

Doubting the Resurrection? Questions and dilemmas in performances of the first 'et expecto' from Bach's Mass in B minor

Uri Golomb

ABSTRACT: The Confiteor in Bach's Mass in B minor comprises three continuous yet contrasted sections. The entire movement is marked with cut- C time signature; the second section (introducing the words *et expecto resurrectionem mortuorum*) is preceded by an *Adagio*; and the final section (starting with the same words) is marked *Vivace ed allegro*. These markings are usually assumed to have been penned by J. S. Bach himself, or under his guidance. In this article, I examine the meaning and implications of these performance instructions from the combined perspectives of performance practice studies (specifically, what these performance indications might have meant for Bach and his contemporaries – and how subsequent editors interpreted them), performance analysis (different performative interpretations of this passage, as documented in sound recordings), as well as melodic-harmonic analysis and reception studies. The paper focuses on four case studies (performances conducted by Nikolaus Harnoncourt, Andrew Parrott, Eugen Jochum and John Eliot Gardiner) which exemplify four distinctive approaches to the first (*adagio*) setting of the Et expecto, seeking to understand the motivations behind each conductor's choices in terms of performance practice, music analysis and hermeneutics. I also examine my own responses to these performances, especially in those cases where my 'objective' analysis of the performance conflicts with my 'subjective' responses as a listener; in this, I will be relying in part on self-reflexive methodologies, such as auto-ethnography and action research.

KEY WORDS: Johann Sebastian Bach; Mass in B minor, BWV 232; analysis and performance

In this paper, I discuss major trends in performances of a passage regarded as among the most extraordinary in Bach's Mass in B minor: the bridge connecting the Confiteor and the Et expecto (bars 123b to 146).¹ Bach's autograph of this movement contains ambiguous

¹ The phrase *et expecto resurrectionem mortuorum* begins on the second minim beat of bar 123, after a simultaneous phrase ending in all five voices on the last syllable of *peccatorum*; this point is usually treated as the starting point of this passage. The *adagio* indication, however, is placed earlier, in bar 121, which also introduces the diminished seventh harmonies which dominate the subsequent *a cappella* setting of *et expecto* (*etc.*). Consequently, several conductors treat bar 121 as the starting point of the passage. I will return to these

performance markings; the debate is intensified by the harmonic and stylistic ambiguities of the passage, and the conflicting expressive and hermeneutic-theological interpretations that have been attached to it. In this paper, I consider these issues from the combined perspectives of *performance practice studies* (specifically, what Bach's performance indications were likely to have meant to his contemporaries – and how subsequent editors interpreted them) and *performance analysis* (different performative interpretations of this passage, as documented in sound recordings), as well as melodic-harmonic analysis and reception studies, and self-reflexive methodologies such as auto-ethnography and action research.

Throughout, I also attempt to tease apart analytic and critical considerations. In his magisterial survey of musical performance studies, Nicholas Cook notes the “page-to-stage” approach still held by many scholars in the discipline (Cook, 2013, pp. 26-29) and also in music theory and analysis (*ibid.*, pp. 29-30 and *passim*): an approach which relegates performers to the realisation of a latent ‘correct’ interpretation of the composer's score. To counter this attitude, Daniel Leech-Wilkinson suggests an approach which “accept[s] different instances of the work as equally valid” (Leech-Wilkinson 2009, Chapter 1, ¶40).

While I concur that “it is probably not sensible to object [to a technically proficient performance] *solely* on the grounds that one's own view is different” (*ibid.*, emphasis added), I believe arguments other than personal taste are available. Scholars as well as critics should not hesitate to express their views on the validity of a performative interpretation, as long as these judgments are supported by arguments that readers can examine for themselves.

My own attempts to do so have often generated an internal dialogue between my ‘musicologist’ persona and my ‘listener’ persona. On the one hand, there were performances which I felt could be justified in historical and/or analytic terms, yet left me cold; on the other hand, there were performances which I found difficult to justify as a musicologist – yet retained, for me, an intuitive sense of rightness.

This internal dialogue is not dissimilar to that between the ‘performer’ and the ‘analyst’ articulated by Janet Schmalfeldt in her 1985 article on Beethoven's *Bagatelles*.² In that paper, Schmalfeldt sought to present a mutually-informative dialogue between her two personas, though subsequent writers (e.g., Doğanatan-Dack, 2008, pp. 300-302; Cook, 2013, pp. 38-40) argued that she made the performer subservient to the analyst (*cf.* Schmalfeldt, 2011, p. 114).

My own internal dialogue has been between the ‘critic’ and the ‘musicologist’. As a record reviewer, I was expected to express my own likes and dislikes, but these preferences were clearly informed by my research. As a scholar researching the history of Bach performance and reception, I felt that I should keep my personal preferences at bay, and sought to account for the performers' decisions in terms of their own aesthetics, adopting, in practice, the relativist attitude recommended by Leech-Wilkinson despite my own reservations.

Consequently, this paper is, in part, an attempt to allow my ‘critic’ persona to speak

issues in the course of this paper.

² See also Schmalfeldt's subsequent reflections on the topic in “On Performance, Analysis and Schubert” (Schmalfeldt, 2011, Chapter 5, especially pp. 113-116).

within a scholarly context. I have chosen four performances of the bridge passage which reveal different relations between these two inner personae:

1. Nikolaus Harnoncourt (1968): a performance based on sound performance-practice grounds, but which has always left me cold, even frustrated, as a listener;
2. Andrew Parrott (1984): a performance which initially created a similar impression, but which I now find affecting and convincing, partly thanks to my work as a researcher;
3. Eugen Jochum (1957): a performance which is wrong in almost every musicological parameter – but which continues to exert a powerfully mystical effect on my ‘listener’ persona;
4. John Eliot Gardiner (2015b): a performance which, despite any scholarly counter-arguments I could offer, might well be my personal favourite rendition of this passage.

In each case, I seek to understand the performers’ own reasoning and motivations, as well as the reasons behind my personal reactions, including those reactions that evolved over time.

The case study: The dual setting of the expectation of resurrection

In *Beyond the Score*, Nicholas Cook chides fellow analysts for their neglect of transitional passages, even though “transitions are places where meaning is both concentrated and open to performers’ intervention” (Cook, 2013, p. 46). The passage under discussion in this paper can be used to illustrate this point. It occurs towards the end of the Credo section (or *Symbolum Nicenum*, to use Bach’s title), and connects the plainchant-inspired double fugue *Confiteor* with the jubilant final movement, *Et expecto*, marked *Vivace e allegro*.

The bridge passage also sets the words *et expecto resurrectionem mortuorum*. It retains the *Confiteor*’s *a cappella* scoring, and “brings in all three possible diminished seventh chords [...] including one with all four enharmonic interpretations” (Cohen, 2008, p. 18). The first of these (a VII dim₇ in G minor) appears under the *adagio* heading in bar 121, before the words *et expecto* first appear (see Footnote 1 above). Bach uses this chord, *inter alia*, to undermine points of apparent tonal stability. In this, it intensifies harmonic procedures already present in the *Confiteor*, whose harmonic tension and chromatic passages partly undermine its *stile antico* character.

