and cembalo, viola, violoncello, and bassoon. This leaves us asking: why?

**Obligato terminology in Sebastian Bach’s cantata manuscripts**

In his article “Solo – Obligato – Concertato,” Matthias Wendt argues that Bach uses “obligato,” or a variant, when an instrument normally associated with the continuo group plays something out of the ordinary for that group. The term can thus function as a notice, similar to *con Pedale obligato*, that something more complicated than normal will

---

67 The qualification occurs when one considers the following: *violino obligato* on the title page of BWV 1050a, D-B Mus. ms. Bach St 130; *flauto obligato* in a correction on the wrapper for the parts of BWV 170, D-B Mus. ms. Bach St 94; and indications for *flauto* and *oboe obligato* on the wrappers for BWVs 157 and 159, D-B Mus. ms. Bach St 386 and D-B Mus. ms. Bach St 633. Please see Appendix A for stable links to images. As evidence for Sebastian attaching *obligato* to a melody instrument, each of these is problematic in its own way – and will be discussed later in this chapter.

68 Obligato terminology connected to the organ has its own subset in the literature, with several recent additions mentioned later in this chapter.

69 For listings of labels attached to instruments, see the relevant charts in Ulrich Prinz, *Johann Sebastian Bachs Instrumentarium* (Kassel: Bärenreiter Verlag, 2005). See also Matthias Wendt, “Solo – Obligato – Concertato,” *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Konzerts: Festschrift Siegfried Kross zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Reinmar Emans and Matthias Wendt (Bonn: Gudrun Schröder Verlag, 1990), 68-76 for a chart referencing solo, obligato, and concertato labels. For a listing of obligato labels under discussion in this chapter, see also Appendix A.

70 Wendt, “Solo – Obligato – Concertato,” see 62-63 for the argument referenced.
happen on the lower end of the instrumental texture, and that the player should be
prepared for it. To the rejoinder that instruments such as the violoncello piccolo do not
receive the *obligato* designation, Wendt writes that, as this instrument would be unique
by its presence alone, it need not be indicated *obligato*. Lawrence Dreyfus refers to the
viola da gamba solo in BWV 199/6 in order to argue along similar lines, writing that
“[when] Bach calls for a gamba to play continuo, he virtually always does so in
conjunction with an adjacent solo gamba part,” since “in Bach’s Germany, the viola da
gamba was no longer an ordinary accompanying instrument in any large ensemble.”

This argument is born out by the viola da gamba never receiving an *obligato*
designation. Furthermore, since this version of BWV 199’s chorale movement was
composed in conjunction with a revision of the cantata for Cöthen, and given the known
presence there of the virtuoso gambist Christian Ferdinand Abel, the viola da gamba part
in this instance could have the status of not only being unexpected in the continuo group
but also having a specific musician ready at hand to play it.

This viola da gamba part is the third of four different versions of this cantata
movement. An examination of BWV 199’s material history offers additional insight into

---

71 "Ein zusätzliches Indiz dafür, daß Bach *obligato* nur bei den – wenn unbezeichnet – auch
entbehrlichen Instrumenten verwendet, liegt darin, daß er das stets konzertierend Violoncello
piccolo anders als das nur ausnahmsweise knozertierende 'normale' Violoncello nicht als
Violoncello piccolo obligato, sondern als Violoncello piccolo solo kennzeichnet.” Wendt, “Solo –
Obligato – Concertato,” 64.
72 Lawrence Dreyfus, *Bach’s Continuo Group: Players and Practices in His Vocal Works*
73 See Prinz, *Instrumentarium*, 543. This argument is complicated somewhat by the fact that the
violoncello never receives “solo” or “concertato” labels, either.
I/20, KB* (Kassel: Bärenreiter Verlag, 1985), 13-41.
75 For C.F. Abel’s relation to Bach in Cöthen, see Walter Knape, et al. "Abel, Christian
this conception of obligato: that indicating the non-normative use of an “expected” instrument.

Table 1.3: Obligato terminology in BWV 199 manuscript sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NBA KB label</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Scribe</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1714</td>
<td>J. S. Bach</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; page title</td>
<td>[Across, page top] Cantata. A Voce Sola. Una Oboe. Due Violini. Una Viola [paper has been torn off; KB speculates “obl.” or “e” originally there] Cont.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 6</td>
<td>c. 1714</td>
<td>J. Lorenz Bach</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Title/label</td>
<td>[Center, page top] Viola obligata. [below first stave] Choral.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 9</td>
<td>1714</td>
<td>J. S. Bach</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>[Center, page top] Violoncello. è Hautbois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>[Left, page top]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

76 Königliche Bibliothek Kopenhagen, C I, 615.
78 Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Mus. ms. Bach P 1162. This part was not originally grouped with St 459, due to its having on it the sketch of the Cöthen version’s last movement in score.
79 Kobayashi, *NBA* IX/2, 203.
80 This hand was labeled W2 in Hofmann, *NBA* I/20 KB, 26 (C 6). For Wollny’s identification of Dürr’s Anonymus W2 as Johann Lorenz Bach, see J.S. Bach, “Nun Komm, der Heiden Heiland” *BWV* 61, Facsim. reproduction, notes by Peter Wollny (Laaber: Laaber-Verlag, 2000), VI-VII. See also Yoshitake Kobayashi and Kirsten Beisswenger, *Die Kopisten Johann Sebastian Bachs: Katalog und Dokumentation*, NBA IX/3 (Kassel: Bärenreiter Verlag, 2007), 6-7.
81 Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Mus. ms. Bach St 459, Faszikel 1.
82 Kobayashi, *NBA* IX/2, 204.
The earliest complete score to this cantata was discovered in 1911, in the Royal Library at Copenhagen.\textsuperscript{86} Before it was found, scholars worked with the performing parts that remained in Germany, and others gathered from different locations in Europe.\textsuperscript{87} Dürr

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
 & & & \\
\multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Chorale} & \\
\multicolumn{3}{|c|}{[Also on lower right corner of 1\textsuperscript{r}, w/ clef & key sig.]} & \\
\multicolumn{3}{|c|}{[Center 2\textsuperscript{r}, added by later hand]} & \\
\multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Cello} & \\
\hline
C 14\textsuperscript{83} & 1717-23\textsuperscript{84} & J. S. Bach & 1\textsuperscript{r} & [Left, page top] \\
& & & & Viola da Gamba zum Choral. und \\
& & & & letzten Aria. \\
C 20\textsuperscript{85} & c. 1723- & Anon L4 & 1\textsuperscript{r} & [Left, page top] \\
& [B. Dig.] & & & Solo \\
& & & & [Center, added by Rust] \\
& & & & Viola da gamba\textsuperscript{x} \\
& & & & Viola da Gamba oder Violoncell, \\
& & & & man vergleich damit die \\
& & & & “Violoncello è Hautbois \\
& & & & überschriebene Stim[m]e [m with \\
& & & & overline]} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{83} Archiv der Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde in Wien. A 88.
\textsuperscript{84} Kobayashi, \textit{NBA} IX/2, 204.
\textsuperscript{85} Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz. D-B Mus. ms. Bach St 459, Faszikel 3
argues that Bach must have thought this cantata quite effective, given that he had least four different versions of it.\textsuperscript{88}

What sets these versions apart, besides transpositions and errata, may be found in the chorale movement. In the autograph score version, the solo soprano’s “Ich, dein betrübtes Kind” (“I, your troubled child”) shares the musical foreground with a viola; Sebastian indicates this with “Chorale con Viola obligata.” Among the other parts from the Weimar period, the viola line exists in the hand of one of Bach’s Weimar scribes, Johann Lorenz Bach, labeled “Viola obligata” (C 6).\textsuperscript{89}

It is at this point that the scoring becomes more complicated. Sebastian changed the instrumentation for a performance in Cöthen, giving this part to a viola da gamba. For the final version of the part, on its stand-alone sheet (C 14), he did not write any label – solo, concertato, \textit{obligato} – at all. At the top of the page appears, merely, “Viola da Gamba zum Choral. und letzen Aria.”\textsuperscript{90}

Then, in a later revision for the first cantata year in Leipzig, the instrumental line in the sixth movement is copied out again by an unknown scribe and labeled “solo” – with no “obligata” or “obligato” in sight (C 20).\textsuperscript{91} Scholars have come to a relative


\textsuperscript{90} Wien, Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde in Wien: A-Wgm A 88. “BWV 199 (Köthener Fassung)/6-8,” \textit{Bach Digital}, accessed February 1, 2015, \url{http://www.bachdigital.de/receive/BachDigitalSource_source_00000052}. See also Hofmann, \textit{NBA} I/20 KB, 26 (C 14).

\textsuperscript{91} St 459, Faszikel 3. \url{https://www.bach-digital.de/receive/BachDigitalSource_source_00002654}. See also Hofmann, \textit{NBA} I/20 KB, 27 (C 20).
consensus that this is meant to be a violoncello piccolo, although there has been ink spilled on whether or not it was a “viola pomposa.” In C 20, in pencil, Wilhelm Rust has written “viola da gamba;” and, in a note below, some qualifications of that same hypothesis. Additional judicious hedging may be seen in Rust’s note from 1853 (found in D-B Mus. ms. Bach St 459, Faszikel 1) commenting on transposition and scoring differences, as well as the variable instrumentation of the sixth movement. In particular, he mentions an autograph for “Violoncello è Hautbois,” from a second Weimar version.

This autograph part, C 9, includes the oboe solo for the second movement, as well as the general oboe part for the last movements, and the cello for movements 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7. The violoncello line for the sixth movement contains ornamental flourishes that the viola did not have previously. Since these flourishes appear in both C 14 and C 20, they originate here.

For our consideration, then, there exist four different instrumental parts for the sixth movement: all of them with different labels. One conclusion that we may

92 See Prinz, Instrumentarium, 585, 596-600.
93 St 459, Faszikel 3. See also Hofmann, NBA 1/20 KB, 31, referring to 27 (C 20).
94 See Hofmann, NBA 1/20 KB, 24-25.
95 St 459, Faszikel 1. See also Hofmann, NBA 1/20 KB, 26 (C 9).
96 St 459, Faszikel 1. Note that the penciled “Cello” is a later addition. I would assume from the fluency of the 32nd notes later in the same part, compared to the disjoint line in m. 2, that Sebastian decided to add the first flourish after he had written out the 16th notes in that same measure – and then added more throughout. If one further assumes he copied out this “Violoncello è Hautbois” part all at once, perhaps he added these flourishes in light of the similar ones in the oboe solo for the second aria, just out of sight on the first page of the part.
97 The one version of this part not given an instrumental indication is C 20. For its qualification as violoncello piccolo, see Hofmann, NBA 1/20 KB, 35. Although Shabalina demonstrates another Cöthen version in her edition of BWV 199, her discovery of a first violin part indicates that the scoring changed from including oboe to a strings-only version – and thus, that the sixth
immediately draw is that, for Sebastian in this instance, “obligato” does not indicate the viola part’s difficulty relative to the other versions. In the change from Weimar II’s violoncello to Cöthen’s viola da gamba and Leipzig’s violoncello piccolo solo, a similar level of technique is preserved, even to the point of possibly requiring a five-string violoncello at the outset.\(^98\) Comparatively, then, the viola version is easier.\(^99\) Furthermore, taking Wendt and Marshall’s points about the non-normativity of the violoncello piccolo and the viola da gamba as explaining the instruments’ lack of a obligato label, the lack thereof in C 9 may be explained by the fact that, if one instrumentalist played both an oboe and a five-string violoncello well enough for the ornamented lines in mvts. 2 and 6, respectively, said instrumentalist would have been memorable enough for Sebastian to have an idea of when he would be available to play the parts; to plan ahead, in other words, for his performance, if he were not already on the Weimar roster.

The stand-alone viola obligata part, C 6, is especially interesting when one considers that Sebastian corrected the orchestral viola part, C 5, by scratching out the Recit tacet for the seventh movement and writing that short line in a separate, smaller system above the larger ones already filled by Johann Lorenz. Is it possible that a similar mistake was made with the indication Chorale tacet for the sixth movement? It would be

\(^{98}\) Hofmann, NBA I/20 KB, 32-33.

Figure 2a: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 1162 (BWV 199 C 6), Weimar viola part. Reproduced with permission.
Figure 2b: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 1162 (BWV 199 C 6), Cöthen 8th mvt. sketch. Reproduced with permission.
Figure 2c: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 1162 (BWV 199 C 6), Cöthen 8th mvt. sketch, cont'd. (Weimar viola part flipped 180 degrees.) Reproduced with permission.
more likely if C 5 were edited along similar lines as BWV 47’s *Violino I* part (B 8 in Mus. Ms. Bach St 104): with a scribble through the erroneous *tacet*, a direction, *Aria sequit sub signo*, and a corresponding sign at the top of an insert.\(^{100}\)

Were BWV 199 C 6 an autograph, like the insert in the *Violino I* part of BWV 47, the idea that Johann Lorenz had made another copying error would be more plausible: resulting in Sebastian having to write out the movement’s longer instrumental line on a separate sheet, rather than as an insert. As neither of these is the case, the stand-alone sheet of C 6 seems intentional.\(^{101}\)

C 6 is significant in another way, connected to the Cöthen version. The fact that Sebastian does not use “obligato” or a variant for the viola da gamba has to be a choice, since he must have been aware of the “viola obligata” indication when he rescored for Cöthen. A draft in his hand for revisions to the last movement: reworking it to include the viola da gamba. The draft begins on the opposite side of the Weimar part, and then continues to the same side, flipped 180 degrees. (See fig. 2a-2c above.)

The passing of the line between four different instruments could have to do with


\(^{101}\) As to why Sebastian Bach chose a viola: C.P.E. Bach mentions that it was his favorite instrument. However, C. P. E. explains that this favoritism was due to the viola’s location in the middle of the harmony, and that Sebastian enjoyed listening to the music from this middle place. (“Als der größte Kenner u. Beurtheiler der Harmonie spielte er am liebsten die Bratsche mit angepaßter Stärcke u. Schwäche” – *BD* III, 285 (no. 801).) Since the texture in C 6 is rather thin, and the viola has more of a melodic role than a harmonic one, there could have been reasons of roster behind this choice.
the presences, expectations, and capabilities of individual players. This was surely a prominent variable, as a performer roster might change from week to week. There could as well be other reasons for the changes. Perhaps after the first performance of BWV 199, Bach gave up the original instrumental choice for the sixth movement as a misstep. Perhaps he wished to hear a change in timbre; or perhaps, as mentioned above, he knew of a particular performer that would be available for each ensuing instrument as the requirement arose.

However, if Sebastian used “obligata” for the viola line to indicate that that viola line was required, when it was relatively less difficult than the three later versions, then there is a potential conflict with another use of the term: its association with the highest level of virtuosity, and indeed with Sebastian’s own performances, as connected to the organ in the obligato organ cantatas.

Recent developments in the scholarship offer new insight into these works: contextualizing them in the eighteenth century and in Sebastian’s overall cantata output, gauging hints at performance practice that they contain, and connecting them to potential roster changes in Leipzig. Several scholars maintain that Sebastian would have played

---

these parts himself; the label *obligato*, where it appears, then, has bound up in it implications of self-insertion. Perhaps this is why Zelter saw fit to add the term after the composer’s *Organo* in a part from BWV 71, *Gott ist mein König*: it served as a proxy for Sebastian’s presence as a performer.\(^{104}\) Perhaps as well one may approach this use of the terminology by considering an analogy between a *obligat Pedal* indication as it appears in an organ work, and *obligato* used to describe the organ in a cantata: advance notice to the player that something technically advanced, connected to this instrument, would be required.

Additional speculation must be reserved for later; suffice to say, at this point, that in the original sources: 1) Sebastian may use “obligato” to indicate a virtuosic part in the cantatas, as per the organ examples, but also 2) “obligato” does *not* necessarily correspond to the most challenging version of a part, as per the example of BWV 199/6. The model of the terminology’s use that accounts for both of these examples is: 3) “obligato” most often attaches to a member of the continuo group behaving in an unexpected way.

The counterexamples to the last model (*violino obligato* on the title page of BWV 1050a, St 130; *flauto obligato* in a correction on the wrapper for the parts of St 94; and

---

indications for *flauto* and *oboe obligato* on the wrappers for BWVs 157 and 159, St 386 and St 633) are each less strong a piece of evidence than they appear. In order: Wendt points out that a young Johann Christoph Friedrich Bach writes “Violino obligato” on the later wrapper for BWV 1050a\(^{105}\) – and I argue that, if one wishes to uncover error in this case, one need only look closer at this page: with its numerous inkblots, a possible attempt at a monogram interwoven with “Bach” in the lower right hand corner (or a practice run with the quill), and most importantly, the correction of J. C. to J. S. Bach as composer. The obvious fluency of the autograph “Violino principale,” on the title page to that violin part, could not form a stronger contrast. Furthermore, if one compares Sebastian’s “Cembalo” of “Cembalo Concertato” on the title page to its part, to Christoph Friedrich’s “Concerto à Cembalo Certato” on the wrapper, one may see how, in the extra fillip at the top of his three “C”s, Christoph Friedrich is perhaps trying to imitate his father’s handwriting, whether he had seen that specific instance or an earlier one.

There exists another example of a Bach son changing the father’s terminology later in the eighteenth century. C. P. E. Bach, writing on the wrapper of BWV 170, St 94.\(^{106}\) The material history as connected to the instrumental changes for the specific line in question is quite complex. The aspect most germane to this paper is that the melodic filigree of the *Organo obligato* belonging to the aria “Mir ekelt mehr zu leben,” is given

---


to the traversière in a stand-alone autograph from late in Sebastian’s life.\textsuperscript{107} Sebastian inserted “organo obligato” on the wrapper of St 94, in addition to the indication of the liturgical day and the “è continuo.” However, C. P. E. Bach was the one to strike through “organo” and write “flauto” instead. No \textit{obligato} or variant is found in the autograph traversière addition. Surely Sebastian had the opportunity to make this change on the wrapper, and/or to add the term to the individual part; that he did not do either is, I believe, telling.

As concerns the model I have outlined above (obligato terminology attaching to instruments of continuo group having a non-continuo part to play), the indications that can most complicate it are several affixed to a melody-instrument in a set of parts and scores for BWV 157 and 159, copied by Christian Friedrich Penzel. That the \textit{obligato} marks on the title pages do not correspond to any such indication within the parts or scores is intriguing; however, these two examples must eventually be situated in Penzel’s overall practice as a copyist, and considered in light of the fact that he made the copies “in the latter half of the eighteenth century.” I will in fact consider findings along these lines in the third chapter of this dissertation.

Laying these manuscripts and attempts to infer intent aside for the moment, let us recall BWV 199. For all the unanswered questions regarding Sebastian’s use of “obligato” in general, and the puzzle of the sixth movement, one thing is certain: that nowhere in the manuscripts does “obligato” describe the poignant, ornate, and complex

\textsuperscript{107} For a discussion of these instrument changes, see Cortens, “Obbligato Organ,” 56-61. See also Stauffer, “Bach’s Late Works,” 121-24, for a discussion of the articulation changes in the traversière manuscript. See also Reinmar Emans, \textit{Kantaten zum 5. Und 6. Sonntag nach Trinitatis}, \textit{NBA} I/17.2 \textit{KB} (Kassel: Bärenreiter Verlag, 1993), 86.
instrumental line of the second movement. This line, for oboe in Weimar I and II and in
the Leipzig version, but for violin in a Côthen version (according to Shabalina’s recent
work) does “obligato” work as one perhaps defines it in our present day: “obbligato (It.,
‘obligatory’): an important accompanying part that should not be omitted, such as an
elaborate instrumental part within a vocal aria.”

The melody instrument sets out a long, winding ritornello. It reinforces the idea of
vocality, taking the soprano’s “Stumme Seufzer, still Klagen” (“silent sighs, quiet
moans”) and making them eminently audible in instrumental form. It moves in thirds and
sixths, performing parallel passages and exchanges that might be particularly difficult to
keep in tune, especially as registers are swapped, and as the soprano negotiates potential
breaks.

This is the type of instrumental line in a vocal aria that I would have called
“obbligato,” without hesitation, when I was first formulating this dissertation. As my
survey of Sebastian Bach’s use of the terminology in his dedications and manuscript
scores has indicated: within this assortment, obligato and its ilk are able to 1) 
communicate an expectation connected to fugue, 2) indicate the presence of a certain type
of keyboard writing, and 3) label continuo group instruments as having an unexpected
role to play. Melody instruments such as the violin, the flute, and the oboe (*pace* BWV
199/2), have no place in this assortment. This is the problem that I faced when
encountering this terminology as used in Sebastian’s manuscripts: how could I reconcile
the use of obligato for melody instruments in certain of Sebastian’s works – in early Bach
reception, in performance, and in modern musicological scholarship – when Sebastian

---

himself did not use it this way?

As I grew more familiar with how expectations connected to genre and certain instruments were in flux over the course of the eighteenth century, a hypothesis surfaced. Namely: the use of obligato as connected specifically to melody instruments gained prominence over the latter half of the eighteenth century via the emergence of the so-called accompanied sonata, and the great influx of works of its type onto the musical market.

Before I embark upon testing this hypothesis in detail, I will give an example of a change that could be explained by it: a switch in labeling connected to a specific composition of Sebastian Bach. This example may be found in his biography as written by Johann Nikolaus Forkel.\(^\text{109}\) For both facts and family legends, Forkel drew on the *Nekrolog* and on his correspondence with C.P.E. Bach. One detail in an exchange between the two of them is telling. On October 7, 1774, C. P. E. sent Forkel additional music by his father, including “Die 6 Claviertrio,” as he calls them: BWV 1014-1019.\(^\text{110}\) An examination of the catalogue of C.P.E.’s estate, assembled in 1790 after his death in 1788,\(^\text{111}\) shows, among his music collection, a tally of Sebastian’s instrumental works that C.P.E. had inherited. Among them are six ‘trios’: the same BWV 1014-1019. At the top of the list is a “Trio in B minor for obligato Clavier and a violin.”


\(^{111}\) For a translation of letters exchanged between C.P.E. Bach and Forkel, see *NBR*, 395-400 (nos. 393-395); Schulze, *BD* III, nos.785a, 785b, 792, 801, 803.
Table 1.4: BWV 1014-1019 in the *Nachlass* of C. P. E. Bach, Hamburg, 1790.\footnote{\textsuperscript{112}}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nachlass text</th>
<th>BWV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Von Johann Sebastian Bach. Instrumental-Sachen</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trio aus dem $H$ fürs obligate Clavier und eine Violine</td>
<td>1014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trio aus dem $A$ fürs Clavier und die Violine</td>
<td>1015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trio aus dem $E$ fürs Clavier und die Violine</td>
<td>1016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trio aus dem $C$ fürs Clavier und die Violine</td>
<td>1017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trio aus dem $F$ fürs Clavier und die Violine</td>
<td>1018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trio aus dem $G$ fürs Clavier und die Violine</td>
<td>1019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forkel had seen a copy of this music, if not the same one in C. P. E.’s *Nachlass*, and C. P. E. specifically called them “Claviertrio” in his letter. However, in his 1802 biography of Sebastian, Forkel describes the identical works as “Sechs Sonaten furs Clavier mit Begleitung einer obligaten Violine” (“6 sonatas for clavier, with an obligato violin accompaniment.”)\footnote{\textsuperscript{113}}

This may seem a very small change. However, since it connects to important issues of change in genre expectations and communication of instrumental hierarchies, I wish to account for it. In order to test my hypothesis of the accompanied sonata’s influence on obligato terminology’s use, I will move to the opposite end of the time period I have thus far explored. I will begin in 1802, the year Forkel’s biography was published as a book, and will work backwards. The scene will shift to Vienna, though

\footnote{\textsuperscript{112} “Bach-Handschriften un –Bildnesse im Nachlass Carl Philipp Emanuel Bachs. Hamburg, 1790.” Schulze, \textit{BD} III, 492 (no. 957).}

Leipzig will appear via an examination of music publishing practices. The composer in question will shift to another familiar one: Ludwig van Beethoven. And the question of work performed by obligato terminology, explored in connection to the publication history of Beethoven’s Septet, op. 20 (1802), will take on even more significance.

This significance is due to the fact that certain remarks that Beethoven made, using obligato terminology to describe his newly composed and newly beloved Septet, were in turn used by none other than Guido Adler as a formula for the compositional achievement typified in the *Wiener klassische Schule*. The use of obligato to communicate compositional mastery may seem, on its surface, to bring us back neatly to where this chapter started. After all, did not the *Nekrolog* say the same thing about compositional greatness in the Bach family? Could Adler’s influence account for “obligato” being used, in musicology and popular music writing, to describe those ornate instrumental lines in those challenging vocal arias of Sebastian Bach? Why then bring into the discussion the accompanied sonata in the first place?

My reason for doing so is twofold. I believe that the influence of obligato terminology used in the accompanied sonata genre accounts for the “turnabout” I describe above: C. P. E. Bach describing BWV 1014 as a “Trio aus dem H b fürs obligate Clavier und eine Violine” and Forkel labeling the same composition (with its fellows) “Sechs Sonaten furs Clavier mit Begleitung einer obligaten Violine.” I hope to demonstrate this by exploring questions of instrumentation and genre in the late eighteenth century. However, I also wish to bring additional nuance to Adler’s use of obligato terminology connected to ideas of compositional greatness. Both of these tasks,
accounting for the Sebastian Bach “turnaround” and nuancing Adler, can be completed via this work: an examination of the accompanied sonata’s presence in materials connected to music publishing, as well as the work that obligato terminology performed in printed music, and music manuscripts, in the second half of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the next.

In order to undertake that work, though, I will first examine Adler’s formulation in detail, and bring nuance to it by exploring the backstory of Beethoven’s Septet, Op. 20. Sebastian Bach, and the idea of the ornate “obligato” aria, will return in this dissertation’s conclusion.
Chapter 2: Adler’s model of Beethoven’s greatness – obligate

Akkompagnement at work

A familiar story

In a 1925 essay in his *Handbuch der Musikgeschichte*, Guido Adler describes a particular model of musical achievement along the following lines. A compositional style flourishes in Vienna from the middle of the eighteenth century onward, coming to fruition in the early nineteenth. The works of three great composers in particular define this style. Their achievements, in turn, set a model of greatness for composers who follow them, up to and including those active during the first years of the twentieth century.\(^{114}\)

This formulation sounds familiar, even mundane: an historical pageant presented not only in textbooks but also in program notes and concert halls. We know the characters in it, their achievements, and their descriptors; we have heard it all before. First: the composers, their web of teachers and students, and the hallmarks of their musical works, all fall under the label of the *Wiener klassische Schule* (“Viennese Classical School”) – the title of the essay in Adler’s *Handbuch*. Second: the man who begins the school is Haydn; the man who continues it alongside him is Mozart; the man who brought it to its summit of glory is, of course, Beethoven. Third: Adler groups the

definitive compositional principles of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven under the label *obligate Akkompagnement* – “obligato accompaniment.”  

The first and second components of this formula are well known, even shopworn; the third, however, is arresting.

In the following pages, I ask why that should be so. Why, when the model of the *Wiener klassische Schule* has become common knowledge in musicology as a discipline, has the exact terminology that Adler uses to delineate the achievements of that same school vanished? As a preliminary answer, I argue that this simultaneous inscription and 

---

115 The spelling of the adjective *obligate* of course depends on which case is active in the original German context. For the sake of uniformity in this dissertation, and drawing off Adler’s 1925 paper “Das obligate Akkompagnement der Wiener klassischen Schule” (mentioned in n126 below), I refer to Adler’s concept, throughout, as “*obligate Akkompagnement*” (unless I am quoting his use of it directly.)

116 When Adler’s “obligato accompaniment” makes one of its rare appearances in English-language music histories, it is usually linked to a paraphrase of Adler’s ideas, or it is mentioned in a way that show Adler’s ideas lurking in the background. For an example of the first: see Charles Rosen, *The Classical Style* (1st ed. New York: Viking, 1971; expanded ed. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1997). In his “New Preface” to the 1997 edition, xiii, Rosen justifies using Haydn’s Op. 33 as an entry point into his discussion of Haydn’s quartets by reminding reviewer Alan Tyson, and the reader, that “op. 33 displays the first appearance in Haydn’s quartets of the “obligato accompaniment” as defined by Guido Adler [in “WkS,” HM].” After repeating Adler’s definition, and making similar high claims for the concept’s work on behalf of aesthetics (“[this] technique is essential to the method of thematic development in Haydn … Mozart, Beethoven, and almost all later Western European music”), Rosen equivocates: “The expression ‘obligato accompaniment’ is not known to *The New Grove* (1980), but at any rate, it was known to Beethoven, who once said that he came into the world with an obligato accompaniment and knew no other.” For an example of a mention in passing, see Maynard Solomon’s description of “Late Beethoven,” in which “counterpoint and polyphonic textures,” among many more devices, evince “Beethoven’s search for germinating influences and modes of expression that could aid him in the symbolization of new spheres of psychic and social experience, inaccessible to the dramatic and overtly dialectical procedures of sonata form and obligato style.” Maynard Solomon, *Beethoven*, rev. ed. (New York; London: Schirmer Trade Books, 1998), 387. As will be seen later in this chapter, some anxiety in German-language scholarship attaches to the fact that Adler’s term does not appear in music scholarship, after his own use of it, until the 1960s. See, for example, Klaus Aringer, “‘Obligates Accompangement’ und Dramaturgie der Instrumente in Beethoven’s Septett,” in *Mozart im Zentrum: Festschrift für Manfred Hermann Schmid zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Ann-Katrin Zimmermann and Klaus Aringer (Tutzing: Hans Schnieder, 2010), 306.
disappearance reflects a multiplicity of meaning that has always been a part of what I call “obligato terminology.” This chapter traces this multiplicity from the beginning of musicology as a discipline, to the beginning of Beethoven’s compositional career in Vienna, to the various beginnings of the modern music printing industry in Germany. Examining Adler’s concept of *obligate Akkompagnement* in more detail is a necessary first step in this project.

The familiarity of the historical pageant mentioned above stems from the concept of the *Wiener klassische Schule* having been a part of musicology since Adler’s work. (Arguably, as musicology’s own origin has been located in that work many times, this might mean since the beginning of the discipline itself.) Interestingly, Adler built on already existing concepts and arguments. The idea of Vienna as a particular locus of compositional achievement did not begin with his use of it in his 1925 essay, nor in his somewhat less extensive exploration in his 1911 *Der Stil in der Musik*.117 *Wiener klassische Schule* is rooted in the deep past, as may be seen by the example of Raphael Georg Kiesewetter using the term *Wiener Schule* for “Haydn, Mozart, and their contemporaries between c. 1780 – c. 1800.”118 The “triumvirate”119 of Haydn, Mozart,
and Beethoven has been handed down in innumerable survey texts as well as in analytical works. The three appear as individual points on a trajectory of musical style as early as E. T. A. Hoffmann’s essay on Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony.

Adler uses *obligate Akkompagnent* to unite the music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven in terms of their style. This style was informed by, and in turn informed, their compositional technique. To justify using this term, he examines its historical context and certain material traces it leaves: explaining its shift away from conveying information about performance practices connected to certain instruments, the continuo in particular. Adler argues that *obligato* first indicated a corrective or directive to the performer: do not improvise this continuo part, do not omit that instrument. However, by the time of the *Wiener Meister*, *obligato* could be said (as Adler indeed says) to indicate a composition fully worked out in the same masters’ particular style. Interestingly, Adler identifies the disappearance of the performance directive aspect of the term, at one specific moment in Beethoven’s *oeuvre*, in order to confirm its work as a indication of compositional technique. He remarks that Beethoven labels his sonata Op. 5, 1796/97, for clavier and cello, “Pour Clavecin avec un Violoncello obligé,” but that Beethoven does not use the

---

120 As an example of this, Webster specifically analyzes Rosen’s *The Classical Style*, laconically concluding: “Criticism recapitulates historiography.” See Webster, *Haydn*, 353-55.

121 Of course, is important to remember that to Hoffmann the three were Romantics. See E.T.A. Hoffmann, *E.T.A. Hoffmann’s Musical Writings: Kreisleriana, The Poet and the Composer, Music Criticism*, ed. David Charlton, trans. Martyn Clarke, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), especially “Beethoven’s Instrumental Music,” 96-103 and “Review of Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony,” 234-251. (There are also reviews of the Piano Trios op. 70, the Mass in C, “Egmont,” and more; the Fifth Symphony review especially has the most famous of all Hoffmann’s romantic rhapsodizing on the subject.) See also Webster, *Haydn*, 349. Similarly, the “Classical” grouping originally did not include all three; Kiesewetter puts Haydn and Mozart together in the “Vienna School. Perfection of instrumental music” [original, 105-7] but places Beethoven alongside Rossini in their “age”: “1800 to 1832.” Kiesewetter, cited in Webster, *Haydn*, 350.
label in ensuing cello sonatas (Op. 69, 1807/08, Op. 102, 1815) because “Er war ganz überflüssig geworden”: the label “had become entirely superfluous.”

To strengthen his use of obligato as an indicator of compositional technique, Adler connects obligate Akkompagnement to his understanding of developments in polyphonic composition in the eighteenth century. The Viennese School, he argues, originated in the galant Stil, incorporating as well the achievements of Italians and “Mannheimers,” the advancements of North German symphonists, and more. Adler traces these accomplishments to the polyphonic style of Sebastian Bach and other “high masters of the Baroque.” Obligate Akkompagnement itself Adler explains as the endpoint of this development: the interwoven autonomy of each part in a composition. All voices have equal importance; thematic material is equally distributed between them. In a 1932 essay, “Haydn and the Viennese Classical School,” Adler describes this principle in a paean to Haydn’s “ideal quartet-writing.”

124 “Das Wesen des neuen obligaten Akkompagnements besteht darin, daß das Verhältnis der Stimmen zur Hauptmelodie das des Akkompagnements ist. Die Begleitung ist ‘obligat’ nicht im
In quartet music, in order that the train of thought may be shared by the four instrumentalists (as Goethe implies, when he calls it “the conversation of four reasonable people”), viola and second violin are made independent. … Here and there, two, three, or four voices display a motive in succession, sometimes alternating so rapidly as to justify the term “open-work” (durchbrochener Stil) which has been applied to this kind of writing … These motives appear now here, now there, in the perpetual flux of the interplay of ideas, always subservient to the eternally manifold gradations of the prevailing thought, sentiment, mood, or emotion.

To sum up all these varieties of polyphonic writing I employ a phrase borrowed from Beethoven, who remarked that he was born with an “obbligato accompaniment” (obligates Akkompagnement). The several instruments take part in the exposition of the principal theme and, at the same time, alternate in commenting upon it with motives of their own.\textsuperscript{125}

In 1911, with Der Stil in der Musik, and in all ensuing elaborations of the Wiener klassische Schule concept up to and including this essay in 1932, Adler uses the label obligate Akkompagnement for his emphasis on Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven’s compositional virtuosity – a complete control, balance, thoroughness, and unity – that in turn creates their trademark style.

Thus, in this formulation, obligate Akkompagnement performs a great amount of aesthetic work. Without Beethoven’s using the epithet first, one wonders whether Adler

would have loaded it with such weight. That use by Beethoven occurred in a December 15, 1800 letter to the music publisher Franz Anton Hoffmeister:

I now briefly state what you[, brother,] can have from me. 1 a Septet, per il violino, viola, violoncello, ContraBasso, clarinetto, corno, fagotto, – tutti obligati, (I can write nothing that is not obbligato, having come into the world with an obbligato accompaniment.)

The remark came soon after the publication of the cello sonata op. 5 (1799/1800), but well before the publication of the cello sonatas opps. 69 and 102 (according to Adler, in 1807/08 and 1815, respectively). Thus far, the usage maps on to Adler’s proposed timeline: the term is still being used c. 1800 but has become superfluous by 1815 at the very latest. If it were a matter as simple as accuracy in chronology, the proposed superfluity is easily problematized: first, by Beethoven describing the cello sonata op. 69 as “a Sonata with obbligato ‘cello [eine Sonate mit obligatem Violonzell]’ in a July 1808 letter to music publishers Breitkopf and Härtel; secondly, by Beethoven asking Archduke Rudolph for the return of a manuscript version of op. 102, “the two Sonatas with cello obbligato [Violonschell oblig[ato]] which I caused to be transcribed for

Complicating Adler’s formula

The problem inherent in Adler’s mapping obligato terminology onto compositional technique can be more thoroughly understood when we explore terminology’s original connection to Beethoven’s Septet, Op. 20: a work with a publication history remarkable for its complexity. What emerges from this exploration, as I will argue in this chapter, is that the obligato terminology in Beethoven’s letter to Hoffmeister owes its appearance there to practices of, and expectations in, late eighteenth-century music publishing.

Indeed, obligate is at least – if not more – obligated to the history of music publishing, if not more, as it is to the history of compositional style.

I demonstrate this through my examination of the origin and development of Beethoven’s Septet, as well as its ensuing publication history. As Adler did not investigate these factors in connection to his use of the label obligato Akkompagnement as an indicator of compositional technique, what emerges from this research is not only the original context of Beethoven’s momentous aside, but also a new understanding of two different meanings of obligato active within in it: one communicating instrumental

---

hierarchies, the other indicating expectations connected to the particular genre of the accompanied sonata.

The Septet appeared in print near the end of Beethoven’s first decade in Vienna. The convoluted history of this composition – how it originated, where and when it was performed, what Beethoven thought of it, and why it was published not only in septet form but also in multiple arrangements – is bound up with Beethoven working to make a place for himself amidst patrons and publishers, performers and the musical public. Situating Adler’s obligate Akkompagnement in its complete context requires examining Beethoven’s place in that context, and the work he did to create and maintain it.  

**Beethoven and Vienna: the money in the music**

To build a successful career in Vienna, Beethoven had to establish himself as a musician worthy of patronage from the very moment he arrived in the city: November, 1792. This process was long in preparation but quick-moving in results. After all, he had had five years to consider his earlier, unsuccessful trip to Vienna in 1787; a visit that had been cut short by his mother’s illness. This time he enjoyed much better fortune.

The biographical literature has thoroughly documented the details of how he became established. Beethoven gained entry to Viennese aristocratic circles through his connections in Bonn; by his association with his teacher Joseph Haydn; and especially

---

130 Tia DeNora, in *Beethoven and the Construction of Genius: Musical Politics in Vienna, 1792-1803* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), thoroughly explores Vienna of this time period, Beethoven’s work in it, and the social forces combining to make his reputation flourish.
through his talent as a performer.\footnote{Solomon, Beethoven, 1998, 77. I use Solomon’s biography for most of the basic facts of Beethoven’s life; Lewis Lockwood, Beethoven: The Music and The Life (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2003), forms an excellent English-language balance. For the most massive scale of detail in a biography, the reader must have recourse to Alexander Wheelock Thayer, Thayer’s Life of Beethoven, rev. and ed. Elliot Forbes (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1967). For an example of the complexities involved in navigating the Thayer corner of Beethoveniana, see footnote 208 below.} He established a strong musical presence in the city from the outset by engaging in several public contests of virtuosity, participating in benefit concerts, and playing in private salons.\footnote{For performance details from Beethoven’s early career in Vienna, see the chapter “A Pianist and his Patrons,” from Solomon, Beethoven, 77-88. DiNora.} As a way of encouraging his efforts, and of securing his talents for their own pleasure, various patrons supported him financially. Their support ranged from giving him gifts, such as musical instruments and living amenities, to giving him money outright.\footnote{Anderson, Letters 1, 58 (Letter 51); Briehe 1, 79 (Letter 65).}

Beethoven’s remarks to a friend from Bonn, Franz Wegeler, in a letter of June 29, 1801, give us an impression of his financial situation at the time: “[Since] last year, Lichnowsky … has disbursed for my benefit a fixed sum of 600 gulden, on which I can draw until I find a suitable appointment.”\footnote{Anderson, Letters 1, 58 (Letter 51); Briehe 1, 79 (Letter 65).} Beethoven moves directly from describing the extent of Lichnowsky’s patronage to celebrating his success in having his music published:

My compositions bring me in a good deal; and I may say that I am offered more commissions than it is possible for me to carry out. Moreover, for every composition I can count on six or seven publishers, and even more, if I want them; people no longer come to an arrangement with me, I state my price and they pay. So you see how pleasantly situated I am.\footnote{In her dissertation, “Beethoven and Musical Economics,” 296, 299-300, Julia Moore puts the letter to Wegeler in the context of Beethoven’s early Viennese achievements: in particular, his recent public concert, and his happy anticipation of one such concert every year (along with other successes.) We know from Beethoven’s life that these high expectations were not realized;}
After additional remarks about his finances, Beethoven then proceeds to discuss “that jealous demon, my wretched health” – his increasing deafness, which makes him “lead a miserable life.”\textsuperscript{136} He finds his epistolary way out of this gloom by proposing plans for a visit to Bonn, by updating Wegeler about mutual friends in Vienna, and by telling him, “Frankly, your love of art still gives me the greatest pleasure” – just before offering to send him “all my works, which … now amount to quite a fair number, a number which is daily increasing.”\textsuperscript{137}

Beethoven had a vested interest in keeping the pace of that “daily increasing” number constant. For though aristocratic support contributed to Beethoven’s hopes for prosperity, we see from the letter that he is keenly aware of the potential for monetary success in publishing his works. Certainly he feels his current composing pace to be extraordinary.

\begin{itemize}
\item Instead, he struggled. Through use of extensive archival, material, and statistical evidence, Moore makes these struggles concrete in terms of the economic turmoil afflicting Beethoven’s Vienna. Austrian currency had been unstable in the last decade of the eighteenth century, due to the government’s experiments with paper money and to Napoleon’s economic and military maneuvers. (For details of Austria’s devaluing its paper currency before the state bankruptcy of 1811, and its efforts to stabilize the currency after, see Moore, 119-30.) At the time of his letter to Wegeler, Beethoven had no way of knowing that the same currency would experience runaway inflation in the early nineteenth century. This hyperinflation greatly increased the cost of living in Beethoven’s Vienna, curtailed expenditures the expenditures of certain of Beethoven’s patrons, and undercut his negotiating power with publishers. Combined, these factors led on the one hand to Beethoven’s lifestyle becoming ever more strained and precarious, and on the other hand to his undertaking projects of massive scope, often with equally massive self-marketing apparatuses. (For Moore’s “financial periodization” of Beethoven’s life, in conversation with the traditional stylistic periodization, see 371-97. Within this discussion, as relating to his “increasingly ambitious and grandiose” artistic plans, see especially 376-77, and 396). Julia Moore, “Beethoven and Musical Economics” (Ph.D. diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1987).
\textsuperscript{136} Anderson, \textit{Letters} 1, 59-60 (Letter 51); \textit{Briefe} 1, 79 (Letter 65).
\textsuperscript{137} Anderson, \textit{Letters} 1, 60-61 (Letter 51); \textit{Briefe} 1, 80-81 (Letter 65).\end{itemize}
I live entirely in my music; and hardly have I completed one composition when I have already begun another. At my present rate of composing, I often produce three or four works at the same time.\textsuperscript{138}

The works so produced did not necessarily proceed directly from composer to publisher. Often there were aristocratic intermediaries involved. Beethoven could count on patrons to sponsor performances of his music, after all, in their salons or private halls. Those same patrons could also ensure those performances stay private for a certain period of time, if they were willing to pay for the privilege.

We see Beethoven negotiating this type of agreement in a letter to the publishing firm Hoffmeister and Kühnel, dated April 8, 1802. After railing against a proposal that he compose a sonata with a revolutionary theme – a proposal with terrible timing, he says, given the promulgation of the Concordat between Napoleon and Pope Pius VII\textsuperscript{139} – Beethoven agrees to a part of the scheme:

\begin{quote}
The lady can have a sonata from me, and moreover, from an aesthetic point of view I will in general adopt her plan – but without adopting – her keys – [sic]
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{138} Anderson, \textit{Letters} 1, 61-62 (Letter 51); \textit{Briefe} 1, 81 (Letter 65). Admittedly, this satisfaction is conveyed as an excuse for never writing his friends; “as you know,” Beethoven remarks in the previous sentence, “writing was never my strong point.”

\textsuperscript{139} The Concordat of 1801 represented “an end to the separation of Church and State brought about by the Revolution”: on the one hand, restoring some (though not all) of the prestige and profile of Catholicism in France, and on the other hand reconciling staunch Catholics to the state. Nigel Aston, \textit{Religion and Revolution in France: 1780-1804} (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2000), 327. Signed on July 15, 1801, the Concordat had “seventy-seven Organic Articles added unilaterally … before its promulgation in April 1802” (329). The delay, Aston writes, was due to Pope Pius VII maneuvering on behalf of Catholic clergy and Napoleon taking steps in advance to negate “opposition in republican circles” (327). “Coincidentally,” Thomas Sipe writes, “it [the Concordat] became law on the same day Beethoven penned his letter to Hoffmeister: April 8, 1802.” Thomas Sipes, \textit{Beethoven: Eroica Symphony} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 40. This makes Beethoven’s verb choice apropos: “… jetzt, da sich alles wieder in's alte Gleiß zu schieben sucht, buonaparte mit dem Pabste das Concordat geschlossen – so eine Sonate?” “… now, when everything is trying to slip back into the old rut, now that Buonaparte has concluded his Concordat with the Pope – to write a sonata of that kind?” See \textit{Briefe} 1, 105 (Letter 84); Anderson, \textit{Letters} 1, 73 (Letter 57).
The price would be about 50 ducats – for that sum she may keep the sonata for her own enjoyment for one year, and neither I nor she will be entitled to publish it – After the expiry of that year – the sonata will be exclusively my property – that is to say – I can and will publish it – and in any case – if she thinks it will do her any honour – she can ask me to dedicate the sonata to her.\textsuperscript{140}

The lady in question could have been the author of another letter to Hoffmeister and Kühnel, written soon after Beethoven’s, on May 1, 1802:

You yourself will see, dear Herr Kühnel, how much Herr Beethoven has demanded and how unreasonable this is. I thank you, therefore, most obligingly for having imparted this report to me, but at the same time must ask Herr Beethoven to cancel my proposal completely.\textsuperscript{141}

To put this price in context: on or around January 15, 1801, Beethoven himself told Hoffmeister that he would charge seventy ducats, total, for four individual compositions. They were not small works, either: he offered Hoffmeister the Septet op. 20, the Symphony No. 1, op. 21, the Piano Concerto No. 2, op. 19, and the Piano Sonata no. 11, op. 22, in that order.\textsuperscript{142}

\textsuperscript{140} Briefe 1, 105 (Letter 84); Anderson, Letters 1, 73 (Letter 57). Beethoven’s brother Carl confirms this practice in a letter of December 5, 1802, to Breitkopf and Härtel, describing the “agreement” Beethoven had been making with the various “music lovers” who had commissioned him:

\begin{quote}
[He] who wants a piece pays a specified sum for its exclusive possession for a half or a whole year, or even longer, and binds himself not to give the manuscript to anybody; after this period the author is free to do as he wishes with the piece.
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{141} Albrecht, Letters 1, 71-72 (Letter 39). Albrecht notes that Wilibald Nagel, who owned the autograph of this letter in 1911, “believed that the writer was Countess Auguste Charlotte von Kielmansegge (1777-64).” See 71-72n1. Albrecht in turn links the author to the creative would-be patron in Beethoven’s April 8 letter.

\textsuperscript{142} Briefe 1, 63-64 (Letter 54); tr. Anderson, Letters 1, 47 (Letter 44). Certain aspects of this letter will be discussed in greater detail in this chapter; one aspect I pass by is Beethoven’s balancing of genre, marketability, and price. He charges twenty ducats each for three of the works, remarking: “Perhaps you will be surprised that in this case I make no distinction between sonata, septet and
If the indignant note of May 1 indeed concerns the price Beethoven named on April 8, the tone is thus understandable. Another patron, conscious of her own position in Viennese society and conscious of her own musicking agenda, would have had less trouble paying fifty ducats. She was Empress Marie Thérèse, who appears on the title page of the published Septet, op. 20, as its dedicatee.

**Septet: patronage and performances**

Marie Thérèse of Naples and Sicily was Holy Roman Empress until a resounding defeat at the Battle of Austerlitz in 1805 led her husband, Francis II, to dissolve the Empire on August 6, 1806. She then bore the titles Empress of Austria and Queen of

---

143 The value of fifty ducats fluctuated greatly over the course of Beethoven’s career. Interestingly, Moore points out that “the amount 50 d[ucats] represented a kind of nearly absolute limit for [Beethoven’s] nominal fees until the 1820’s; yet the purchasing power of a 50 d fee had declined by a third by 1821, and remained at approximately this level until the end of Beethoven’s life.” *Musical Economics*, 344, 348. See also her list of Beethoven’s known publication fees, all adjusted to ducats (without calculating “the effects of price inflation on the purchasing power of fees,” though she does elsewhere), in Table 17, 331-33. The value of fifty ducats in metal currency over the course of Beethoven’s career, ranged between extremes of 131% (in 1810) and 48% (in 1817) of its 1795 value(335). Comparable figures taking into account Beethoven’s accepting paper currency until the year 1807 show extremes of 102% (1798-99) and 14% (1817) of the fee’s 1795 value(336). “Beethoven did not begin to request payment of publication fees in metal currency until 1806-07,” Moore writes, demonstrating that this happened after “the value of his fees had declined by 50%” in paper currency. As one final point of comparison: when Beethoven had the *Missa solemnis* published, he increased his profits by selling “10 hand-copied manuscripts at 50 d each to heads of state and aristocrats” (Moore 358.) Thus, by the time the *Missa* was published in 1827, the lady Beethoven writes about in 1802 would be in the company of the Czar of Russia, the Kings of France and Prussia, and many more, though she would have inflation to thank for it. See also *Werkverzeichnis* 1, 790-93, 800-801.
Hungary until her death on April 13, 1807, of complications from the birth of her twelfth child.\textsuperscript{144} During her entire adult life, she was an ardent patron of music, commissioning new works of all sorts, keeping favorite composers on retainer, and participating in certain performances as a singer.\textsuperscript{145} Though some criticized her for these pastimes, the composers, instrumentalists, and singers involved knew their fortune in having such a patron.\textsuperscript{146}

Marie Thérèse had her favorite composers, not many of which remain well known today.\textsuperscript{147} Of composers better known, Joseph Haydn only wrote a \textit{Te Deum} in C (Hob. XXIIIc:2) for her specifically.\textsuperscript{148} Beethoven dedicated his Septet to Marie Thérèse, and tailored \textit{Die Geschöpfe des Prometheus}, op. 43, to her taste.\textsuperscript{149} This short list gives the accurate impression that the two did not figure largely in music composed for and commissioned by the empress. Rather, as John Rice argues, it reflects in musical terms the influence she had on, as well as her rivalry with, Viennese aristocrats.\textsuperscript{150}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{144} For details of the dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire and the establishment of the Austrian Empire, see Peter H. Wilson, \textit{Heart of Europe: A History of the Holy Roman Empire} (Cambridge: Harvard University Press (previously titled \textit{The Holy Roman Empire: a Thousand Years of Europe’s History} [London: Penguin Books, Ltd.], 2016), 647-57. For details of the life and cultural work of Empress Marie Thérèse, see John Rice, \textit{Marie Therese and music at the Viennese court} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 1-2, 6-12, 259-61.
\item \textsuperscript{145} Rice’s work gives excellent overviews of Marie Thérèse’s artistic activities. For basic facts of her life, see Constantin von Wurzbach, \textit{Habsburg, Maria Theresia von Neapel}, in the \textit{Biographisches Lexikon des Kaisertums Oesterreich}, 60 vols. (Vienna: Kaiserlich-königliche Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, 1861), vol. 7, 81.
\item \textsuperscript{146} Anecdata to that effect are scattered through Rice’s monograph. For an especially poignant reaction to Marie Thérèse’s early death, see Weigl’s writing from his autobiography, quoted on Rice, \textit{Marie Therese}, 261.
\item \textsuperscript{147} Including Michael Haydn, Weigl, Eybler, Wranitzky, Mayr, and Pär. See Rice, \textit{Marie Therese}, 29, 35, and more generally the chapter “The empress as collector of music.”
\item \textsuperscript{148} Also, presumably to honor her, Haydn gave a previously composed mass the new name “Theresiensmesse” in the early nineteenth century. Rice, \textit{Marie Therese}, 240-42.
\item \textsuperscript{149} Rice, \textit{Marie Therese}, 251.
\item \textsuperscript{150} Rice, \textit{Marie Therese}, 230-34.
\end{itemize}
Thérèse wished to create her own cultural apparatus for her court, knowing very well the efforts by Van Swieten and others to perform works by composers both living and dead. “[L]ess of an antiquarian than the baron,” in regard to sacred music, she nonetheless respected his taste. Her wish to appropriate this legacy symbolically and materially explains, Rice argues, Marie Thérèse’s competition with Prince Lobkowitz over the purchase of Van Swieten’s music library after his death.\footnote{Rice, Marie Therese, 233, and 234-36, gives additional details of the rivalry between the Empress and Lobkowitz.}

Beethoven might have been treading carefully with Marie Thérèse, since she already had her favorites, and since Lobkowitz and other aristocratic patrons could possibly give him more immediate support than she. Be that as it may, aspects of his dedication of the Septet exhibit a certain boldness. As may be seen from Beethoven’s letter to Hoffmeister and Kühnel, of April 8, 1802, a dedication was usually a later step in the move from commission, to composition, to private ownership, to publication. The case of the Septet is thus unusual, since Beethoven announced its dedication well before it was published.\footnote{He did so at his public academy on April 2, 1800. Rice makes this point about the dedication in his exploration of how the Septet fit into Marie Thérèse’s practice of patronage, 244-45.} Though Marie Thérèse accepted the dedication, receiving a manuscript copy before April 8, 1802 (when Beethoven mentions to his publisher that she has it)\footnote{Anderson, Letters I, 73 (Letter 57). Briefe I, 105 (Letter 84). This is the same letter in which Beethoven replies to the sonata proposal.}, whether or not she commissioned the Septet remains an open question. Rice argues that she did, citing in reference the publication timelines of the String Quartets, op. 18, and the String Quintet, op. 29. The eventual dedicatees of those works, Prince Lobkowitz and Count Fries, paid Beethoven for “exclusive ownership” of them; an
arrangement that delayed the works’ appearance in print.\textsuperscript{154}

Rice points out that this general timeline maps onto the dates we know of the Septet’s first performance, compared to its eventual publication date.\textsuperscript{155} Beethoven’s first known mention of the composition to a publisher is in a letter to Hoffmeister on December 15, 1800. Rice points out as well that this is almost a year to the day after the first private performance. As will be seen, in ensuing communications Beethoven repeatedly urges the faster printing of the Septet. This makes sense, as, even still in manuscript, the music was being performed in various locales. In the two-year span between premiere and publication, the following known performances took place.\textsuperscript{156}

\textbf{Table 2.1:} Certain known performances of Beethoven, Op. 20, before print publication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Occasion</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 20, 1799</td>
<td>“dans le petit sale de Jan” [a hall in Jahn’s restaurant]</td>
<td>Concert, led by violinist Ignaz Schuppanzigh</td>
<td>Josephine Deym (née Brunsvik), letter of December 21, 1799\textsuperscript{157}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Dec. 20, 1799</td>
<td>Unknown [probably Palais]</td>
<td>Private concert, sponsored by Prince</td>
<td>Reminiscaces of Johann Nepomuk Emanuel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{154} Rice, \textit{Marie Therese}, 245. Op. 18 was published by Mollo & Co. in two volumes, in between June and October, 1801; op. 29 by Breitkopf and Härtel, in December, 1802. See \textit{Werkverzeichnis} 1, 104-5, 173.

\textsuperscript{155} For that timeline, see \textit{Werkverzeichnis} 1, 117-19.

\textsuperscript{156} Undoubtedly additional performances occurred; most of those in table 2.1 are traceable via material records (though the March 1802 performance(s) involving Beethoven’s friend Ignaz Schuppanzigh are, as far as I have found, unconfirmed.) Countless performances took place after the Septet’s publication as well, since it proved to be one of Beethoven’s most popular compositions. In particular, it seemed a specialty of Schuppanzigh’s. He led a performance of it in 1816, “at [his] concert to mark his departure for Russia”; then led another on January 25, 1824 (shortly after his 1823 return from Russia), to a packed concert hall. See Solomon, \textit{Beethoven}, 322, 415-16.

\textsuperscript{157} See Armand de Hévesy, \textit{Petites amies de Beethoven} (Paris, 1910), 19, cited in Rice, \textit{Marie Therese}, 246, and \textit{Werkverzeichnis} 1, 119. Deym, née Brunsvik, describes her brother’s reaction to the music: “[Franz] was transported by it, especially by a septet composed by Beethoven, which must have been the non plus ultra, as much for the performance as for the composition.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 2, 1800</td>
<td>Wiener Hofburgtheater</td>
<td>Musical “Akademie”</td>
<td>Schwarzenberg, recorded by Otto Jahn on Oct. 3, 1852&lt;sup&gt;158&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some time in 1800/01</td>
<td>Palace of Prince Odescalchi</td>
<td>Music-making with friends</td>
<td>Announcement, before April 2, 1800&lt;sup&gt;159&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February, 1801</td>
<td>Guicciardy home</td>
<td>Music-making with friends</td>
<td>Beethoven, letter to Nikolaus Zmeskall, “1800/01”&lt;sup&gt;160&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 23, 1801</td>
<td>King’s Theatre, Haymarket</td>
<td>Johann Peter Salomon’s London concert series</td>
<td>Josephine Deym, letter written after February 10, 1801&lt;sup&gt;161&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March, 1802</td>
<td>Dresden</td>
<td>Performance(s) by Schuppanzigh (?)</td>
<td>Announcement of April 21, 1801&lt;sup&gt;162&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The settings of these performances range from the very public to the intimate. In performance-related material that survives, whether related to public or intimate settings, obligato terminology makes no appearance.<sup>164</sup> It is not used in the public notice for the

---

<sup>159</sup> *Werkverzeichnis* 1, 119. See facsimile in *Briebe* 1, 51.
<sup>160</sup> *Briebe* 1, 59 (Letter 52); Anderson, *Letters* 1, 69-70 (Letter 56).
<sup>161</sup> Kopitz/Cadenbach, *BSZ* 1, 143 (Item 121).
<sup>162</sup> The announcement of this performance appears as, “Great Room, King’s Theatre”, *The Times*, no. 5084 (Tuesday 21 April 1801), I, col. 1. The contrabassist Dragonetti played in the April 23 performance:

New Grand Septetto (MS.) for Principal Violin, Viola, Violoncello, Clarinet, Bassoon, Corno, and Double Bass, Messrs. Salomon, Pieltain, Dahmen, W. Mahon, Holmes, Leander, and Dragonetti; Luigi Van Beethoven.


Salomon repeated a performance of the Septet on May 27, 1801, “by particular desire.”
<sup>163</sup> *Briebe*, 101 (Letter 79).
<sup>164</sup> Manuscripts in circulation at this time could have contained the terminology; however, they have not been preserved. Beethoven’s autograph score does not include it. Nor does the manuscript corrected for printing survive. See *Werkverzeichnis* 1, 119-20. The one handwritten
April 2, 1800 academy; nor is it used in any of the primary source references for the other performances above.\(^{165}\) This absence is not for lack of opportunity. For example: in the documents that Beethoven wrote related to the Septet, a personal request to his friend Zmeskall that he participate in a private performance of the same presented a tailor-made opportunity for obligato terminology.\(^{166}\) In this note, written sometime in 1800 or 1801, Beethoven invites his “Dearest Count of Music,” on “the best paper I possess,” to play the cello part in the Septet, at the palace of Prince Odescalchi, as “Schindlecker is not here.”\(^{167}\) Then Beethoven makes the ultimate plea: “[If] you don’t play, the whole record we have of it connected to Marie Thérèse’s collection, found in an inventory now part of the Kaisersammlung, describes the work merely as “Beethoven. Septetto.” The relevant page appears as Figure 1.3 in Rice, Marie Therese, 32. The inventory itself (Catalogo alter Musicakalien u. gehört in das privat Musikalien Archive S. Maj. des Kaisers) currently resides in the Nationalbibliothek. A-Wn, call number INV. / Kaisersammlung Graz 1. For a general overview of this inventory, especially as it relates to the Kaisersammlung, see Rice, Marie Therese, “The empress as collector of music,” 14-47; for the specific catalogue reference, see 15n6.

The announcement of “eine große musikalische Akademie” lists composers as a matter of course, but certain performers as well: Mlle Saal, singing an aria from Haydn’s Creation, and a duet from the same with “Herrn. Saal”; “Herren Schuppanzigh, Schreiber, Schindlecker, Bär, Nikel, Matauscheck, und Dietzel,” on violin, viola, ‘cello, clarinet, horn, bassoon, and contrabass, respectively. Empress Marie Therese is also listed as the Septet’s dedicatee. See Werkverzeichnis 1, 119. Salomon’s announcement mentions a “Principal Violin,” which aligns with the impressive cadenza given to that instrument in the last movement. See n48 above.

He does not. The reason cannot be because this is a letter to a friend, and thus the language of publishing or the technicalities of music are not called for. Beethoven performed with Zmeskall, after all; certain letters of Josephine Deym (née Brunsvik) (written in between January 1801 and November 1802) mention Beethoven and Zmeskall meeting her to play various pieces. See Koptiz/Cadenbach, BSZ 1, 143-45.

Anderson, Letters 1, 69 (Letter 56); Briefe 1, 59 (Letter 42). Anderson indicates in n4 that Philipp Schindlöcker, Marie Thérèse’s principal cellist, had “played in the first public performance of the septet on April 2, 1800.” Nikolaus Zmeskall von Domanovecz (1759-1833), a talented amateur cellist, was perhaps Beethoven’s “most constant Viennese friend” (Solomon, Beethoven, 82.) He ran errands for Beethoven with publishers, participated in all matter of social events, loaned him money, and even prepared quills for him. These details are scattered through their correspondence. Beethoven’s letters to Zmeskall overflow with informality, affection – and even a musical gesture or two that are, to put it mildly, hilarious. See especially a letter of possibly November 1802 (Anderson, Letters 1, 81 (Letter 65); Briefe 1, 136 (Letter 115)), in which Beethoven’s affection cascades into WoO 101, “Liebster Graf!”
musical performance will have to be cancelled.” Beethoven’s reputation as an ornament to aristocratic cultural life would be burnished by a good performance; so would a demonstration of reliability. Thus, his plea gives way to the worry that, if the performance is cancelled “I shall be most certainly suspected of having omitted to do something.”

This letter implies that the cello part is most definitely obligato in the most basic sense of the term: without this instrument, the music cannot go forward. The letter also inscribes various individuals into the performance. Beethoven’s scrawl up the letter’s left margin (“Eppinger is playing the violin”) could have been an inducement for Zmeskall to play, or an indication that the cello part is the one remaining obligato instrument lacking. Finally, in this personal context, the use of obligato terminology could have flattered Zmeskall into performing without any second thoughts. Lest one think Beethoven using such language in a letter to a friend to be far-fetched, he had already done just that, and with the same friend. A few years before the Odescalchi concert, he had written Zmeskall, “Je vous suis bien obligé pour votre faiblesse de vos yeux.” The note referenced WoO 32, a duet for viola (played by Beethoven) and cello (played by Zmeskall). In performance, it had apparently required that Beethoven borrow a pair of eyeglasses from his friend. He referred to their personal joke again on the WoO 32

---

168 Briefe 1, 59 (Letter 42); Anderson, Letters 1, 69-70 (Letter 56). Emphasis original.
169 The violin was another instrument without which the performance could not go forward, given Beethoven’s intricate writing for it throughout, and its virtuosic cadenza in the last movement.
170 The way in which Beethoven polices Zmeskall’s preparation after assuming his agreement could have prompted second thoughts from anyone less good-natured. “The rehearsal is at eleven o’clock tomorrow morning. I am sending you the score so that you may have a look at the solo part in the last minuet, which, as you know, is the most difficult.” Briefe 1, 59 (Letter 42); Anderson, Letters 1, 69-70 (Letter 56).
manuscript, which reads: “‘Duett mit zwei obligate Augengläsern von L. v. Beethoven’.”¹⁷¹

The note to Zmeskall shows one opportunity for obligato terminology. Josephine Deym could have used it in her letters to her sister Therese Brunsvik about the various performances she attended and participated in; Dolažálek could have used it likewise in his reminiscences. No trace of it is seen in surviving sketches related to the Septet, in its autograph, or in materials preserved from public performances.¹⁷² For all Beethoven’s concern in managing specific performances and instruments, for all the complexity of his navigation of Viennese noble circles, for all the consideration he gives to his compositions at this still-early stage of his career, he only uses this language of musical obligation, as connected to the Septet, in correspondence with a music publisher. The question we shall then turn to ask of “tutti obligati,” and of obligato terminology in general, is: what work does this terminology do, as the Septet moves to print?

**Septet: preparation for publication**

This brings us to the publisher of op. 20: Franz Anton Hoffmeister. Already a composer, Hoffmeister took up work as a music publisher in the early 1780s, “when Viennese music publishing was still in its infancy.”¹⁷³ His firm, in its various incarnations...

---

¹⁷¹ Briefe 1, 43 (Letter 35); Anderson, Letters, 32, 32n2 (Letter 30); both editions date this note to c. 1798.
¹⁷² See nn48, 50, and 51.
¹⁷³ Alexander Weinmann. “Hoffmeister, Franz Anton.” Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online. Oxford Univ. Press, accessed February 1, 2017. Hoffmeister (1754-1812) was apparently Mozart’s friend, though the String Quartet op. 20, K. 499 (pub. 1786) bears Hoffmeister’s name via association rather than an actual dedication. Hoffmeister also was the first, with Kühnel, to
and dual locations—Leipzig and Vienna—issued his own music alongside works of
"Haydn, Mozart, Vanhal, Albrechtsberger, Pleyel," and more. Due to his growing focus
on composition in the early 1800s, Hoffmeister transferred the Leipzig branch of the
business to his partner Ambrosius Kühnel and the Vienna branch to the Chemische
Druckerey.\textsuperscript{174} By the time he began printing Beethoven’s works in greater number—and
his new partnership with Kühnel notwithstanding—Hoffmeister’s publishing output had
dwindled considerably from its peak in the early 1790s.\textsuperscript{175}  

\textsuperscript{174} Hoffmeister’s business operated first under his name in Vienna, occasionally linked to those of
booksellers, beginning in 1785; from 1800 to 1805, due to his partnership with Kühnel, himself
based in Leipzig, the firm took on both their names, with the addition “Bureau de Musique.” In
1805, Hoffmeister left the Leipzig branch, in order to focus on composition; Kühnel in turn sold
the Bureau to Carl Friedrich Peters in 1814. In 1806, Hoffmeister sold the Vienna branch to the
Chemische Druckerey, which had been established in 1803 by Alois Senefelder, the inventor of
lithography.

It is important to distinguish Franz Anton Hoffmeister from Friedrich Hofmeister,
another music publisher who founded his eponymous firm in Leipzig in 1807. Friedrich
Hofmeister Musikverlag still operates today. So does the Edition Peters Group: first known as the
“Bureau de Musique, C. F. Peters,” and then known by different names over the course of the
nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The Chemische Druckerey also changed names as many times
as it changed hands. Haslinger, its owner by 1826, acquired the Mollo publishing firm as well, in
1835. The Haslinger firm was in turn acquired by Robert Lienau (A. M. Schlesinger) in 1875.
Lienau (Schlesinger) merged with Musikverlag Zimmerman in 1990. See Alexander Weinmann,

\textsuperscript{175} Weinmann points out: “By April 1793, [Hoffmeister’s] firm had reached the publication
number 293, but in the next ten years it added only 30 items and lacked a coherent programme.”
Weinmann, “Hoffmeister,” \textit{GMO, OMO}. 
Beethoven’s seven surviving letters to Hoffmeister date from between December 1800 and September 1803. In contrast to the downturn in Hoffmeister’s individual publishing efforts by this time, Beethoven was well on his way to a flourishing career, busy consolidating the gains he had made in the early years of his work in Vienna. Publishing being a vital part of those gains, it makes sense that we see Beethoven, in his letters to Hoffmeister that reference the Septet, conscious from the outset of the work’s potential for success in print. “This septet has been very popular,” he writes in the first preserved letter to Hoffmeister, dating from December 15, 1800. Even so, Beethoven was thinking of ways to increase its popularity. He immediately continues: “For its more frequent use one could arrange the three wind instrument parts, i.e. the bassoon, clarinet and horn, for another violin, viola and violoncello…” Given that, earlier in the letter, Beethoven lists the seven individual instruments – “per il violino, viola, violoncello, ContraBasso, clarinetto, corno, fagotto” – and tells Hoffmeister that they are “tutti obligati,” we may conclude that, as far as instrumentation is concerned, the “obligato”

---

177 Briefe 1, 54 (Letter 49); Anderson, Letters 1, 42-43 (Letter 41). Beethoven’s own dating of the letter is: “… am 15ten (oder so was dergleichen) Jenner 1801” – the parenthetical of which Anderson translates as “or thereabouts.”
178 The original German is worth reproducing in full: “… tutti obligati, (ich kann gar nichts unobligrates schrieben, weil ich schon mit einem obligaten accompagnement auf die Welt gekommen bin.) Dieses Septett hat sehr gefallen, zum Häufigern gebrauch könnte man die 3 Bläßinstrumente nemlich: fagotto, clarinetto, und corno, in noch eine violine, noch eine Viola, und noch ein Violoncello übersezen.” Briefe 1, 54 (Letter 49); tr. Anderson, Letters 1, 42-43 (Letter 41). In the Briefwechsel, editor Brandenburg uses italics to indicate where Beethoven switches from Kurrent cursive to Latin script. See Briefe 1, “Einführung. III,” XXXII.
aspect of the Septet does not refer to the most specific aspects of its instrumental make-up: the tone color combination of clarinet, bassoon, and horn, with strings.  

A month later, on or about January 15, Beethoven mentions to Hoffmeister another idea along the same, revenue-optimizing lines: “And for the time being I am offering you … a septet (about which I have already told you, and which could be arranged for the pianoforte also, with a view to its wider distribution and to our greater profit)…” On April 22, he mentions the idea again:

It would be very nice if my dear brother, besides publishing the septet as it stands, were to arrange it too for a flute, for instance, and perhaps as a quintet. This would satisfy the lovers of the flute [emphasis Beethoven’s] who have already entreated me to do this; and they would swarm around it and feed on it like insects.

This remark in particular is worth noting, as Hoffmeister could have taken it as tacit permission to arrange the septet for a type of quintet.

Finally, Hoffmeister apparently received word in the summer that Salomon in London meant to engrave the Septet and, in doing so, pre-empt his own publication. He must have written Beethoven with his alarm, because sometime in between June 21 and 23 of 1801, Beethoven writes to correct him tartly (“I almost feel inclined to be annoyed with you for thinking me capable of playing such a dirty trick”) since he sent Salomon a copy “out of friendship” and for performance only. Without any permissions given to

---


180 Briefe 1, 63-64 (Letter 54); tr. Anderson, Letters 1, 47 (Letter 44).

181 Briefe 1, 72 (Letter 60); tr. Anderson, Letters 1, 51 (Letter 47).
another publisher, Hoffmeister and Kühnel still have the sole right to publish. In his assurances, Beethoven emphasizes his own honesty:

I am so conscientious that I have refused to give the pianoforte arrangement of the septet to several publishers who approached me about this. Yet I don’t even know whether you are going to make use of the septet in that arrangement. 182

“Tutti obligati” – Analytical Approaches

Beethoven’s suggestions for different instrumental arrangements of Op. 20 give us an effective entry point to explore more deeply the meaning of his aside: to ask what he means when he writes that the Septet is “tutti obligati.” From the outset, we may say that Beethoven can absolutely imply more than one thing by it. 183 The meanings could range from the elevated to the practical to the humorous, and could indeed involve various shadings of each, since Beethoven loved all matter of wordplay. 184

The practical suggestions he makes, however, indicate that Beethoven not only thought that his septet’s instrumental constituents were flexible from the very beginning,

182 Briefe I, 76 (Letter 64); tr. Anderson, Letters 1, 55 (Letter 50). Anderson gives the date as 21 June; Brandenburg as June 22 or 23.
183 For example, Solomon, introducing the revised edition of his Beethoven biography, muses, “But mysteries and obscurities will always abound. I do not expect ever fully to understand … what he meant when he wrote that he came ‘into the world with an obbligato accompaniment,’ presumably a caul.” “Introduction to the Revised Edition,” Beethoven, XIX. Solomon refers only to the quotation’s location in the Anderson translation (Anderson, Letters 1, 42–43 (Letter 41)) and German original (Briefe 1, 54 (Letter no. 49)); he does not indicate where the hypothesis originated. Anderson notes, merely: “Tradition has it that Beethoven was born with a caul.” Anderson, Letters 1, 41n5, 42.
184 As an example of Beethoven’s humor, in “Zum Begriff,” 6, Voss points to the wordplay immediately preceding the obligato terminology, when Beethoven writes, “doch wenn der Hr. Bruder [Hoffmeister] eben so gewissenhaft sind, als manche andere Ehrliche Stecher, die uns arme Komponisten zu Tod stechen …” Briefe 1, 49 (Letter 54). Anderson translates this phrase as: “But if our worthy brother is as conscientious as many other honourable engravers who hound us poor composers into our graves …”, explaining: “Beethoven is indulging in one of his favorite puns on the verb ‘stechen’ which can mean ‘engrave’ and ‘goad’.” Anderson, Letters 1, 42 (Letter 41n4).
but also that the number of instruments could be pared down for maximum marketability. Since “tutti obligati” thus does not, at first glance, mean specific type or number of instruments, Adler’s contention that it must imply a certain compositional style takes on more weight. However, examining the score of op. 20 with the definition of the obligate Akkompagnement principle in mind – balanced interchanges of thematic material, requiring the performance of each autonomous part as written – proves that the work contradicts Adler’s principle.