This sense of “suspensive directionality”, defined as “suspense as to the direction the music will take” (Cohen, 1994, p. 37), contrasts markedly with the “clear” or “simple” directionality (*ibid.*) of the *Vivace e allegro*, dominated by the certainties of constant V-I cadences, intensified by the full orchestration and fast tempo, and introducing the final words: *et vitam venturi saeculi, amen* (“and life in the world to come, amen”).

Several mass settings of this period (e.g., by Zelenka and Heinichen, whom Bach could have heard or read in Dresden) treat the *Et expecto* as part of a larger unit, starting at the *Confiteor* or earlier; in some cases, the word *mortuorum* is singled out for special treatment (see also Klek, 2007, p. 334). The Credo in these masses usually ends with a jubilant setting of *et vitam venturi saeculi*. Bach seems unique, both in commencing the final movement of his Credo on the words *et expecto* and in setting that phrase twice (see also Butt, 1991, p. 100).

Critical-analytic responses to this passage have varied greatly: some writers on the Mass

singled it out for special attention, while others virtually ignored it. This disparity is also reflected in actual performances. Interpretations of the Et expecto bridge passage thus constitute a particularly potent example of how changes in the way the music sounds can radically alter listeners' perceptions of its expressive ambience and, in texted music, of text-music relations.

Performance practice considerations

Bach's autograph score includes several performance directives for the Confiteor. The movement bears the time signature ζ , indicating two minim beats to a bar; the smallest rhythmic value is the quaver. Bar 121 includes an *adagio* marking. In bar 147 (counted as bar 1 of a new movement in several editions), the marking *Vivace e Allegro* appears beneath the continuo line, preceded, in bar 142, by a change of key signature, from three sharps (F sharp minor) to two (D major). The interpretation of these markings depends both on a general understanding of their significance in mid-eighteenth-century Germany and on the performers' understanding of the music's expressive ambience and symbolic significance.

Assuming that these markings are in Bach's hand, or were dictated by him, they still raise significant puzzles in terms of their realisation in performance:³ What does *adagio* mean in the middle of a ζ movement? Why did Bach place this indication at bar 121, *before* the beginning of a new section in the middle of bar 123? Is this a tempo transition, or a modification of an existing tempo? Should the answer to this be affected by the absence of quavers in the bridge passage? Which parameters should be affected by this indication – basic tempo, tempo flexibility, dynamics, articulation? Hovering over these questions is a basic scepticism regarding the reliability of external evidence in interpreting notational conundrums, especially those connected with *alla breve* (e.g., Donington, 1989, p. 14; cf. Abravaya, 2006, pp. 143-144).

Performance, analysis and hermeneutics affect each other in this context. Performers can begin from the 'technical' end, interpreting what Bach's performance indications imply for specific parameters – tempo, dynamics, articulation and so forth – and on that basis decide (if they deem such a decision necessary) what the music might mean. Alternatively, they might begin by establishing their view on the music's expressive or symbolic significance, and on that basis decide how to interpret Bach's notation. These two options need not be mutually exclusive. Eighteenth-century treatises on performance suggest that the meaning of performance indications partly depends on the music's expressive import; see, for instance, Quantz's discussion on the interpretation of *adagio* in specific cases (1966 [1752], pp. 163-164).

Self-reflexive methodologies

In the following sections, I will examine the solutions adopted in practice in four recordings, seeking to understand the logic and motivation behind these solutions, both in terms of

³ Similar questions plague the ζ time signature and the *Vivace e allegro* marking. Most editors and performers have assumed implicitly that the *Adagio* and *Vivace e allegro* markings were made by the composer. However, Peter Wollny (2009, pp. 139-141) claims that these markings are not in Bach's hand, and hypothesised that they might have been inserted by Bach's son Johann Christoph Friedrich. According to this hypothesis, these markings might still have been made in J. S. Bach's lifetime, with J. C. F. acting as "Kopist und Korrektur" (*ibid.*, p. 141) on his father's behalf. Wollny makes no comment regarding the time signature.

performance practice and in terms of analytic and hermeneutic interpretation. I will also offer my own evaluation of each performance. In doing so, I will be relying on listening notes I have kept while doing research on recordings of the Mass in B minor for my doctoral dissertation at Cambridge University. I also rely on undocumented yet vivid recollections of earlier responses to some of these recordings.

In seeking to account for my reactions, I will be adopting features from self-reflexive methodologies employed in education research and social sciences. My retrospective examination of my listening notes and recollections partly incorporates the methods of auto-ethnography. This method is defined as “an approach to research and writing that seeks to describe and systematically analyze (*graphy*) personal experience (*auto*) in order to understand cultural experience (*ethno*)”, in order “to illustrate facets of cultural experience, and, in so doing, make characteristics of a culture familiar for insiders and outsiders” (Ellis *et al.*, 2010, section 2, ¶6).

Auto-ethnography is largely a retrospective endeavour; however, my research on the Confiteor’s performance history remains an ongoing project. In particular, Gardiner’s 2015 versions became available while my work on this paper was still in progress. The self-reflexive approach, therefore, fed directly into my current research. The resulting spiral of action, reflection and repeated action (etc.) is associated with Action Research, a method employed to examine ongoing practical projects and their efficacy in achieving their aims – as well as the desirability and validity of those aims, which might change in the course of research.

Within Action Research, my approach probably comes closest to the Emancipating/Enhancing/Critical Science Mode which aims to “help [researchers/participants] to better understand fundamental problems by raising their collective consciousness” (Berg, 2001, p. 187; see also Newton and Burgess, 2008, p. 21). As Berg implies, Action Research is usually a collaborative enterprise; the present paper is an individual venture, though I hope that whatever insights I offer into my own practices might inspire similar self-examination in others.

CASE STUDIES

Denying the bridge: Nikolaus Harnoncourt (1968)

Albert Schweitzer seems to praise Bach for *not* composing the bridge passage. Bach, he writes, is “guided by the correct feeling that in the Credo everything presses onward to a big conclusion”, resisting the temptation of setting the words *et expecto resurrectionem mortuorum* to “music with something mysterious and a touch of longing in it” (Schweitzer 1911 [1908], vol. 2, pp. 320-321). However, his list of conventional temptations that Bach resisted (“retardation”, “intimacy”, “mysteriousness”, “longing”) can more accurately be described as a list of *un*-conventional decisions that Bach *did* make. Some of the qualities Schweitzer denies are unambiguously present in the bridge passage: slowing down the music,⁴ delaying the arrival of the *Vivace e allegro*, intimate *a cappella* scoring. Mystery and longing are arguably suggested by the intense, unstable harmonies.

⁴ Even if the *adagio* indication is not in Bach’s hand, and even if it does not refer to a slower tempo, there is an element of retardation involved in the avoidance of quavers from bar 121 onwards.

Nikolaus Harnoncourt, in his 1968 recording of the Mass, created an aural analogue to Schweitzer's interpretation.⁵ He observes that Italian performance directives indicated character as much as tempo, and argues that

The Alla breve of the *Confiteor*, the Adagio and the Vivace e Allegro must therefore be performed at almost the same tempo. ... A change of tempo at the Adagio avenges itself at the very latest in the link passage to the Et expecto (bar 146), since a natural transition to the Vivace e Allegro can only be attained through a slight acceleration of the crochets, never through a violent change of tempo. (Harnoncourt, 1975 [1968], p. 10; cf. Stauffer, 1994, p. 237).