The contrabass is, perhaps unsurprisingly, the culprit.\(^{185}\) Taking the introductory Adagio and the Allegro con brio together, the Septet’s first movement has 289 measures. Of these, the contrabass is independent in only fifteen (mm. 77-79, 135, 138, perhaps 140, 160-61, perhaps 164, 172, 235-38, and perhaps 251). This independence occurs mostly at internal cadences, when its note creates a dominant seventh or a root-position tonic chord. Its degree of independence in the rest of the music is limited. It most often doubles the violoncello at the octave, sometimes with a pared-down version of the cello’s rhythmic figures (playing the downbeats when the cello plays an Alberti bass, for example.) At other times, the contrabass doubles the notes of the French horn and/or the bassoon, the viola, and the violin; sometimes, if playing two octaves below rather than just one, its line falls under the cello doubling the same instrument at the octave in between. Since these doublings occur with the contrabass at least one octave lower than the other sounding instrument(s), the harmony is complete without said contrabass in terms of pitch class. In terms of harmonic specific gravity, the contrabass still has an important part to play.

\(^{185}\) Voss makes the same point about the contrabass, in “Zum Begriff,” 11-12.
The contrabass makes certain important contributions, overall: it grounds the Septet throughout in terms of timbre, it emphasizes the rhythmic propulsion towards various cadences, and it occasionally completes a chord. It is not a fully developed thematic part, however, and so, it contradicts Adler’s principle of *obligate Akkompagnement*. Applying that principle to the Septet thus can seem an exercise in contradiction: what Egon Voss labels “a music-historical joke.” Voss goes on to explain the punchline; namely, “that a term meant to capture the essential character of an entire epoch was derived from a work to which it can only be applied to a certain extent.”

Writing about the Septet op. 20 and its connection to Adler, Voss and other scholars have sought to circumvent this contradiction in various ways. These ways range from detailed analyses of certain movements’ internal structures, to an expansion of Adler’s entire concept in order to incorporate compositional choices that Adler did not describe in his original monograph. In an example of the former, Arnold Feil analyzes subtleties of rhythmic exchange to connect Adler’s principle to Beethoven’s composition in as concrete a way as possible. To do so, however, Feil has to sidestep the contrabass issue in the other movements. Exemplifying the expansion process, on the other hand, Klaus Aringer unpacks the “instrumental dramaturgy” at work in the Septet by examining

---

186 “Dass aber nicht das Septett, sondern Symphonien und Streichquartette zur Demonstration dienten, geschah selbstverständlich nicht von ungefähr; denn das Septett taugt als Anschauungs- und Demonstrationsmodell dessen, was Adler unter "oblig. Akkomp" vestand, nur wenig. Es ist wie ein Witz der Musikgeschichtsschreibung, dass ein Begriff, der wesentliche Merkmale einer bestimmten Epoche erfassen sollte, ausgerechnet anhand eines Werkes formuliert wurde, auf das dieser nur in Grenzen zutrifft.”

the highly individualized roles that Beethoven wrote for several of the instruments.\textsuperscript{188} Aringer draws off Egon Voss’ own, earlier expansion: the argument that the principle of \textit{obligate Akkompagnement} encapsulates a certain musical “dynamic”\textsuperscript{189} inherent to Beethoven’s compositions, one quite palpable in the Septet. According to Voss, this \textit{Dynamik} includes “the accentuation of rhythmic impulses, the illumination of melodic and motivic-thematic processes, the emphasizing of harmonic procedures,” and more.\textsuperscript{190}

On a practical level, Voss’ and Aringer’s expansions of Adler’s \textit{obligate Akkompagnement} solve the contrabass problem. Voss also complicates Adler’s concept by pointing out that Adler took all his examples of it from Beethoven’s symphonies and string quartets.\textsuperscript{191} This brings to the fore the issue of genre. A certain tension stems from the connection of \textit{obligate Akkompagnement} to the “lower” genre of the Septet, given its position in the line of frothy divertimenti and serenades popular in late eighteenth-century Vienna. Complicating that very position diffuses this tension.\textsuperscript{192} Both Voss and Aringer


\textsuperscript{189} Voss’ term is \textit{Dynamik}, which he takes care to define as more encompassing than merely indicating “loud” or “soft.” Voss, “Zum Begriff,” 12. Voss chose \textit{Dynamik} over \textit{Dynamismus}; I have followed suit.


\textsuperscript{191} Voss, “Zum Begriff,” 5.

\textsuperscript{192} For more on these issues of genre, status, and instrumentation, especially as relate to the Septet, see Dörte Schmidt, “Kammermusik mit Bläsern unter der Umbau des Gattungssystems,” in \textit{Beethoven Handbuch}, ed. Sven Hiemke (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 2009), 496-545. See especially the subsection “Satz und Besetzung oder: Die Überschreitung des Divertimentos durch das ‘obligate Accompagnement,’” 524-26. In a separate monograph, Carl Dahlhaus mentions this
explore the lineage of larger-scale chamber works for string and wind instruments, and offer examples of the Septet’s that set it apart from its fellows. For example, Voss points out that similar works usually contain at least one same-instrument pair; even given that the Septet is unique in this way, Aringer argues that its many subtleties of instrumentation set it apart even more.\textsuperscript{193}

Though Voss and Aringer expand the principle of \textit{obligate Akkompagnement} to fit it to the Septet, they only give passing mention to the work’s ensuing arrangement history. This is not to say that that same history disproves their points; rather, it adds weight to some of their respective arguments. Intimations of the importance of compositional \textit{Dynamik} and individualized instrumentation choices in the Septet may be seen in an examination of septet becoming quintet and then trio. The examination also

\textsuperscript{193} Voss, “Zum Begriff,” 8-9; Aringer, “Obligates Akkompagnement,” 308.
sheds light on Beethoven’s desire for creative control, even in (as he calls it) “our prolific age of transcriptions.”

**Septet to Quintet: the question of arrangements**

Beethoven was anxious for the Septet’s success in his early years in Vienna. However, his desire for widespread circulation of his music had limits. Said limits included publishers’ piracy; copyists’ piracy; and publishers, copyists, and performers working together (sometimes with unwitting assistance from Beethoven’s dedicatees) to make piracy more convenient.

Though Beethoven was open to changing the scoring of his compositions, to make a better profit, this too had its limits. Arrangements of compositions for different performing forces could take place on a spectrum of publisher-composer cooperation. While Beethoven occasionally took on arrangement work himself after being pressed for it, or volunteered a student or friend as arranger or editor, sometimes they would be made without Beethoven’s edits, without his input, without his permission, or even without his knowledge.

Various discussions of the arrangement process, scattered through the correspondence, indicate that control of the final product was paramount for Beethoven. For example, on June 1, 1802, his brother Carl wrote Beiktorf and Härtel about a plan for arranging certain compositions. Carl writes that he had “pointed out to him [Beethoven]

---

that a skillful composer had already arranged several works under his supervision,” and lists the genres involved.\textsuperscript{195} He then sketches out additional details of the process.

All usable combinations will little by little be produced, then thoroughly inspected, and if necessary altered by my brother …. My brother makes no profit here, because the person who arranges them will be well paid, but he [Ludwig] will not be sufficiently compensated for the time that he has devoted to the project, and does it only out of paternal love [for his compositions].\textsuperscript{196}

Beethoven confirms this process, with the “drastic corrections” he had to make to arrangements of op. 8 and op. 25, in a letter to Hoffmeister and Kühnel in September 1803.\textsuperscript{197} The wish for editorial control may also be seen in Beethoven’s repeated requests that his publishers send him final proofs. A few of these many requests were linked to a situation that unfolds in Beethoven’s correspondence with Ferdinand Ries and with Breitkopf and Härtel in May and June of 1803. Beethoven repeatedly mentions corrections to the first published version of the sonatas op. 31, nos. 1 and 2.\textsuperscript{198}

The [Nageli] edition is so beautiful that it is most unfortunate that it should have been launched into the world with that extreme slovenliness and lack of care …. It is an extremely unpleasant experience, particularly for the composer, to see an otherwise finely engraved work full of mistakes.\textsuperscript{199}

Due to this array of errors, Beethoven mistrusted Breitkopf and Härtel’s printing of his Variations, Op. 35, and stressed his need to see the proofs. This was not the first, and

\textsuperscript{195} Albrecht, \textit{Letters to Beethoven} 1, 72 (Letter 40). Albrecht identifies the composer as “probably … Franx Xaver Kleinheinz” (73n3.)

\textsuperscript{196} Albrecht, \textit{Letters to Beethoven} 1, 72-73 (Letter 40).

\textsuperscript{197} \textit{Briefe} 1, 183 (Letter 157); Anderson, \textit{Letters} I, 97 (Letter 82.)

\textsuperscript{198} \textit{Briefe} 1, 166-71, 184 (Letters 140, 142-44, and 158); Anderson, \textit{Letters} I, 92-96 (Letters 76-79 and 81). Nägeli had printed these two sonatas in Zürich; the number of mistakes in them made Beethoven 1) request that Breitkopf and Härtel notify the public and 2) order Ries to send a list of them to Simrock in Bonn.

\textsuperscript{199} Beethoven to Breitkopf and Härtel June 1803. \textit{Briefe} 1, 166-67 (Letter 140); Anderson, \textit{Letters} I, 93-94 (Letter 79).
certainly would not be the last of these requests, written with varying amounts of urgency and/or abusive language.

Franz Anton Hoffmeister’s arrangement of the Septet op. 20 for string quintet, published in Vienna in July 1802, provides us with a perfect storm of conflict between composer and publisher, centered on arrangements, errata, and (to Beethoven’s mind) the deception of the public. The basic timeline is as follows. Beethoven wrote Hoffmeister in December 1800 and then again in January 1801, offering the Septet and other compositions for publication. Hoffmeister apparently accepted his offer in a letter of January 24, 1801. However, the Septet itself was not published until June 1802.

Beethoven made clear his dismay at the delay, and the publishers their reasons, in various exchanges. As late as June 19, 1802, Hoffmeister and Kühnel wrote their Viennese agent, Caspar Josef Eberl, that Beethoven would receive the Septet in the near future, and that they would console him, in the meantime, with a good edition of the

---

200 In the same letter, Hoffmeister describes his intention to have certain Mozart piano sonatas arranged for string quartet, inquiring whether Beethoven would want to participate. See Briefe 1, 65 (Letter 55).
201 Werkverzeichnis 1, 120.
202 On February 27, 1802, Hoffmeister and Kühnel wrote Eberl, directing him to tell Beethoven that they have not finished with the Septet, “because of Schuppanzigh.” Ignaz Schuppanzigh, the violinist who had played at its premiere, apparently wished to perform it in concert “as a still-unpublished novelty” in Dresden, March 1802. See Beethoven, Septett Es-dur, Opus 20, Urtext edition (Munich: G. Henle Verlag.), Egon Voss, ed., “Bemerkung,” Kriticher Bericht, 17; as well as Briefe 1, 101 (Letter 79) and 101n4. On March 13, Eberl wrote to the firm in Leipzig that Beethoven was waiting “with longing” for his piano sonata op. 22 (“Herr von Beethoven erwartet schon mit Sehnsucht die Sonate”) and then speculated that hearing about Schuppanzigh in Dresden would spur Beethoven (“mag ihm dazu anspornen”) to participate in a concert of his own. In any case, Beethoven apparently told Eberl to pass along the word: press on with engraving the Septet. See Briefe 1, 102 (Letter 80). On April 8, 1802, Beethoven wrote Hoffmeister about his pleasure at the printed appearance of op. 22, but then added: “Send my septet out into the world a little faster – because the rabble is waiting for it – and you know that the Empress has it – and there are rascals in the Imperial City as there are at the Imperial Court …” Beethoven undoubtedly feared that a copyist would distribute the work in manuscript, ahead of official publication. Anderson, Letters 1, 73 (Letter 57); Briefe 1, 105 (Letter 84).
piano sonata op. 26. On the 30th, they directed Eberl to promise Beethoven five free printed copies of the Septet, and to offer one copy printed on good paper for the dedicatee, Empress Marie Thérèse. Beethoven wrote Hoffmeister on July 14 to take them up on that offer and to complain about the Septet being published in two separate volumes. Finally, on July 24, Eberl related that same objection to Hoffmeister and Kühnel, but also passed along Beethoven’s thanks for the fine work done on the engraving.

This timeline is worth examining in such detail because of Beethoven’s reaction to Hoffmeister’s quintet arrangement of the op. 20. After their exchanges about the different versions of the Septet that could be made (as Beethoven wrote on January 15, 1801, “with a view to its wider distribution and to our greater profit”), it seems that the first result was the arrangement of it for string quintet. Eberl passed along only one aspect of Beethoven’s reaction to the arrangement, in a letter to the Leipzig office written on August 25, 1802. He wrote that Beethoven received two copies of the quintet, but that he was still unhappy that in this version, as in the original, the music was divided into two

---

203 “… er solle „künftige Woche Septetto erhalten. Wir trösten ihn mit einer guten Auflage von Op. 26 en Commiss. Bur. De Mus. Er fragt außerdem an: ‘Hat er Nova?’” Briefe 1, 113-14 (Letter 93). This could have been Beethoven asking for the latest news, as he was in Heiligenstadt at the time.

204 Briefe 1, 115 (Letter 95).

205 “– das 7tet in zwei Theile, das gefällt mir nicht, warum? – und Wie?” Briefe 1, 117 (Letter 98).

206 “… er danket nicht nur allein für die Exp. [exemplars] sondern auch für die so saubere Reine auflage, nur ist es ihme nicht recht, das es in 2 Parient engetheilt ist …” Briefe 1, 118 (Letter 100). Eberl then passed along a correction Beethoven has made to penultimate measure of the violin part. Namely: Beethoven points out that the E-flat requires an “8va” insert, making it a jump of a fourth from Bb6 to Eb7 rather than a jump of a fifth down to Eb6; the next chord, crossing four strings, should be marked “loco.”
The historical record shows, however, that Beethoven thought much more poorly of the quintet arrangement by the end of October 1802. He made his disapproval of the arrangement public, publishing an announcement in the *Wiener Zeitung* to reject it forcefully:

*Notice in the ‘Wiener Zeitung’ of October 20 [sic], 1802*

---

207 “… Beethoven habe die 2 Exempl quintetten behändigt, ist ihm aber sehr unliebe daß wieder in 2 Partien ist, der Preis davon [?] ist zu hoch, ich fühle es, der absatz so wohl von 7tet als quintet ist sehr sehr unbeteütend …” *Briefe* 1, 119 (Letter 101.)

208 Anderson’s date of October 20, 1802 (see her *Letters* 3, 1434 [“Appendix H, “Press and Other Notices,” 1]) is incorrect, as the announcement appears in the *Wiener Zeitung* on October 26. See “Nachricht.” *Wiener Zeitung*, October 26, 1802, No. 86, p. 3871 (http://anno.onb.ac.at/cgi-content/anno?aid=wrz&datum=18021026&seite=35&zoom=27). Curiously, the *Briefwechsel* lists this same publication as appearing on October 27. See Brandenburg, *Briefwechsel*, 126n5. This could be because Beethoven’s announcement appears in the “Anhang” (3845).

The choice of October 20 can be traced back to an early editorial intervention in what is universally acknowledged as the monument of Beethoven biography, Alexander Wheelock Thayer’s *Life of Beethoven / Ludwig van Beethovens Leben*. Thayer was an American-born librarian and journalist who first thought of writing the biography when he detected differences between certain primary sources on Beethoven’s life and the biography written by the now discredited Anton Schindler. In his preface to most recent English-language edition, *Thayer’s Life of Beethoven* (1967), editor Elliot Forbes untangles the work’s history—which timeline, detailed over v-vi, I condense and present here. Thayer saw the first three volumes of his biography published, in German before he died in 1897. Hermann Deiters, a friend of Thayer’s, an accomplished editor himself and the translator of Thayer’s original English manuscript into German for Volumes I-III, then revised Volume I and completed Volume IV from Thayer’s notes. Deiters did not see the latter in print, though, since he died in 1907. Hugo Riemann completed the German-language edition of the biography—again, using Thayer’s notes—and made additional revisions, with the last (a second revision of Volume I) published in 1917. The English version, *Thayer’s Life of Beethoven*, was edited and revised by the editor Henry Edward Krehbiel “based … as much as possible on the original Thayer manuscript from which Deiters had worked,” though “[ end bracket? choosing his own method of presenting the material” that Thayer had not written up. “The result,” writes Forbes (in 1967), “was Krehbiel’s English version … published by the Beethoven Association of New York in 1921.” Forbes uses the rest of his preface to describe his own working method, which helped him navigate the layers of the various existing versions of the text, streamline the material in light of now-established biographical data, and cope with the fact that all of Thayer’s original notes have been missing since 1921. For more details, see Alexander Wheelock Thayer, *Thayer’s Life of Beethoven*. Revised and edited by Elliot Forbes. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1967. See “Preface,” v-xviii.
I consider that I owe it to the public and to myself to state publicly that the two quintets in C major and E major [sic], one of which (taken from one of my symphonies) was published by Herr Mollo in Vienna and the other (taken from the well-known septet of mine, Op. 20) by Herr Hoffmeister at Leipzig, are not original quintets, but merely transcriptions made by those worthy publishers – The making of transcriptions is on the whole a thing against which nowadays (in our prolific age of transcriptions) a composer would merely struggle in vain; but at least he is entitled to demand that the publishers shall mention the fact on the title-page, so that his honour as a composer may not be infringed nor the public deceived – This is in order to prevent cases of this kind arising in future. At the same time I am informing the public that a new and original quintet which I have composed in C major, Op. 29, will be published very soon by Breitkopf & Härtel at Leipzig.

I offer this minute contribution in the spirit of Thayer’s own focus on “the orderly organization of documentation, with judgments concerning the trustworthiness of the varying types of evidence” (Forbes, x), and in tribute to Thayer’s plaintive remark to Deiters in a letter of August 1, 1878: “If you prepare anything about me, please note that I was the first person ever to use Beethoven’s Sketch Books for chronology, as well as the first to seek out old advertisements and the like” (Forbes, viii).

In the 1872 edition Thayer, translated by Deiters, lists October 30 as the announcement date, judging by his “Am 30.October brachte die Wiener Zeitung folgende,” (see vol. 2, ch. 4, 196, of Ludwig van Beethoven’s Leben Berlin: W. Weber, 1872). The announcement did indeed appear on October 30; it appeared a few days previously as well, however. Possibly October 30 was the only Wiener Zeitung with the announcement that Thayer saw, perhaps in a collection Beethoven memorabilia preserved by a source. For the purposes of this error’s transmission, “20 October 1802” appears in the Riemann edition. See Alexander Wheelock Thayer, Ludwig van Beethovens Leben, vols. I-V, ed. and rev. Hugo Riemann(Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1922), vol. II, 110. The 20 October 1802 dating in the English version of Thayer’s work may be found in both the 1960 reprint of the 1921 Krehbiel edition, vol. I, ch. XV, 228, and the 1967 Forbes edition, vol. II, 302. Possibly “20” made its way into Riemann’s version as a result of various edits. Riemann relocated the Wiener Zeitung announcement from Thayer’s chronological placement (196 of the 1872 ed.) to earlier in the volume (110 of the 1922 ed.). Thayer linked the announcement to Beethoven’s emotional state, since, chronologically, the notice appears soon after Beethoven wrote his Heiligenstadt Testament. Riemann separated the two completely, perhaps to help the narrative build towards Heiligenstadt, without any nitty-gritty printing disputes diffusing the Testament’s emotional power. Riemann managed this by placing the announcement after a discussion of the First Symphony – similarly arranged by another for string quintet, though by Mollo and not Hoffmeister. In the most recent edition, Forbes decides to split the difference, situating the notice correctly in terms of chronology, but connecting it to remarks on arranging practices that appear before the Heligenstadt Testament. Finally, Riemann was the only one to add the opus number into the discussion (“gleichzeitig mit einem solchen des Septetts Op. 20 bei Hoffmeister und Kühnel”) so, in his case, perhaps one “20” followed the other.

The same announcement was published as an “Anziege” in the Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung, November. 3, 1802 issue, No. 6, Intelligenzblatt IV, col. 15. This too did not make the biographical cut in any version at all of Thayer’s work.
These are indeed strong terms. This change in attitude, from making the same objection to the quintet’s printed form that he had made to that of the septet (movements 1-3 in the first volume, movements 4-6 in the second) to having a vehement repudiation published, certainly appears drastic. Furthermore, since Beethoven himself repeatedly wrote that he would create arrangements of op. 20 for alternative performing forces for the sake of increased success in print, it behooves us to examine Hoffmeister’s arrangement to see what Beethoven might have been objectionable.

---

209 Translation from Anderson, Letters 3, 1434 (“Appendix H, “Press and Other Notices,”” 1) There is a small error in regard to the Septet’s key, with “Es” taken to mean “E” rather than “E-flat.” As examined in the previous note, the announcement appeared in both the Wiener Zeitung (October 26, 1802 (nr. 86, p. 3871) and the Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung (Nov. 3, 1802 issue, No. 6, Intelligenzblatt IV, col. 15). I use brackets to indicate where the AmZ announcement differs from the WZ version, leaving out minor variants in punctation and changes in spelling due to the WZ’s Fraktur and the AmZ’s Antiqua.


Ludwig v. Bethoven [Beethoven]

210 Ferdinand Ries made arrangements on Beethoven’s behalf; Beethoven himself checked them for errors. See Ries’ letter to Simrock, September 13, 1803; Albrecht, Letters to Beethoven 1, 115 (Letter 67): “Some very good piano quartets and trios could be made from his [Mozart’s] string quintets, only they would have to be in score. These same speculations could also be made with Beethoven’s quintets, quartets and trios. Beethoven would examine them to please me and would permit them to be engraved, since he had revised them.” Also, Carl Beethoven mentioned (possibly) Franz Xav?er Kleinheinz as an arranger when he offered Breitkopf and Härtel
Septet vs. Quintet: Errata Examined

As seen in the above discussion of proof requests, errata were on Beethoven’s mind at this time. In his letter to Hoffmeister of April 8, 1802, he complains about the mistakes Mollo made in reprinting his Quartets op. 18.

Herr Mollo has again recently published my Quartets, let us say full of faults and Errata, great and small; they swarm like fish in water, i.e., there’s no end to them. Questo è un piacere per un autore. That’s what I call printing; my skin is all over prickings and chaps from the beautiful editions of my quartets.²¹¹

Just as in the Mollo, there are plenty of fish in the Hoffmeister arrangement. In collecting examples of various types of errata, I focused especially on the fourth movement: Tema con Variazioni. There are typesetting mistakes (Vln 2, var. 4 m. 11, upper half of decrescendo missing); mistakes in dynamic and articulation markings (ex: Vlns. 1 and 2, Vlas. 1 and 2, Tema m. 14, three different terms for sforzando, on various notes in a single chord: Fp, sF, Fz); and missing accidentals (Vla 2, var. 4 m. 9, Ab3 should be A-natural3; m. 14 Db4 should be D-natural4: in each of these, the missing accidental different versions of pre-existing works; see n81, above. Since Hoffmeister as well could have had arrangers contracted to his firm, though he himself was a composer, it is possible that he did not create the quintet arrangement. Likewise, there exists the possibility that Beethoven did not make the ensuing arrangement of op. 20 into op. 38 (though, as Carl’s letter of June 1, 1802 implies, he would have checked that arrangement for errors and altered it as necessary; see n81.) Though I acknowledge these possibilities, I have chosen for the sake of brevity to refer to the quintet as Hoffmeister’s and both the septet and the trio as Beethoven’s.

²¹¹ Anderson, Letters I, 57 (Letter 51). Briefe I, 105-6 (Letter 84). The image of the (little) fish and the punning in the original show that Beethoven could be sardonically amused by it all.

Hr. Mollo hat wieder neurdings meine Quartetten sage: voller Fehler und Errata – in größer Manier und kleiner Manier herausgegeben sie wimmeln wie die kleinen Fische im Wasser d. h. ins undendliche – questo e un piacere per un autore – das heißt ich stechen, in Wahrheit meine Haut ist ganz voller Stiche und Rize – von dieser schönen Auflage meiner quartetten …

The Beethoven Archiv has the translation: “[they] wiggle about like little fish in the water.”
muddies a tonicization). These are on a smaller scale, along the lines of a mistake mentioned by Eberl in a letter to his supervisors in Leipzig: Eb6 instead of an Eb7 in the violin at the end of the original Septet score.

There are certain awkward moments in the quintet’s counterpoint that could have irritated Beethoven. For example, in the third variation of the fourth movement, Hoffmeister made some mistakes in rewriting the non-melodic lines at the first half cadence (mm. 3-4). Perhaps the smaller ambitus of his non-melodic instruments (two violins and viola, at the beginning of the third variation) compared to Beethoven’s (violin, viola, cello, and contrabass) constrained him somewhat; however, even within those constraints, other choices than the ones he made were possible.

Hoffmeister gives the violins what is basically a unison line from mm. 3 to 4, and uses the second viola to double them an octave below (with one quick jump up that puts three separate instruments on F4 simultaneously.) He attempts to avoid the unison by writing the first violin a double neighbor, so it moves from G4 (rather than Eb4) to F4, but this maneuver in turn sets up parallel fifths with the first viola’s C4 to Bb3. Hoffmeister’s later cadences, in mm. 8 and 16, are structured more similarly to the original; mm. 3-4 move away from that original in a way that leads one to wonder why Hoffmeister chose that unison at all.

---

212 This list is by no means exhaustive for this movement. See “Quintetto pour 2 violons, 2 violes et violoncelle, oeuv. 20 / composée par L. v. Beethoven,” (Leipzig: Bureau de Musique de C. F. Peters, 1820-1829. The identical plate numbers – 110-111 – indicate that this is a reprint of Hoffmeister & Kühnel original, pub. 1802; C. F. Peters has, however, included metronome markings.) New York Public Library: Performing Arts Research Collections – Music. Drexel 5394-5394.1.

213 July 24, 1802. Briefe 1, 118 (Letter 100). See n206 above.
It is worth questioning whether awkward or erroneous counterpoint would have provoked Beethoven’s ire as much as printing errors, piracy, and arrangements made without permission. On the one hand, Beethoven had arrived in Vienna conscious of the gap in his compositional skill evinced by his ignorance of counterpoint. Since he had worked intensely to master it, he could take mistakes along those lines, made by others arranging his own works, as a personal affront. On the other hand, as concerns these moments of contrapuntal awkwardness in in the quintet arrangement, we may see parallel octaves and unisons in the septet original as well. At the mm. 3-4 cadential point in the third variation, for example, Beethoven has certain non-melodic instruments double the melodic instruments: the violin doubles the clarinet an octave below, and the viola doubles the bassoon at the unison. As I see it, the main difference in this variation

---

between Beethoven’s choices and Hoffmeister’s is that Beethoven uses these doublings to reinforce the strings’ role as occasional harmonic support to the wind instruments carrying the melody. The chords as Beethoven sets them are a clear, if sparse, ii6 – V(6/4–5/3) progression: a quiet completion of the cadential gesture in clarinet and bassoon. In contrast, Hoffmeister moves three instruments from scale-degree 4 to 5. He gives the first violin an embellishment with scale-degree 2 to create a third rather than a unison, but he still does not write enough harmony to imply a specific ii6 predominant, rather than IV, in the absence of the two instruments playing the melody.

**Instrumental Drama and Dynamik**

There are errors in the quintet setting that have greater consequences for the work’s overall musical effect. Take, for example, the beginning of the third variation. Beethoven sets imitative points of entry, for bassoon and clarinet, at the octave. This creates pleasing concordances, mostly at the tenth but occasionally at the sixth. (See mm. 1d & 2c of the variation, and the elegant exchange in the second half of m. 7.) Given the gestural energy, the thematic exchange, and the timbral contrasts, this moment constitutes a basic example of Egon Voss’ *Dynamik*.

As one may have noticed in the discussion of counterpoint above, before the errors of mm. 3 and 4, Hoffmeister gives the opening imitation to viola and cello, and sets it at the unison. In terms of ambitus, imitation at the unison compresses any and all tenths and sixths into uniform thirds.
Figure 4a: Beethoven, Septet op. 20, mvt. 4 var. 3, mm. 1-8. Reproduced with permission.

Figure 4b: Hoffmeister, Quintet (Beethoven Septet op. 20, arr.) mvt. 4 var. 3, mm. 1-8.

Compare m. 7 of the quintet with the original m. 7. In the second half of Hoffmeister’s m. 7, the first viola alternates with the cello, creating the effect of the same two thirds, repeated.

Lest one think this mistake is one that merely runs through the whole movement, at m. 8b, Hoffmeister restores the original difference in range by vaulting the first viola
up an octave, to duplicate what was the violin line in the original scoring. The first violin in Hoffmeister’s version takes over the phrase in m. 10 and adds an ornament in m. 12. Then the first viola and the cello return to the same imitation at the unison, with the same collapse of tenths and sixths into uniformity.

In terms of instruments functioning within that ambitus, a canon played by viola and cello at the unison creates a sound much murkier than the same played by clarinet and bassoon an octave apart. As Beethoven had wind instruments to work with as well as strings, perhaps the comparison is not completely fair. However, given the register distinction in Hoffmeister’s mm. 8b to 12c, a less uniform timbre for the listener in the rest of the variation should have been easy to create.\footnote{It is possible, though unlikely given the range of the instruments in question, that there was an 8va mark for the viola or an 8vb for the cello missing in draft or not observed by the engraver. This is undercut by the fact that an 8va or 8vb could be very easily added to the plate after the main engraving was done.}

\textbf{Figure 4c:} Hoffmeister, Quintet (Beethoven Septet op. 20, arr.) mvt. 4 var. 3, mm. 9-14.

These two choices of instrumentation and registration, however small on the surface, led to changes in timbre and texture that could have caught Beethoven’s attention
in a negative way when he sat down to examine the setting in detail. Continuing from the third variation, he would have found in the fourth variation one outright error and several choices in setting: which all, in Voss’ and Aringer’s terms, altered the music’s Dynamik by obscuring the individualistic quality of the original instrumentation.

In the septet, this variation in the minor mode is notable for textural elegance, a quality admittedly preserved in the quintet setting. Running triplets in first one and then two of the upper strings delicately outline the new modality, while notes sustained by different instruments create a pellucid backdrop both above and below. Low strings ground the whole with a pizzicato walking bass. Beethoven’s setting uses the different instrument types to striking effect. The violin leads with the running triplets; the viola joins at the octave for three of four phrases. The cello and contrabass play pizzicato support, doubling each other at the octave throughout. The winds provide the drama of long sustained notes, alternating in the first half of the variation, and moving from unison to an echo effect in the second. For several reasons, the most striking part of this drama is the figure passed from the horn to clarinet and bassoon, and then back through the woodwinds again.

The horn plays it first: a simple jump of a fifth, followed by a scalar descent in the minor to scale-degree 2. This is not new, since the horn played fifths in the theme, alternating between scale-degrees 1 and 5 at cadential points. After that opening to the fourth movement, though, it fell silent. Only at variation four does the horn play again. It begins with the same notes that it played in the theme, as though it has just remembered what it played before, but then moves down the scale to help the violin define the new
modality.\textsuperscript{216}

Other aspects of these moments of sounding horn differ. Its fifths in the theme are buried in the instrumental texture at the cadence. In the fourth variation, though, the horn’s gesture at the beginning sounds quite exposed. The gesture itself reinforces its horn-ness: the rising fifth familiar from work after work in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries meant to evoke the hunt. The clarinet and bassoon take the gesture for measures 5-8; all three play in mm. 9-12; and then the horn cues the other two in an echo effect, bringing all three wind instruments together in mm. 14-16 to a cadence.

\textbf{Figure 5a:} Beethoven, Septet op. 20, mvt. 4 var. 4, complete. Reproduced with permission.

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.8\textwidth]{figure5a.png}
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{216} Aringer discuss this moment in “Obligates Akkompagnement,” 321-22, linking it not only to Beethoven’s “horn cantilena” in other moments of the Septet, but also to a trope of soloistic writing for the instrument in the late 18\textsuperscript{th} century: moments in which the composer detached an individual horn from its usual pair. “Beethoven setzt das einzelne Horn in seinem Septett ungewöhnlich häufig in Moll statt in Dur, verwiesen sei auf die von schmerzlichen Vorhaltstönen durchsetzte Hornkantilene (T. 68-73) in der Mitte des zweiten Satzes, die b-moll Variation des vierten Satzes, und die es-moll Introduktion zum letzten Satz (T. 1-16). Moll-Passagen bildeten Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts einen gängigen Bestandteil der solistischen, von der gewöhnlichen paarigen Besetzung losgelösten Naturhornschreibweise” (321).
Even taking into account the difficulties of communicating clarinet, horn, and bassoon via stringed instruments, errors in the quintet arrangement undercut this moment’s particular energy.

The problem begins with a glaring mistake in the anacrucis to the fourth variation: the first viola is missing the Bb3. Its effect is to erase the opening gesture, thus making the horn vanish even more than by virtue of being played by a different instrument. The first viola continues the line as if transcribing, entering on F4.

**Figure 5b:** Hoffmeister, Quintet (Beethoven Septet op. 20, arr.) mvt. 4 var. 4, complete.
The horn leaping-fifth gesture does return in mm. 4-5, and is appropriately transcribed in echo in mm. 12-13; however, no alternation of timbre as striking as clarinet and bassoon vs. horn is possible, due to the decrease in instrumental number and their uniformity as strings. Thus, the first viola does double duty as horn in mm. 1-4 and bassoon in mm. 5-8.

The horn’s disappearance, both in physical form and on the page in this transcription, brings to mind Peter Szendy’s discussion of arrangements: his musings on the extent to which, in their communication, diffusion, clarification, or correction of
musical works, they remain haunted by the soundings of those same works.217 Szendy puts forward that arrangers are “signing … a listening”: that they are “[the] ones who sign their names inside the work, and don’t hesitate to set their name down next to the author’s.”218 We thus see an initial problem in applying this idea to the quintet arrangement of the septet: Beethoven’s own castigating Hoffmeister for putting his, the composer’s, name on the septet, and not having indicated that Hoffmeister transcribed it. “At least,” Beethoven announced, “he [the composer] is entitled to demand that the publishers shall mention the fact [of transcription] on the title-page, so that his honour as a composer may not be infringed nor the public deceived.”219 Szendy’s model uses the Romantic-era transcriptions of Liszt as examples of this double-signing. At a point in which the concept of the work is still emergent, this truthfulness in double-signing – the stamp of one composer on the work of another – is impossible. But as concerns truth, Beethoven rants against the lack of Hoffmeister’s name on the arrangement, thus calling this quintet not just an arrangement or transcription, but a lie.220

I will return to Szendy’s ideas when considering Beethoven’s own arrangement of

---

218 Szendy, Listen, 35-36.
220 Again, lest this appear too strong a label, Beethoven himself calls Hoffmeister a liar (implied in retrospect, connected to the septet arrangement), in a note of mid to late September, 1803 (Anderson has “c. September 18,” Brandenburg, “etwa 20. September”), concerning other arrangements.

The arrangements [Ops. 8 and 25 to Ops. 42 and 41] were not made by me, but I have gone through them and made drastic corrections in some passages. So do not dare to state in writing that I have arranged them. If you do, you will be telling a lie, seeing that, moreover, I could never have found the time, or even had the patience, to do work of that kind – Are you satisfied?” See Anderson, Letters 1, 97 (Letter 82); Briefe 1, 183 (Letter 157). This “letter” is actually a postscript to a longer one, the contents of which remain unknown, since it has never been found. In it, Beethoven repeats, “Are you satisfied?” in what could be a sardonic refrain.
the Septet. Returning to the many mistakes in the quintet arrangement: presumably, realizing their extent sent Beethoven into high dudgeon, to the point of stating that “those worthy publishers [Mollo and Hoffmeister]” had, in his words, infringed upon his honor and deceived the public. With issues of musical reputation and personal honor brought into the fray, one might think that Beethoven would frame this wish that arrangements be accurate and honest in strong musical terms as well. Obligato terminology, in other words, could have performed helpful work in this situation, whether by indicating that the composer required the presence of certain instruments or certain musical material in the arrangement, or by indicating to the public that aspects of the arrangement, in comparison to the original, were faulty. However, except for the one reference in his letter to Hoffmeister of December 15, 1800, no type of “obligato” appears in anything connected to the entire quintet controversy.  

Of course, the publication history of the Septet does not end in late 1802. Its many arrangements attest to its great popularity. Hoffmeister’s quintet setting alone appeared in ten different editions, in Leipzig, Paris, and London. Arrangements of the complete Septet for piano solo, piano and various melody instruments, piano four hands, and both nine and eleven wind instruments, all appeared in Beethoven’s lifetime. The arrangements proliferate further when settings of single movements are taken into

---

221 Nor does it appear anywhere in the lengthy controversy over the two publishing houses dueling for the Quintet, op. 29.

222 The reprints included: Leipzig, 1806, when Kühnel was in charge of the company; 1814 and 1820, after Peters had taken over the company; Paris: by Sieber père, ca. 1804, Imbault, ca. 1811, Pleyel, ca. 1812, Janet et Cotelle, no earlier than 1812; Pacini, ca. 1825, and Schlesinger, 1827; and London: Clementi, 1807. See Werkverzeichnis 1, 122. Note that additional reprints over the course of the nineteenth century are very possible; the Werkverzeichnis editors stopped tracking them at the year 1830. See Werkverzeichnis, Introduction, 30 and 62.

223 Werkverzeichnis 1, 121-24.
Its popularity ended up infuriating Beethoven. Biographer Alexander Wheelock Thayer preserved an anecdote illustrating the extent of that anger.

One day Neate [an English visitor] spoke to him about the popularity of his Sonatas, Trios, etc., in England, and added that his Septet was very much admired: “That’s damned stuff!” (or “a damned thing”), said Beethoven, “I wish it were burned!” or words to this effect, to Neate’s great discomfiture.225

Other anecdotes along similar lines survive.226 Some of Beethoven’s frustration undoubtedly lay in the refusal of contemporaries to be challenged, musically;227 one can imagine his reaction to the contemporary reviewer who preferred the Septet to the Eroica, or what he would say to the reviewer who preferred the eleven-woodwind arrangement of the Septet (complete with serpent) to the Hammerklavier.228 In ensuing critical reception, to say nothing of musicological literature, as the aesthetic status of works considered more challenging increased, that of others, previously praised to the skies (the Septet, especially, for its “ingratiating” and “pleasing” qualities), sank. Thus Lewis Lockwood’s remarks, typical of musicological critique of these compositions:

We can identify at least three strains in Beethoven’s larger works. The first consists of those written for worldly success, in which he aimed to inaugurate an independent career but not to shock patrons or listeners too radically. This group comprises the first two piano concertos, the Septet, and the First Symphony.

224 Werkverzeichnis I, 124-25
226 See, for example, Czerny’s comments to Otto Jahn: “[Beethoven] could not endure [the Septet] and grew angry because of the universal applause with which it was received.” Referenced in Aringer, “Obligates Akkompagnement,” 305.
228 Review of Bernhard Henrick Crusell’s arrangement, Frankfurt Allgemeiner musikalischer Anzeiger, 1826; tr. in Critical Reception, 161 (no. 83).
Then there are, Lockwood continues, an “intermediate class of works” which showed “signs of higher imagination” than the first but still were “designed to ingratiate,” as did works in the first category.229

Lockwood does nuance his categorizations, and furthermore attributes Beethoven’s creating these ingratiating works to “his burning ambition to achieve public recognition.”230 As I have Beethoven’s letters to Hoffmeister, discussing the Septet’s popularity and its various possibilities for arrangement, neatly align with this motivation. However, Beethoven’s arrangement of the op. 20 as his piano trio op. 38 (piano, clarinet or violin, and cello) complicates the picture somewhat. It is likely that Beethoven completed this arrangement before he saw the quintet version.231 Therefore, his issuing the septet as a trio would not amount to a musical corrective, in the way that the Wiener Zeitung announcement was a public one.

Consider, however, the ideas put forth by Voss and Aringer, about the Dynamik and instrumental drama present in the Septet. Examining the trio arrangement op. 38 alongside op. 20 demonstrates the choices Beethoven made to communicate these qualities using a different ensemble.


230 Lockwood, Beethoven, 175-76.

231 Both Ludwig and Carl mention a piano arrangement of the Septet as a fait accompli (in June 1801, and on September 25, 1802, respectively. See n180 above.)
Comparing the original version of the first half of the theme to the op. 38 setting shows the convenience of the piano in the trio. For the piano implies the timbral similarity of the four instruments whose parts it plays, yet also marks their difference from the clarinet/violin and cello representing the original winds.

**Figure 6a:** Beethoven, Septet op. 20, mvt. 4 *Tema*, mm. 1-8. Reproduced with permission.

With the five string instruments of the quintet, such a juxtaposition of similarity and
difference is impossible. At most, Hoffmeister can add interest by opening the lower part of the texture via the cello’s entrance in m. 4.

**Figure 6c:** Hoffmeister, Quintet (Beethoven Septet op. 20, arr.) mvt. 4 *Tema*, mm. 1-8.

In terms of *Dynamik* and instrumentation choice, op. 38 conveys one specific timbral aspect of op. 20 setting much more effectively than the quintet version: namely, the energy of the contrabass rumbling along in the Septet, doubling the cello at the octave, emphasizing buildups to cadences.

**Figure 7a:** Beethoven, Septet op. 20, mvt. 4 var. 3, mm. 1-8. Reproduced with permission.
The trio accomplishes a similar effect quite simply, since Beethoven has the piano’s extensive range available. By including octaves in the left hand, Beethoven is able to duplicate the effect of having the contrabass in the instrumental texture. We see this in a comparison of the third variation in the trio to both the original and the quintet.

At the outset, in the trio setting, Beethoven puts the imitation back at the octave. Thus, even if the uppermost voice is taken by violin instead of clarinet, a timbral difference between the two string instruments is perfectly audible, and tenths and sixths are back to their non-compressed selves.

Figure 7b: Beethoven, Trio op. 38, mvt. 4 var. 3, mm. 1-8. Reproduced with permission.

Figure 7c: Hoffmeister, Quintet (Beethoven Septet op. 20, arr.) mvt. 4 var. 3, mm. 1-8.
One way Beethoven has distilled seven instruments into three involves making the same choice as the one which gave Hoffmeister counterpoint trouble: electing to have an incomplete harmony in the “backing” parts (here entirely played by the piano) at the first internal cadence. The difference is that, though the uppermost melodic part is doubled by the uppermost in the background parts, the movement in the other parts is contrapuntally elegant. Note again that the lower octave doubling in the piano left hand duplicates the contrabass’ grounding of the entire texture in the original.

Finally, though the piano is the instrument in the trio analogous to the string family in its ability to span a large range while possessing timbral similarity (allowing for shadings of difference along the ambitus), Beethoven does not always give the string parts of the Septet to the piano in the Trio. The choices he makes in the fourth variation function as an effective transcription of instrumentation effect, even as they preserve the drama of the give-and-take between the winds and the individual quality of the horn part.

**Figure 8a:** Beethoven, Trio op. 38, mvt. 4 var. 4, mm. 1-3. Reproduced with permission.

Beethoven introduces the piano equivalent to a walking bass played on a string instrument, with duple octaves set against the running triplets of the right hand. Again,
the contrabass effect is included, and indeed highlighted by the octave being broken rhythmically. (The staccato marked, combined with this rhythm, could be an attempt to evoke the particular bounce of pizzicato on an instrument not equipped to provide the same effect.) The cello takes the horn gesture, with the opening Bb3 included.

Since including the Septet’s rapid-triplet octave doubling of violin and viola in the second quarter of the variation would make the piano part exceedingly difficult, Beethoven chooses to move the left hand completely up an octave. This also balances the inclusion of another instrument doubling the horn line.

**Figure 8b: Beethoven, Trio op. 38, mvt. 4 var. 4, mm. 4-8. Reproduced with permission.**

![](image)

Interestingly, it is after the repeat that Beethoven chooses to give the cello line in the original septet back to the cello of the trio. I believe he did this to highlight just how he is marking the trio cello as the septet horn in this variation. In the original, the horn does not play its gesture in this section. The violin/clarinet takes on the original lines of clarinet and bassoon, but melds them together, creating unison sforzandi and swells in mm. 8d-11d. The countermotion of the original violin and viola needs to be played in the piano in
these measures; this would be impossible with one hand. So, the cello is allowed to be a cello, momentarily, marked by its pizzicato.

**Figure 8c**: Beethoven, Trio op. 38, mvt. 4 var. 4, mm. 9-12. Reproduced with permission.

When the horn in the original repeats its gesture one last time to round off the variation, the cello in the trio must once again leave its cello-ness behind.

**Figure 8d**: Beethoven, Trio op. 38, mvt. 4 var. 4, mm. 13-16. Reproduced with permission.

This brief exercise in comparison shows just how Beethoven builds interest and drama via contrasting instrumental forces in both the original septet and the trio. In other
words: compared to the quintet, the trio sees all of Voss’ *Dynamik* and Aringer’s instrumental dramaturgy return. The trio arrangement is worth considering on Szendy’s terms of “arranger as listener.” What do we encounter in Beethoven’s “listening” of Beethoven? A systematic exploration of Beethoven’s arrangements of his own works for other instrumental forces would be necessary for any conclusive statement on this topic; however, we may be sure of encountering an attention to details of instrumentation, and instrumentation in translation, like the attention we see demonstrated in the trio setting.

**Arrangements, Listenings, Playings**

Reading Beethoven’s earlier exchanges with Hoffmeister through the lens of Szendy’s “arranger as listener,” we encounter a cacophony: Beethoven hearing the septet multiplied to a dizzying degree in all manner of sound combinations. In proposing to Hoffmeister so many different versions of the septet for various groupings of instruments, Beethoven seems to be imagining different “playings” of a work just as much as different “listenings” of it: the septet in new musical forms, brought to sound by various members of the musical public, whether alone or in groups, in circles domestic, dilettante, or professional. In grappling with the arrangement’s difficulties and encountering its felicities, the players would hear the arranger’s “listening” of the work but would also create their own.\(^\text{232}\)

We see an intimation of this idea of “playings” in a review of the Trio op. 38. The arrangement had been published in January, 1805 by the Bureau des Arts et d’Industrie\textsuperscript{233}; the review appeared in the \textit{Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung} of August 28 of that same year. After remarking on the French dedication, “noteworthy because of the odd phrase in which the composer states that he is giving precisely this work \textit{sic} to his patron because it is easy to perform,” the reviewer praises the arrangement as an excellent setting of the Septet, itself “known to be one of the most beautiful, or at least one of the most agreeable and amiable by this master.” Then the reviewer proceeds to discuss particulars:

As it goes without saying with this composer, the new arrangement is very good. The violin part, as can likewise be taken for granted, is a different one from that for clarinet. If one alternates the two instruments, one can enjoy the trio with satisfaction all the more often, for through the small alterations in both, this interesting painting is illuminated in several more pleasant colors. Nevertheless, the reviewer feels that the clarinet is the superior choice, presuming it is played very well. The whole work emerges like an original and almost as well as it does on the seven instruments. The performance of the keyboard part is, for Beethoven’s music, really very easy.\textsuperscript{234}

The praise of the music’s pleasing nature, the assumption that the purchasers could make their own instrumentation choices, and the remarks about the ease of the piano part give a vivid impression of the “playings” that would emerge from this arrangement. The historical details behind the dedication, on which the reviewer remarks, add even more layers to this impression. Unlike the dedication of the Septet op. 20 to Empress Marie Thérèse, the Trio op. 38 is inscribed to a Dr. Johann Adam Schmidt. Beethoven had

\textsuperscript{233} Werkverzeichnis 1, 224.
written his friend Wegeler, on November 16, 1801, asking about Schmidt’s dedication to medicine, his “experiments with galvanism,” and his chance of working a miracle cure for deafness. What work Schmidt did for Beethoven must have impressed, reassured, or at the very least comforted him, earning him the dedication. Additional details suggest that the dedication had Beethoven envisioning this trio being performed in Schmidt’s family circle. The first page of the piano part contains exactly that suggestion: that the trio be played within the family when the daughter’s piano abilities had improved. Thus we have a different playing envisioned in a dedication, a different social circle likewise, as well as picture of family intimacy and music learning inscribed in it, embodied in Mlle. Schmidt making progress at the piano while her father accompanies her on the violin.

Navigating all of Beethoven’s envisioned "playings," while enmeshed in this analysis and material history, we might be forgiven for losing sight of this chapter’s subject. We have found it nowhere in this entire assemblage of op. 20 material. Though one might expect to see it because of the piano’s importance in recreating the string texture of the original, or because of the piano’s importance to the Mlle Schmidt’s education, there is no reference to any sort of “obligato” on the title page of this arrangement. There is no reference to “obligato” on the title page of the original Septet, either. When he was still corresponding with Hoffmeister, Beethoven wrote the titles for the works in his June 21, 1801 letter; the title he proposed for Op. 20 merely lists the instruments (“pour un violon, viole violoncelle, contrabasse, un cors, une clarinette, un violoncelle, contrabasse, un cors, une clarinette, un violoncelle, contrabasse, un cors, une clarinette, un

---

235 Anderson, *Letters* 1, 66-67 (Letter 54); *Briefe* 1, 89 (Letter 70).
and the dedication. “Much will still have to be altered or corrected in the titles,” Beethoven adds. “I leave that to you.”\(^\text{237}\) Obviously, “obligato” was not added. The frontispiece of Op. 38 lists the instruments as “le Pianoforte / avec l’accompagnement de la Clarinette ou Violon et Violoncelle concertans.”\(^\text{238}\)

This brings us to a conundrum. There, at long last, is half of the terminology that we have been looking for: “accompagnement.” However, that same half is completed by “concertans” and not by any variant of “obligato.” We might ask: are the two adjectives interchangeable?\(^\text{239}\) If so, why has obligato even been used as a musical descriptor this long while? If not, what specific work does each term do?\(^\text{240}\)

To ask these questions after interrogating the Septet (with its instruments called *tutti obligati* only once) about its various aliases, its role in a complex network of patronage, its performance appeal in so many different locales, and its possibly having torpedoed Hoffmeister’s relationship with Beethoven … to ask all of these questions through all of these contexts is not conclusive, seeing as it is only one composition. We have held the Septet under a bright light for some time. Now, it is time to shift that light to certain practices of music publishing in the mid to late eighteenth century, widening

\(^{237}\) Anderson, *Letters* 1, 56-57 (Letter 50); *Briefe* 1, 76-77 (Letter 64).

\(^{238}\) *Werkverzeichnis* 1, 224.

\(^{239}\) Of course, they are not. See Janet Levy, “The *Quatuor Concertant* in Paris in the Latter Half of the Eighteenth Century,” (Ph.D. diss., Stanford University, 1971). Levy surveys the terminology in order to “[correct] the tendency of modern scholars to interpret the term as necessarily denoting virtuoso display, as in a concerto.” Cited in Klorman, *Mozart’s Music of Friends*, 37n44.

\(^{240}\) Consider as well the potential redundancy in the original title of the Kreutzer Sonata, Op. 47: “Sonata per il Pianoforte ed un Violino obligato, scritta in uno stile molto concertante, quasi come d’un concerto.” Beethoven finished composing the sonata in spring, 1802. The abundant language in the title will be discussed in the forthcoming expansion of this dissertation’s conclusion.
the types of material we peruse. Examining where “obligato” and its variants appear in music publishing catalogues explains the work it was doing in Beethoven’s letter of December 15, 1800. In this letter, Beethoven was marketing himself aggressively and with boundless confidence to a new publisher and a new friend. In that overflow of enthusiasm, while engaging in wordplay in the way he so liked to do, he switched to the inside “industry” language that he was sure that new friend, a “beloved and worthy brother in the art of music,” would appreciate.

After situating “obligato” in the context of music publishing practices, I will return to Adler’s formulation, and conclude with where, if anywhere, to take it. What I deduce from this examination, alongside concluding considerations about Adler’s ideas of the proper nature of *obligate Akkompagnement*, will contribute to an understanding of the different workings of *obligato* terminology in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.
Chapter 3: Adler, Beethoven, and Breitkopf – obligato terminology in script and print

Obligato terminology, expanded

As sketched in chapter one, the “obligato terminology” that is so often found in titles, on wrappers, and on printed frontispieces, encompasses language that offers information on instrumental hierarchies in a musical composition. As understood most generally in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, this terminology would enable parties responsible for selecting music to determine how it would fit their ensembles — that is, whether or not they had the instruments and/or instrumentalists necessary to perform it. A more nuanced understanding, stemming from my examination of how the terminology was used in working music manuscripts of Sebastian Bach’s circle, pinpoints a specific aspect of this use: “obligato” attaching to an instrument ordinarily associated with the continuo group, and indicating that, in the context of the composition, or movement of a composition, the same instrument is behaving in an extraordinary way.

This specific use still functioned within a broader range of obligato terminology, containing meanings active in various musical contexts. I have catalogued the implications discussed thus far in this dissertation, from the most general to the most specific, as follows:
### Table 3.1: Obligato terminology (expanded)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terminology</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Implication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>obligatus</td>
<td>Cover pages: Vivaldi, <em>L’Estro Armonico</em> Corelli, Op. 6</td>
<td>Indicating an instrumental hierarchy: whether or not a specific instrument or instruments is/are required. The most general use of this terminology. Often synonymous with the “concertato/ripieno” split, but can attach in turn to “concertato” terminology as a mode of emphasis. (See Corelli, Op. 6.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obligato</td>
<td>Cover pages, and within music manuscripts: Johann Sebastian Bach</td>
<td>Indicating, very specifically, an instrument from the continuo group playing a non-continuo part in the musical texture, either throughout a composition or in specific movements. Never used for a melody instrument. “Certa” or “certata” occasionally used in its place for viola and cembalo, specifically. Somewhat synonymous with “concertato” terminology; which, however, is used for melody instruments as well. Obligato terminology never is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non obligus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non obligato</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obligé</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>necessario</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. ad libitum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ad placitum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beneplacitum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non obligus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non obligato</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non obligé</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obligo</td>
<td>Within text, and within music: Zarlino Frescobaldi, <em>Fiori Musicali</em>, “con obligo dal basso cantare”</td>
<td>A contrapuntal problem to be solved; A specific rule to be followed throughout a composition. Used first in Zarlino’s text, then in occasional cover pages and within individual pieces (Frescobaldi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs. non obilo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fuga obligata</td>
<td>Within text: Marpurg</td>
<td>“The most advanced type of fugue …” Encompassing Bach vs. Handel.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Terminology used by theorists. One instance in musical MS that I have found is the “Fuga obligata” of Dutch composer Quirinus von Blankenburg. As I demonstrated in chapter two, Beethoven’s use of obligato terminology included first “tutti obligati,” and then “obligates accompagnement.” Guido Adler used the second, turned into “obligates Akkompagnement,” to quantify the compositional achievement of the *Wiener klassische Schule*. Compositional achievement has always existed within obligato terminology’s range of meanings; however analyzing how Adler was able to shift that range to submerge a certain material record, even while bringing the particular narrative of compositional greatness to the surface, requires a study of said material record. This chapter examines the obligato terminology circulating in music publishing materials before and during Beethoven’s career, in order to argue that Beethoven was using not one aspect of the terminology, but two: one to inscribe instrumental hierarchies and another to indicate the presence of a specific genre – the accompanied sonata. The contextualization of this dual use complicates Adler’s own use of Beethoven’s parenthetical (“ich kann gar nichts unobligates schreiben, weil ich schon mit einem *obligaten accompagnement* auf die Welt gekommen bin”242). I conclude by considering the aesthetic priorities that informed Adler’s choices: exploring what allowed him to decouple Beethoven’s obligato terminology from this original materiality.

---


242 See n126, above.
A Brief History of Breitkopf

We can begin by examining music-publishing practices in the mid to late eighteenth century. Of course, “music publishing practices” is an expansive category of inquiry. I initially focus on certain practices of one of the many houses that published Beethoven’s music during his lifetime, the one that had set the bar for competitors already before Beethoven’s birth. The Breitkopf firm had the advantage of age over Artaria, Simrock, Hoffmeister and Kühnel, and many more. Founded in 1719 by Bernhard Christoph Breitkopf (1695-1777), it built its reputation on publishing religious, scholarly, and literary works. When his son Johann Gottlob Immanuel Breitkopf took over the printing side of the firm in 1745, however, its output changed. In his early professional life, Johann Gottlob Immanuel had invented a new printing system of moving and divisible type. It made music printing a profitable venture, since pieces could now be produced much more quickly and in far greater numbers than was possible using engraved plates. The work of the Breitkopf firm was one of the catalysts for “a

244 Hereafter, “Breitkopf” as an individual name will refer to Johann Gottlob Immanuel. Bernhard Christoph will be referred to by his complete name.
commercially oriented system of interests and forces” that, Axel Beer argues, “built up” music publishing into “a solid structure comparable to that in the book trade.”246 This system had long since grown to span Europe by the time Beethoven began his career in Vienna.

Still, while its fame and fortune can be seen quite clearly in retrospect, the firm faced its share of challenges as well. One of them arose just after Breitkopf’s introduction of mosaic type. The Seven Years War (1756-63) saw the invasion of Saxony by Prussia in 1756. This, combined with the economic effects of the war overall, caused a downturn in the consumption of music, which in turn led to a glut of unsold pieces in Breitkopf’s shop.247 To remedy this problem, Breitkopf implemented a carefully coordinated marketing strategy: making available, for the consumer, detailed catalogues of pieces that could be purchased.

This marketing strategy continued after the region had recovered from the Seven Years’ War. In fact, Breitkopf refined and systematized it. He printed at least one

---


247 For overviews of the Seven Years War, see Marian Füssel, Der Siebenjährige Krieg. Ein Weltkrieg im 18. Jahrhundert, (München: Beck, 2010), situating the conflict in its global context. Dennis Showalter, Frederick the Great: a Military History (London: Frontline Books, 2012), gives interesting details of Frederick II’s strategic choices connected to Saxony.
catalogue a year, every year, between 1760 and 1775. After a hiatus from 1788 to 1781, a
second run of catalogues spanned 1782 to 1801. (For a complete timeline of catalogue
publications, see Appendix B.) All of these publications were released at the Leipzig
trade fairs, which were held at times coinciding with certain important days of the
Christian liturgical year: at the New Year (Neujahrmesse), the third Sunday after Easter
(called Ostermesse, or Jubilatemesse, after “Jubilate,” the name for that Sunday), and the
first Sunday after St. Michael’s Day (Michaelmesse or Michaelismesse).

Breitkopf’s publicity efforts give us a clear image of eighteenth-century brand
awareness. That is: Breitkopf released different types of catalogues in rapid succession,
each tailored to draw off previous publications and to inform future ones. As his
networks expanded and the firm’s fame grew, and as he gathered new music sent to him
by an increasing number of composers and fellow publishers, Breitkopf had to update
regularly each publicity platform that he possessed in order to stay abreast of this influx.

Breitkopf released six volumes of the Verzeichnß musikalischer Bücher between
1760 and 1780, each containing lists of compositions printed by movable type or
engraving, alongside pedagogical, historical, and theoretical books, also available in

---


249 These multi-day markets have a history stretching back into the Middle Ages. For an overview of the trade fairs especially as relating to books, see Leonard A. Wheatley, “Leipzig Book Fair and the German Book Trade.” The Bibliographer: A Journal of Book-Lore 6 (1884) September, 94–96. Cited at: https://www.carolineschelling.com/appendices/volume-1/sup-ap-leipzig-trade-fairs. See also Brook, “Introduction,” BThC, x-xi. As Michaelmas falls near the equinox, certain northern European societies have used it, since the Middle Ages, as a quarter day, marking the beginning of autumn. Thus “Michaelmas term” at Oxford and Cambridge, for example, begins on September 29. There is one language-related difference; “Michaelmesse” connotes “St. Michael’s Day Market” in German, whereas “Michaelmas,” like “Christmas,” simply indicates the liturgical day in English.
print. Pieces that he possessed in manuscript appeared between 1761 and 1780 in four volumes of the *Verzeichniß Musikalischer Werke*. In 1769, he published a stand-alone volume listing sacred music in the firm’s possession: *Verzeichniß lateinischer und italienischer Kirchen-Musiken*. This *Verzeichniß* is significant for the list, in its backmatter, of every catalogue Breitkopf had published to date, and of which material form of music each catalogue contained (printed, engraved, or manuscript). Amongst these *Verzeichnisse* appeared the publications that have drawn the most musicological study: the Breitkopf *Catalogi* and *Supplementi*.

The six volumes of the *Catalogo* appeared from 1762 to 1765, followed by sixteen *Supplementi* published through 1787; the twenty-two together contain “888 pages” and “almost 15,000 incipits.” This corpus, known in English-speaking musicology today as the Breitkopf Thematic Catalogue, “by virtue of its size, breadth of coverage and sociological import, may well be the most useful single bibliographic aid to 18th-century research.”

As Barry S. Brook points out, the “thematic” label is a slight misnomer, for the unifying premise of these volumes is that of an incipit catalogue: identifying a composition through its first few notes or measures, regardless of their relative thematic

---


importance. This premise was Breitkopf’s solution to a music-specific problem as he described it in the “Nachricht” to his 1769 sacred music *Verzeichniß*.

Since, in both these volumes [the *Verzeichniß Musikalischer Werke* of 1761 and 1764] are found all the pieces which may be used for chamber music, so I have, in order to properly inform the *Liebhaber* (as so many pieces exist which are often of the same type and from a single composer), printed a special catalogue, sorted according to the different instruments, in which the opening of each piece has been set in notation. The *Catalogi* document active composers and repertories, trends in music copying, printing, and engraving, networks of geographic exchange, and shifts in genre expectations. I will discuss certain of those genre expectations in a larger context, since each *Catalogo*, as well as each eventual *Supplemento*, both expanded the information presented in previous *Verzeichnije* and announced future Breitkopf publications. To navigate this larger context, and in keeping with the subject of this dissertation, I examine the presence, or absence, of *obligato* terminology in the *Catalogi* (1762-65), explore where this terminology was first used in the entire publication corpus, and locate where it was used after the sixth *Catalogo* appeared in print. Analyzing where *obligato* appears not only clarifies Breitkopf’s reasons for using the terminology but also makes concrete certain changes in how it inscribed instrumental hierarchies and communicated expectations connected to genre.

This analysis is important for reconsidering Adler’s formulation about the

---


253 “Da in diesen beyden letzten Verzeichnissen alle die Stücke, welche zur Cammermusik gebraucht werden, befindlich sind: so hat man, um die Liebhaber, wegen der Menge derselben, welche öfters von gleicher Art, und von einem einzigen Componisten vorhanden sind, gehörig zu unterrichten, nach den verschiedenen Instrumenten, einen besondern Catalogum drucken lassen, in welchen die Anfänge eines jeden Stücks, in Noten ausgesetzt, abgedruckt worden.” Breitkopf, *Verzeichnis ... Kirchenmusik*, 1769.
Viennese classical school and for underscoring the terms Breitkopf set out for himself on every single Verzeichniß. He insisted that all of the musical books or works collected, in each volume, be “neatly sorted into their proper categories” (“in ihre gehörige Classen ordentlich eingetheilet.”) To analyze this cataloguing is thus to see Breitkopf’s priorities and how they changed over time, as well as to understand better how the publishing firm shaped patrons’ engagement with all matter of music on catalogue pages.

“Obligato” in the Breitkopf Thematic Catalogue

Breitkopf built anticipation for the Catalogi by announcing its forthcoming appearance in VMB volumes 1 and 2 (1760 Neujahr-Messe, and 1761 Oster-Messe), as well as the first volume of the VMW (1761 Michaelmesse.) Beginning in 1762, the six Catalogi appeared in print as follows:

Table 3.2: Catalogi publication timeline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pub. Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1762</td>
<td>Catalogo delle Sinfonie, che si trovano in manoscritto nella officina musica di Giovanni Gottlob Immanuel Breitkopf, in Lipsia. Parte Ima.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1762</td>
<td>Catalogo dei Soli, Duetti, Trii e Concerti per il violino, il violin piccolo, e discordato, viola di braccio, viola d’amore, violoncello piccolo e violoncello, e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Appendix B for complete titles and links to scans of originals in the Staatsbibliothek and the Göttinger Digitalisierungszentrum. “Nachricht,” VMB 1, 32; “Nachricht,” VMB 2, n.p. (backmatter); “Vorbericht,” VMW 1, n.p. (frontmatter.)

Unlike the VMB and VMW volumes, none of the Catalogi has a Fair day given as its publication point. One might be able to extrapolate those days from contemporary sources and any preserved correspondence.
viola di gamba. chi [sic] si trovano in manoscritto nella officina musica di Breitkopf in Lipsia. Parte II da

1763 Catalogo de’ Soli, Duetti, Trii e Concerti per il flauto traverse, flauto piccolo, flauto d’amore, flauto dolce, flauto-basso, oboe, oboe-d’amore, fagotto, sampogne, corno di caccia, tromba, zinche e trombone. che si trovano ... Parte III za.

1763 Catalogo de’ Soli, Duetti, Trii, Terzetti, Quartetti e Concerti per il cembalo e l’harpa. che si trovano ... Parte IV ta.

1765 Catalogo de’ Quadri, Partite, Divertimenti, Cassat. Scherz. ed Intrade ô Francese Ouverteures a diversi stromenti, che si trovano ... Parte V ta.

1765 Catalogo delle Arie, Duetti, Madrigali e Cantate, con stromenti diversi e con cembalo solo, che si trovano ... Parte VI ta.

In these six volumes, “obligato” or a variant (obligati, obl., etc.) appears both in the more general category labels (which usually indicate genre) and in specific indications for groups of pieces, or individual pieces.

Table 3.3: Appearances of obligato terminology in the Catalogi.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Parte, Year</th>
<th>2. Instrument(s) featured</th>
<th>3. Total # category labels</th>
<th>4. Obligato refs in 3.</th>
<th>5. # collns // # pieces</th>
<th>6. Obligato refs in 5 [* in colln. title]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I 1762</td>
<td>various [sinfonie only]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80 collns // 453 pcs.</td>
<td>2 fagotto (1) violoncello (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II 1762</td>
<td>strings</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>172 // 743</td>
<td>11 flauto traverso (2) oboe (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>violino (1) violoncello (3) cembalo (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III 1763</td>
<td>winds</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>123 // 464</td>
<td>11 oboe (2) fagotto (8) tromba (1*)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Several aspects of this chart are intriguing: the variety of instruments labeled “obligato,” the near-complete absence of the label from the catalogue containing vocal music, and the relatively low number of references compared to the total number of pieces. The most eye-catching outlier is seen in Part IV. Compared to two obligato references in the sinfonie volume out of 453 individual entries, and to eleven references in the string instrument volume out of 743 entries (though two examples of cembalo obligato are from the same Handel composition, listed twice), the eighty-eight references to obligato out of 278 total pieces in the cembalo/harpa volume call into question any conclusion we might draw about the terminology’s relative scarcity from the other volumes.

When one controls for genre categories in Parte IVta, the work Breitkopf is doing
with the “obligato” label in connection with the cembalo and harp becomes clear.

**Table 3.4**: Obligato terminology in *Parte IV* (music for cembalo and harp).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page # [Brook ed. // Catalogo]</th>
<th>*<em>Catalogo de’ Soli, Duetti, Trii, Terzetti, Quartetti e Concerti per il cembalo e l’harpa ... Parte IV</em></th>
<th>**Obligato terminology in Parte IV*ta (music for cembalo and harp).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category label</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total # of piece collect -ions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Obligato refs in titles of 2.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116 // 2</td>
<td>Soli o Sonate a Cembalo Solo.</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125 // 11</td>
<td>Duetti a due Clavicembali Concertati</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126 // 12</td>
<td>Trii a Clavicembalo obligato con Flauto o Violino.</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130 // 16</td>
<td>Terzetti a Cembalo obligato con altri Stromenti obligati.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130 // 16</td>
<td>Quartetto a Cembalo obligato con altri Stromenti obligati.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131 // 17</td>
<td>Concerti a Cembalo obligato con altri Stromenti obligati.</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137 // 23</td>
<td>Harpa / Soli</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pieces for solo cembalo or harp, and duets for either of the two instruments, do not receive the designation. In this volume, any trio, terzetto, quartetto, partita, or concerto, containing a cembalo or harp, does receive it. The function of the label thus appears genre-specific, as may be seen in the category title and the first page of the “Trii”:

TRII / a Clavicembalo obligato con Flauto ó Violino.
I. Sonata del Sigr. C. P. E. / BACH, a Cl. ob. c. V. [incipit]
I. Sonata del Sigr. G. BENDA, / a Cl. ob. c. Fl. [incipit]
VI. Sonate del Sigr. BINDER, a Cl. ob. c. V. [six incipits]²⁵⁶

The collection listings continue, each with the same structure of terminology: “Sonata [or Sonate] del [composer], a Cl. ob. c. [violin or flute].” The ubiquity of the “obligato” label attached to the cembalo in the “Trii” category, with all the pieces possessing only one additional melody instrument, indicates very clearly that the cembalo takes two of the voices in a trio-sonata texture in each and every piece. Thus, if a client were to order a copy of the third sonata from the Binder collection, that sonata’s cembalo part would be written out for the player in full; it was not meant to be realized at the keyboard, lest the interdependence of the three trio parts be compromised. This is exactly what Adler

²⁵⁶ Brook, ed., BThC, 126 (Catalogo ... Parte IVta, 12).
describes in his historical overview of obligato terminology, leading up to his discussion of *obligate Akkompagnement*:

If, contrary to the norm, this accompaniment has been fully realized in written form, as in certain duos, trios, etc. then it was labeled “obligat”; that is, it should be performed [just] as it had been notated. On the title page thus appeared, “Mit obligatem Klavier.”

Breitkopf’s use of *obligato* to indicate a fully realized keyboard part did not appear for the first time in the *Catalogo Parte IVta*. In the three volumes published earlier (Vols. 1 and 2 of the *Verzeichniß Musicalischer Bücher*, and vol. 1 of the *Verzeichniß Musicalischer Werke*), we see the terminology used the same way.

**“Obligato” in early Breitkopf Verzeichnisse**

For example, in the table of contents for the *Verzeichniß Musicalischer Werke*, Vol. 1, 1761, we only have to look at the “Clavicembel” category of second main group (specific to keyboard instruments: “II. Die Orgel und das Clavecimbel”), to see: “II.B.4. Trios für das obligate Clavecimbel, mit einer Violine oder Flöte.”

This entry aligns with one in the earlier Organ category: “II.A.4. Trios für zwey Claviere und Pedal;” as well as with an entry in the later Violin group: “III.3. Trios für...”

---


zwey Violinen und Baß.” In these entries for organ and for violin, there are exactly three physical components implied: two separate keyboards and pedals for the former, and three different instruments for the latter. The “cembalo + solo instrument” combination is the one that must be labeled with “obligato,” in order to locate two of the three components in the two hands of the keyboard player.

Going back slightly earlier, to the first Verzeichniße Musicalischer Bücher (1760), we see differences in content but similarities in instrument ordering. As the contents listed are books and pieces that Breitkopf has in print, there are far fewer instrumental types represented in the table of contents.\textsuperscript{259} Works for the voice, for the organ and cembalo, the violin, harp, lute, and flute are the only ones to have their own groups. The keyboard group itself is subdivided into categories by type and size. The contents list:

1. Books on keyboard subjects,
2. keyboard methods,
3. organ pieces,
4. “Kleine Stücke” for the cembalo,
5. “Großerer Stücke,” including many genre types,
6. “Sonaten,” and finally,
7. “Obligates und concertirendes Clavicembel, mit verschiedenen Instrumente.”

This last category in turn subdivides into:

A. Trios mit einer Violine,
B. Trios mit einer Flöte oder Violine,” and
C. “Concerte mit mehrern Instrumenten.”\textsuperscript{260}

---


\textsuperscript{260} Breitkopf, \textit{VMB}, 1760 Neujahr-Messe, “Inhalt.”
Breitkopf duplicates this ordering of the table of contents for the following year’s second volume of the *Verzeichniß Musicalischer Bücher*. There, however, the category title for VII.7 has been pared down to “Obligates und concertirendes Clavicembel.”

**Obligato vs. Concertato**

These two categories for 1760 and 1761, and the pieces linked to them in each volume’s contents, strongly imply that the difference between “obligato” and “concertato” terminology attaches to genre, namely: “obligato” indicates that the keyboard part in a trio-sonata texture has been fully realized, and “concertato” indicates that additional instruments are participating in the give-and-take musical context of a concerto.

This difference explains a complication that appears in the 1761 *VMB 2.* A duet

---


262 Handily, certain other details in *VMW 1*, 1761, explain apparent errata in the *Catalogi*. For example, this volume contains works for “Die Flute Traverse d’Amour” and for the “Flauto Basso” – listed in the “Inhalt” under XVI and XVII. Both instruments appear on the title page of the 1763 *Catalogo ... Parte IIIza*, but are consolidated with the “Flute Douce” pieces in the body of that catalogue volume. (See *BThC*, Brook ed. 104, *IIIza.24*) Since there is only one composition for each of these instruments, it apparently made sense to Breitkopf to save the space that individual category titles would occupy. The works have their own problems of attribution: 1) the concerto for flute traverse d’amour is listed in the *VMW 1* as by Georg Leo but without composer in *C. Parte IIIza*; and 2) the sonata for flauto basso, fagotto, and violone is listed in the *VMW 1* as a work of C. P. E. Bach, but in the *C. Parte IIIza* as by C. P. E. (a sonata for “Fagotto oblig. Flauto Basso, e Cemb”) (Brook ed. 92 / *IIIza.12*), by S. Bach (a Trio for Flauto Basso, Fagotto c. Violone (Brook ed. 104 / *IIIza.24*), and just by “Bach” (Brook ed. 111 / *IIIza.31*). This inconsistent attribution is just one example of many. Breitkopf himself makes an announcement in the “Vorbericht” to the *VMW 1*, 1761, acknowledging the existence of these types of errors, and saying that the help of the “Kennern” in uncovering them would please him greatly.
by Wilhelm Friedemann Bach that appears in *Catalogo Parte IVta*, 1763, as “Concerto di F. W. Bach, a due Clavicembali Concertati,” is listed in 1761 under the category: “Duetten für zwey concertirende Claviere.” However, the 1761 details of the piece read: “Bach, Fr. W. Organista in Halle, Concerto à due Cembali obligati, senza Stromenti. a 1 Thlr.”

On the surface, this implies that “obligato” and “concertato” are interchangeable; however, when one notices the additional language in the 1761 description, the vacillation between the terms makes sense. A reader might conclude that, while this work for two cembali is written in a concerted style, it lacks the additional instruments that appear in works with the label “concerto” every other time said label appears in the volume. (In the table of contents for *VMB* 1 and 2, as well as this volume, groupings of instruments in genres with more parts receive the general label “für … verschieden Instrumente,” “mit andern Instrumenten,” or merely “mit Instrumenten.”)