The notes I made on listening to this performance in 2000-2002 suggest that I discerned no change of tempo in the transition from the *Confiteor* to the bridge passage, though I did notice a "slight slowing – with no real effect – at [bar] 136" (February 6, 2000). Two years later, measuring the opening bars of each section with a metronome, I noted that the bridge passage begins at a slightly slower tempo than the *Confiteor* (minim = MM84 and minim = MM76 respectively). This was confirmed in a Sonic Visualiser measurement, which suggested a constant slowing-and-speeding motion in bars 121-123, with an overall slowing-down countered by moments of slight speeding within the bridge itself. The most significant broadening occurred in bars 134-136, but it too was countered by a speeding-up around bar 141.

Other performance parameters also seem to remain stable, possibly accounting for my impression that even the slowing down around the enharmonic modulation in bar 138 had "no real effect" and that the entire section had a "matter-of-fact" feel to it. The resulting performance comes closer than any to supporting Schweitzer's view. Indeed, if performances like Harnoncourt's had been prevalent in the 1890s-1910s, when Schweitzer was working on his book, it would be easier to contend that Schweitzer had simply ignored this passage. This, however, appears unlikely (see my discussion of printed editions below).

Evaluation of Harnoncourt's 1968 recording

In his study *On Bach's Rhythm and Tempo*, Ido Abravaya argues that an *adagio* indication in mid-section usually signifies "any kind of short-term slowing down (nowadays usually denoted by *ritardando*, *allargando* etc.) or a written out fermata" (Abravaya, 2006, p. 141). If this interpretation is applicable to bar 121 in the *Confiteor*, then the word *adagio* only applies to bars 121-123. This lends support both to Harnoncourt's annotations and to his actual performance.

Nonetheless, I continue to find this performance wholly unconvincing. My problem is not so much with the unvaried tempo as with the lack of attention to the passage's other distinguishing features. Even if there had been no *adagio* indication, the dramatic shift in style, texture and harmonic language should have registered. Bach moved here from a relatively *stile antico* fugue to a 'madrigalesque' passage, rich in harmonic tensions and evocative word-paintings. All this seems to be lost on Schweitzer; and Harnoncourt, while acknowledging the point in writing (1975 [1968], p. 12; reprinted 1989 [1984], p. 196), all

⁵ On the parallels between Schweitzer's performance prescriptions and Harnoncourt's performance practice, see Golomb (2004), pp. 93-96 (especially p. 94).

but erases it in his performance.

Harnoncourt's relatively uninflected reading of the Confiteor is typical of his 1968 version of the Mass as a whole. In his notes to this "First recording with original instruments according to the autograph" (Harnoncourt, 1975 [1968], p. 1), Harnoncourt cites detailed, speech-like rhetorical phrasing as paramount (*ibid.*, p. 10), and his analyses of specific movements (*ibid.*, pp. 11-12; reprinted in Harnoncourt, 1989 [1984], pp. 191-198) contain ample references to rhetorical figures. His performance, however, either ignores these figures or underlines them in an understated manner. This might also reflect the interpretive priorities of Hans Gillesberger, who conducted the choir while Harnoncourt directed the ensemble from the cello.⁶

In his second recording of the Mass, made in 1986, Harnoncourt's approach to musical rhetoric had become much more pronounced and readily discernible in performance, with detailed shaping of individual phrases in solo voices, choir and orchestra alike. His range of tempi, articulation and dynamics widened considerably.⁷ In keeping with this stylistic shift, his treatment of the Confiteor has also changed: while the movement's initial *alla breve* is roughly the same tempo in both performances (MM84), the bridge passage is noticeably broader in 1986 (MM48), with greater dynamic flexibility. This is by no means the most radical difference between these two renditions of the Mass in B minor, but it does suggest that Harnoncourt abandoned his earlier conviction that no significant change of pace should occur at bar 121.

Andrew Parrott: Gradual change of affect

The bridge passage has been compared to "Gesualdo's chromatic madrigals" (Stauffer, 1994, p. 136), both in terms of the passage's "adventurous chromatic progressions and the modulation to distant key areas" (*ibid.*, p. 237) and in terms of its explicit word-paintings – most obviously, the rising figure on *resurrectionem* (soprano I, bars 130-131; bass, bars 132-133; tenor, bars 133-134) and the falling figure on *mortuorum* (soprano I, bar 131; bass, bars 133-134; tenor, bars 134-135). The enharmonic modulation in bars 137-139 could be interpreted as an illustration of the word *expecto*, in the senses of both waiting and hope (Klek, 2007, p. 334); and the constant use of the diminished seventh chord to destabilise tonal expectations has been connected with the concept of a pregnant "expectation" (Wolff, 2013, p. 19). These madrigalesque features can gain greater immediacy when presented by a consort of single voices,⁸ which allows for greater independence and transparency in the shaping of individual vocal phrases in such parameters as dynamics, accentuation (including the use of consonants) and phrasing.

Andrew Parrott, in his 1984 rendition, adopts Harnoncourt's basic stated parameters:

⁶ Photographs from recording sessions by Harnoncourt and Gillesberger (e.g., <http://picsr.com/tags/gillesberger>, <https://www.flickr.com/photos/hansthijs/24499279833/>) suggest that the latter sometimes conducted the choir with his back to the orchestra, allowing no eye contact between him and Harnoncourt.

⁷ For a comparison between the two performances, see Golomb (2004), pp. 100-106.

⁸ The Bach choir debate is beyond the scope of this paper; suffice it to say that I find the arguments for the one-singer-per-vocal-part hypothesis (e.g., Parrott, 2000; Rifkin, 2002) thoroughly convincing. For recently-published counter-arguments, see Andreas Glöckner (2010 and 2011), with responses by Andrew Parrott (2010b; reprinted 2015, pp. 328-346) and Joshua Rifkin (2010, 2012); and Robert Marshall (2009) with Parrott's response (2010c).

relatively small change of tempo, no change of metre, and a gradual rather than sharp transition. Within these parameters, however, he leaves ample room for projecting the differences between the sections. In his paper on the use of ripienists in the Mass in B minor, Parrott argues that the Confiteor should be scored in the manner of *Affetuoso* style rather than *stile antico* – i.e., sung by a consort of single voices, without vocal or instrumental ripienists⁹ – precisely because of the bridge passage. While acknowledging the stylistic gap between the *Confiteor* and the bridge passage, Parrott adds that “[o]ne of the miracles of the Confiteor is the manner in which [the Et expecto] emerges from the fading counterpoint” (2010a, p. 24 and 2015, p. 312; cf. Ehmann, 1961, p. 37), therefore requiring a gradual transition between the sections.