The “obligati” indication could thus explain that the two cembali contain, within their own parts, the accompaniment and the basso that the additional instruments would ordinarily contribute. That said, in the *Catalogo Parte IVta*, 1763, this language has been excised, presumably to free up critical space.

---

Einen größern Fehler haben die geschriebenen Musicalien, in der öfters, theils aus Vorfaß, theils aus Irihthum, falschen Angabe der Verfasser. So wenig ich im Stande gewesen bin, auch durch Hülfe meiner Freunde, alle diese Unrichtigkeiten zu entdecken: desto mehr wird es mich erfreuen, wenn mir die Entdeckung derselben von Kennern mitgetheilet warden wird.

It would appear that crowdsourcing was alive and well in the second half of the eighteenth century.

263 See *Catalogo ... Parte IVta*, 11 (Brook ed. 125); and Breitkopf, *VMW* 1, 37.

264 See Breitkopf, *VMW* 1, “Inhalt.”

265 Breitkopf himself discusses the exigencies of the catalogue’s layout in his “Nachinnergung” to the *Catalogo, Parte Inma*. As Brook translates it: “From time to time [in the *Catalogi*], one will find that the number of symphonies with themes [*Sinfonien in Noten*] will be greater or smaller than the number given in the [non-thematic] Title Catalogues. When the number is greater, it is
The Friedemann Bach example in *VMW* 1, 1761, is not the only one of its kind in the corpus published through 1787. However, the few ensuing examples of “obligato” describing a keyboard instrument in an indicated “concerto” are confined to the *Verzeichnisse Musikalischer Büher* and *Werke*. In all *Supplementi* to the original *Catalogo*, cembalo music has “obligato” attached to the keyboard only in non-concerto ensembles. If the keyboard receives a modifier at all in the concerto listings, from 1766 to 1787, the modifier is “concertato.”

The obligato label, as connected to the keyboard, is used in this way through the *Supplementi*, specifically indicating the keyboard as one of two instruments in a trio-sonata texture. The cembalo is the instrument most consistently treated in terms of obligato terminology; there is far less consistency where other instruments are concerned. Recall the list in Table II above. In all six *Catalogo* volumes, obligato terminology

---

266 See Brook, ed., *BThC*, 252-53 (S. I.52-53); 290-93 (S. II.34-37); 327-29 (S. III.17-29; note one “Partita” in the “Concerti” category, on Brook, 329 / S. III 29, with instruments “a Cemb. oblig. Viola oblig. Violonc. oblig. 2 Flaut. e Violino,” composed by Simonetti); 364-66 (S. IV.28-30); note one “Notturni” in the “Concerti e Concertini” category, on 366 / S. IV.30, with instruments “a Cembalo oblig. o Harpa, 2 Viol. e Basso. intagliati in Parisi. Opera IV, composed by Martini; 402-6 (S. V. 26-30); 430-432 (S. VI.22-24); 473-79 (S. VII.33-39); note that the engraved Trii and Terzetti, from Paris, Frankfort am Main, Bonn, London, Amsterdam, and Leipzig [labeled “Coll. I. et II.”], do not have the terminology applied to them; 514-18 (S. VIII.34-38); note the continuing influx of engraved music from Paris, Amsterdam, London, Frankfort am Main, and Bonn); 549-55 (S. IX. 29-35); 579-82 (S. X.19-22); note for the first time, no obligato used for keyboard in the “Trii e Terzetti,” “Quattri e Divertimenti,” or Quattro intagliati categories; 612-18, S. XI.24-30; note that “obligato” appears again in the “Trii” category; 656-66 (S. XII.32-42); 692-99 (S. XIII. 24-31); 743-56 (S. XIV.43-56); 812-26 (S. XV. 54-68); and 868-73 (S. XVI.28-33).
attaches to a variety of instruments besides the cembalo: flauto traverso, oboe, violino, viola, violincello, fagotto/bassono, corno, tromba, harpa, and liuto. In the original *Catalogo*, these examples are also quite rare. So in order to ascertain why these instruments receive this label, we must first ask *when* they do: not only in connection to specific works, but also in connection to those works as products of certain trends in eighteenth-century music. Situating the terminology in this way gives us crucial information regarding how it was used: not only to assert instrumental hierarchies (and possibly subvert them), but also to indicate specific genres and how they changed over time.

**A Brief Return to Adler**

There are immediate complications to consider at this point. First, although obligato terminology can work to situate instruments within hierarchies, said hierarchies can differ from genre to genre. When one considers as well that genre expectations are in flux over the course of the long eighteenth century, the ensuing historiographical challenge becomes clear. In discussing “obligato” and its ilk, the “indicating genres” aspect of the terminology is easy to elide into the “inscribing hierarchies” aspect. For example, following his explanation of “obligato” as indicating a fully realized keyboard part, Adler writes about another meaning of the word: “an old historical practice” (“ein alter historischer Brauch”).

This sense of “obligato” was also used when, in an ensemble piece, one or another instrument was seen as a necessary part of the whole, whereas other instruments
could be used “ad libitum” or left out – an old historical practice. In sonatas of all kinds, in which, for example, the bass part was performed by both clavier and cello, or the primary part performed by both clavier and violin, the cello or the violin could conceivably be left out. Some early compositions of the Klassiker have this usage.  

Adler is by no means incorrect to call this use of obligato terminology “an old historical practice.” However, the way he ties his description of that practice to his ensuing description of how “true contrapuntal style” came to the fore in the Wiener klassische Schule (rendering all instruments obligatory in any given musical texture), requires more nuance. Specifically, he ties it to an alleged disappearance of obligato terminology, using as evidence the example of Beethoven’s cello sonatas. However, in doing so, he subsumes “obligato working differently in different genres” into an overall understanding of “obligato inscribing instrumental hierarchies.”

Part of the nuance I wish to bring to Adler’s descriptions involves separating these two aspects of obligato terminology. Certainly, “the terminology does specific work in a specific genre” can fit under the wider umbrella of “the terminology inscribes instrumental hierarchies,” since much of that specific work is hierarchical. However, it is the specificity of its behavior as connected to genre that must be correctly understood. A flute called “obligato” in a divertimento of 1767 is so called for a different reason than one called “obligato” in an accompanied sonata of 1781. Likewise, the terminology can

perform different work when connected to different instruments within a singular labeled genre. In other words, if one sees a composition labeled “trio” containing a “cembalo obligato,” that instrument is given the label for a different reason than, say, a “violino obligato” in another trio – even if both are found on the same page of the Breitkopf Thematic Catalogue. The following pages make this phenomenon tangible through analysis of additional examples in the Breitkopf corpus.

**Obligato Inscribing Hierarchies**

Recall my earlier discussion of Sebastian Bach arranging certain concertos of Vivaldi’s Op. 3, *L’Estro armonico*, published in 1711. Vivaldi’s publisher used “obligato” to describe a solo violin, violins in groups, and a single cello playing alongside a group of violins. Regardless of instrument, “obligato” in that context indicated that said instrument could not be left out. Corelli’s op. 6, published posthumously in 1714 by Roger in Amsterdam, likewise contained in its title: “Concerti grossi con duoi violini e violoncello di concertino obligato …”, followed by the instruments of the “concerto grosso ad arbitrio.”268 In that case, “obligato” emphasized not just the necessity of the instruments’ presence but also the concertino/concerto grosso split. This was the use that

---

Sébastian Brossard referenced in his c. 1708 *Dictionnarie*, when he treated “obligato” as synonymous with “necessario” and “concertante.”

This usage also exists in the six volumes comprising the Breitkopf *Catalogi*. Tabulating the times “obligato” appears in it, and tracking the corresponding genres indicated, I have deduced important trends. (See Appendix C.) For example, in this collection almost all the non-cembalo obligato references appear in ensembles of multiple specific instruments: the sinfonia, the partita, the “ouverture,” and the concerto. When the term does appear in the smaller-scale trio sonatas (and “quadri,” or “quartet sonatas”) it most often attaches to a lower instrument, one usually associated with the continuo group. Thus, “violoncello obligato” appears in various sonate and in one quartetto: Brook ed. 72 (*Parte II*.40), 76 (*Parte II*.44), and 130 (*Parte IV*.16); while “fagotto” or “bassono obligato” appears in different sonate and in one group of quadri: Brook ed. 92 (*Parte III*.12) and 111 (*Parte III*.31.)

Though some larger-scale works contain lower instruments with an “obligato” designation, there are also specific instances, in these pieces, of the terminology giving additional hierarchical information when attached to a melody instrument. In a sinfonia by Foerster, for example, “obligato” puts a wind instrument on equal footing with a

---


270 See James Webster, "Towards a History of Viennese Chamber Music in the Early Classical Period." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 27, no. 2 (1974): 212-47. doi:10.2307/830559. On 214, he references the quartet sonata (“analogous to the trio sonata … in Protestant Germany”) in order to prise the works of Haydn that Breitkopf describes as “quadri” out of the classical quartet designation, so as to place them squarely in the more historically and geographically accurate “divertimento à quatro.” See 226-27. “Divertimento” before 1780 had not acquired its lightweight reputation in comparison to the Classical string quartet, a development that occurred as the latter came to the cultural fore after 1780 (227-231).
concertato string instrument (see p. 62, II.30). In another example, a Martino sinfonia, “obligato” distinguishes two violins from two other labeled “ripieno.” (See 67, II.35. “Obligato” is also applied to two oboes in the same work.) A Fasch work contains “2 Ob. Conc.” in the collection title, but the description of the instruments in one of that collection’s pieces begins with “2 Oboi oblig.” Since the other works in the collection do not use “obligato” for their two oboes, possibly the two were marked as obligatory so that, in performance, they would counter the volume of the clarini and corni also listed.

The entire fifth Catalogo, containing larger-scale ensembles that range in type from Partite to Divertimenti to Ouvertures and more, offers a remarkable display of detailed instrumental indications. A comment Breitkopf makes in his postscript to the first Catalogo gives a noble reason for this display: accuracy. After describing the difficulty of his task, and asking the Kenner and Liebhaber to forgive him for any mistakes, he writes:

It is not only the incorrectness of names … which may have occasionally led me into error, but also the instruments and the number of voices which I have indicated above each and every theme [Themate]. Who does not know of the liberties this or that musician takes in a piece by now omitting, now adding voices, or by transcribing pieces intended for this or that instrument for another one? I have myself found sufficient traces of such arbitrary alterations; and how many may I not have discovered, all of which account for so many errors in my Catalogue?271

Given what we have already seen of publishing houses making arrangements or alterations of pieces for other performing forces in order to profit, and given that Breitkopf was a capable businessman, this comment seems judgmental at best. Reading

---

271 Brook, “Introduction,” BthC, xiii. (I:“Nacherinnung.”) Note that Breitkopf’s use of “Themate” here contrasts to his more usual “Anfänge [in Noten].”
on, we see that there is a much more practical reason for Breitkopf’s emphasis on accuracy of instrumentation in his *Catalogi*.

The differences in the price [of certain works in both the *Catalogi* and in *VMB* 1, 2, and/or *VMW* 1] … will be easily grasped if one considers that I have fixed the price at 4 gl. per sheet, and that I charge for a full sheet for each main voice [*Hauptstimme*], such as violin, viola, bass viol [*Baß*]272, oboe, but only for half a sheet for horns and other reinforcing voices [*Ausführstimmen*]; so that everyone will be able to find the costs of his choices easily, since I will maintain these prices as long as the currency permits.273

This explains why so many of the *sinfonie* in the first volume have “corni” or “2 corni” indications following the specific number of voices: the fee for copying would be less for a *sinfonia* with six instruments if two of those instruments were horns rather than flutes. For increased sales, Breitkopf would surely want patrons to realize just that. The pricing system also could explain certain appearances of obligato terminology. In the Foerster *Sinfonie* example (Brook ed. 7 / *Parte I.7*), the label “2 Fag. oblig.” could imply that the full price would be charged for copying each of these bassoon parts. This reason for “obligato” use might explain the rarity of the terminology attached to these instruments in the *Catalogi*—simultaneously non-keyboard, non-*Hauptstimme*, and not in the “core” ensemble274—when those same instruments (though not ubiquitous) appear regularly;

---

272 Though Brook chooses the “Bass viol” for *Baß*, I believe that Breitkopf refers to whatever instrument plays the bass part in the innumerable instances of the “core” ensemble: “2 Viol. V. B.” or “two violins, viola, and basso.” Webster has outlined the reasons for considering “celli, double-basses, and bassoons” as potential *Basso* (Webster, “Viennese Chamber Music,” 237); furthermore, the translation of the categories in the *VMB* and *VMW* volumes from German to the Italian of the *Catalogi* changes all of Breitkopf’s “Baß” indications to “Basso.” (For example: “Solos für eine Violine und Baß” becomes “Soli … a Violino Solo col Basso.”) In other words, Breitkopf’s customers would not need a bass viol to fill out the core ensemble featured in so many of these pieces of music.


274 “2 Violini, Viola e Basso,” a group almost ubiquitous in ensemble pieces, seen for example in the Agrell symphonies on *VMW* 1, 45.
patrons might balk if they had to pay full price consistently for what they considered Ausfühlstimmen. This reasoning cannot be completely supported by comparing entries in the Catalogo Parte Ima to the Verzeichniß Musicalischer Werke Vol. 1, something that Breitkopf cues his patrons to do in his “Nacherinnerung”:

This first attempt includes the symphonies that were listed by the names of their composers from the 45th to the 49th page of the Catalogue of Musical Works That Have Not Been Made Known Through Printing. 

For example, a Catalogo entry for Agrell reads:

![Figure 9: Agrell, Sinfonie. Brook, ed. BThC, 2 (Parte Ima, 2.) Reproduced with permission.](image)

The corresponding entry in the Verzeichniß Musicalischer Werke, v. 1 (pg. 45) reads:

Agrell, Joh. Maest. di Capella in Norimberga, VI. Sinfonie à 2 Violini, Viola e Basso, 2 à Corni ad lib. a 4 thl. 16 gl.

The odd entry out in the Catalogo Agrell entry is Sinfonia IV, “a 6 Voci.” This is probably a typo, since the matching incipit in RISM belongs to a “Sinfonia a 4 Part,”

---

275 Breitkopf, “Nacherinnerung,” Catalogo Parte Ima, 1762 Neujahrmesse; Brook, BThC, 1966, xiii (tr.) and 31 (original). Brook italicizes to convey the emphasis Breitkopf gave the words by using a larger font.
for two violins, a viola, and basso.\textsuperscript{276}

While this would appear to confirm the reasoning of linking obligato terminology to price, the “ad lib.” example is the only one of its kind on pp. 45-49 of the \textit{VMW} v. 1. Furthermore, neither the Foerster nor the Holzbauer examples of “obligato” itself (linked to bassoon and cello; see Appendix C) appears in the \textit{VMW}.

It would appear that it was a publisher’s choice, then, whether to include this terminology or not. The reasons behind that choice were probably varied. For example, surely Breitkopf was the one to decide to include “obligato” in every single one of the labels for the cembalo trios; it beggars belief that all of those manuscripts came to his publishing house sporting the same terminology. This implies that Breitkopf created categories such as Trii, Terzetti, and Concerti (in the cembalo and harp group) to communicate specific and consistent information regarding practicalities of performance. Whether similar reasoning applies to the other appearances of the terminology, specifically connected to non-keyboard instruments, depends on what work the terminology did for him and for his patrons.

Let us return to the fifth volume of the \textit{Catalogo}, full of \textit{Partite} and \textit{Ouvertures}. James Webster elsewhere offers an excellent conclusion concerning genre that we may apply to this volume’s contents.

[The] period 1750 to 1780 witnessed a development from general titles, terms, and concepts to specific ones. The titles of compositions changed from \textit{Partita} and \textit{Divertimento} to the specific \textit{Sonata} (in the modern sense), \textit{Quartet}, and so forth (and, as a side effect, \textit{Partita} and \textit{Divertimento} acquired new, specialized

\textsuperscript{276} RISM ID no.: 190002085. This work’s MS was apparently labeled “Quartette,” with Locatelli as composer; RISM identifies its bibliographic appearance in “Brook 1966, vol.1:1762, clm.2 (Agrell).”
The particular attention Breitkopf paid in the same volume to the details of *Partite* composed on a larger scale and *Ouvertures*, such as the number of voices and the specific instruments, reflect the same efforts he made in the other *Catalogi*. If these efforts indeed indicate that he wanted his customers to be sure of what it was they were purchasing, what would be needed to perform it, how much the parts would cost to copy, the conclusion that we may draw, reflecting Webster, is that genre expectations still being in flux had minute yet concrete ramifications for the performing, purchasing musical public. In the context of these works, obligato terminology operates in the *Catalogi* in a way that can both reify hierarchies of instrumentation and upend existing hierarchical expectations.

**Obligato establishing genre**

In one particular genre’s presentation within the Breitkopf catalogue corpus (all the *Verzeichnisse* as well as the *Catalogi*), we see obligato terminology used two ways. First, in *Verzeichnisse Musicalischer Bücher* (the parts of the corpus that list music in print) the terminology establishes instrumental hierarchies connected to this new genre. However, when the same pieces are presented in the *Supplementi*, they are rapidly

---

277 Webster, “Viennese Chamber Music,” 247. Though Webster does reference the very specific locale of Vienna and its circle of influence, and points up its isolation from Northern and Western Europe, the appearance in the *Catalogi of Partite and Divertimenti* for a wide variety of instrumental combinations and ensemble sizes, as well as *Quadri* for many permutations of four instruments, implies that music circulating in manuscript in non-Viennese circles displayed certain similar trends.
subsumed into a preexisting genre, emphasized by different appearances of obligato terminology, following the categories that Breitkopf set up for his presentation of music available in manuscript. The genre in question is the “accompagnied sonata,” making an impressive début in Supplemento II, 1767. (See pp. 27 and 28, below.)

One of the first and most successful French musicians to compose along these lines was the virtuoso violinist de Jean-Joseph Cassanéa de Mondonville (1711-1772). His Pièces de clavecin en sonates avec accompagnement de violon, published in 1734, achieved “a perfect balance between the two, [by] exploiting the possibilities of both instruments.”278 The new genre of the accompanied sonata gained popularity quite rapidly.279 A logical question for performers, publishers, and other consumers of music to ask of these works was whether or not the melody instrument was required. This at least would explain the term “obligato” or “obligé” attaching itself to a melody-instrument part when the composer or publisher wished to indicate its being necessary to the texture. The indication of an optional melody instrument was: “non obligato,” “non obligé,” or “ad libitum.” The technical level of the accompaniment could vary, even in settings marked “obligato” or “obligé”; the lines marked as “ad libitum” could come in for their share of critique when the accompanied sonata was evaluated as a whole.280

Mondonville’s music appears once in the entire Breitkopf catalogue corpus, in the third volume of the VMB, 1763. His “Pièces de Clavecin en Sonates, avec

---

280 ref
Accompagnement de Violon. à Paris & à Lille” are situated using the taxonomy, “VII.

Die Orgel und das Clavecimbel. / 7. Obligates und concertirendes Clavecimbel mit
verschiedenen Instrumenten. / a. Trios mit der Violine.”

As one may see from the VMB page, the collections in this subcategory have obligato
terminology both in the general attached to the keyboard (in examples originally printed
in Leipzig and Amsterdam.) Though Mondonville’s work only has “avec
Accompagnement” and no obligato terminology attached to either instrument, Schobert’s
sonata collection further down the page (the only other collection printed in France)
contains exactly the multiple descriptors that represent the most particular delineation of
musical forces in the accompanied sonata genre. “II. Sonate per il Cembalo solo

---

281 Interestingly, the Amsterdam-printed Radeker example appears to be a type of hybrid: the
terminology attaches to the keyboard instrument, but “accompagnato” appears as well, attached to
the melody instrument. This hybridization becomes much more common in ensuing Breitkopf
catalogues.
accompagnate con un Violino non obligato” provides a goodly amount of information; the key bit is the conclusion that the keyboard music can be purchased without having to purchase in turn the violin part (which probably doubles the keyboard melody in most places.)

As the Catalogo containing keyboard music was published that same year, Mondonville’s collection does not appear in it. His music’s presence in the 1763 VMB foreshadows the influx of this type of chamber work over the next decade. Indeed, the fourth volume of the VMB, published in 1770, remarks on the source of that influx. In that volume’s “Nachricht,” Bernhard Christoph Breitkopf “und Sohn” write:

The present fourth edition of our collection contains musical books and printed music, which have been published since 1763 and collected by us. Since that time, we have gone a step further, adding an assortment of French and English musical works, which is composed of the latest works published in Paris and London up until the beginning of the present year. But this time, our collection extends no further than one example each; which, however, because of the great quantity produced annually, is valuable enough as a test of the taste of the Liebhaber; especially since so many of them are not accustomed to playing from engraved and printed music, but rather would often prefer to pay great sums for manuscripts than purchase these, or even wish to receive only those works which are pleasing to them from such collections.282

In between 1763 and 1770 there appeared the second volume of the VMW (1764), the fifth and sixth Catalogi (1765), and then the first five Supplementi (1766-1770.) In 1769

as well, Breitkopf released the solitary *Verzeichniß lateinischer und italiänischer Kirchen-Musiken* (notable, as mentioned previously, for its “Nachricht” listing all publications to date, and in press.)

Presumably Breitkopf had some newly accumulated manuscripts to advertise in the *Supplemento I*; the accompanied sonata does not appear in it many times. However, it is given striking placement in the *Supplemento II* (1767); where we see the “Op. I” of Schobert (listed four years previously in the *VMB 3.*).

![Supplemento II (1767), 31-32. Reproduced with permission.](image-url)

**Figures 11a & 11b:** *Supplemento II* (1767), 31-32. Reproduced with permission.

---

283 Brook, ed., *BThC*, 287-88.
Figure 11c: Supplemento II (1767), 33. Reproduced with permission.

This appearance has both striking and potentially confusing aspects. On the striking side: grouped under “SOLI a CEMBALO,” these works are given additional luster in the subheading, with “intaglate in Parigi” following the “SONATE a CEMBALO SOLO.”

The potentially confusing aspect of this section may be seen beginning with the one work of Honaüer on p. 31 (a sonata “avec l’accompagnement d’un violon”) and moving
through the works of Mozart (an appearance valuable for Mozart scholars, of KV 6-9\textsuperscript{284}),
to those of Schobert, on pp. 32-33. One wonders whether the Schobert name was enough,
in Breitkopf’s mind, to justify grouping together sonatas “con Violino non obligato,”
“senza Violino,” “con Violino e Basso ad libitum,” “con 2 Violini e Basso,” and finally
just “con Violino” – to say nothing of moving on to include concerti and collections of
sinfonie.\textsuperscript{285} If the name were an additional unifying factor, it would add to the collecting
power of the label “Sonates pour le Clavecin seul avec l’Accompagn. d’Instrum.” above
all the compositions presented. Be that as it may, in ensuing Supplementi, “sonates” of
the type listed here were grouped in ways that accorded with Breitkopf’s “catalogo”
method of indicating required instruments. Sonate like those of Eccard on p. 31, in other
words, remained in “SOLI a CEMBALO,” albeit with an indication of “intagliati;” while
works for keyboard and one melody instrument, with that instrument either “obligato” or
“ad libitum,” appeared under a new subcategory of the “Trio” label: the appendage
“intagliati in Parigi,” marking a division in the category “TRII, mit obligates Clavier.”

Presumably this was Breitkopf’s way of having his cake and eating it: including
enough to mark this as a fashionable novelty, while embedding it within the terminology

\textsuperscript{284} Moving from “Mr. Mozard” to works of Johann Schobert is also significant for Mozart
historians, since Schobert, quite fashionable in Paris and noted by his contemporary Friedrich
Melchior von Grimm as writing “charming” compositions (though with “no valuable ideas to be
emulated”), has been accepted as a musical influence on the young Mozart. For Grimm quotation
and Schobert biography, see Herbert C. Turrentine, ”Schobert, Johann." Grove Music
http://proxy.library.upenn.edu:2920/subscriber/article/grove/music/25017. Schobert’s influence
probably first came to the fore for Mozart during the latter’s first stay in Paris, from November
1763 to April 1764. See Stanley Sadie, Mozart: The Early Years, 1756–1781 (New York: W.W.

\textsuperscript{285} The sinfonie is more explicable, given the nature of that genre being in flux. See n.47 for
sinfonie for solo piano. In the Schobert case, of course, each collection has a violin and two horns
ad libitum. All three instruments being “ad libitum” is confirmed by the entries in VMB 4, 104.
that he had used to define categories in his manuscript *Catalogi* since its first volume, categories with which his patrons were familiar. This appeal to familiarity was grounded in his experience of consumer behavior. The “Nachricht” to *VMB* 4, 1770, shows an awareness of the practices of the *Liebhaber*, and of how the same individuals might resist using engraved music even if, in the case of the accompanied sonata, it was *à la mode*. In other words, Bernhard Christopher Breitkopf and Johann Gottlob Immanuel knew both the risks involved and the potential for profit attached to novelties, and thus chose to include enough of the familiar (the instrumental requirements implied by “*TRII, mit obligates Clavier*”) alongside the new (”*intagliati in Parigi*”) to reassure their patrons of continuities in music practice.

The inversion of this point may be seen by several works on pp. 31-32 of *S. II* being presented differently in the *VMB* 1770 (“[containing] musical books and printed music, which have been published since 1763 and collected by us.”) Presumably, since the *VMB* contained engraved and printed music only and thus might be the guide for a subgroup of the *Liebhaber* (as implied by the “Nachricht” quotation above), Breitkopf could include different categories and labels than in his catalogues of manuscript music. A category not included in the *Supplementi* appears in the *VMB*: after “4. Kleine Stücke aufs Clavier für Angänger” (101) and “5. Größere Stücke für das Clavecimbel, als Parthien, Suiten, Sinfonien und andere dergleichen Sammlungen” (101-2), we see “6. Sonaten fürs Clavier” (102.)

In this category, we see the sonatas printed in *S. II* as “par M. Eccard” by “Eckard,

---

286 See n278 above.
287 “Parthien, Suiten, Sinfonien und andere dergleichen Sammlungen” are all for solo piano.
Jean Geofr.” The only obligato terminology appearing in the “Sonaten” category is just above the Eckard entry, describing certain works of a “Mdselle Bayon.” (Presumably,

![Image](image.png)

**Figure 12a:** *VMB* 4 (1770), 102. Reproduced with permission.

288 *VMB* 4, 102. The next entry, of Captain de Beecke, is remarkable for reinforcing the fact that the memory of the Seven Years War was surely still present. Frederick Eugene II of Württemberg had fought in that war on Prussia’s side; he ascended to the duchy only 1795 (thus, here, his title of “Prince”). See Michel Hubert, *L’Allemagne Dynastique, Tome II — Anhalt-Lippe-Wurtemberg* (France: Laballery, 1979), 459–60, 474–78. Captain de Beecke apparently balanced military duty with musical pursuits.
the fact that only half of the sonatas were accompanied by “Violon obligé” meant that the collection could appear in this category without confusion. The other option, eliminating the accompanying instrument altogether, was not possible in these sonatas of Mlle Bayon due to the violin’s being “obligé.”) That erasure did happen in the case of Honaüer, though; the sonatas from the S.II, 31 appear in VMB 4 as “Six Sonates pour le Clavecin. Livr. I.” The sonata “avec l’accompagnement d’un violon” is not indicated as such at all.

The works of Mozart referenced on Supplemento II p. 31 appear in the next section: “7. Solos für das Clavier, mit einer Violin ad Libitum.” The “ad libitum” label in a category label never appears in any of the Catalogi or Supplementi; it is a use specific to the six VMB, describing printed or engraved music.

![Figure 12b: VMB 4 (1770), 103. Reproduced with permission.](image)

Mozart’s four sonatas from the S.II are divided into two oeuvres. The collection following them, “VI. Sonat. Oeuv. IV. Amsterdam,” is a prime example of re-categorization; it had already appeared in Supplemento III (1768), p. 27, in the category
VIII. Die Orgel und das Clavecinbäl.


Martini, Giov. il Tedesco, Scì Notturni per l’Harpa o Cembalo con 2 Violini, Viola e Violoncello. Op. IV. Parisi, fol. trav. 3 tfl. (5 tfl.)


Wegenitz, Christl. II. Divertimenti da Cembalo accompagnato da un Violino e Basso, con un Divertimento a Dua Cembali. Vienna, 1770. fol. trav. 1 tfl. 8 gl.


Bach, J. C. Six Concerts pour le Clavecin, 2 Violons & Violoncelle. Oeuvr. I. Amsterdam. 1755. fol. 5 tfl. 6 gl.


Müthel, Giov. Gottfried, Concerto I e II. per il Cembalo concertato, accompagnato da 2 Violini, Viola e Basso. Riga e Mietau, 1767. fol. 1 tfl. 16 gl.

Schober, Concert a Clavecin concert. 2 Violons, Viole e Basse. Oeuvr. IX. Paris. fol. 1 tfl. 16 gl.


Zuck.
“TRII a Cembalo obligato. CON VIOLINO O TRAVERSO. / Intagliati in Amsterdam,” as
“VI. Trii di Wolfgang MOZARD [sic] a Cemb. e Violino.”

Finally, tracing Schobert’s opps. 1-9 and 11-14 (S.II.32-33), one sees them located in categories specific to the VMB. Opuses 1-3, 8, and 14-15 appear in the “7. Solos für das Clavier, mit einer Violin ad Libitum” category, VMB 4, 103-4. Opuses 4-5, on the other hand, are now grouped under “6. Sonaten fürs Clavier” (p. 103.) The remaining opuses, 6-7, 9, and 11-13, judging by their specific instrumentation and labels in S.II (implying trio and concerto categories, respectively), would probably appear in the VMB 4’s “8. Stücke für das concertirende Clavier, mit einem und mehrern obligaten Instrumenten” (the category equivalent to “Trii,” Terzetti,” and “Quartetti / Quadri” in the Catalogi and Supplementi), and “9. Clavier-Concerte.” Sure enough, opuses 6 and 7 appear in the “b. Mit mehrern Instrumenten” (= “Terzetti”) subsection of VMB 4, and opuses 11-13 appear in the “9. Clavier-Concerte” category, down to the detail of “Concert. Pastorale,” in op. 13.

To summarize: VMB 4, cataloging printed music (whether type or engraved), sorts that music into different categories than in the Supplementi: categories in which obligato terminology functions mostly to demarcate the genre of the accompanied sonata and to indicate certain instruments (either Ausfühlstimmen, or members of the erstwhile continuo group, or both) that might be expendable in terms of musical texture. (See, for example, the Mayer concerti on VMB 4, 105, with its “2 Corni ad libitum” in contrast to the “obligati” of the rest of the ensemble.) That said, one can occasionally find examples

---

289 Brook, ed., BThC, 327.
290 The VMB 4 also includes a Concerto Op. 10 that Breitkopf neglected to include in the Supplemento II.)
of obligato terminology used to indicate two fully realized parts on the keyboard (see the Gruber example on the top of the same page.)

When examined closely, the category titles in the Supplementi I-V demonstrate different approaches to dealing with the influx of engraved music from Paris and Amsterdam. (See Appendix D.) The accompanied sonata novelty falls into this group; after one stand-alone in S.II, it is subsumed into “Trii” and “Terzetti,” with the distinction of a subcategory indicating where a certain piece, or group of pieces, was engraved. As explained above, this sets apart these compositions while maintaining the overall categorization structure that Breitkopf implemented in the Catalogi from the beginning: a default to obligato terminology assigned to the keyboard instrument in the “Trii” and “Terzetti” category titles, within the overall Cembalo group. Through 1770, the section containing Mozart and Schobert, on S.II, pages 31-33, is the most obvious section title outlier; there exist individual pieces within the “Trii” and “Terzetti” categories with obligato terminology attached to melody instruments and instruments of the continuo group. This terminology attaches for the reasons outlined above.

Ensuing Supplementi are informed by the same overarching categorization principle in the Cembalo section, compared to the volumes of the VMB. The main change from Supplementi I-V is that examples of obligato terminology occur more and more frequently. The terminology still attaches to a variety of individual instruments, for reasons already outlined: inscribing a hierarchy, indicating the accompanied sonata genre, or marking something specific about an Ausfühlstimme or about the behavior of a member of the continuo group. The Supplementi still contain the terminology in category
titles only for the “Trii” and “Terzetti;” and in doing so, they describe works that have a complex source history in terms that the Liebhaber could immediately understand as communicating genre expectations.

Certain compositions of Luigi Boccherini, listed in different Supplementi and VMBs, form outstanding examples of this phenomenon. Boccherini (1743-1805) was an Italian virtuoso cellist and skilled composer: “the chief representative of Latin instrumental music during the Viennese Classical period.” His works were highly popular throughout Europe; much of his style has been classified as “sweet,” “ingratiating,” “melodic.” As per Speck and Sadie:

[The] directions ‘soave’, ‘con grazia’ and ‘dolce’ or ‘dolcissimo’ are among the commonest in his music. … It is perhaps the pervading charm, gentleness or even effeminacy of his music, as well as its lack of firm direction, that drew from the violinist Giuseppe Puppo the well-known remark about Boccherini's being ‘Haydn's wife’.  

As per the experience of a popular and prolific composer in the late eighteenth to early nineteenth centuries, Boccherini faced the same problem that Beethoven was to rage against in letters to publishers: rampant piracy of his music.

The particular examples in the Supplementi and VMB demonstrate the route taken from publisher to publisher by two Boccherini collections. One was an extremely popular set of six sonatas: Boccherini’s Op. 5, 1769, composed for the amateur pianist Mme

\[\text{References:}\]


292 Ibid. For an overview of Boccherini reception history, and for more on the loaded nature of that reception, vis-à-vis musical value in gendered terms, see especially Elizabeth Le Guin, Boccherini’s Body: An Essay in Carnal Musicology (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006).
Brillon de Jouy. The other, six sonatas consisting of arrangements of individual movements from various quartets and quintets, was compiled by a “Mr. Nadermann,” luthier to the Queen of France. Breitkopf of course had no way of immediately knowing that the latter was a collection of arrangements with a complicated array of sources. (See Appendix E for this array.) Nor, if he did, would it really have mattered. For in the end, Breitkopf treated these two collections in the same way. He listed them in the VMB 4, 5, and 6 as “Sonaten,” with obligato terminology attached to the violin in each case. He listed them in the Supplementi IV, XV (the Op. 5), and XII (the arrangements), beneath either the “TRII. A CEMBALO OBLIGATO CON VIOLINO” (IV) label or “TRII intagliati” (XII and XV.) It is the latter two Supplementi entries that demonstrate the intersection, though not the interchangeability, of obligato attaching to two different instruments as an indication of genre expectations. In S.IV, 1769, the Op. 5 collection has the title “VI. Trii di Luigi BOCHERINI, a Cembalo e Violino. intagliati in Parigi,” while in S.XV, 1782-84, it has the title “VI. Trii da L. BOCCHERINI, a Cemb. e Violino obl. Vienna.” Finally, the arranged collection appears in S.XII, 1778, as “VI. Sonate da L. BOCHERINI. a Cemb. e Viol. oblig. Parigi,” and in the TRII. intagliati category.

These appearances of obligato terminology – communicating expectations connected to genre – show it oscillating between keyboard instrument and melody instrument, between “Trii” and “Sonate.” This particular oscillation has been emphasized, and controlled, in the Breitkopf catalogue corpus, which assembled music from various European locales, categorized it, and redistributed it through the publisher’s own networks. The oscillation, moreover, is linked to the type of music circulating,
whether manuscript or engraved. We thus see that we must take into account several layers of musicking to situate the work that obligato terminology performs in a specific group of catalogues. Situating that work in various musicking activities in the latter half of the eighteenth century and moving into the nineteenth, requires even more careful calibration.

Thus, returning to where I began: is the terminology, as used by Bretifkopf in the catalogue corpus, relevant when brought to bear on Beethoven’s Septet op. 20? After all, decades had passed since Schobert’s accompanied sonatas first collided with Breitkopf’s trio categories. The change of locale, also, is surely significant. Vienna’s publishing scene, although much younger than Leipzig’s, had become quite active by Beethoven’s first year there. Beethoven certainly was not restricted to Hoffmeister and Artaria in Vienna; his active publishing agenda, seen in letters to Simrock in Bonn, Breitkopf and Härtel, and other publishers across Europe, confirms that fact. However, what work of obligato terminology remained visible at this point and in this place? In other words, can the dual function I outlined in connection to the VMB, Catalogi, and Supplementi above, be substantiated in Beethoven’s aside to Hoffmeister?

The second main assortment of catalogues published by Breitkopf (and after 1795, by Breitkopf and Härtel293), in between Oster-Messe 1792 and Jubilate-Messe 1801294, shows that the same dual function – communicating hierarchies and establishing genre – was still active. The terminology still functions slightly differently from

293 Gottfried Christoph Härtel was made the heir to the Breitkopf firm in 1796, instead of G. I. Breitkopf’s sons. An able businessman, Härtel sought Beethoven’s friendship and patronage, encouraging him in his compositions (for everyone’s profit); yet took him to task from time to time and drove a hard bargain for composition fees.