Parrott treats bars 121-123 as a *ritardando*, settling on a new, slower tempo at the words *et expecto* in bar 123b. His *ritardando* begins in bar 118, shortly after the end of the final statement of the *cantus firmus* in the tenor. His tempo for the Confiteor is similar to Harnoncourt’s in 1968; but Harnoncourt barely slows down (from MM84 to MM73) in the bridge, whereas Parrott’s bridge begins at around MM56, about 30% slower. Prior to measurement, I noted that Parrott’s bridge passage “sounds almost the same tempo” as the Confiteor (listening notes, February 6, 2000). This might be accounted for by the gradualness of Parrott’s *ritardando*; additionally, my listening expectations might have been affected by drastic tempo differences in other recordings. At the time, I also felt that “nothing in particular” happened in this performance, except for “slightly more activity for expression” around bar 137.

Returning to the performance three years later, I began to notice more details, making note of “some local [dynamic] waves” (April 29, 2003), and describing the phrasing as “not unshaped, but not strongly projected”. By 2010, I found Parrott’s rendition to be “the most continuous in tempo terms” among one-per-part performances, yet “also the most dynamically active”.

Around this time I became familiar with an annotated edition published by the musicologist and conductor Hermann Kretzschmar in 1899 – and noted a surprising resemblance between the dynamic contours he recommended and those realised in Parrott’s rendition. Partial concordances include: a dynamic swell in bars 125-126 (a rise in the tenor followed by a fall in the other voices in Kretzschmar; a rise in all voices – led by the tenor – and a fall in all voices in Parrott); an alto and tenor-led *crescendo* in bars 127-128; a *crescendo* and *diminuendo* on “resurrectionem mortuorum” (bass, bars 133-135; tenor, bars 134-136); quiet dynamics in bars 137-140; a general rise and decline in bars 140-145 (more detailed in Parrott – his tenor adds dynamic nuances in his *mortuorum* in bars 143-145 which are not indicated by Kretzschmar).

These concordances are not as surprising as they might appear. Kretzschmar’s dynamics often trace each part’s melodic contours or underline harmonic patterns of rising tension and deceptive resolution (e.g., a small *crescendo* leads to the $V_{5/6}$ chord in bar 139; the chord itself is accentuated, its resolution traced by a descent to *piano*). Kretzschmar’s use of detailed written indications could be connected with the practice of performing the work

⁹ C. P. E. Bach introduced instrumental doubling into the Confiteor in his 1786 performance of the Symbolum Nicenum; similar doublings were suggested by Stauffer (1997, pp. 224-231), Rilling (1984, p. 103) and Klek (2007, p. 334n). Rilling only adopted this practice in his 1988 recording.

with large amateur choirs, where written indications could facilitate a coordinated interpretation. Parrott evidently relied on his singers to shape phrases in accordance with their “good understanding of the underlying intention of a musical phrase”, be it harmonic patterns or word-paintings (Parrott, in interview with the author, February, 2002; quoted in Golomb, 2004, p. 127). Parrott seems to have restrained his singers in the Confiteor – their dynamic contours there barely fluctuate – but encouraged them to adopt greater flexibility in the bridge passage, a differentiation consistent with his classification of the two sections as *antico* and *affetuoso* respectively. The resulting reading subtly underlines the greater tension in the opening half of the bridge (up to bar 140), the transformation affected by and after the enharmonic modulation in bars 140-142 and the subsequent surge of tension and dissipation in bars 143-146.

Evaluation of Parrott’s recording

Parrott’s nuances require attentive listening to achieve their effect. His dynamic contours might resemble Kretzschmar’s, but the latter’s curves are stretched wider. Kretzschmar also suggests a slow tempo,¹⁰ giving listeners time to observe the dynamic unfolding – though at the risk of losing the thread – whereas Parrott’s faster tempo requires greater alertness. Kretzschmar also drives his points further through the use of detailed articulation and accentuation, whereas Parrott’s singers adopt a smoother approach.

This subtlety might account for my own experience: this is one case where the process of research and analysis altered my perception and experience. My PhD listening notes, and my recollections of earlier experiences, suggest that I initially perceived Parrott’s rendition of the bridge passage as blandly uneventful. This impression changed with growing acquaintance, but it was when I started focusing my research on this passage, in preparation for the present paper, that I began to find Parrott’s reading particularly vivid and involving. I am aware, however, that other listeners picked up on Parrott’s expressive nuances more quickly than I had.

Interlude: Annotated editions and metre switches

Kretzschmar’s annotated score, richly supplied with dynamic, articulation and tempo markings, provides a detailed glimpse into the way this music might have been performed before the age of recordings. The edition – published by Breitkopf and Härtel and edited by a founding member of the Neue Bach Gesellschaft (Jones & Wiechert, 2015) – seems to have enjoyed some popularity in the early twentieth century. Its recommendations were adopted by the American conductor Theodore Thomas (Luongo, 2006, pp. 57-60; 2007, pp. 325-327); Henry Wood provided his choristers with Julius Spengel’s *Klavierauszug* of Kretzschmar’s edition in at least one of his performances (Wood, 1910), suggesting that he might have been conducting from Kretzschmar’s score.¹¹ Similar treatments of the bridge

¹⁰ Kretzschmar marks the Confiteor as *Allegro molto moderato e solenne*, implying a measured tempo in 2/2 metre. In bar 121, he recommends a transition to 4/4 metre, re-introducing the C time-signature at the *Vivace e allegro* in bar 147.

¹¹ The information comes from a set of printed notes which Wood prepared for his choristers, requesting alterations to their vocal score ahead of the rehearsal. Wood does not name the edition; he does, however, identify bars by page numbers (for instance, bar 118 in the Confiteor is listed as “p. 164, b. 1”), and these correlate precisely with Spengel’s edition.

passage can be found in other annotated editions (Otto Goldschmidt, 1885, Arthur Sullivan, 1908, Frank Damrosch, c. 1927). Without recordings by any of these editors, we cannot know for sure to what extent, and in what way, their performance recommendations were adopted by them or by others who used their editions;¹² as Nicholas Cook notes, there are known cases where artists' performance choices on record differed substantially from those included in their editions (Cook, 2013, p. 128). However, in the absence of recordings, editions like Kretzschmar's are the closest we can come to gaining an idea of prevailing practices at the time.

Kretzschmar's performance directives for the bridge passage are consistent with several contemporaneous analyses and commentaries. In his *Führer durch den Konzertsaal*, Kretzschmar describes the bridge passage as a "melancholy, thematically-severe Adagio" (*schwermütigen, thematisch strengen Adagio*), reflecting the "standpoint of death-fearing men" (*Standpunkte des vor dem Tode bangenden Menschen*; 1905, p. 188). This emphasis on fear and severity – rather than mystical expectation – is consistent with the dramatic approach implied by his performance instructions. Even more in accord with Kretzschmar's annotation is Hubert Parry's detailed account of the *minutiae* of word-painting in this passage, where "every word is made to tell" (Parry, 1909, p. 320), dramatically evoking "the sense of hesitating bewilderment *and terror*" (*ibid.*, emphasis added; cf. Prout, 1876, pp. 522-523, Wolff, 2013, pp. 19-20).

The recording that comes closest to realising Kretzschmar's tempo and dynamics indications is Robert Shaw's 1960 version.¹³ For his period, however, Shaw seems to be a rule-proving exception; few non-HIP performances adopt the dynamically active approach suggested by Kretzschmar, Wood, and other turn-of-the-century editors.¹⁴ These conductors' penchant for relatively uninflected dynamics does not necessarily imply that they ignored the word-paintings noted by authors like Kretzschmar and Parry; they might instead have believed that these details need not, or should not, be highlighted in performance, an attitude consistent with prevailing contemporaneous attitudes to Bach performance (Fabian, 2003, pp. 132-133, 241-246 and *passim*; Golomb, 2004, pp. 42-44, 55-57 and *passim*).