294 SBB, Unter den Linden, Musikabteilung, Parts 1/13 in: Mus. Ab. 177/2.
manuscript music to music in print, though not nearly as markedly as before. For example, the obligato label still attaches to the clavicembalo in the 1792 and 1794 volumes of the *Verzeichniß Musikalischer Schriften*, though these examples are very rare.\(^{295}\) There are additional important differences in these *Verzeichniß* from the VMW catalogues gone before. First, an alphabetical arrangement of the composers takes priority; nothing is categorized by genre. Second, obligato terminology is, as mentioned above, quite rare. Third, a significant influx of “Begleitung” appears; synonymous with “accompagnement” or “accompagnmento,” it gives just as little indication as to whether the instrument indicated is obligato or ad libitum.\(^{296}\)

![Image](image.png)

**Figure 13:** *Verzeichniß Musikalischer Schriften* (1792), 8. Reproduced with permission.

\(^{295}\) The only two such entries in this publication are six sonatas by Carl Fr. Abel (*VMS* 1792, 6) and six by J. L. Krebs (12), clearly marked as having been first published in 1762 and 1760-62, respectively. In the 1794 volume, though the terminology is still there, the dates are not.

\(^{296}\) *Verzeichniß Musikalischer Schriften, welche von der Breitkopfschen Buchhandlung am alten Neumarkte in Leipzig verlegt, oder doch in mehrerer Anzahl bey ihr zu bekommen sind.*
Other new developments include the possibility of subscription; one may see in the example above Johann Nikolaus Forkel, Sebastian Bach’s first publisher, offering one such subscription for six clavier sonatas with “Violine unnd Violoncellstimme.”

Finally, there are a very few sonatas listed as “à tre” or “à trio,” but in the great majority of occurrences, “Sonata” or “Sonaten” forms its own descriptor. It almost always describes “clavier” or “pianoforte;” the few “clavicembali” present are from older works. Obligato terminology still occasionally attaches to a melody instrument in that description, thus still indicating the accompanied sonata genre. Any categorical oscillation between trio and sonata, though, with obligato terminology attaching to a keyboard instrument, has disappeared.

No obligato terminology attaches to any keyboard whatsoever in the catalogues for engraved and printed music, published yearly between 1792 and 1801. Otherwise, the main difference in the two catalogues for manuscript is present in these other catalogues as well: the terminology’s relative rarity. When it does appear, it does one of two things. First, it attaches to melody instruments most often in the accompanied sonata genre, but also, now, to themes with variations, “pot-pourris,” and additional pieces of “sociability music.” See, for example, two Benda sonatas listed at the 1793 Oster-Messe.

---

297 See the example of six Binder sonatas (indicated as written in 1763) in *Verzeichniß Musikalischer Schriften* (1792), 5. This listing is given again in *Verzeichniß Musikalischer Schriften* (1794), p. 5. Though the clavicembalo is still there, the 1763 date is gone.
Figure 14: *Verzeichniss neuer Musikalien*, Oster-Messe 1793. Reproduced with permission.
Situating these trends in Vienna, the thematic catalogue of Artaria & Co., published concurrently as this second Breitkopf group, demonstrates similar usage. Obligato terminology appears in connection to melody instruments alongside keyboards, in accompanied sonatas, themes and variations, pot-pourris, and other “sociability music” genres.

Beethoven in fact took Artaria to task for misusing obligato terminology on the cover page of one of his earlier publications: the variations for piano and violin on the theme “Se vuol ballare,” WoO 40. Artaria published this work in 1793. Beethoven had apparently corrected a “very important” error (among many), that he describes in a letter of August, 1793:

First of all, there is a mistake on the title-page where it is stated ‘avec un violon ad libitum’. Since the violin is inseparably connected with the pianoforte part and since it is not possible to play the variations without the violin, this should be worded ‘avec un violon obligate’, exactly as I corrected it, moreover, in one copy.299

The error appears on the front page of the Verzeichniss neuer Musikalien that appeared at the Michaelis-Messe, 1793. What Beethoven thought of this, we do not know. However, it is irrefutable that Beethoven knew how obligato terminology defined instrumental behavior in the accompanied sonata genre, and in smaller-scale “sociability music” similar to it, from very early in his compositional career.300

---

298 Werkverzeichniss 2, 102-3. This version of the title page, published in July 1793, has been preserved in A-Wgm and HR-Zh.
299 Anderson, Letters 1, 7 (Letter 5) August 1793; Briefe 1, 14 (Letter 10). The recipient of the letter is not indicated. Anderson hypothesizes that it is Nikolaus Zmeskall; Brandenburg disagrees.
300 Both Voss and Aringer acknowledge this, in “Zum Begriff,” xx and “Obligates Akkkompagnement,” xx respectively.
Verzeichniss neuer Musikalien, welche in der Breitkopfschen Musikhandlung in Leipzig zu bekommen sind.

Michaelis-Messe 1793.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>André</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ange</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymo</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baumbach</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandl</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartellieri</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clementi</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 15: *Verzeichniss neuer Musikalien*, Michaelis-Messe 1793. Reproduced with permission.
He also obviously knew how it could be used, or misused, in print or in manuscript publication. Finally, as described in the previous chapter, he did not forgo the terminology as his career progressed.301

That progression took place with the help of Breitkopf and Härtel. It is in another letter to them that we see the other work of obligato terminology, aligning with that present in the Catalogo, Parte Vta, active in Beethoven’s mind. This work of delineating a hierarchy of instrumentation, and indicating that the same hierarchical expectation might be overturned, informs certain printing and compositional choices connected to the Third Symphony, op. 55, Eroica.

In the early nineteenth century, Breitkopf and Härtel continued its success in music publishing, a well-oiled machine humming along in its established routines. However established, the firm was always on the lookout for music that would sell well, to both the Kenner and the Liebhaber. After he established a working relationship with Beethoven, Härtel would write him, or his representatives, to ask for music he knew would be popular. He attempted to obtain compositions for publication at the various fairs, he encouraged Beethoven to consider large-scale vocal works, and he recommended the mosaic-type printing process, implemented at the firm so long ago.302

301 Letters between Beethoven and the Scottish publisher George Thomson entail one of the longest-running exchanges on what proper melody-instrument accompaniments should be, and how difficult (i.e. “obligé” or not). Thomson commissioned Haydn and Beethoven alike to arrange Scottish and English songs for voice, piano, and instruments. See especially Anderson, Letters 1 (Letter 352), February 29, 1812; Briefe 2, 247-48 (Letter 556).

302 See especially Härtel’s letter of January 28, 1803, discussing a prospective publication by subscription of new Beethoven piano sonatas. Härtel writes:

Should he [Beethoven] need a considerable amount of copies, say, over 500, perhaps 1,000, we would advise him to have us print them using typeset notes because:

1) for a large number of copies the printing is far cheaper;
On August 26, 1804, after publishing the Septet op. 20 through Hoffmeister and navigating all the drama of the ensuing arrangement for quintet, Beethoven wrote to Breitkopf and Härtel to inquire about having recent works published.

He had a “matter which affects me closely … that several publishers who have some of my compositions, are so atrociously dilatory about bringing them to the light of day.” Thus, he remarked: “I distinctly remember that you once wrote to me saying that you would be able to deliver a prodigious number of copies in a few weeks.” Beethoven wanted to see certain works appear as quickly as possible: “my oratorio [“Christus am Oelberge”] – a new grand symphony [the Eroica, op. 55],” as well as the Triple Concerto op. 56, and the solo sonatas opp. 53 and 54. (Of the last two, Beethoven added: “if you should like to have one of these with an accompaniment, I would also agree to arrange this too.”)\textsuperscript{303}

This letter is most famous for Beethoven’s remark about the Eroica’s name. Few scholars have continued on to what Beethoven wrote next.

The title of the symphony is really Bonaparte [Ponaparte] and in addition to all the other usual instruments it has the accompaniment of three horns [sind noch besonders 3 Obligate Hörner Dabey] – I think it will interest the musical public [das Musikalische Publikum] – I should like you the symphony in score instead of engraving the parts.\textsuperscript{304}

\begin{itemize}
  \item[2)] it will be completed much faster (we can finish printing the 3 Sonatas in 8 days, even if 10,000 copies are needed);
  \item[3)] because piano players are very accustomed to typeset music in our editions and we would take care to provide a very clear printing;
  \item[4)] because with the shipment of the copies from here, much would be saved on postage … Whether your brother would rather have us engrave them or have them engraved in Vienna (which is perhaps the least desirable), we are prepared in any case to apply ourselves gladly on his behalf.
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{303} Albrecht, \textit{Letters to Beethoven}, 92-93 (Letter 53); \textit{Briefe} 1, 152 (Letter 128).
\textsuperscript{304} Anderson, \textit{Letters} 1, 116 (Letter 96); \textit{Briefe} 1, 218 (Letter 188).
One can picture this entry in the *Sinfonie* category; it would have “3 Corni obl.” next to it. One could also imagine that performing this symphony might entail additional expense – except, we do not have to imagine, because that is exactly what happened. The archives of Beethoven’s patron Lobkowitz contain an account book, kept by his court conductor Anton Wranitzky, that detail the cost of holding a rehearsal for the *Eroica*.

*Item*: rehearsal by Beethoven of his symphony and concerto: the same orchestra but with a third horn – thus, 22 persons at 2 florins, 44 florins.  

The extra horn player meant an extra two-florin payment.

Just as Empress Marie Thérèse probably would not have thought much about a commissioner’s fee, so Lobkowitz surely did not blink at two more florins on a given evening. What I wish to bring to the fore with this small detail is the realization that Breitkopf’s monetary distinction between *Hauptstimmen* and *Ausfühlstimmen*, in 1762, could still be a factor in practical considerations of musical performance in 1804. Adding another *Ausfühlstimme* to the two of its kind already there, and then giving them all musical material that could not be left out, led Beethoven to give the three horns the “obligato” label.  

---


306 Another material record indicates that Beethoven recognized the necessity of allowing the horns to arrange their own logistics in the performance of his music. A note printed in the *Eroica* first edition reads: “La parte del Corno terzo e aggiustata della sorte, che possa eseguirsi ugualmente sul Corno primario ossia seconario.” Conductor Erich Leinsdorf translates this as: “The part of the third horn is arranged so that it can be performed on the principal or the second horn.” Leinsdorf interprets this to mean that Beethoven “intended the third horn as a deputy for the stretches when the first needed time for a changeover to the other crook.” Erich Leinsdorf,
Interestingly, the same account statement contains another instrument-related note, following that about the third horn and the grand total. “Zulag für ersten Contrabass -------- 1f.” Later in the statement, of another rehearsal for the Eroica, Wranitzsky wrote about extra charges incurred

\[\text{Item}\ \text{dieselbe Prob v[on] Bethowen von 22 Personen p[er] 2f -------- 44f}\]
\[\text{Zulag für Contrabass u[nd] Instrument-Tragen für 2 mal --------------- 3f}\]

“Extra for the contrabass, plus instrument cartage for two times.”

A specialist contrabass had apparently been brought in to the rehearsals; thus an extra florin fee. For the second rehearsal, twice the normal portage fee for the contrabass was added (presumably, Albrecht argues, because it had been forgotten the first time.)

Though the contrabass was not labeled obligato in any manuscript of the Eroica, the presence of three (one virtuoso included) was apparently necessary. The “musical public” indeed took note of horn and contrabass, as may be seen in the symphony’s earliest review in print (April 17, 1805.) The reviewer noted that “the musical connoisseurs and amateurs were divided into several parties” over the symphony. One group in particular thought it “[had] produced neither beauty nor true sublimity and power.”

Through strange modulations and violent transitions, by placing together the most heterogeneous things, as when for example a pastorale is played through in the grandest style, with abundant scratchings in the bass, with three horns and so

---


Albrecht, Letters to Beethoven 1, 136, (Letter 81).

Albrecht hypothesizes that this contrabassist was Anton Grams; a similar fee was paid for his instrument cartage for the Akademie of January 23, 1805, in which he performed in the Eroica as well as Beethoven’s Symphony No. 1 and “a symphony in Eb by Anton Eberl.” See Albrecht, Letters to Beethoven 1, 154, 154n1, 156-57n6 (Letter 95).
forth, a true if not desirable originality can indeed be gained without much effort. However, genius does not proclaim itself by simply bringing forth the unusual and the fantastic, but rather by creating the beautiful and sublime.309

The reviewer concludes by admonishing, in particular, “a continuous tumult of the combined instruments.”

Another review, of January 1807, mentioned the instrumentation, though in terms more universally positive amidst other critique.

The first movement is impressive and full of power and sublimity. The working-out is true and comprehensible; the reinforcement of the bass lines with the wind instruments, particularly the horns, heightens the effect considerably. … The scherzo menuetto is a piece full of lively, restless motion, against which the sustained tones of the three horns in the trio contrast exceptionally well.310

When the symphony was reviewed by the *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* (18 February 1807),311 glowing praise had become official. Describing the Finale, the reviewer praises the instrumentation:

Thus … through an excellent division among the various instruments (particularly through exquisite choice of the wind instruments), they [thematic episodes] give great and continually new charm to the whole. … [The] great richness of B’s imagination is revealed as it again and again finds ways to let the principal theme, then the secondary subjects, glimmer through, now as an accompanying voice, now as an obligatory bass line and so forth.312

309 “Vienna, 17 April 1805.” Der Freymüthige 3 (17 April 1805): 332. Tr. in Critical Reception 2, 16-17 (No. 145.)
311 Correspondents from Vienna (2 May 1805), and Mannheim (see n308), had sent in reviews earlier. See Critical Reception 2, 17-20 (Nos. 146 and 148.)
The marked presence of wind instruments, as well as thematic material flitting about from the fore to “accompanying voices” to the “obligatory [nothwendig] bass line” prove Beethoven’s compositional greatness to the reviewer; they are also aspects of musical works marked by use of obligato terminology in music publishing. As seen above, obligato and ad libitum in the Catalogo Parte Vta often indicate whether wind instruments – the horn, especially – are required or not. This aspect of the terminology does more than communicate information about the music manuscript’s price and its performance logistics. After almost fifty years from the appearance of the Catalogo Parte Ima, in Beethoven’s attaching it to the three horns that would interest the musical public, obligato terminology works to situate unexpected instrumentation choices, instrumental colors, and instruments’ receiving thematic material all within hierarchies of expectation that had been in flux since Hadyn’s outstanding orchestral innovations and instrumental treatments.313

This brings us back to the question of the contrabass in Beethoven’s Septet, op. 20, connected with Adler’s formulation of obligate Akkompagnement. Since the contrabass does not carry any melodic material, and, indeed, possesses little independence of line (save for a few key notes at certain cadential points), interpreters must undertake considerable work to fit Adler’s construction to the composition. The models proposed by Voss and Aringer, of Dynamik and instrumental dramaturgy,

Weise bald das Hauptthema, bald die Zwischensätze, bald als begleitende Stimme, bald als nothwendigen Bass u. dgl. hindurchschimmern zu lassen. “Nothwendig,” though not used in catalogues, has an association with obligato terminology in this dissertation; see chapter 1, n.11, for its use by Agricola and C.P.E. Bach in connection to Christoph Bach’s compositional mastery.
encompass both the lack of independence in the contrabass and Beethoven’s insistence that all seven parts of his Septet are obligato. As they have pointed out, and as my examination of mid to late eighteenth century music publishing expectations in Leipzig and Vienna makes clear, Beethoven insists because he knows that certain parts might be assumed to be optional, given instrumental hierarchies present in ensemble works – ensembles that are the descendants of the Partite, the Divertimenti, the Ouvertures, and the other compositions, with their variety of instruments, in the Catalogo, Parte V (1765.)

In this case, Beethoven was not without precedents. On the earlier side of the time frame I have been considering in this chapter, Luigi Boccherini had to use the terminology to convey important aspects of instrumentation and printing choices to his publisher. We may see this in his autograph MS of a “Divertimento, Opera Prima,” composed in 1773, for “due Violini, Flauto obbligato, Viola, due Violoncelli, e Baßo di Ripieno.”

At the bottom of the title page, Boccherini wrote an “Avvertimento.”

The Contrabass part is not obbligata, in the sense that, if you print these Sonate without the aforementioned, nothing will be missing.314

However, with Beethoven’s remark that he was “born with an obligato accompaniment” coming on the heels of the obligato-ness of all the instruments in his septet, and in light of the analysis of obligato in the Breitkopf Catalogi and Verzeichnisse, I conclude that the two aspects of obligato terminology – indicating hierarchical expectations (or their overturning) and communicating genre – are both at work. Beethoven jokes about a

practice of obligato connected with the genre of the accompanied sonata, using, furthermore, *Kurrent* and Italianate script intermingled throughout. In conflating these two aspects of obligato terminology, and arguing that the single obligato concept (seen, Adler indicates, on various title pages) became obsolete within Beethoven’s lifetime, Adler brought into being his idea of *obligate Akkompagnement* as the highest form of compositional art.

Adler does acknowledge the fact that the terminology attaches to instruments; he writes that instruments help propel and define the energy of thematic exchange occurring in the compositional art of the Viennese Classical School. However, in situating these two aspects – instrumentation and composition – he elevates the latter.

In the characterization of the obligato accompaniment of the Viennese School, two elements are to be distinguished: the coloristic [*das koloristische*] and (more important for true art) the soulful [*das seelische*].

Earlier in his essay, he had performed his own taxonomy of obligato as a word:

The emphasis of this composite word, both adjective and noun bound together, lies in the noun: the “obligat” alone is the soul of the body.

The idea that proper compositional mastery conveys true art, that true art occurs through the perfect interaction of musical forms, and that music’s soul rests just there: surely we hear, in this construction, echoes of Adler’s own teacher, Eduard Hanslick, and the aesthetic priorities of his followers.

The multiplicities of obligato terminology must then be carefully controlled, even

---

as Adler is directing them to fade from view in the aesthetic, if not the historic, record.

“Obligato” as an indication that all instruments are necessary, while originally inscribing an internal instrumental hierarchy even as it possibly upended expectations, became subsumed in the all-encompassing necessity of recreating the composer’s will as seen in a score, thanks to aesthetic developments in the nineteenth century. In this way, the terminology did become superfluous, and did in fact become an invisible assumption about a work, proving Adler correct.

However, “obligato” as indicating a genre lived on through the nineteenth century, in the descendants of the accompanied sonata embodied in music played by amateurs. This genre indication did eventually disappear, but only because its home in domestic musicking circles passed into music history with the advent of recorded sound.

Leaving Breitkopf and Beethoven, we now possess additional nuance for Adler’s construction of compositional greatness, additional definitions to add to our obligato taxonomy, and, most importantly, complete clarity about the “turnaround” I noted in the first chapter of this dissertation. After having considered the collision of the trio and the accompanied sonata evident in Breitkopf catalogue pages, we understand perfectly why C. P. E. Bach and Johann Nikolaus Forkel use obligato terminology differently to describe the same work. That collision goes some way towards explaining the following image: an arrangement of the St. Matthew Passion aria “Erbarme dich,” for piano, voice, and “obligater Violine.” This arrangement was published very soon after Mendelssohn’s revival of Sebastian Bach’s “Passionsmusik,” in Berlin, 1829. I conclude that it was made
to capitalize upon the revival’s immediate fame and the aria’s being a highlight of that performance.


Considering obligato terminology as it has been used to describe “Erbarne dich” and arias like it brings me closer to the goal I had when beginning this dissertation: understanding not only why musicologists, critics, and other musicking individuals writing in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries use this terminology differently than Sebastian Bach did in the eighteenth – but also, more importantly, why it attaches to certain vocal-instrumental interactions. Drawing off knowledge gained from the exploration of Beethoven’s op. 20 and Breitkopf’s catalogues, I will look for the work
obligato does in connection to these displays of human, and instrumental, vocality and virtuosity.

The curious case of “Erbarne dich”

Considering obligato terminology as it has been used to describe “Erbarne dich” and arias like it brings me closer to the goal I had when beginning this dissertation: understanding not only why musicologists, critics, and other musicking individuals
writing in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries use this terminology differently than Sebastian Bach did in the eighteenth, but also, more importantly, why they often use it to describe certain ornate, complex vocal-instrumental interactions.

First, to draw a more vivid contrast with how the terminology has performed this work in Bach reception, I will examine Sebastian Bach’s own structuring of the section of the *Matthäus-Passion* (hereafter *MP*) containing “Erbarme dich” and its companion aria “Gebt mir meinen Jesum wieder.” I will then examine commentators’ descriptions of the interaction of voice and violin in “Erbarme dich,” before moving to its publication as an “Arie mit obligater Violine” soon after Mendelssohn’s 1829 *Singakademie* performance.

**Autograph, Technicalities, and Romantic Reception**

In his 1736 autograph of the *MP*, Bach does not use any variation on “obligat” to describe the most prominent instrument in “Erbarme dich,” the violin. Instead, he labels the entirety “Aria. Violin concert, due Violine e Viol[e] col Alto Chori [Fini].” On the most basic level, this outlines performing forces; more particularly, it indicates that one of the violins has a concertato part. The aria appears immediately after a moment of high drama in the passion narrative, Peter’s denial of Jesus.

---

317 For this this autograph, see the record at *Bach Digital* for: D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 25. (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz.) The record may be found at: http://www.bach-digital.de/receive/BachDigitalSource_source_00000842. For the label of “Erbarme Dich” specifically, see the first page of no. 39; for that of “Gebt mir meinen Jesum wieder,” see the first page of no. 42.
I emphasize this because “Erbarme dich” has a counterpart that follows almost on its heels, after another dramatic moment in the narrative; an aria scored in the same way. Bach writes a near-identical performance direction for “Gebt mir meinen Jesum wieder,” the aria for bass occurring immediately after Judas's suicide in the narrative. “Aria. Violino concert, due Violini, Viola, Basso e Cont [symbol] di [Cori]” indicates that the forces are almost identical to those indicated for “Erbarme dich.” Indeed, Daniel Melamed points out that an earlier version of this section of the MP contains a symmetry of instrumentalists. “Erbarme dich” gives the string accompaniment to the second orchestra of the MP’s famous double ensemble, and the concertato violin part to a violin from the first orchestra. The distribution is switched for “Gebt mir.” Melamed mentions the “cross-wise” symbolism attributed to this gesture by other analysts; however, he posits a simpler technical reason for it. He argues that Bach probably “did not count on twice his usual complement of violinists [in 1727] … but rather used only one violinist on each line in each orchestra instead of the typical two.” Thus, “any aria with three violin lines had to borrow from the other chorus.”

The scoring is thus similar to the point of symmetry; in addition, the arias take place after dramatic moments in immediate succession. However, “Erbarme dich” is by far the more famous in the reception of the MP. It has been so since 1829. “Gebt mir” was cut from Mendelssohn’s revival performance on the 12th and 21st of March 1829,

---

318 Daniel Melamed, *Hearing Bach’s Passions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 62. He then argues that the particular violinist borrowing did not make the jump into the 1736 performing parts because the two groups would have been further apart from each other, as indicated by the use of two continuos instead of just one. See the entirety of his third chapter, “The Double Chorus in the *St. Matthew Passion* BWV 244” for additional analysis of performing parts, and the argument that the “double-chorus/orchestra” arrangement was in fact a much more lopsided concertato-ripieno construct.
whereas the reviewer in *AMZ* wrote that after “Mad. Türrschmidt performed her first solo with chorus [“Ach! Nun ist mein Jesus hin”] with heartwarming intimacy,” then “So too did Fräulein v. Schätzel [perform] the very difficult cantilena of the aria “Erbarme dich mein Gott,” with its particular violin solo accompaniment.”

Praise for this aria’s violin solo, and occasionally for the violinist, appear in additional sources describing the 1829 revival. Often, this praise dovetails with adulation for the singers. In his memoirs, Eduard Devrient (the actor singing Mendelssohn’s Jesus) describes how

> The ladies … achieved the full effect with their moving numbers: Madame Milder, with her ingratiating voice, particularly the accompanied recitative “Thou dearest Savior [Du lieber Heiland],” Miss von Schätzel, with her full-throated tone, the aria “Have mercy, Lord” [Erbarme dich]. The latter was accompanied by Eduard Rietz, with his big and rich violin tone, in appropriate style and expression – an incomparable song of repentance.

“Erbarme dich” became a favorite for violin and mezzo-soprano/alto performers alike.

For example, when Brahms arranged a “Geistliches Konzert” for April 10, 1868, to feature the premiere of his *Deutsches Requiem*, violinist Joseph Joachim played “Erbarme dich,” with his wife Amalie Weiss singing the alto part. “Erbarme dich” was even once used as shorthand for the *MP* as a whole. Witness Friedrich Nietzsche in 1888, writing a friend to let him know that “that Paris is wild with enthusiasm for – the St. Matthew Passion,” and that, “Le Figaro – truly Le Figaro! – has devoted an entire page

---


320 Wolff et al., *NBR*, 518, no. 411.

to reprinting part of the score: namely the melancholy aria “Erbarme dich, mein Gott.”

Given his enthusiasm for music, it is possible that Nietzsche knew of, or studied, a relatively early analysis of the MP, published in Berlin by Trautwein, in 1852. Johann Theodor Mosewius, the director of the Sing-Akademie in Breslau, wrote an aria-by-aria analysis in one of the first larger-scale analytical projects concerning the work: *Johann Sebastian Bachs Matthäus-Passion – musikalisch-ästhetisch dargestellt*. In it, Mosewius describes “Erbarme dich” as “in every respect[,] one of the most precious pieces in the entire work.” He analyzes the aria’s ritornello form, key structure, vocal line and “obligate Violine” in great detail before moving on to a brief description of “Gebt mir meinen Jesum wieder.” He outlines the instrumentation of the latter aria much more tersely, referring to “einer obligaten Geige.” Mosewius then calls the aria “very brilliant,” but goes on to remark that, although its instrumentation indicates that it must have a great effect, it can be cut from performance. He himself, after all, had done so in April 1830.

Mosewius was one of the few to mention “Gebt mir” in remarks on the MP. For many ensuing commentators, in academic literature and popular criticism, “Erbarme dich” became fixed as one of the high points, in a monumental work, in Sebastian Bach’s superlative compositional career. Why the enthusiasm and critical acclaim for “Erbarme dich” and not for “Gebt mir,” even though their scoring is almost identical and they

---


324 “Ich habe die Arie in den Aufführungen fortgelassen, sie überhaupt niemals mit Instrumenten gehört, glaube aber, sie müsse von grosser Wirkung sein.” Mosewius, *Matthäus-Passion*, 55. For a description of Mosewius’s rehearsals leading up to the Breslau performance on 3 April 1830, see *BD* VI, 630, D 94.
function as a pair in the Passion drama? I believe that the answer draws off not only dramatic tension and character, but also the style in which the violin part is composed. In terms of dramatic tension, there are important differences in the recitative sections before each aria. Peculiar aspects of the recitative leading into “Erbarme dich” include the foregrounding of time and memory (in terms of the text: Peter remembers Jesus’ prophesying his denial) and the emphasis on extremes of vocal range (in terms of the Evangelist’s line on “und ging hinaus”). In the aria proper one must consider as well the diffusion of the identity of the individual singing. An alto singing “Erbarme dich” does not align as straightforwardly with the character of Peter (sung by a bass in the narrative sections), as the bass singing “Gebt mir” does with the character of Judas. In the simplest interpretation possible, the alto becomes the emotion felt by Peter, or the prayer

325 Let us compare these sections. Before “Erbarme dich,” the Evangelist’s recitative is punctuated by different characters (and then a full chorus) chiming in to accuse Peter of guilt by association. After the third denial, the Evangelist relates that Peter remembers what was said/sung to him (and to the listeners) in the first part of the MP. (This is no small feat of memory for the congregation, incidentally, since a long sermon separated the two parts.) In terms of characterization, it can be argued that the alto singing “Erbarme dich” extends the emotional net of the aria further round the listener – since Peter as a bass is not obviously singing the words of repentance, said words are not easily relegated to a character in a drama (and thereby detached from the listener). “Gebt mir,” in contrast, is sung by a bass – the one Bach indicated had to sing the role of Judas – and after a tenor and bass chorus reaction to that same bass’s suicide. Time is fractured after the suicide, in other words, instead of folded in on itself – even as vocal identification of that bass with Judas is solidified rather than being diffused, as in the case of bass-Peter and alto aria-singer. (For more on individual characters and vocal roles in the MP, see Melamed, Hearing Bach’s Passions, 2005; specifically chapter 2: “Singers and Roles in Bach’s Passions.”) The juxtaposition of Peter and Judas is not unique to Bach. Leaving aside the Passion tradition, there exists a stand-alone drama from Bach’s time that testifies to the pair’s importance by having them offer their own emotional reactions to events of the Passion. See Der weinende Petrus, written by “Sylvander” (Bresslau: Liegnitz, 1726). An earlier setting was printed in 1675; Der weinende Petrus, by Christian Weise. (Bach drew off this version for a very few parts of the Johannes-Passion.) One can argue from Bach’s changes to the JP that he saw Peter’s denial as possessing more dramatic potential in music. John’s gospel contains neither Peter’s denial nor Judas’ suicide; Bach chose to interpolate the former (in several different versions of the JP, in arias of vastly different affect) and not the latter.
entered into by all the listeners, in this communal ritual. However, the long historical tradition of ascribing unheard-of emotional power to “Erbarme dich”, even when excised from its original religious context, leads one to wonder whether this can be linked to something musical in that aria that does not happen in its companion.

Scholarship on Subjectivities

John Butt offers an answer to this question, albeit without mentioning “Gebt mir,” in *Bach’s Dialogue with Modernity*. He uses obligato terminology, connected to the violin, to do so. His analysis indicates that he understands obligato to mean “expected/obligatory instrumental solo.” Then, however, he proceeds to treat obbligato as a conveyor of a greater meaning. Writing about “Erbarme dich,” Butt argues against what he takes to be the usual assumption that “this aria [is] a superlative solo for alto accompanied by a violin obbligato that sets the scene, but which is essentially subservient to the voice.”

---


327 John Butt, *Bach’s Dialogue with Modernity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 79. Cumming’s article on subjectivity figures largely in recent scholarship on “Erbarme Dich.” Naomi Cumming, “The Subjectivities of ‘Erbarme Dich’,” *Musical Analysis* 16/1 (1997), 5-44. A response to this article appears in Peter Johnson’s “Performance and the Listening Experience: Bach’s ‘Erbarme Dich’,” in *Theory into Practice: Composition, Performance and the Listening Experience. Collected Writings of the Orpheus-Institute*, No. 2, ed. Nicholas Cook, Peter Johnson, and Hans Zender (Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 1999). Johnson uses “spectrogram analyses [to compare] two performances of Bach’s aria ‘Erbarme dich’ in order to show that recent methods of music theory manage to interpret a performance’s subjective reception in an objective way” (6). One issue with this interpretation, in common with Cumming’s approach, is that the analysis of the opening eight measures of “Erbarme dich” – solo violin and backing strings – is meant to speak for the creation of subjectivity, and of subjective reception, in the aria as whole. In other words, this aria could be for opening violin ritornello
Butt agrees with Naomi Cumming in stating that “the solo violin part … has the most complete version of the melody, in the opening eight bars of the ritornello.” He points to the alto entrance as crucial in that it “diverts into countermelody after the opening gesture, or shadows the more ornamented violin melody.” (He reprints mm. 8b to 12 of the aria, violin and voice in isolation, to support this point.) This would be mere technical detail, were it not for the fact that Butt ascribes symbolic and theological importance to the violin due to its “model of musical perfection – to which a human (i.e. the singer) aspires without ever quite succeeding.”328 His conclusion is worth quoting in its entirety:

Here, then, there seems to be a musical model of perfection lying behind the music. … What makes this music sound so personal and intensely moving is surely both the exquisite expressiveness of the ritornello model and the very human efforts of the singer to approach this …. The violin, then, is a human artifact that allows us to reach things that we cannot ‘naturally’ do, thereby taking us to levels of expression and sensation that we would not otherwise experience.329

The interplay of voice and solo instrument in “Erbarme dich,” however, is even more complex than Butt describes.

**Voice and Violin**

Butt is right to point out that the violin takes over the ritornello for the voice after the latter’s opening gesture (m. 9); however, the opposite happens in m. 34, as the alto alone. To be fair, Cumming touches on the particulars of vocal/instrumental interaction in her conclusion. Johnson leaves the same well enough alone.

329 Ibid., 80-81.
completes the same gesture offered by the instrument in exactly the same context. At certain points in the aria the violin is the one offering small counter-gestures while the alto sustains the main melody. (See especially mm. 13-14, 27-29.) Most importantly, though, there are entire phrases in this aria in which the solo violin and the alto are essentially playing and singing in unison. Take for example measures 11-12b, and 16d-18c. The violin plays appoggiaturas on notes shared with the voice, and escape tones arpeggiating downward in a Lombardic rhythmic figure to the same appoggiaturas, whereas the voice moves down by step. Neither of these ornaments, though, is something the voice is incapable of singing. One may see this in the appoggiaturas in m. 13, 16, and 31, as well as the Lombardic figures in mm. 31 and 32. If anything, the violin’s ornaments in mm. 11 and 12 serve as a way to distinguish between the two – the violin not doing something that the voice cannot do, but, rather, something quite convenient for the instrument: ornamenting by flitting up a fifth and then a minor sixth, easily obtainable.

---

330 Johann Sebastian Bach, *Matthäuspassion*, ed. Alfred Dürr. BWV 244, *Neue Bach-Ausgabe* II/5 (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1972), 179. [Hereafter Bach, *MP*, *NBA*.] This alto completion occurs an octave lower than it “should,” and thus does not preserve the ascending contour of the opening ritornello. The potential support for Butt’s point therein (the voice cannot attain what the violin easily reaches) can be countered by asserting that, out of contour as it is, the alto’s completion of the gesture repeats the opening of the entire ritornello proper and enables the elision of two measures (9 and 10) into one (34) and thus a quicker progression to the close. Note that Robert Levin uses this and other observations on the structural peculiarities of “Erbarme dich” in order to take issue with Karol Berger’s understanding of da capo arias. See Robert D. Levin, review of *Bach’s Cycle, Mozart’s Arrow: An Essay on the Origins of Musical Modernity*, by Karol Berger, *JAMS* Vol. 63, No. 3 (Fall 2010): 658-684, esp. 661-62.

331 Bach, *MP*, *NBA*, 180-82.

332 Ibid., 180, 182.
Figure 17a: “Erbarme dich,” Matthäus-Passion (NBA), no. 39, mm. 1-9.
Reproduced with permission.
Figure 17b: “Erarme dich,” Matthäus-Passion (NBA), no. 39, mm. 10-18.
Reproduced with permission.
via a string crossing. Then, in mm. 17b to 18c, alto and violin sound in unison, the only exceptions being two appoggiaturas and one passing tone, all in the violin part.\textsuperscript{333}

**Ornamentation**

Lest this catalogue seem pedantic, it should be remembered that Bach was known within his lifetime for writing out ornamentation in full rather than leaving its inclusion to the performer’s discretion. This tendency was a critical point of evidence in the Bach-Scheibe controversy: used by Johann Adolf Scheibe to point to Sebastia Bach’s rigidity, excessive learnedness, and turgid style, but used by defenders to indicate thoroughness, care for players and singers, and a supreme awareness of how his music should sound. In his first rebuttal of Scheibe’s critique, the Leipzig professor of rhetoric Birnbaum lists other composers of note who write out all ornaments and goes on to say:

> What is called the “manner” of singing or playing [the addition of ornaments] is almost everywhere valued and considered desirable. It is also indisputable that this manner can please the ear only if it is applied in the right places but must on the contrary uncommonly offend the ear and spoil the principal melody if the performer employs it at the wrong spot.\textsuperscript{334}


\textsuperscript{334} Quoted in Wolff et. al., *NBR*, 346-47, no. 344; *BD* II, 304-5, no. 409.
Birnbaum concludes that “prescribing a correct method according to his intentions” is a way “to watch over the preservation of his [Bach’s] own honor.” In a fascinating example of changing attitudes toward this trend, the pupil of J.S. Bach and the **Hofcomponist** at Frederick II’s Royal Berlin Opera, J.F. Agricola, confronts the castrato and famed pedagogue of an earlier generation, Pier Francesco Tosi. Agricola translated and wrote a commentary on Tosi’s 1723 treatise, *Opinioni de’ cantori antichi e moderni*. The **Hofcomponist** called his effort *Anleitung zur Singkunst* and published it to great acclaim in 1757. When discussing appoggiaturas, Tosi condemned the “foreign infantile practice” of composers writing out ornaments because “they want to give the impression that they know how to sing better than the singers themselves.” Agricola disagreed.

Some of us German singers on the other side of the mountains [i.e. the Alps] would prefer, in the event of not being able to invent something clever ourselves, to be guided by the composer or, at least, by the accompanist …. Even if we want to be what we are not, it is not necessary to disclose all our secrets.

With this in mind, such small variations in an aria in a carefully copied-out Bach autograph merit comment. And with the violin playing what the alto in “Erbarme dich” is capable of singing, within its range, one must wonder why the instrument is given so many more ornaments than the voice. Perhaps this is a method with which Bach can call attention to the instrumental nature of one of the solo parts: a way that is not idiomat...
virtuosity, at least in comparison to the blazing violin string crossings of “Gebt mir meinen Jesum wieder.” In “Erbarne dich,” such is the overlap between violin and voice that the small ornaments could be a way of distinguishing between the two in their moments of unison.

Register

Figure 17c: "Erbarne dich," *Matthäus-Passion (NBA)*, no. 39, mm. 19-24. Reproduced with permission.

Another method of differentiating the solo parts, one that Butt emphasizes, is that of register: the violin attains pitches that the alto cannot. There is no low-range extension to counter this; the alto never sings below B3, let alone G3. However, critical moments of exchange in the aria make a point of bridging the gap between registers. Measure 21 and its corresponding m. 45 show this perfectly. The violin starts an octave above the alto, but descends even as the alto ascends an octave in 21 and a sixth in 45. Each time when the parts cross there is a grinding double dissonance: the violin plays B and then A against the alto’s A-sharp in m. 21, and E and then D against a D-sharp in m. 45. At both times descent and ascent balance each other, and the violin’s landing a ninth below its starting point frees the voice to offer its concluding gesture with only the continuo as support – a dramatic moment of isolation.

There is nothing like silence in almost all of the other parts to highlight a voice or instrument. The fact that almost all other sounds stop while the alto concludes with “meiner Zähren willen” (in A and A’) demonstrates that Bach had an ear for the power of nothing, as well as the power of ornamentation and virtuosity.
Figure 17d: “Erbarne dich,” *Matthäus-Passion (NBA)*, no. 39, mm. 41-48. Reproduced with permission.
The interaction of voice and violin in “Erbarne dich,” then, is critical; furthermore, it is the specific type of interaction that burnishes the aria in its reception, compared to the reception afforded its counterpart. The violin’s virtuosity in “Gebt mir meinen Jesum wieder” involves thirty-second note runs up and down the scale and, more particularly, rapid-fire string crossings. In other words, the virtuosity is obviously idiomatic to the violin. It performs these roulades alongside a strident bass line, which receives extra power from parallel rhythmic flourishes in the continuo. Compare this to “Erbarne dich,” in which violin and alto maneuver in the same range, exchanging melodic gestures; ascending and descending so as to balance each other as closely as possible.

**Figure 18:** “Gebt mir meinen Jesum wieder,” *Matthäus-Passion (NBA)*, no. 42, mm. 11-18. Reproduced with permission.
To what purpose? Though attention is drawn via ornamentation and string crossings to the “violin-ness” of the violin in both of these arias, this instrumental quality edges closer to the vocal only in “Erbarme dich.” There are other important aspects to this aria, of course. A folding over of time exists in the recitative and chorus build-up. There is a diffusion of the voice’s “identity”: no basso Peter is heard, and no allegorical character like the Daughter of Zion is indicated in the libretto. I argue, however, that technical detail and emotional charge have their counterpart in Bach’s careful elision of voice and violin in “Erbarme dich.” Perhaps the blurring involved at this moment in the *MP* gives the listener room enough to find her own position from which to experience the aria’s affect; or perhaps she is listening all the more carefully for being unsettled by voice and instrument sounding along such similar lines.

Butt is one commentator; the language in his argument about an instrument’s supernatural power has the potential to surface, it seems, whenever “Erbarme dich” is mentioned. Obligato terminology is not always used when the violin’s power is discussed; this is in keeping with its overall relative rarity in writing about music.
However, since it does appear more often in connection to these vocal-instrumental interactions in Baroque eras, it is worth considering how the terminology has been passed down in writing about music.

Adler’s obligate Akkompagnment is one example of primary source usage, though a problematic one, as I have argued. Controlling for differences in German and English usage, most scholars utilize the terminology in ways that align with its appearance in the apparatuses of Sebastian Bach scholarship, as well as with its appearances in primary sources (though with the projection back of the language onto a melody instrument, as I have discussed previously). The taxonomy found in successive editions of Werner Neumann’s Handbook of Joh. Seb. Bach’s Cantatas serves as an excellent example of this attention to source detail on the one hand and the acceptance of obligato’s expanded range of meaning on the other. The first edition, published in 1947, has as its Anhang L: “Übersicht über die Arien mit 1 oder 2 obligaten Instrumenten.” Within that table, however, keyboard instruments are set apart, via a reinforcement of the terminology in play: “Mit 1 Flöte,” the table begins, proceeding through wind, brass, and string instruments – but ending “Mit obligatem Cembalo” and “Mit obligater Orgel.”

A source of the terminology for its dissemination in less formal writings (reviews, program notes, and more) is surely the physical music itself. The Arie mit obligater Violine of 1830 is one such source, but how far backward, and how far forward, can such use of the terminology be pushed?

---

First, the publication must be situated historically. For a good part of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Felix Mendelssohn was given the credit for resurrecting Bach single-handedly, with his 1829 revival of the *St. Matthew Passion*. This famous performance has since been analyzed and complicated by historians. Mendelssohn made numerous cuts and rewrites, compressing the entirety of the *MP* into two hours. Much of what he cut exemplified early nineteenth-century skepticism regarding Pietist poetry; for the 1829 performances, all except two of the arias were jettisoned. Of the two (“Buß und Reu” and “Erbarme dich”) the latter was published later that year by the Berlin-based T. Trautwein in an arrangement for soprano, violin, and pianoforte: *Arie mit obligater Violine*.343

As a publication, this version of “Erbarme dich” interests in terms of the demand in Berlin for specific music (as it undoubtedly capitalized on the popular impact of Mendelssohn’s revival) and in terms of how its performing forces are framed. The presence of obligato terminology attached to a melody instrument, in the presence of a piano, hints that this arrangement falls within the lineage of the accompanied sonata / “sociability” genres. Recall Beethoven’s lengthy negotiations with Scottish publisher George Thomson. Thomson commissioned Haydn, Beethoven, and other famous composers, to arrange Scottish and English songs for voice, piano, and instruments. In their correspondence on the matter, one issue that keeps resurfacing is how difficult the melody-instrument “accompaniments” (also called “symphonies” and “ritornells”) should be. At one point, Beethoven signs his name to a letter asking for information on whether or not the instruments are obligato.

Then I would like to know if I can make the violin and violoncello obligé, of the sort that the two instruments can never be omitted, or in the present manner, that the clavecin makes an ensemble by itself.\textsuperscript{344}

The same principle under which the terminology operates in the accompanied sonata applies to these songs written for Thomson; the change is the presence of a singing voice, or voices. The arrangement of “Erbarme dich” falls into the same category. By contrast, Breitkopf’s \textit{Catalogo delle Arie, Duetti, Madrigali e Cantate, con Stromenti Diversi e con Cembalo Solo … Parte V\textit{I}a} demonstrates a vast difference in publishing practices in piano reduction of the \textit{JP} (arr. Ludwig Hellwig) in 1830 as well, and then the full score in 1831. As related earlier, Trautwein also published Mosewius’ analysis of the \textit{MP} in 1852.\textsuperscript{344}

\textit{“Puis je voudrais savoir si je peux faire la violine et le violoncelle obligé, de sorte que les deux instruments ne peuvent jamais être omis, ou de manière présente, que le clavecin fait un ensemble pour soi-même.”} Anderson, \textit{Letters 1} (Letter 352), February 29, 1812.
Recall that this was when obligato terminology could describe instrumental hierarchies and/or hint at their overturn, but before the influx of usage specific to accompanied chamber sonatas and similar works. The catalogue is divided into various parts. “Arie. con stromenti” is subdivided into voice categories, which each contains works listed alphabetically by composer; “Arie. a voce con cembalo” merely lists works alphabetically by composer, with “Sopr. Solo.” or “Alto S.” Very few instruments, aside from the core “II. Violini, Viola e Basso,” are indicated in the “Arie. con stromenti” section. Recitatives are occasionally indicated; opera titles, far more so. In approximately 506 individual pieces in this Catalogo, the word “obligato” appears precisely one time: for violoncello, in a cantata by Bononcini. (See Appendix C.) Other instrumental indications of interest occur in this category, including the only “ad lib” in all 506 entries, for two oboes in a Harrer aria, as well as a “Violoncello conc.” (alongside a cembalo) in an aria from a Handel opera.346

A look at material from Leipzig (but circulated to Berlin) sixty-five years previous demonstrates how this use changed in order to appear on the Trautwein publication title page in 1829/1830. Roughly seventy-five years in the future, in 1905, another Breitkopf and Härtel publication of Bach arias used the terminology in precisely the same way as Trautwein did in 1829/30. Under the auspices of the Neuen Bachgesellschaft, several “Ausgewählte Arien und Duette min einem obligaten Instrument und Klavier-oder Orgelbegleitung,” were compiled and edited by Eusebius Brook, ed., BThC, 163-200 (Catalogo ... Parte VIta, 1765).  
Ibid., 187-88.
Mandyczewski and published in successive Jahrgänge. The “Arien für Sopran” was the first; similar volumes for alto, tenor, and bass, as well as duets, followed.

To make very clear how dispersal of the terminology flows from music edition to concert program to review, one need only consult relevant examples. One such is a cluster of repertoire from five programs sung by Marian Anderson during her 1938/39 touring season.

“Kreuz und Krone,” aria from BWV 12, Weinen, Klagen, Sorgen, Sagen
“Bist Du bei mir”
“Zum reinen Wasser,” aria from BWV 112, Der Herr ist mein getreuer Hirt

The two framing arias appear as nos. 7 and 12 in the second volume of Mandyczewski’s compilation for alto, which Anderson owned. Their instrumention is clearly labeled:

“Kreuz und Krone,” with its preceding recitative (“Wir müssen durch viel Trübsal”), as “Arie für Alt mit obligater Oboe;” “Zum reinen Wasser,” as “mit obligater Oboe d’amore.” The performances of this repertoire cluster took place as follows.

Nov. 4, 1938, Queen’s Hall, London.
   Oboe and Oboe d’Amore – Leon Goossens
Nov. 6, Salle Industrielle de Lille
Nov. 8, Théâtre National de l’Opéra
   Hautbois: M. Louis Gromer
Dec. 4, Aaron Richmond’s Summer Series, Boston
   Kosti Vehanen, Accompanist, Louis Speyer, Oboe Obligato

---

349 Marian Anderson collection. Series V. Programs and Publicity. Box 179, folder 08558.
Dec. 6, Carnegie Hall
Oboe and Oboe d’amore – Engelbert Brenner

Anderson’s pianist, Kosti Vehanen, is usually given billing in the program frontispiece, closer to her name. The only time the oboe player receives equal billing is on Dec. 4. In addition to the performers being named as above, the listings of these arias in these programs have obligato terminology attached: in English and French, the English with both the “obbligato” and “obligato” spellings. (Likewise, each aria is given an English or French title, depending on the locale.)

Goossens, Gromer, Speyer, and Brenner were surely each prominent oboists in the cities where Anderson performed this repertoire; Brenner is mentioned as such in a review of Anderson's Carnegie Hall recital. There is no precise way of knowing which of them, if any, marked up the oboe / oboe d’amore parts in the Mandyczewski volume surviving in Anderson's music collection. A handwritten leaf for the oboe d’amore is pasted over the first page of “Zum reinen Wasser,” either to facilitate a page turn, or because the performer received the copy ahead of time and a page somehow returned to Anderson’s possession, or both.351 Certain markings indicate attention paid by Anderson, Vehanan, and oboist, to each other: faint numbers penciled by a fermata in the vocal part, for example, as well as the classic "watching eyes" mark in the oboe part.

Obligato terminology travels from program to review, as may be seen in one of the December 6 Carnegie Hall performance, published on December 10, 1938. “Marian Anderson Triumphs At Packed Carnegie Hall: DIVA ‘STEALS’ OPERA’S CROWD.”352

---

351 M1495.A64 Box 71, Folder 3, Marian Anderson Collection of Printed Music, University of Pennsylvania.
352 “Marian Anderson Triumphs at Packed Carnegie Hall: DIVA ‘STEALS’
After praising the “Greatest of Contraltos” for her performance of Schubert songs, the reviewer writes:

There were even more treats for the listeners. Engelbert Brenner of the New York Philharmonic Orchestra played the oboe and oboe d’amore obligato accompaniment when Miss Anderson interpreted Bach’s “Weinen, Klagen, Sorgen, Zagen,” and “Zum Reinen Wasser,” arias [sic] for contralto that are seldom used. He took his bow with the vocalist and her Finnish pianist, Kosti Vehanen, who had three compositions on the program, namely, “Deserted Street,” “Finnish Humoresque,” and “Finnish Folk Song.”

Brenner is given equal standing with vocalist and pianist in a way marked by the reviewer. Also notable is the reviewer’s having the program at hand, the better to name correctly the songs Vehanen had composed.

It is significant that this migration of terminology from music to program to review occurred in this small cluster of Sebastian Bach’s music in a way that was not repeated in ensuing years. After all, Anderson performed other Bach arias in concert, arias which possessed ornate instrumental solos in their original settings. An example is “Es ist vollbracht,” from the Johannes-Passion, which she sang numerous times in her 1940-42 seasons. The reason for a lack of viola da gamba, or even a violoncello, in performance must be due to Anderson’s using an arrangement of “Es ist vollbracht” for voice and piano accompaniment only: C. F. Peters’ 1891 “Arien-Album: Sammlung berühmter Arien für Alt mit Pianofortebegleitung.”

The example of Marian Anderson’s performances, late in 1938, demonstrates how obligato terminology can enter discourses of music reception at the popular level.

---

"... New York Amsterdam News (1938-1941); Dec 10, 1938; ProQuest Historical Newspapers: New York Amsterdam News, 18.
353 M1495.A64 Box 70, Folder 1. Marian Anderson Collection of Printed Music, University of Pennsylvania.
However, this does not account for the terminology’s connotation of the supernatural, which can also appear. Though reviewers describe Anderson’s voice in countless different ways, using vocabularies of images, feelings, textures, tastes, and colors to quantify its effect, I have found little in the record that uses obligato terminology to describe her voice interacting with a melody instrument.

Thus, the connection of a supernatural power to obligato terminology could be a feature of academic discourse or perhaps appear only in discussions of individual bravura arias. Perhaps an aria’s reputation and difficulty could control the rhetorical intensity of the obligato terminology, after that terminology had been “activated” by an instrument being present.

However, something I experienced years after the 2011 performance of *Agrippina* brought voice and non-voice interacting squarely to my attention – in an incongruous slice of popular culture.

**Obbligato Noir?**

Another fine summer day, by Lake Michigan in 2013, after a morning spent mulling over my dissertation, I decided to treat myself to an hour or two reading a novel. I plucked Raymond Chandler’s *The Long Goodbye* from the shelf at random and went to go sit outside. Everything proceeded as usual, for noir … and then, Philip Marlowe, private eye, took a call from a source. The two of them discussed the enigmatic character of the novel, Terry Lennox. Marlowe brought the conversation to a close, with a terse:
“Did he see you?”

“If he did, he didn’t let on. Hardly expect him to in the circumstances. Anyhow he might not have remembered me. Like I said he was always pretty well lit in New York.”

I thanked him some more and he said it was a pleasure and we hung up.

I thought about it for a while. The noise of the traffic outside the building on the boulevard made an unmusical obbligato to my thinking. It was too loud. In summer in hot weather everything is too loud. I got up and shut the lower part of the window and called Detective-Sergeant Green at Homicide. He was obliging enough to be in.\footnote{Raymond Chandler, \textit{The Long Good-Bye} (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Hamish Hamilton, 1953), 202-3.}

I don’t remember what happened next; I may have dropped the book. For there was the terminology, in a work of popular fiction. And not just any popular fiction, but Raymond Chandler. \textit{How}, I asked myself later, did obligato manage to make the jump into hard-boiled noir? And how, I asked (or maybe shouted, straight across the lake to Milwaukee), was I supposed to incorporate its appearance into my argument?

I have attempted to do so by situating the terminology not just in Chandler’s novel but also, via broad strokes, in certain material records of classical music in America popular culture.

Thus, in the above passage, the word “obligato” strikes a particular chord, one of many in a careful composition of character that runs the course of the novel. Marlowe’s references to high art music while working a case, like his setting out recreational chess problems in his spare time, burnish his moral credentials in the readers’ minds. Nor is Marlowe the only character whose (accurate) high taste Chandler links to (genuine) high feeling. District Attorney Springer misquotes Shakespeare; the press writes him up as a
corrupt buffoon. Amos the chauffeur quotes T. S. Eliot; Marlowe speaks as cordially to him as he does to anyone.

There are particular notes in this chord, in its preparation, and in its resolution, that catch the reader’s attention. The obbligato/obliging pun is tossed off at the end of the passage, but the noise pollution and the oppressive heat have been marked before in the book and will be marked again. With regard to those two themes, heat and noise, Chandler uses “obligato” to locate Marlowe’s thoughts physically: under his sweaty brow, between his ears, squarely stuck in his own head. The thrum of cars and the honking of horns, distant, more than a window away, alternates with Marlowe’s thoughts – but too loud. So Marlowe cuts off the traffic with one stroke of a window and cues another sound: the give-and-take of conversation with a Detective Sergeant, hard-boiled.

In this analysis, it emerges that “obligato” has more than one function at this point in The Long Good-Bye. As a reference to high art music, it situates Philip Marlowe on the book’s cultural-moral spectrum. However, as a noun – a thing – “obligato” locates his mind working with and against his surroundings; capturing, in one term, the alternation between external sound and internal thought. And Marlowe makes a point of calling it “unmusical.”

Where did Chandler encounter this terminology? Though he grew up in Great Britain, attended school at Dulwich (arriving just after P. G. Wodehouse graduated), he could very well have seen “obligato” in a variety of material contexts: perhaps on the radio or in reviews of orchestra performances.  

A remark made at the end of a

taxonomy of The Blonde implies Marlowe’s own engagement with performances of that type.

There is the pale, pale blonde with anemia of some non-fatal but incurable type. She is very languid and very shadowy and she speaks softly out of nowhere and you can’t lay a finger on her because in the first place you don’t want to and in the second place she is reading The Waste Land or Dante in the original, or Kafka or Kierkegaard or studying Provençal. She adores music and when the New York Philharmonic is playing Hindemith she can tell you which one of the six bass viols came in a quarter of a beat too late. I hear Toscanini can also. That makes two of them.356

Or Chandler could have seen the language in record catalogues. Victor Records357 had produced numerous such catalogues from the beginning of the twentieth century on, along with tie-in publications: In these catalogues, obligato terminology performed specific work: indicating arias, songs, or other works with voice and a prominent instrumental line.358 Like the Breitkopf catalogues, those of RCA Victor changed over time; by 1947, for example, the number of times obligato terminology appears diminishes considerably.359 Still, The Long Good-Bye demonstrates that Philip Marlowe, at least, listens to music on the radio or on record:

to the evening classical music programme on the radio” with his wife, Cissy, until her death (122). On the first wedding anniversary to fall after her death, Chandler wrote: “For thirty years, ten months and four days, she was the light of my life, my whole ambition. Anything I did was just the fire for her to warm her hands at. That is all there is to say. She was the music heard faintly on the edge of sound” (213-14).

356 Chandler, The Long Good-Bye, x.
357 RCA Victor’s official name through 1945; Marian Anderson recorded under both names.
359 See RCA Victor Record Review, 1947, Vol 9-11, 7. Marian Anderson’s performance of “Erbarme dich” is described as “with violin solo,” whereas only across the page does one see Joseph Fuchs listed (alongside the other instrumentalists) as playing “Violin Obbligato.”
I went to a late movie after a while. It meant nothing. I hardly saw what went on. It was just noise and big faces. When I got home again I set out a very dull Ruy Lopez and that didn't mean anything either. So I went to bed.

But not to sleep. At three A.M. I was walking the floor and listening to Khachaturyan working in a tractor factory. He called it a violin concerto. I called it a loose fan belt and the hell with it.\(^{360}\)

The important link to be drawn between Victor catalogues and obligato terminology being dispersed through a certain slice of American popular culture lay in the presence of idiomatic “obligato” music in those catalogues: coloratura arias involving echo effects, vocal imitations of birds, bells, and more. Some mainstays of this idiom included works of Meyerbeer (the mad scene/vision from *L’Étoile du Nord*, “Ombre lègere” from *Le pardon de Ploërmel*), Handel (“Sweet Bird” from *L’Allegro, Il Pensero, ed il Moderato*), David (“Charmant oiseau” from *La Perle de Brasil*), and, of course, Donizetti (the mad scene from *Lucia*).\(^{361}\)

My final hypothesis, then, is that scholarly and popular constructions of obligato as indicating particularly virtuosic vocal-instrumental interactions in Sebastian Bach arias drew off the terminology as it functioned in multiple material contexts as the twentieth century unfolded. The material contexts include program notes, performances, recordings, and popular literature, alongside scores and works of history and analysis. The constructions have in turn remained useful in musicological and critical discourses. My goal in outlining this terminology’s expansion in the eighteenth century has always been to inform use of the terminology in the twenty-first. However, the particular material lineage of obligato that I was not able to trace as effectively as I would

\(^{360}\) Chandler, *The Long Good-Bye*, x.

\(^{361}\) See all of these listed under “Flute obbligato, Songs with,” in *Catalogue of Victor Records*, 1920, “Fl.”
have wished remains the one I briefly mentioned above: bravura or *brillante* arias as performed in concert and in staged opera across Europe in the eighteenth to the twentieth centuries. Glancing at certain programs – not all, but some – printed during the period when, according to William Weber, concerts were governed by “principles of miscellany and collegiality,” one sees obligato terminology used to indicate a specific virtuoso’s presence in performance. (See, for example “Signor Puzzi,” playing “Corno Obligato” in two arias on Madame Dulcken’s “Annual Grand Morning Concert,” May 31, 1841.\(^{362}\))

When a specific instrumentalist is not named, the term might be assigned to a particular, out-of-the-ordinary instrument, alongside the performer. (See, for example, Madam Duscheck singing “Ein mit englischen horn obligates Rondo von Mozart,” at “Ein großes Vocal-Concert,” in Leipzig, on Nov. 21, 1796.\(^{363}\)) Finally, individual inflections still take place. Thus, Mozart’s autograph “Scena con Rondò mit Klavier solo,” indicating the complex piano part he wrote out from a violin part, in his turning the *Idamante* insert for tenor “Non piú. Tutto ascoltai ... Non temer, amato bene,” K. 490, into the concert aria “für Mad’elle Storace und mir”: “Ch’io mi scordi di te? ... Non temer, amato bene,” K. 505. But, in 1791, Mozart used “obligato” for the only time in his thematic catalogue, to describe the concert aria for bass and contrabass, “Per questa bella mano” (K. 612) as “Ein Baß Aria mit obligaten ContraBaß.”\(^{364}\)

And of course, there are variants in use, constantly: different spellings of obligato terminology, different capitalizations, different


placements in sentence order (correct or incorrect, in variety of languages) – and sometimes, instead, the terminology of “concertato,” “concertante,” and the like. Finally, sometimes, no terminology to indicate instrumental hierarchy, genre, virtuosity of line, etc., appears at all.

Additional work remains to be done with concert programs in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, as well as with certain songs arias; particularly those from French grand opera (especially Meyerbeer), and those associated, in their reception, with specific singers (for example, Jenny Lind). The vast amount of material present for this work has led me to concede it as beyond this dissertation’s scope; however, I hope that the work completed here, on obligato terminology in Sebastian Bach’s manuscripts, in Beethoven arrangement and reception, in the Breitkopf catalogue corpus, and then, very briefly, in Bach reception, has demonstrated that such a project could be fruitful: in studying the expectations, practices, and priorities attached to certain musical instruments in particular contexts, and how those same attachments change over time.

**Récitatif obligé**

Most importantly, a study of obligato terminology especially in the French repertory will enable us to situate better one final use, coined by none other than Jean-Jacques Rousseau, in his *Dictionnaire de la Musique*: the *récitatif obligé*. For its proper context, his definition of *obligé* in his *Dictionnaire* runs along similar lines as Brossard’s and Walther’s – “that which one may not remove without spoiling the Harmony or the
Song; which distinguishes them from the parts that fill out the texture, which are not added except in order to make a greater perfection of the Harmony.” Significantly, he concludes with: “Brossard says that Obligé may also mean restraint or subjection [assujetti]. I do not know if this word has, today, such a meaning in music.”

The oldest use of the term is gone, for Rousseau; Zarlino’s constraints no longer signify. However, he uses obligé to conceptualize the récitatif obligé: an innovation that he wishes to see more of in French opera, an Italianite borrowing, and a part of his overall conception of the unity of melody:

“Récitatif obligé” is that which, mixing ritournelles and characteristics of the symphony, obliges, as it were, the “reciter” and the orchestra, the one to the other, so that they must be attentive and attend to each other mutually. These passages, alternating recitative and melody, vested in all the éclat of the orchestra, are the most touching, ravishing, and energetic in all modern music. The actor, agitated, transported by a passion which does not permit him to say everything, interrupts himself, stops, and becomes silent, during which the orchestra speaks for him; and these silences, so filled, affect the auditor infinitely more than if the actor had spoken to himself everything that the music makes heard.

Rousseau concludes by pointing out that récitatif obligé had been most effectively used

---

365 “… celle qu’on ne sauroit retrancher sans gâter l’Harmonie ou le Chant.” Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Dictionnaire de musique (Paris: Vve. Duchesne, 1768), vol. XI, 305; Le Dictionnaire de musique de Jean-Jacques Rousseau: une édition critique, ed. Claude Dauphin (Bern: Peter Lang SA, 2008), XI, 296 (Dauphin 507). For the original French, see Appendix A. Rousseau’s definition of Récitative obligé is even more compelling in that he frames it as a conversation that the “recitant” has with the orchestra – and that they both must be attentive to one another (XIII, 875; Dauphin 590). This sounds quite similar to, albeit grander than, Charles Avison’s introduction to his Op. 7, Sonatas for harpsichord, accompanied by two violins and cello: “This kind of music … is rather like a Conversation among Friends, when the Few are of one Mind and propose their mutual Sentiments, only to give Variety and enliven their Select Company.” Charles Avison, Six Sonatas (London: Edinburgh and Newcastle, 1760), quoted in Ceballos, Keyboard Portraits, 195.

366 See Appendix F for text.
in *Le Devin du Village*, and asks: why would grand French opera not use it as well?\textsuperscript{367}

Answering that question, and exploring whether or not *récitatif obligé* moved further into French musical culture than its appearance in Diderot’s *Rameau’s Nephew*, will require situating it carefully within French musical history in the late eighteenth and nineteenth century.

To conclude in turn: through this chapter, I have traced material evidence of the “highbrow” in popular culture, records of performance both concrete and transient, discourses of virtuosity, and Romantic reception of the Baroque combine, in order to understand yet another definition of “obbligato.” Where before it appeared as a term describing a certain type of fugue, detailing required instruments in a piece, indicating the necessity of organ pedal – as well as a term whose oscillation between genres tracks changes in style and expectation in the late eighteenth century – we have seen in these pages how discourses and material traces of virtuosity led to the understanding of “obbligato” as a solo instrument taking on the power of voice to communicate emotion or create meaning. All of these definitions are still active and in use today. What different or new work obligato terminology performs in the future will be fascinating and exciting to see, and, I believe, to hear.

**APPENDICES**

**Appendix A:** Complete chart of obligato terminology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terminology</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Implication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>obligatus</td>
<td>Cover pages: Vivaldi, <em>L’Estro Armonico</em>Corelli, Op.</td>
<td>Indicates an instrumental hierarchy: whether or not a specific instrument or instruments is/are required. The most general use of this terminology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obligato</td>
<td>See Chapter One, Chapter Three, and Breitkopf catalogues in general.</td>
<td>Often synonymous with the “concertato/ripieno” split, but can attach in turn to “concertato” terminology as a mode of emphasis. (See Corelli, Op. 6.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obligato</td>
<td>Also, any search in RISM will find some of these examples.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obligato</td>
<td>Cover pages and parts, within music manuscripts, in music publishing</td>
<td>For certain instruments, can indicate an overturning of hierarchical expectations; thus, an <em>Ausfühlstimme</em> (ex: the horn) is required rather than optional.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obligato</td>
<td>mostly engraved, out of Paris, London, or Amsterdam)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obligato</td>
<td>Breitkopf <em>Supplementi</em> from II onward, <em>Verzeichnisse Musikalische Bücher</em>, and other publications from the second wave of catalogues (1782-18001).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obligato</td>
<td>See Chapter Three.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obligato</td>
<td>Indicates, specifically, a melody instrument being required in the genre of the accompanied chamber sonata.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obligato</td>
<td>The collision between this usage and the next (seen in Breitkopf <em>Supplementi</em> from II onward) has been responsible for certain levels of admixture, exchange, and confusion in the literature.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obligato</td>
<td>Cover pages and parts, within music manuscripts, in music publishing (MS and print): Breitkopf <em>Parte IVta</em>, other Breitkopf publications such as the <em>Verzeichnisse Musikalischer Werke</em>, in keyboard categories. See Chapter Three.</td>
<td>Indicates, specifically, a keyboard instrument with a fully written out, realized part: crucial for that instrument to have if it is to provide two of the three voices in the trio-sonata genre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obligato [declined appropriately]</td>
<td>Cover pages and parts, and within music manuscripts: Johann Sebastian Bach. See Chapter One.</td>
<td>Indicates, specifically, an instrument from the continuo group playing a non-continuo part in the musical texture, either throughout a composition or in specific movements. Never used for a melody instrument. “Certa” or “certata” occasionally used in its place for viola and cembalo, specifically. Somewhat synonymous with “concertato” terminology; which, however, is used for melody instruments as well. Obligato terminology never is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obligo vs. non obligo</td>
<td>Within text, and within music: Zarlino, <em>Le Istitutioni Harmoniche</em>. Frescobaldi, <em>Fiori Musicali</em>, “con obbligo dal basso cantare.” See Chapter One.</td>
<td>A contrapuntal problem to be solved; A specific rule to be followed throughout a composition. Used first in Zarlino’s text, then in occasional treatises, on rare cover pages, and within individual pieces (ex: Frescobaldi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fuga obligata vs. fuga sciolta fuga non obligata</td>
<td>Within text: Marpurg, <em>Abhandlung von der Fuge</em>. See Chapter One.</td>
<td>“The most advanced type of fugue …” Encompassing, for Marpurg, Bach vs. Handel. Terminology used by theorists. One instance in musical MS that I have found is the “Fuga obligata” of Dutch composer Quirinus von</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| obligat- Stimme (declined appropriately) | Ex: Johann Christoph Bach in the *Nekrolog*, Koch.  
See Chapters One and Three. | Used in the fugal theorizing, above; however, it is also a continuation of the demarcation powers of *vocis obligatis*, referring to fully realized, autonomous parts of a composition. This becomes important in eighteenth-century discussions of genre and compositional practice. Thus Sulzer and Koch. |
| obligate Akkompagnement | Guido Adler  
See Chapter Two. | Adler’s formulation of the bedrock compositional principles of Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven: the *Wiener klassische Schule*. |
| obligato | Within written music, published music, reviews of music, musicological literature, and certain segments of popular culture.  
See Conclusion. | Vocal-instrumental interactions in a particularly ornate, complex, and/or virtuosic style. In this case, the terminology can do everything from indicating a special instrumentalist on a concert program to implying that an instrument possesses supernatural power to convey meaning. |
| obligato obligato | Within music: Johann Mattheson, Brockes-Passion. Editors of Seb. Bach (in spurious *Schlage doch, gewünschte Stunde*, BWV 53) | Indicating that an out of the ordinary, rare, or potentially bizarre instrument is required. Mattheson uses it in his Brockes-Passion to indicate the glockenspiel; editors of Bach, in BWV 53 to indicate a duet for bells (actually composed by Melchior Hoffmann). |

---

## Appendix B.1: Obligato Terminology in Sebastian Bach MSs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BWV/mvt. Name</th>
<th>Liturgical day / occasion</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Term. used in Partitur (score) or Stimmen (perf. parts)</th>
<th>Source call number in which term appears</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47 <em>Wer sich selbst erhöhet, der soll erniedriget werden</em></td>
<td>17th Sun. after Trinity</td>
<td>13 October 1726 <strong>Organ</strong>*</td>
<td>Partitur [Title page] […] Organo obligato […] JSB</td>
<td><strong>Partitur</strong> D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stimmen [Title page] Organo oblig. CPE</td>
<td><strong>Stimmen</strong> D-B Mus. ms. Bach St 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 <strong>Erfreut euch, ihr Herzen</strong></td>
<td>2nd Day of Easter; based on secular cantata BWV 66a [Lost]</td>
<td>10 April 1724; 26 March 1731 (66a perf. 10 Dec. 1718) <strong>Bassoon</strong></td>
<td>Partitur [Title page] Basson oblig. JSB</td>
<td><strong>Partitur</strong> D B Mus. ms. Bach P 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[mvt. 1] … Concerto – à 4 Voci – 1 Tromba, 2 Hautb [nb insert of Bassono oblig] 2 Violini Viola e Conti[nuo?] / [...] Bach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Piece Title (Language)</td>
<td>Date/Context</td>
<td>Partitur</td>
<td>Stimmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70/3</td>
<td><strong>Wachet! betet! wachet!</strong></td>
<td>26th Sun. after Trinity (70a = 2nd Sun. of Advent)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Lost?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Nov. 1723 (70a perf. 6 Dec. 1716) Violoncello</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stimmengen Lost?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td><strong>Man singet mit Freuden vom Sieg</strong></td>
<td>Probably after 1728 [see KB 119] Bassoon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partitur Violoncello obligato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stimmen Dehn, S. W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Title page (1)] Violoncello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>obligato Scribe unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Title page (4)] Violoncello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>obligato CPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[cello part] Violoncello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>obligato CPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td><strong>Ich lasse dich nicht, du</strong></td>
<td>6 Feb 1727? Copied in “2nd half of 18th c.” (1760–)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Title page] fl. Obl. Penzel, Christian Friedrich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>segnest mich denn</strong></td>
<td>Purification?</td>
<td>1789) <strong>Oboe, Flute</strong></td>
<td><strong>Stimmen</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159 <strong>Sehet, wir gehn hinauf gen Jerusalem</strong></td>
<td>Quinquagesima (Estomihi)</td>
<td>Copied in “2nd half of 18th c.” (1760–1789) appar. perf. 1729 (27 Feb?) <strong>Oboe</strong></td>
<td><strong>Partitur</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Stimmen</strong> [Title page] Oboe oblig. Penzel, Christian Friedrich [as are all below] [Oboe part, B 5] Oboe concert.</td>
<td><strong>Stimmen</strong> D B Mus. ms. Bach St 633</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163/3 <strong>Nur jedem</strong></td>
<td>23rd Sun. after</td>
<td>24 November 1715 <strong>2 Violon-cello</strong></td>
<td><strong>Partitur</strong> [3rd mvt.] Aria. à 2 Violoncello obligat:</td>
<td><strong>Partitur</strong> D-B Mus. ms. Bach P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Instruments</td>
<td>Partiture</td>
<td>Stimmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28 July 1726</td>
<td>Organ [JSB]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flute [CPE]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

JSB

CPE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>172/5</th>
<th>177</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Erschallet, ihr Lieder, erklinget, ihr Saiten!</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ich ruf zu dir, Herr Jesu Christ</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Sun. after Pentecost</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sun. after Trinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weimar 1714; Violoncello Leipzig 1731; Organ</td>
<td>6 July 1732 <strong>Bassoon</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197/6 \n<em>Gott ist unsre Zuversicht</em></td>
<td>Wedding cantata \n[mvt 6 = parody of BWV 197]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partitur</td>
<td>Stimmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partitur</strong></td>
<td><strong>Stimmen</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th mvt.: “Chorale con Viola obligata” JSB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partitur</strong></td>
<td><strong>Stimmen</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>D-B Mus. Ms. Bach St 459, Faszikel 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partitur</strong></td>
<td><strong>Stimmen</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>D-B Mus. ms. Bach St 130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B.2: Obligato Terminology in Sebastian Bach MSs -- further resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BWV/mvt. Name</th>
<th>Source call number in which term appears.</th>
<th>Prinz, Wendt, NBA KB</th>
<th>Other items of interest.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66 Erfreut euch, ihr Herzen</td>
<td><strong>Partitur</strong>  D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 73  <strong>Stimmen</strong>  Lost?</td>
<td>Prinz, 395  Wendt, 70  Dürr, <em>KB I/10, 7</em></td>
<td>[Title page] “una tromba se piace”  [Header] “Bassono oblig.” interpolated!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70/3 Wachet! betet! betet! wachet!</td>
<td><strong>Partitur</strong>  Lost  <strong>Stimmen</strong>  D-B Mus. ms. Bach St 95</td>
<td>Prinz, 565  Wendt, 70  Dürr, <em>KB I/27, 103</em></td>
<td>Cortens, “Obbligato Organ,” 60-64, 76-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partitur</td>
<td>Stimmen</td>
<td>Prinz</td>
<td>Higuchi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 1046</td>
<td>D-B Mus. ms. Bach St 386</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>KB I/34, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-B Mus. Ms. Bach P 1048</td>
<td>D-B Mus. ms. Bach St 633</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>KB I/8, 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 137</td>
<td>D-B Mus. ms. Bach St 471</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>KB I/26, 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-B Mus. ms. Bach P 154</td>
<td>D-B Mus. ms. Bach St 94</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>KB I/17.2, 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost</td>
<td>D-B Mus. ms. Bach St 23</td>
<td>565</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partitur</td>
<td>Stimmen</td>
<td>Prinz, Wendt, Beißwenger</td>
<td>Partitur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-B Mus. Ms. Bach P 91</td>
<td>Lost</td>
<td>395, 74, 78, 80, 82</td>
<td>[6th mvt.] inscription written across top of page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK Kk C I 615 BWV 199 (mu 6701.0731) København (Copenhagen), Det Kongelige Bibliotek</td>
<td></td>
<td>501 (for Kopenhagen source, not D B Mus. Ms. Bach P 1162)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-B Mus. Ms. St 459, Faszikel 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragment contained in Mus. Ms. Bach P 111 (BWV 29)</td>
<td></td>
<td>565</td>
<td>Possible monogram at the bottom of the page: JCF (?) Bach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C: Publication Timeline of Breitkopf Catalogues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Fair [if indicated]</th>
<th>Title[^1]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