Even Helmuth Rilling, who usually recommends bringing out expressive details in performance, suggests a circumspect approach in the bridge passage. He insists that performers should avoid "any attempt to emphasize rhythmic activity", and suggests that the choir "can complement the unreal dimension of the text by the use of an almost whispered diction" (Rilling, 1984, p. 103). While his analysis is close to Parry's, his performance recommendations evoke "an allegory of the timeless state of the sleep of death articulated within Lutheran eschatological thought" (Chafe, 1991, p. 83).

¹² Wood's notes to his choristers contain explicit instructions for them to ignore or amend some of Kretzschmar's instructions.

¹³ A close approximation of Kretzschmar's articulation and accentuation patterns can be found in Frans Brüggen's 1989 recording.

¹⁴ Shaw, who used the edition that Friedrich Smend edited for the Neue Bach Ausgabe, is not likely to have been familiar with Kretzschmar's edition; but, as already noted, Kretzschmar's dynamics consisted primarily of tracing each voice's melodic contours, so convergence is not an unlikely explanation.

Eugen Jochum: Hushed mystery and the anxiety of doubt

Rilling largely follows his own performance directives in his recorded performances of this passage.¹⁵ His recommendations are, however, even more fully realised by Eugen Jochum, especially in his 1957 recording. Like most editors in the 1890s-1910s, and conductors in the 1950s-1970s, Jochum interprets *adagio* as marking a transition to 4/4, and *Vivace e allegro* as a return to 2/2.

One eighteenth-century source could be interpreted as supporting this correlation. Kirnberger writes that a 2/2 metre, though “serious and emphatic”, should be “performed twice as fast as its note values indicates, unless a slower tempo is specified by the adjectives *grave*, *adagio*, etc.” (1982 [1771], p. 386). However, since the entire paragraph discusses 2/2 as a metre, Kirnberger is unlikely to imply a change in the basic 2/2 beat. More probably, he meant that an *adagio* in 2/2 slows down the minim beat, just as an *adagio* in 4/4 slows down the crotchet beat.

It is unlikely that musicians like Kretzschmar, Shaw and Jochum would have relied on Kirnberger. More likely, they were affected by a nineteenth-century understanding of *adagio* as ‘very slow indeed’. In his review of a 1926 performance of the Mass in B minor by the Berlin Singakademie, Heinrich Schenker chided the conductor Georg Schumann for a similar confusion. Schenker insisted that bars 121-123 “are just a transition to the actual Adagio”; the bridge passage “is not to be taken all too broadly”, since Bach’s marking “has nothing in common with an Adagio by Beethoven, for example” (quoted and translated by Knijff, 2007a, p. 257). This interpretation of Bach’s *adagio* is reminiscent of the *adagio* = *ritardando* interpretation I proposed based on Abravaya’s research, both in interpreting bars 121-123 as transitional and in stating that the tempo of the bridge passage itself “has to be related to the basic tempo” of the Confiteor (*ibid.*).¹⁶

Knijff (2007b, p. 3) concludes from Schenker’s comments that “Schumann must have slowed down abruptly at b. 121.” A similarly abrupt change can be heard in Jochum’s renditions. In his recordings of the Mass, Jochum follows a comparatively rigid Confiteor with a *subito piano*, *legato sostenuto* at the *adagio* mark, presumably at 4/4 given the slow pace.¹⁷ He maintains these parameters throughout the bridge, up to and including the end of bar 146. This uninflected rendition is especially notable in performances otherwise characterised by a wide dynamic range (Golomb, 2004, pp. 49-50, 188; Golomb, 2005, section 4.3.2). The tempo gets slower as the passage progresses, especially before the modulation in bar 137 – though a Sonic Visualiser analysis of the 1957 recording suggests that after the modulation the tempo returns to its earlier level. There is a further softening –

¹⁵ For a detailed comparison between Rilling’s performance recommendations, as documented in his book on the Mass, and his recordings of that work, see Golomb (2007).

¹⁶ In Schenker’s case, this might be correlated with his general pursuit of unity and organicism. In other contexts, Schenker pre-echoed a performance ethic normally associated with HIP by demanding more detailed (HIP musicians would say ‘rhetorical’) phrasing, which achieves unity without sacrificing local details; see Cook (2013), pp. 110-11.

¹⁷ The continuo’s crotchet pulse is barely audible and there are no significant accentuations, so it is difficult to distinguish between crotchet = MM66 at 4/4 and minim = MM33 at 2/2. In the absence of video documentation, I can only speculate that Jochum might have found it easier to keep his large, partly amateur choir together marking four beats to a bar rather than two; I am grateful to Andrew Parrott (personal communication) for suggesting this line of thought. As a listener, I feel that the lack of metric accentuation enhances the sense of weightlessness and mystery.

ritenuto and *diminuendo* – in bar 146, which encompasses the last two notes before the *Vivace e allegro*; the jump upwards in dynamics and tempo only occurs at the downbeat of bar 147.

Jochum's renditions of the bridge passages combine literalism – switching tempi along with all other parameters at precisely the points marked in his NBA score – with uniformly hushed dynamics. Several other conductors from this period (1950s-1980s) adopt a similar strategy, with a marginally wider dynamic range. This preference for treating the three sections of the *Confiteor* as uniform blocks, differentiated from each other but internally uniform, and to avoid the kind of internal shaping suggested by early twentieth-century editions, is consistent with Jochum's stated preference for "the effect of added organ 'registers' à la Baroque" as opposed to "Romantic 'swells'" (Jochum, 1990 [1965], p. 16). The result might be reflective of "a modernist tendency towards monumentalisation" (Cook, 2013, p. 125) and the notion, common at the time, that tempo modifications are anachronistic in Bach's music and that each movement should be performed with almost unvaried dynamics and articulation (Golomb, 2004, pp. 42-44, 54, 56, 225-229).

Evaluation of Jochum's 1957 recording

My initial notes on Jochum's performances basically reflected an impression that his bridge passage is unshaped – dramatically separated from the *Confiteor* and the second *Et expecto* alike yet internally unvaried. Studying the performances again for this paper, I found myself increasingly moved and affected by his approach, despite protestations from my inner scholar (*cf.* Cook, 2013, p. 97). In terms of performance practice, Jochum's interpretation has very little basis in Bach's notation or in the conventions that informed it, though it does form part of a decades-old tradition. In terms of analysis, I associated the patterns of tension and resolution in the passage with a dramatic potential which is all but erased in Jochum's hushed uniformity, which to my ears evokes a sense of mystical stillness.