[^1]: The dates and titles for this timeline are taken from Brook, “Introduction,” *BThC*, xi-xii. I have verified dates and added links to those volumes that have been digitized by Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin and the Göttinger Digitalisierungszentrum.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1762</td>
<td>Catalogo dei Soli, Duetti, Trii e Concerti per il violino, il violin piccolo, e discordato, viola di braccio, viola d’amore, violoncello piccolo e violoncello, e viola di gamba. chi [sic] si trovano in manoscritto nella officina musica di Breitkopf in Lipsia. Parte IIda</td>
<td>BThC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td>Catalogo de’ Soli, Duetti, Trii e Concerti per il flauto traverse, flauto piccolo, flauto d’amore, flauto dolce, flauto-basso, oboe, oboe-d’amore, fagotto, sampogne, corno di caccia, tromba, zinche e trombone. che si trovano ... Parte IIIza.</td>
<td>BThC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td>Catalogo de’ Soli, Duetti, Trii, Terzetti, Quartetti e Concerti per il cembalo e l’harpa. che si trovano ... Parte IVta.</td>
<td>BThC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td>Ostermesse</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1764</td>
<td>Verzeichniß musikalischer Bücher, sowohl zur Theorie als Praxis, und für alle Instrumente, in ihre gehörige Classen ordentlich eingetheilet; welche bey Bernh. Christoph Breitkopf und Sohn in Leipzig um beystehende Preiße à Louisd’ors 5 Thlr. zu bekommen sind. Dritte Ausgabe.</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1764</td>
<td>Neujahrmesse</td>
<td><a href="http://digital.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/werkansicht?PPN=PPN778676625">http://digital.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/werkansicht?PPN=PPN778676625</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1765</td>
<td>Catalogo de’ Quadri, Partite, Divertimenti, Cassat. Scherz. ed Intrade ò Franese Ouverteures a diversi stromenti, che si trovan ... Parte Vta.</td>
<td>BThC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1765</td>
<td>Catalogo delle Arie, Duetti, Madrigali e Cantate, con stromenti diversi e con cembalo solo, che si trovano ... Parte VIta.</td>
<td>BThC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1767</td>
<td>Supplemento II. Dei Catalogi delle Sinfonie, Partite, Ouverture, Soli, Duetti, Trii, Quattro e Concerti</td>
<td>BThC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Supplement</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1768</td>
<td>Supplemento III. Dei Catalogi delle Sinfonie, Partite, Ouverture, Soli, Duetti, Trii, Quattri e Concerti per il violino, flauto traverso, cembalo ed altri strumenti. che si trovano ... in Lipsia.</td>
<td>BThC (Supp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1769</td>
<td>Supplemento IV. Dei Catalogi delle Sinfonie, Partite, Ouverture, Soli, Duetti, Trii, Quattri e Concerti per il violino, flauto traverso, cembalo ed altri strumenti. che si trovano ... in Lipsia.</td>
<td>BThC (Supp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1769</td>
<td>Ostermesse</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770</td>
<td>Supplemento V. Dei Catalogi delle Sinfonie, Partite, Ouverture, Soli, Duetti, Trii, Quattri e Concerti per il violino, flauto traverso, cembalo ed altri strumenti. che si trovano ... in Lipsia.</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770</td>
<td>Oster-Messe</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770</td>
<td>Michaelmesse</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1771</td>
<td>Supplemento VI. Dei Catalogi delle Sinfonie, Partite, Ouverture, Soli, Duetti, Trii, Quattri e Concerti per il violino, flauto traverso, cembalo ed altri strumenti. che si trovano ... in Lipsia.</td>
<td>BThC (Supp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1772</td>
<td>Supplemento VII. Dei Catalogi delle Sinfonie, Partite, Ouverture, Soli, Duetti, Trii, Quattri e Concerti per il violino, flauto traverso, cembalo ed altri strumenti. che si trovano ... in Lipsia.</td>
<td>BThC (Supp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1773</td>
<td>Supplemento VIII. Dei Catalogi delle Sinfonie, Partite, Ouverture, Soli, Duetti, Trii, Quattri e</td>
<td>BThC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Supplement</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1774</td>
<td>Supplement IX</td>
<td>Dei Catalogi delle Sinfonie, Partite, Ouverture, Soli, Duetti, Trii, Quattro e Concerti per il violino, flauto traverso, cembalo ed altri strumenti. che si trovano ... in Lipsia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1775</td>
<td>Supplement X</td>
<td>Dei Catalogi delle Sinfonie, Partite, Ouverture, Soli, Duetti, Trii, Quattro e Concerti per il violino, flauto traverso, cembalo ed altri strumenti. che si trovano ... in Lipsia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1776 ed 1777</td>
<td>Supplement XI</td>
<td>Dei Catalogi delle Sinfonie, Partite, Ouverture, Soli, Duetti, Trii, Quattro e Concerti per il violino, flauto traverso, cembalo ed altri strumenti. che si trovano ... in Lipsia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1777</td>
<td></td>
<td>Verzeichniß musikalischer Bücher, sowohl zur Theorie als Praxis, und für alle Instrumente, davon die Anfänge in dem V. VI. VII. VIII. IX. und Xten Supplemente zu finden sind, in ihre gehörige Classen ordentlich eingetheilet; welche bey Johann Gottlob Immanuel Breitkopf, in Leipzig, um beystehende Preiße in Louisd’or à 5 Thlr. zu bekommen sind. Fünfte Ausgabe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1778</td>
<td>Supplement XII</td>
<td>Dei Catalogi delle Sinfonie, Partite, Ouverture, Soli, Duetti, Trii, Quattro e Concerti per il violino, flauto traverso, cembalo ed altri strumenti. che si trovano ... in Lipsia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1779 ed 1780</td>
<td>Supplement XIII</td>
<td>Dei Catalogi delle Sinfonie, Partite, Ouverture, Soli, Duetti, Trii, Quattro e Concerti per il violino, flauto traverso, cembalo ed altri strumenti. che si trovano ... in Lipsia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780</td>
<td></td>
<td>Verzeichniß musikalischer Bücher sowohl zur Theorie als Praxis, und für alle Instrumente, davon die Anfänge in dem XI. XII. und XIII. Supplemente zu finden sind, in ihre gehörige Classen ordentlich eingetheilet; welche bey Johann Gottlob Immanuel Breitkopf, in Leipzig, um beystehende Preiße in Louisd’or à 5 Thlr. zu bekommen sind. Sechste Ausgabe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1781</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supplement XIV. Dei Catalogi delle Sinfonie, Partite, Ouverture, Soli, Duetti, Trii, Quattro e Concerti per il violino, flauto traverso, cembalo ed altri strumenti. che si trovano ... in Lipsia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year(s)</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1782. 1783 ed 1784</td>
<td><em>Supplemento XV. Dei Catalogi delle Sinfonie, Partite, Ouverture, Soli, Duetti, Trii, Quattri e Concerti per il violino, flauto traverso, cembalo ed altri stromenti. che si trovano ... in Lipsia.</em></td>
<td>BThC (Supp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1785. 1786 ed 1787</td>
<td><em>Supplemento XVI. Dei Catalogi delle Sinfonie, Partite, Ouverture, Soli, Duetti, Trii, Quattri e Concerti per il violino, flauto traverso, cembalo ed altri stromenti. che si trovano ... in Lipsia.</em></td>
<td>BThC (Supp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1792</td>
<td><em>Verzeichniß Musikalischer Schriften, welche von der Breitkopfischen Buchhandlung am alten Neumarkte in Leipzig verlegt, oder doch in mehrerer Anzahl bey ihr zu bekommen sind.</em> [part 1] <a href="http://digital.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/werkansicht/?PPN=PPN778579166">http://digital.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/werkansicht/?PPN=PPN778579166</a></td>
<td>IVc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1792 Oster-Messe</td>
<td><em>Verzeichniß neuer Musicalien welche in der Breitkopfsichen Buchhandlung in Leipzig zu bekommen sind</em> [part 1] Parts 1/7 in: Mus. Ab. 177/2 SBB, Unter den Linden – Musikabteilung</td>
<td>IVa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793 Oster-Messe</td>
<td><em>Verzeichniß neuer Musicalien welche in der Breitkopfsichen Musikhandlung in Leipzig zu bekommen sind</em> [part 2]</td>
<td>IVa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793 Michaelis-Messe</td>
<td><em>Verzeichniß neuer Musicalien welche in der Breitkopfsichen Musikhandlung in Leipzig zu bekommen sind</em> [part 3]</td>
<td>IVa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1794</td>
<td><em>Verzeichniß Musikalischer Schriften, welche von der Breitkopfsichen Buchhandlung am alten Neumarkte in Leipzig verlegt, oder doch in mehrerer Anzahl bey ihr zu bekommen sind.</em> [part 2] <a href="http://digital.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/werkansicht/?PPN=PPN77857962X">http://digital.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/werkansicht/?PPN=PPN77857962X</a></td>
<td>IVc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1794 Oster-Messe</td>
<td><em>Verzeichniß neuer Musicalien welche in der Breitkopfsichen Musikhandlung in Leipzig zu bekommen sind</em> [part 4]</td>
<td>IVa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1794 Michaelis-Messe</td>
<td><em>Verzeichniß neuer Musicalien welche in der Breitkopfsichen Musikhandlung in Leipzig zu bekommen sind</em> [part 5]</td>
<td>IVa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Messe/Text</td>
<td>Supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1795</td>
<td>Verzeichniss neuer Musikalien welche in der Breitkopfischen Musikhandlung in Leipzig zu bekommen sind [part 6]</td>
<td>IVa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1795</td>
<td>Verzeichniss neuer Musikalien welche in der Breitkopfischen Musikhandlung in Leipzig zu bekommen sind [part 7]</td>
<td>IVa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1796</td>
<td>Verzeichniss neuer Musicalien welche in der Breitkopf und H&quot;artelschen Musikhandlung in Leipzig zu bekommen sind [part 8]</td>
<td>IVa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1796</td>
<td>Verzeichniss neuer Musicalien der Breitkopf und H&quot;artelschen Musikhandlung in Leipzig zu bekommen sind [part 9]</td>
<td>IVa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1797</td>
<td>Verzeichniss neuer Musicalien welche bey Breitkopf und H&quot;artel in Leipzig zu bekommen sind [part 10]</td>
<td>IVa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1798</td>
<td>Verzeichniss neuer Musicalien welche bey Breitkopf und H&quot;artel in Leipzig zu bekommen sind [part 11]</td>
<td>IVa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>Verzeichniss neuer Musicalien welche bey Breitkopf und H&quot;artel in Leipzig zu bekommen sind [part 12]</td>
<td>IVa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801</td>
<td>Verzeichniss neuer Musicalien welche bey Breitkopf und H&quot;artel in Leipzig zu bekommen sind [part 13]</td>
<td>IVa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix D: “Obligato” connected to instruments, in Breitkopf Catalogi I - VI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parte, Year</th>
<th>Pg. # Brook / original</th>
<th>Collection titles</th>
<th>Instrument lists for specific pieces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I 1762</td>
<td>6 / 6</td>
<td>VI. Sinfonie del Christ. FOERSTER, … <em>Raccolta II.</em></td>
<td>VI. a 10 Voc. I Tromb. 3 Ob. 2 <em>Fag. obligh.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 / 18</td>
<td>VI. Sinfonie del HOLZBAUER, … <em>Racc. II</em></td>
<td>II. a 7 Voci. 2 Corni. <em>Violoncello Oblig.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>II. <em>a Viol. C. Fl. Tr. Obl.</em> 2 Viol. V. B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III. <em>Viol. picc. C. Oboe Obl.</em> 2 Viol. V. B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>compare to I. a Viol. Conc. 2 Viol. V. B.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III. <em>di Hendel. a Viola e Cemb. Oblig.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76 / 44</td>
<td>II. Sonate a Violoncello con altri Stromenti dell’ANONYMO.</td>
<td>I. <em>a Viol. obl.</em> Fl. Violino coll Basso.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>II. <em>a Viol. obl. Ob. d’Amor. Gamb. c. B.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>nb: this is the same piece as on p. 72 / 40, above</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IV. del Sgr. Pfeiffer, <em>a Cemb. obl.</em> e V. d. G.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III 1763</td>
<td>92 / 12</td>
<td>VI. Sonate a Flauto, Violino, et Basso, del C. F. E. BACH, …</td>
<td>VI. <em>Fagottoboliq.</em> <em>Flauto Basso e Cemb.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>nb: this is the same piece as the Trio for Flauto Basso, Fagotto c. Violone, listed on p. 104 / 24 [no terminology used], and on 111 / 31, below.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Composers</td>
<td>Instruments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109 / 29</td>
<td>III. Conc. a Oboe Conc. 2 Viol. V. B. Racc. I.</td>
<td>I. di Briochi, a 2 Oboi oblig.</td>
<td>I. a 2 Oboi 2 Fl. 2 Viol. 2 Fag. Viola c. B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112 / 32</td>
<td>IV. Quadri da diversi a Fagotto obligato.</td>
<td>IV. di Krause, a Fagotto Oboe col Basso.</td>
<td>IV. di Krause, a Fagotto Oboe col Basso.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126 / 12</td>
<td>IV. Quadri da diversi a Fagotto obligato.</td>
<td>II. di Graun, a Fagotto oblig. Violino col Basso.</td>
<td>II. di Graun, a Fagotto oblig. Violino col Basso.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>IV.</td>
<td></td>
<td>TRIL a Clavicembalo obligato con Flauto ó</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td>129 / 15</td>
<td>Violino.</td>
<td>27 collection titles, with all 27 containing either Cl. ob. / Cemb. obl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130 / 16</td>
<td>TERZETTI a Cembalo obligato con altri Stromenti obligati.</td>
<td>8 pieces, gathered under 3 collection titles, with all 3 containing either Cl. ob. / Cemb. obl.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130 / 16</td>
<td>QUARTETTO, a Cembalo obligato con altri Stromenti obligati.</td>
<td>I. Quart. del Sigr. L HOFFMANN, a Cemb. obl. con Violino, Violoncello obl. et Basso.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131 / 17</td>
<td>CONCERTI, a Cembalo obligato con altri Stromenti obligati.</td>
<td>104 pieces, gathered under 43 collection titles, with all 43 containing either Cl. ob. / Cemb. obl. / Cembalo obligato</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138 / 24</td>
<td>[HARPA] TRII.</td>
<td>6 pieces, gathered under 4 collection titles, with all 4 containing Harpa obl.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138 / 24</td>
<td>PARTITE e CONCERTI</td>
<td>6 pieces, gathered under 4 collection titles, the 3 Partita / Partite titles containing Harpa obl., but the Concerto title containing Harpa Concert.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1765</td>
<td>144 / 6</td>
<td>VI. Partite del Sigr. HARRER, a 8 e 10 Voci. Racc. V.</td>
<td>V. a 10 Voci. 2 Corn. 2 Ob. 1 Fl. tr. 1 Viol. da Gamb. 1 Violonc. obl. 2 Viol. c. B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145 / 7</td>
<td>IV. Partite del Sigr. HARRER, a 6, 7 e 9 Voci. Racc. VI.</td>
<td>III. 7 Voci. Liuto obblig. 2 Flauti, 2 Viol. V. B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148 / 10</td>
<td>VI. Partite del Sigr. ROELLIG, a 6 Voci, Racc. III.</td>
<td>I. 2 Corni obbl. 2 Viol. V. B. II. 2 Corni obl. 2 Viol. V. B. V. 1 Oboe, 2 Viol. Viola obl. B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152 / 14</td>
<td>VI. Partite da diversi Autori. <em>Racc. VI.</em></td>
<td>III. di Scheibe, <em>a 4 Voci, 1 Flauto oblig.</em> 2 Violini, B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
compare to:  
II. *2 Corni, 2 Ob. 2 Viol. V. B.*  
III. *2 Corni, 2 Oboi, 2 Viol. Viola, Bassono e Violono.* |
Sò deffermi d’Amor, Bel … [Compare to:] |
| 187 / 25 | HARRER. | 1. *Sopr. s. 2 Viol. 2 Ob. ad lib. V. B.*  
Dorilla tanti e tanti … |
| 188 / 26 | HENDEL. | nb: 5. *Bass. s. 2 Viol. V. Violonc. conc. C.*  
Ven[i?]… |
### Appendix E: *Supplementi* I-V, Category Labels for “Cembalo” Section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. vol. Date</th>
<th>Relevant Category Labels</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I / 1766</td>
<td>CEMBALO.</td>
<td>51 / 251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOLI.</td>
<td>51 / 251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRII / A CEMBALO OBLIGATO CON VIOLINO.</td>
<td>52 / 252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TERZETTI / A CEMBALO OBLIGATO.</td>
<td>53 / 253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONCERTI / A CEMBALO CONCERTAT. II. VIOL. VIOLA, BASSO.</td>
<td>53 / 253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II / 1767</td>
<td>CEMBALO.</td>
<td>26 / 282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOLI.</td>
<td>26 / 282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PARTITIE ACCOMODATE al CEMBALO SOLO.</td>
<td>28 / 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SONATE a CEMBALO SOLO, / intagliate in Parigi.</td>
<td>31 / 287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SONATES pour le Clavecin Seul, avec l’Accompagn. / d’Instrum. par Mr. SCHOBERT à Paris.</td>
<td>32 / 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRII a CEMBALO OBLIGATO / con VIOLINO ô TRAVERSO.</td>
<td>34 / 290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TERZETTI a CEMBALO OBLIGATO / con VIOLINO ô FLAUTO e BASSO.</td>
<td>35 / 291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONCERTI a CEMBALO CONCERTATO, / A DUE VIOLINI, VIOLA e BASSO.</td>
<td>36 / 292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III / 1768</td>
<td>CEMBALO.</td>
<td>24 / 324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOLI.</td>
<td>24 / 324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soli intagliati in Parigi.</td>
<td>25 / 325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRIII a Cembalo obligato. / CON VIOLINO O TRAVERSO.</td>
<td>27 / 327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intagliati in Amsterdam.</td>
<td>27 / 327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TERZETTI a Cembalo obligato. / CON VIOLINO O FLAUTO E BASSO.</td>
<td>27 / 327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV / 1769</td>
<td>CONCERTI a Cembalo concertato. / CON PIU STROMENTI.</td>
<td>28 / 328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOLI.</td>
<td>26 / 362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonate, a Cembalo Solo, intagliate in Parigi, &amp;c.</td>
<td>26 / 362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRII. / A CEMBALO OBLIGATO CON VIOLINO.</td>
<td>28 / 364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[nb Bayon &amp; “Bocherini” pieces have individual “intagliati in Parigi.”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hayden work = “Terzetto … a Cembalo, Violino e Basso.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONCERTI e CONCERTINI a Cembalo concertato con più Stromenti.</td>
<td>29 / 365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[nb one “a Cembalo oblig. o Harpa” for Martini “Notturni,” p. 30]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V / 1770</td>
<td>CEMBALO</td>
<td>23 / 399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOLI.</td>
<td>23 / 399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SONATE, a Cembalo Solo, intagliate in Amst. &amp;c.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRII.</td>
<td>26 / 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A CEMBALO OBLIGATO, CON VIOLINO O TRAVERSO.</td>
<td>26 / 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRII, intagliati in Amsterdam.</td>
<td>26 / 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TERZETTI, a Cembalo obligato.</td>
<td>27 / 403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CON VIOLINO o FLAUTO e BASSO, intagliati in Parigi &amp;c.</td>
<td>27 / 403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QUATTRI DIVERTIMENTI.</td>
<td>28 / 404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONCERTI, a Cembalo concertato, con più Stromenti.</td>
<td>29 / 405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix F: Certain Boccherini Entries in the Breitkopf Catalogues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Breitkopf Supplementi / VMB</th>
<th>Category / Subcategory (if applicable.)</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work, year, pg.</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppl. IV, 1769, 28²</td>
<td>CEMBALO</td>
<td>VI. Trii di Luigi BOCHERINI, a Cembalo e Violino. intagliati in Parigi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMB 4, 1770, 104</td>
<td>VII. Die Orgel und das Clavecimbel.</td>
<td>Boccherini, Luigi di Lucca, Sei Sonate di Cembalo e Violino obligato. <strong>Op. V. Parigi.</strong> fol. 3 thl. (4 thl.)³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMB 5, 1777, 130⁴</td>
<td>VI. Die Orgel und das Clavecimbel.</td>
<td>Boccherini, (Luigi) sei Sonate per il Clavicembalo e Violino obligato. <strong>Riga 1774.</strong> fol. 2 thl.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² Brook ed., *BThC*, 364
³ In the “Nachricht,” before the main body of VMB 4 commences, the Breitkopfs (father and son) tell the “Liebhaber” that, due to patrons being unaccustomed to playing from printed and engraved music, they will offer a two prices for items listed. The first is for the printed or engraved copy of the piece in question, available as long as supplies last; the second, in parentheses, is for a manuscript copy. (Those pieces with only a single price after their listing are only available in manuscript.) Further, Breitkopf indicates to patrons that “if one wants to have a copy of only a single piece from a whole work, then our Catalogus printed in notes, Supplement I, II, III, and IV, shows the beginnings of each one in notes, and the price can be easily found out of the whole.” (“… zumal da so viele [Liebhaber] derselben nicht nach gestochenen und gedruckten Musicalien zu spielen sich gewöhnen, sonder öfters lieber Abschriften theurer bezahlen als diese haben wollen, oder auch nur die ihm gefälligen Stücke aus solchen zu erhalten wünschen …. Will aber jemand nur einzelne Stücke aus einem ganzen Werke in Abschrift haben: so wird unser Catalogus in Noten, Supplement I. II. III. und IV. die Anfänge eines jeden zeigen, und der Preis sich leicht selbst aus dem Ganzen finden lassen.”)
⁴ There is no Boccherini entry under any “TRII. A cembalo obligato con violino / intagliati in [locale]” in Supplementi V-X (1770-1775.) According to the Gérard catalogue, accompanied sonatas for keyboard and violin after op. 5 consist of arrangements and/or cannot be traced. See Yves Gérard, *Thematic, Bibliographical and Critical Catalogue of the Works of Luigi Boccherini*, tr. Andreas Mayor (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1969), 43-55 [available online, with registration, at http://www.luigiboccherini.it/gerard/] These two factors, along with op. 5 having a 1774 Riga reprint, strongly suggest that Breitkopf merely obtained that Riga reprint, thus listing the work in two consecutive VMB volumes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source for Breitkopf</th>
<th>Printed</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October, 1781, Vienna, Torricella, nos. 1-6. Plate no. 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> Brook ed., <i>BThC</i>, 814. The last <i>VMB</i> volume, no. 6, appeared in 1780.

<sup>2</sup> This “Trii” entry directly follows an entry reading: “III Sonate da L. BOCCHERINI, a Cemb. e Violino. Op. II. Offenbach.” See Brook ed., <i>BThC</i>, 814. Breitkopf lists them in the key and incipit order that corresponds with Sonatas No. 3, 2, and 1 of Gérard No. 24. These sonatas were compiled in turn by an anonymous author, along with three more, consisting of “arrangements for the harpsichord (and violin <i>ad libitum</i>) of [the] six trios Op. 14 of 1772.” Gérard further relates that “[the] first three sonatas are unpublished in the form of sonatas for harpsichord solo (and violin <i>ad libitum</i>),” though the last three are. The publication that the Gérard catalogue then details includes Gérard nos. 98, 99, and 100, but in reverse order: with “Op. I” in the title: “(c. 1780?), Offenbach am Main, André: Tre Sonate per il cembalo, violino <i>ad libitum</i>, del Signore Boccherini …” See Gérard, <i>CWLB</i>, 30. It therefore appears that the <i>Sonate</i> in the Breitkopf <i>Supplemento</i> XV, 56, are the (published) “Op. II” to the “Op. I” listed in Gérard. The clinching piece of evidence, in addition to the Breitkopf incipits matching Gérard nos. 95, 96, and 97, is that “Op. II” has arranged the sonatas in the same backwards order (compared to their original Boccherini Op. 14 order) seen in “Op. I.”

<sup>3</sup> Yves Gérard notes: “The composition of the six sonatas of Op. 5 was completed during Boccherini’s stay in Paris. They were dedicated to Mme Brillon de Jouy and their success enhanced the reputation of their author. Innumerable MS. copies of these sonatas circulated in Europe up to the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, many of them incomplete or full of mistakes.” See Gérard, <i>CWLB</i>, 33. For details on the complete op. 5, see 33-43.
Source for Vénier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS info.</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autograph MS. (separate parts): Parma, Conservatorio, Bibl. Palatina cf VI 104/37566 and 105/37567. [nb: MS copy (score) may be found in Paris, Conservatoire, D. 4652.]</td>
<td>‘Opera V. 1768. Sei sonate per forte-piano con accompagnamento di un violino, composte da Luigi Boccherini, mano propria.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compare to:

**In Breitkopf Supplemeniti / VMB**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work, year, pg.</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Category / Subcategory (if applicable.)</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suppl. XII, 1778, 34 [sup. ]</td>
<td>CEMBALO</td>
<td>TRII. intagliati</td>
<td>VI. Sonate da L. BOCHERINI. a Cemb. e Viol. oblig. Parigi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMB 6, 1780, 160</td>
<td>V. Die Orgel und das Clavier.</td>
<td>7. Sonaten mit Begleitung einer Violine oder Flöte</td>
<td>Bocherini, (Luigi), Six Sonates pour le Clavecin, Fortepiano ou Harpe avec Accomp. de Violon obligé. Fol. 2 thl. 10 gl.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source for Breitkopf**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gérard Cat. info.</th>
<th>Printed</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

[\[sup. \]] Brook ed., BThC, 658.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sonata info (arr.)</th>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Boccherini original (date comp. / 1st ed., pub.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G. No. 40, C Major (no. 1)</td>
<td>Allegro con spirito</td>
<td>Quartet Op. 2 no. 6 (1761 / 1767, Vénier) 1st movement, Allegro con spirito G. No. 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minuetto amoroso (trio)</td>
<td>Flute quintet Op. 17 no. 2 (1773 / c. 1775, La Chevardière) 2nd movement, Minué amoroso G. No. 420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. No. 41, B-flat Major (no. 2)</td>
<td>Allegro moderato</td>
<td>Flute quintet Op. 17 no. 4 (see above) 1st movement, Allegro moderato, 2nd movement, Minué Allegro G. No. 422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Menuetto (trio)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. No. 42, D Minor (no. 3)</td>
<td>Grave, Allegro.</td>
<td>Quartet Op. 9 no. 2 (1770 / 1772, Vénier) 1st movement, Grave, Allegro G. No. 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Minuetto and trio?)</td>
<td>Flute quintet Op. 17 no. 1 (1773 / c. 1775, La Chevardière)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 “This and the five following sonatas …cannot be considered authentic, as Boccherini seems to have taken no part in the transcription. The arrangements are perhaps the work of Naderman.” See Gérard, CWLB, 47.
10 This information duplicates that outlined in Gérard, CWLB, 47-50.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allegro commodo</th>
<th>Largo</th>
<th>Allegro non tanto</th>
<th>Allegro con spirito</th>
<th>Allegro</th>
<th>Rondeau, Allegro non molto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. Minor (no. 4)</td>
<td>G. No. 43</td>
<td>G. No. 44</td>
<td>G. No. 45</td>
<td>G. No. 44</td>
<td>Flute quintet Op. 17 no. 6 (see above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd movement, Minué amoroso, Trio</td>
<td>1st movement, Allegro commodo</td>
<td>2nd movement, Largo [some MSs: ‘Adagio’]</td>
<td>3rd movement, Allegro</td>
<td>1st movement, Allegro non tanto</td>
<td>2nd movement, Rondeau. Allegro non molto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. No. 419</td>
<td>G. No. 159</td>
<td>G. No. 159</td>
<td>G. No. 160</td>
<td>G. No. 159</td>
<td>G. No. 424</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G: Select Quotations

Sébastien de Brossard
_Dictionnaire de la Musique_, 1708 (3rd ed.)


*À dois Violini obligati.* Veu dire, *À deux Violons obligez*.  
*Con Fagotto obligato.* Avec un _Basson obligé_.  
*Con Viola obligata.* Avec une _Basse de Viole obligée_, &c.

Souvent il signifie aussi, _contraint_, ou _rétrait_ dans de certaines bornes ou limites, ou assujetti à de certaines loix, qu’on s’impose souvent à soymême pour quelque dessein ou quelque expression, &c. En ce sens on dit _Contrapunto obligato, Fuga obligata_, &c. Voyez, _LEGATO_.

C’est dans le même sens qu’on dit d’une _Basse-Continuë_ qu’elle est _obligée_ ou _contrainte_, lorsqu’elle est bornée à un certain nombre de mesures qu’on repette toujours, comme dans les _Chacones_; ou bien lorsqu’elle est obligée de suivre toujours un certain movement, ou de ne faire que certaines _Nottes_, &c. Car il y en a d’une infinité de manières. Voyez, _PERFIDIA_.

Johann Gottfried Walther
_Musicalisches Lexicon oder Musicalische Bibliothec_, 1732


(2. gezwungen, in gewisse Grentzen eingeschlossen, oder gewissen Gesetzen (die man aber wegen eines gewissen Vorsatzes [?], sich selbst machet und aufleget) unterworffen. In diesem Verstande sagt man: _Contrapunto obligato, Fuga obligata_, u.s.v. In eben dergleichen Verstande brauchet man auch diesen _terminum_ von einem _General Basse_, wenn solcher in eine gewisse Anzahl Tacte

---

1 Sébastien de Brossard, _Dictionnaire de la Musique_ (Amsterdam: E. Roger, ca. 1708), 38-40. Reprint of 1992 (Paris: Minkoff.) “Car il y a en a d’une infinité de manières” is possibly taken from, “Et benche gli oblighi siano infiniti…” [“Although the oblighi could be infinite” [?]] in Zarlino, _IH_, ch. 63, 256.
eingeschränkt ist, so allemahl repetiert werden müssen, wie in Ciaconen geschichtet; oder aber, wenn er allezeit ein gewisses mouvement halten, oder nur gewisse Noten machen muß, u.d.g.\textsuperscript{2}

\textbf{Jean-Jacques Rousseau}

\textit{Dictionnaire de musique}, Paris, Duchesne, 1768

Obligé. \textit{adj}. On appellee \textit{Partie Obligée}, [celle qui récite quelquefois,\textsuperscript{3}] celle qu’on ne sauroit retrancher sans gâter l’Harmonie ou le Chant; [ce qui la distingue\textsuperscript{4}] des Parties de Remplissage, qui ne sont ajoutées que pour une plus grande perfection d’Harmonie, mais par le retranchement desquelles la Pièce n’est point mutilée. [Ceux qui sont aux Parties de Remplissage peuvent s’arrêter quand ils veulent, la musique n’en va pas moins; mais celui qui est chargé d’une \textit{Partie Obligée} ne peut la quitter un moment sans faire manquer l’exécution.\textsuperscript{5}]

Brossard di qu’\textit{Obligé} se prend aussi pour contraint ou assujetti. Je ne sache pas que cet mot ait aujourd’hui un pareil sens en musique. (Voyez CONTRAINT.)\textsuperscript{6}

“Récitatif obligé”

\textit{Récitatif obligé}. C’est celui qui, entremêlé de Ritournelles et de traits de Symphonie, \textit{oblige} pour ainsi dire le Récitant et L’Orchestre l’uns envers l’autre, en sorte qu’ils doivent être attentifs et s’attendre mutuellement. Ces passages alternatifs de Récitatif et de Mélodie revêtue de tout l’éclat de l’Orchestre, sont ce qu’il y a de plus touchant de plus ravissant, de plus énergique dans toute la Musique moderne. L’Acteur agité, transporté d’une passion qui ne lui permet pas de tout dire, s’interrompt, s’arrête, fait des réticences, durant lesquelles l’Orchestre parle pour lui; et ces silences, ainsi remplis, affectent infiniment plus l’Auditeur que si l’Acteur disoit lui-même tout ce que la Musique fait entendre. Jusqu’ici la Musique Françoise n’a su faire aucun usage du \textit{Récitatif obligé}. L’on a tâché d’en donner quelque idée dans une scène du \textit{Devin du Village}, et il paroit que le Public

\textsuperscript{3} Omitted in Rousseau’s entry for Diderot’s \textit{Encyclopédie}, 1749.
\textsuperscript{4} “à la différence” in the \textit{Encyclopédie}.
\textsuperscript{5} Omitted in the \textit{Encyclopédie}.
a trouvé qu’une situation vive, ainsi traitée, en devenoit plus intéressante. Que ne feroit point le Récitatif obligé dans des scenes grandes et pathétiques, si l’on en peut tirer ce parti dans un genre rustique et badin?

---------

**Johann Georg Sulzer**, Johann Philipp Kirnberger, and J. A. P. Schulz

*Allgemeine Theorie der schönen Künste*, 1771-74

Obligat. (Musik)

Vom italiënischen Obligato. Man nennt in gewissen mehrstimmigen Tonstücken die Stimmen obligat, welche mit der Hauptstimme so verbunden sind, daß sie einen Theil des Gesanges; oder der Melodie führen, und nicht blos, wie die zur Ausfüllung dienenden Mittelstimmen, die nothwendigen zur vollen Harmonie gehörigen Töne spielen. Die Mittelstimmen, welche blos der Harmonie halber da sind, können weggelassen werden, ohne daß das Stück dadurch verstümmelt oder verdorben werde; sie können einigermaßen durch den Generalbaß ersetzt werden. Aber wenn man eine obligate Stimme wegließe, würde man das Stück eben so verstümmeln, als wenn man hier und da einige Takte aus der Hauptstimme übergieniege.⁷

---------

**Denis Diderot**, *Le neveu de Rameau ou La Satire seconde*. (1779?) (Ed. J. Fabre. Geneve, Droz, 1950.)

En chantant un lambeau des Lamentations de Jomelli, il répétait avec une précision, une vérité et une chaleur incroyable les plus beaux endroits de chaque morceau; ce beau récitatif obligé où le prophète peint la désolation de Jérusalem, il l'arrosa d'un torrent de larmes qui en arrachèrent de tous les yeux. Tout y était, et la délicatesse du chant, et la force de l'expression, et la douleur. Il insistait sur les endroits où le musicien s'était particulièrement montré un grand maître. S’il quittait la partie du chant, c’était pour prendre celle des instruments qu’il laissait subitement pour revenir à la voix, entrelaçant l’une à l’autre de manière à conserver les liaisons et l’unité du tout; s’emparant de nos âmes et les tenant suspendues dans la situation la plus singulière que j’aie jamais éprouvée… Admirais-je? Oui, j’admirais! Était-ce touché de pitié? J’étais touché de pitié; mais une teinte de ridicule était fondue dans ces sentiments et les dénaturait.

---------

**Johann Nikolaus Forkel**

*Ueber Johann Sebastian Bachs Leben, Kunst und Kunstwerk*. Ch. IX [Bachs Kunstwerke], (Leipzig, 1802.) *BD VII*, 73-74

II. Claviersachen mit Begleitung anderer Instrumente


Heinrich Christoph Koch

Musikalisches Lexikon, 1802

Obligat, (obligato) gebunden. Die jetzige Bedeutung diese Kunstwortes, nach welcher man unter einer obligaten Stimme eine solche Stimme eines Tonstückes verstehet, die entweder in dem Verfolge desselben hier und da in kurzen melodischen Sätzen den Hauptgesang führt, oder die mit dem Hauptgesange so verbunden ist, daß sie, ohne das Tonstück zu verstümmeln, nicht weggelassen werden kann, hat ihren Grund in der alten Musik, in welcher alles, wo nicht förmliche Fuge, doch wenigstens fugenartig und gebunden gearbeitet war.

Weil nun eine obligate oder gebundene Stimme, das ist, eine solche, welche Bindungen enthält, nicht ausgelassen werden kann, ohne den ganzen Zusammenhang der Harmonie zu zerstören, so hat man den Ausdruck obligat auch auf solche Stimmen in Tonstücken nach der freyen Schreibart übergetragen, die zur Darstellung des ganzen Zusammenhanges eines Tongemäldes unumgänglich nothwendig sind.

Das Beyword -obligato- bey der Aufschrift einer Stimme, z. E. Flauto obligato, zeigt demnach an, daß diese Stimme nicht bloß zur Ausfüllung der Harmonie vorhanden sey, sondern daß sie entweder zuweilen den Hauptgesang führen oder sich doch wenigstens mit der Hauptstimme so vereinigen werde, daß sie, ohne das Tonstück zu verstümmeln, nicht weggelassen werden kann. S. den Artikel Concertirend.8

8 Heinrich Christoph Koch, Musikalisches Lexikon (Frankfurt: 1802), col. 1080-1081; reprint ed. (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1964).
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