The aforementioned dramatic potential arises primarily from the constant use of the diminished-seventh chord, re-interpreted, re-notated and resolved in different ways. Its use can be described as enhancing the sense of pain and tension – but also as removing the sense of clear tonal direction, thereby creating a sense of obscurity and aimlessness. This is reflected in the tone and imagery of several commentaries: Rilling (1984, p. 103) refers to "the unreal dimension of the text"; Cushman (1959) writes in his Notes to the 1959 recording conducted by Grischkat that "the voices hang almost motionless in space, waiting for the resurrection of the dead"; Andreas Glöckner (1990) speaks in his Notes to the re-issue of the 1965 recording conducted by Maazel of "the stillness of the *Adagio*". Jochum's performance seems to be inspired by similar imagery. Rather than creating a performance in which "every word is made to tell" (to re-quote Parry), Jochum's renditions seem to create a sense of constant, unwavering expectation, while excluding the suggestions of pain and fear.

My personal favourable reaction to Jochum's performance could be a reflection of this sense that it does reveal an important aspect of this passage – as well the sheer beauty of the still, small voice of Jochum's choir. The overall result is spiritually evocative, and its sense of suspended directionality can be related to the implications of Bach's unstable harmonies and complex texture. The fine details of these harmonies and textures might not always be perceivable; but my awareness of these omissions hardly seems to bother me

when engrossed in that experience. Ultimately, however, I prefer performances that try to shed light on the richness and detail of this passage. Parrott's reading is one example; a polar opposite is represented by John Eliot Gardiner's recent interpretation.

John Eliot Gardiner (2015) and the search for Bach's doubts

In a recent online lecture, Helmuth Rilling (2010, time index 53'47'') says that Bach "loses his faith" during the bridge passage, thereby casting doubt on a central tenet of Christian belief, by associating the expectation of the resurrection with fear and uncertainty. This notion clashes with the image of Bach as representative of supreme order. Wilfrid Mellers (1980, pp. 229-230) goes even further than Rilling, contending that even in the *Vivace e allegro* "human anxiety and terror are swept aside", rather than addressed. John Eliot Gardiner, who quotes Mellers approvingly, similarly describes the bridge as revealing Bach's "vulnerability and doubts", suggesting that, for once, "Bach felt Luther's terror of death and found a way, perhaps even a need, to express it in music" (2013, pp. 509-510).

Rilling's general adherence to the Fifth Evangelist image might account for his reluctance to give performative expression to what he perceived as Bach's doubts. Gardiner does not share this reservation. His 1984 recording used to strike me as the most dramatic rendition of the bridge passage. As Shaw did in 1960 (and as Henry Wood advocated in 1910), Gardiner extends the final notes of bar 146 (where many conductors already begin the *Vivace e allegro*), rendering them both slower and quieter than the already slow and quiet bridge itself. The rest of the passage, however, is internally uniform; the dramatic gestures are located at the transitions into, and out of, the bridge. Several later performances – notably Hengelbrock, Brüggen, Hickox and Junghänel – reveal a higher level of local activity, as does Gardiner's recent studio recording, released by his independent label Soli Deo Gloria (SDG).

The most detailed treatment I found, however, comes from a live performance which Gardiner conducted shortly after recording the SDG version. All of his recordings create a wide tempo gap between the *Confiteor* (minim = MM 100-110 in the final bars), the bridge passage (minim = MM 20-25) and the *Vivace e allegro* (minim = c. MM 120). The live version, however, offers a more detailed dynamic and articulatory shaping of the bridge passage itself. Gardiner reserves the "whispered diction" (Rilling, 1984, p. 103) for specific moments rather than allowing it to dominate the entire passage, as can be heard in the [audio example](#) (Gardiner's live 2015 performance of the Confiteor, bars 115-146; see also the annotated excerpt from the score, below).

122

rum. Et ex-pe-re-cto, ex-pe-cto re-sur-re-cti o-nem.

rum. Et ex-pe-re-cto, ex-pe-cto re-sur-re-cti o-nem.

to rum. Et ex-pe-re-cto, ex-pe-cto re-sur-re-cti o-nem.

to rum. Et ex-pe-re-cto, ex-pe-cto re-sur-re-cti o-nem.

rum. Et ex-pe-re-cto, ex-pe-cto re-sur-re-cti o-nem.

rum. Et ex-pe-re-cto, ex-pe-cto re-sur-re-cti o-nem.

rit.

131 *p* *pp* *pp*

o - nem mor - tu o - rum, ex - pe -

o - nem mor - tu o - rum, ex -

mor - tu o - rum, mor - tu o - rum, mor - tu o - rum, ex -

mor - tu o - rum, re - su - re - cti o - nem mor - tu o - rum, ex -

cto re - su - re - cti o - nem mor - tu o - rum, ex -

mf dim. *pp*

139 *cresc.* *dim.* *p* *rit.*

cto re - su re - cti o - nem mor - tu o - rum, et ex -

pe cto ex - pe cto re - su - re - cti o - nem mor - tu o - rum,

pe cto re - su re - cti o - nem mor - tu o - rum,

pe cto re - su re - cti o - nem mor - tu o - rum,

pe cto re - su re - cti o - nem mor - tu o - rum,

Figure 1. Confiteor, bars 115-146

Gardiner begins the *ritardando* and *diminuendo* almost as soon as the tenor's cantus firmus ends in bar 118. At first, this seems to set the stage for the emergence of Kretzschmar-like dynamic waves, with a tempo which probably comes close to that

envisioned by Kretzschmar, either changing the metre to 4/4 or abandoning metre altogether. In bars 125-134, Gardiner mostly matches Kretzschmar's detailed annotations; while avoiding sharp accentuations, he offers audible emphases on individual notes, with the focus moving from one voice to another. Only some of these emphases can be heard in the earlier studio versions.

At the point where one might expect further intensification – the tenor/bass *resurrectionem* – Gardiner's interpretation becomes more subdued. The basses' rising figure is barely highlighted by either dynamics or articulation – the emphasis in bar 133 is, instead, on the altos' *mortuorum*; and the emphasis on the tenors' *resurrectionem mortuorum* in bars 134-135 emerges less from their own rather subtle activity than from the hushing of the other voices, which eventually affects the tenors as well. The second half of the passage is more active, with several rises and falls in bars 139-142, before a final descent into stillness in bars 142/3, and a further *diminuendo/ritardando* on the upbeat to the *Vivace e allegro*. The *Vivace* itself is among the fastest on record, its sudden burst ringing all the more powerfully after the preceding stillness.

Evaluation of Gardiner's 2015 versions

Among Gardiner's recent versions, I discuss only the ones with which I became familiar while writing this paper. My personal feeling that both of them – especially the live relay – are among the most moving versions I have heard might be due in part to the impact of this first encounter.

Several arguments could be raised against the historical authenticity of Gardiner's rendition. The changes of metre at bars 121 and 147 have little or no support in Bach's notation; and some commentators are likely to take issue with Gardiner's richly-detailed interpretation. The maxim that "in Bach, if something is not possible without a conductor, it's a sign that it's not a good interpretation" (Philippe Herreweghe, quoted in Sherman, 1997, p. 284) is not universally accepted,¹⁸ but it does have circumstantial evidence to commend it. The level of rehearsal and preparation required to achieve Gardiner's results is not likely to have been part of Bach's performing environment, which might have gravitated more towards a 'reading' than an 'interpretation' of the score (Joshua Rifkin, in Sherman, 1997, pp. 379-380; see also Golomb, 2013, pp. 22-23). Under such circumstances, detailed shaping of each part might have been easier to achieve with a consort of single voices – an option Gardiner rejects (Kemp, 2016) – rather than by full choral forces.

If historical considerations might militate against Gardiner's interpretation, analytic and hermeneutic considerations can be used to support it. The dynamic swell in bars 143-145, for instance, can be correlated with the final two appearances of the diminished seventh chord, reflecting Gardiner's own view that the enharmonic modulation in bars 138-139 represents "the first tentative 'hope in' (by no means yet 'belief in') the resurrection of the dead" (p. 511).

Gardiner's performance goes even further than Kretzschmar's late nineteenth-century recommendations, encompassing both the hushed mystery recommended by Rilling and the expression of pain and despair suggested by Parry, Mellers and himself (see also Klek, p. 333n). This correspondence between newer and older interpretive practices might be seen

¹⁸ Sherman (2003), esp. 238-241; cf. Dreyfus (1983), p. 317; Butt (2002), pp. 9-10.

as an illustration of what Dorottya Fabian called the “Hegelian spiral model” (Fabian, 2003, p. 246) of stylistic progress: “Performance features that have gone out of fashion” – including “rhythmic flexibility and expressive freedom” – “may reappear again after a while but although they are similar they are never the same” (Fabian, 2015, p. 278).

In hermeneutic terms, Gardiner joins a tradition primarily documented in English-language sources on the Mass in B minor – writers like Parry, Prout and Mellers who emphasize those moments where Bach expressed apparent crises of faith in his church music. Such characterisation need not clash with the view of Bach as a devout Lutheran. Christian liturgical art, including eighteenth-century Lutheran church music, allowed for such expressions. Two of Bach’s cantata libretti (BWV 60 and 66), for instance, featured dialogues between Fear (*Furcht*) and Hope (*Hoffnung*) – both presumably facets of the same believer’s soul: Fear, terrified of death, expresses doubt in Christ’s resurrection and in his own salvation. Such libretti, set to operatically-inspired music, give voice to fearful doubt within the liturgy; in both cases, Hope prevails by convincing and calming Fear, not by silencing him. The two settings of the *Et expecto* in the Mass in B minor could be described as enacting a similar narrative trajectory.

However, especially in the first half of the twentieth century, theological interpretations of Bach’s music became more limited, informed or misinformed by later strands of Lutheran theology – neither Luther’s nor Bach’s – which were reflected backwards on Bach (Lloyd, 2007). As part of this process, the image of Bach the Fifth Evangelist has increasingly converged with the image of Bach the Abstract Mathematician; Günther Ramin, who served in Bach’s post as Thomaskantor in 1940-1956, encapsulated this image when he described Bach’s approach to expression as “Über-persönlich” (Hellman, 1973, p. 58). This view, articulated by writers like Hans Besch, Wilibald Gurlitt and Karl Geiringer, is closely associated with analyses which emphasize symbolism in Bach’s music and downplay the role of expressive drama, a tradition already prevalent in the work of Kretzschmar’s student Arnold Schering.¹⁹ Traces of this approach can be discerned in the performances of conductors like Ramin, Karl Richter and (in his earlier recordings) Helmuth Rilling,

In the context of this image, the notion of Bach’s representing, in music, Christian believers *overcoming* their crises of faith has been superseded by the image of “a zealous Lutheran [whose] healthy mind was not troubled with doubts” (Bitter, 1873 [1865], p. 46). The notion that Bach would associate the promise of resurrection with music that embodies instability and expresses fear – thereby suggesting a momentary suspicion that the resurrection will not come – does not sit well with those who would rather hear untainted perfection and unswerving faith in his music; this might explain some writers’ and performers’ tendencies to downplay the passage’s dramatic potential, above and beyond the related general tendency to interpret Bach’s *oeuvre* as restrained and ascetic.

For agnostics like Gardiner and myself, on the other hand, there is something attractive about the notion of Bach’s music giving expression to doubt and suspension of belief – associated with a more general tendency to emphasise the latent expressive intensity of his

¹⁹ Schering divides musical symbols into two types: “symbols of feeling” and “symbols of idea”; the latter are sub-divided into “depictive (objectifying)” and “conceptual (intellectual)”. In Baroque music, “the symbolism of feeling had to retreat before the symbolism of ideas” (1986 [1935], p. 197). Bach’s “*rhetorical* symbolism” belongs to the most intellectual type – the conceptual symbol of idea (*ibid.*, p. 201). A similar approach can be found in the writings of Hans-Heinrich Unger and Arnold Schmitz.

oeuvre. This preference for a more ‘human’ Bach, a Bach that we (who do not necessarily share his faith) can identify with, is, of course, a decidedly non-historical consideration. In his performative realisation of this view, however, Gardiner does rely on highlighting features latent within the score.

CONCLUSION

Gardiner, Mellers and others hear in the bridge passage the human, vulnerable side of Bach’s artistic persona. This interpretation clashes with certain versions of the Bach-as-Fifth-Evangelist image, which might account for attempts to downplay the passage’s uniqueness. A ‘compromise’ option can be detected in Rilling’s suggestion of a performance manner emphasizing the mysteriousness of the pending resurrection rather than the anxiety at its potential non-fulfilment.

If, as I suggest, the *adagio* indication preceding the bridge passage indeed means *ritardando* rather than a new tempo, this implies a narrowing of the tempo gap between the bridge passage and the Confiteor. These considerations have led performers like Harnoncourt (in 1968) to turn the bridge passage into a continuation of the Confiteor, suggesting that whatever unique features it has will emerge without performative intervention. Even within these parameters, however, it remains possible to underline the internal strains and tensions which set the bridge passage apart from the Confiteor. Several one-per-part versions – notably Andrew Parrott’s and John Butt’s – illustrate this with particular clarity. This is not, however, an inevitable outcome of the use of solo singers; Rifkin and Kuijken offer more tranquil readings, characterised by a narrower dynamic range and smoother singing.

The chamber-scale performances also eschew the larger-than-life imagery of a Bach who “soars above like some huge, primitive mountain rock [*Urgestein*] ... lonely and sublime ... unapproachable by any other music” (Fritz Volbach, n.d.).²⁰ Volbach – who avoids mentioning the bridge passage in his movement-by-movement introduction to the Mass in B minor – described Bach as “the greatest German mystic” (cf. Gurlitt, 1957 [1949], p. 76), a view reflected in interpretations of the bridge passage suggested by Rilling and realised by Jochum, among others. The suspensive directionality generated by Bach’s use of the diminished seventh chord can support a sense of the suspension of time, and the imagery of timelessness was used in several accounts of this passage, reflected in – and perhaps inspired by – hushed performances in the Jochum mould.

The same harmonic tensions and ambiguities can also support a sense of unsettled anxiety, as do the frequent contrapuntal clashes and madrigalesque word-paintings. Several interpreters’ avoidance of this expressive-dramatic aspect might have been generated by their reluctance to accept that Bach expressed doubts about the resurrection, notwithstanding his ultimate resolution of these doubts in the concluding *Vivace e allegro*; one is certainly tempted to ascribe such motivation to conductors such as Eugen Jochum, Karl Richter and Helmuth Rilling, who shared a core Christian faith as well as a belief in Bach as “a good Christian and a fine theologian who, as no musician before or after him, studied and meditated on the Bible” (Jochum, 1990 [1965], p. 16).

²⁰ Volbach writes these words in the introduction to his Eulenburg edition of the Mass. The edition is not dated, but was certainly completed before his death in 1940.

In this paper, I investigated several types of questions: the meaning of Bach's original notation; the way this notation was interpreted by subsequent generations of performers; the effect this had on listeners' perceptions of the music's meaning and expressive ambience;²¹ and how performance and analysis can shed light on each other. I also sought to account for my own reactions to several performances, partly in response to several auditors – most memorably John Rink – who felt that I have disguised my personal views so well that it seemed as if I had none. In previous cases, I have tried to separate my reviews and critiques, where my likes and dislikes had to feature prominently, from my scholarly research, where I tried to understand the performances on their own terms. On this occasion, I endeavoured to present and explain my own emotional and ideological biases. These personal reactions inevitably feed into my research – and vice versa; studying these performances has in some cases altered the way I felt about them. This tension and mutual feedback between scholarly findings and subjective response is one with which many of my readers are likely to be familiar.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This paper draws on research conducted under the auspices of a British Academy Visiting Fellowship, hosted by Prof. Nicholas Cook at Cambridge University. I am indebted to the British Academy for their support and to Nicholas Cook for his insightful guidance and feedback. I am grateful to Bradley Brookshire, John Butt, Bruno Gingras, Harai Golomb, Manuela Marin, Andrew Parrott, Joshua Rifkin and Janice Stockigt for valuable advice on my research and on earlier drafts of this paper.

I was introduced to the self-reflexive methodologies employed in this paper while studying for a teaching degree at the Levinsky College of Education, and applied them in an examination of my own teaching at Tel Aviv University. I am particularly indebted to Ilana Elkad-Lehman and Amira Ehrlich (Levinsky College) for introducing me to key concepts in this field and for the training I received in their application; and to one of the anonymous readers for suggesting their relevance in the present paper.

Special thanks to Mine Doğanatan-Dack and the organisers of the Re-Thinking Music Analysis and Performance study day for giving me the opportunity to present my research, and to the anonymous readers of this paper for their insightful comments.

REFERENCES

- Abravaya, I. (2006). *On Bach's rhythm and tempo*. Bochumer Arbeiten zur Musikwissenschaft (ed. Werner Breig), Vol. 4. Kassel: Bärenreiter.
- Berg, B. L. (2001). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Besch, H. (1938). *Johann Sebastian Bach: Frömmigkeit und Glaube. Band I: Deutung und Wirklichkeit: Das Bild Bachs im Wandel der deutschen Kirchen- und Geistesgeschichte*.

²¹ I plan to conduct a complementary study examining responses to selected renditions from listeners of diverse backgrounds to performances of this movement – a project for which I will seek collaboration from researchers in music cognition.

- Gütersloh: Verlag C. Bertelsmann.
- Bitter, C. H. (1873 [1865]). *The life of J. Sebastian Bach. An Abridged Translation from the German of C. H. Bitter*. Trans. and ed., Janet Kay-Shuttleworth. With preface by Sir Julius Benedict. London: Houlston and Sons.
- Butt, J. (1991). *Bach: Mass in B Minor*. Cambridge Music Handbooks. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Butt, J. (2002). *Playing with history: The historical approach to musical performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cohen, D. (1994). Directionality and complexity in music. *Musikometrika*, 6, 27-76.
- Cohen, D. (2008). Bach: Forerunner of the future through exploration of the potential of learned and natural schemata. *Understanding Bach*, 3, 9-30.
- Cook, N. (2013). *Beyond the score: Music as performance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cushman, R. (1959). Notes to the recording of Bach's Mass in B minor conducted by Hans Grischkat (Vox VBX7, 1959).
- Doğantan-Dack, M. (2008). Recording the performer's voice. In M. Doğantan-Dack (Ed.), *Recorded music: Philosophical and critical reflections* (pp. 293-313). London: Middlesex University Press.
- Donington, R. (1989). *The interpretation of early music*. London: Faber & Faber.
- Dreyfus, L. (1983). Early music defended against its devotees: A theory of historical performance in the twentieth century. *Musical Quarterly*, 69, 297-320.
- Ehmann, W. (1961). "Concertisten" und "Ripienisten" in der h-moll-Messe Joh. Seb. Bachs. Kassel: Bärenreiter.
- Ellis, C., Adams, T. E., & Bochner, A. P. (2010). Autoethnography: An overview. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative social research*, 12(1), Art. 10. <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1589/3095>
- Fabian, D. (2003). *Bach performance practice, 1945-1975: A comprehensive review of sound recordings and literature*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Fabian, D. (2015). *A musicology of performance: Theory and method based on Bach's solos for violin*. Cambridge: Open Book Publishers.
- Gardiner, J. E. (2013). *Music in the castle of heaven: A portrait of Johann Sebastian Bach*. London: Penguin Books.
- Geiringer, K. (in collaboration with I. Geiringer). (1966). *Johann Sebastian Bach: The culmination of an era*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Golomb, U. (2004). *Expression and meaning in Bach performance and reception: An examination of the B Minor Mass on record*. PhD dissertation, Cambridge University. <http://uri-golomb.com/files/golomburi.pdf>
- Golomb, U. (2005). Rhetoric and gesture in performances of the First Kyrie from Bach's Mass in B minor (BWV 232). *The Journal of Music and Meaning*, 3, sec. 4.1.1. www.musicandmeaning.net/issues/showArticle.php?artID=3.4
- Golomb, U. (2007). Performance in theory and in practice: Helmuth Rilling's interpretations of Bach's B minor Mass. *Orbis Musicae*, 14, 77-116. <http://www.tau.ac.il/arts/music/hebrew/Publications/download/Golomb.pdf>
- Golomb, U. (2013). Analysis, creativity and musical rhetoric in performances of the duet Et in Unum from Bach's B minor Mass, BWV 232. *Min-Ad: Israel Studies in Musicology Online*, Vol. 11, 22-40. <http://www.biu.ac.il/hu/mu/min-ad/13-11/02-Golomb-Et.pdf>

- Glöckner, A. (1990). Notes to a re-issue of the recording of Bach's Mass in B minor conducted by Lorin Maazel (1965; re-issue: Philips 426 657).
- Glöckner, A. (2010). On the performing forces of Johann Sebastian Bach's Leipzig church music. *Early Music* 38(2), 216-222.
- Glöckner, A. (2011). 'The ripienists must also be at least eight, namely two for each part': The Leipzig line of 1730 – some observations. *Early Music*, 39(4), 575-585.
- Gurlitt, W. (1951). Johann Sebastian Bach in seiner Zeit und Heute. In W. Vetter & E. H. Meyer (Eds.), and H. H. Eggebrecht (Bearbeitung), Bericht über die wissenschaftliche Bachtagung der Gesellschaft für Musikforschung (Leipzig 23. bis 26. Juli 1950) im *Auftrage des deutschen Bach-Ausschusses 1950* (pp. 51-80). Leipzig: C. F. Peters.
- Gurlitt, W. (1957 [1949]). *Johann Sebastian Bach: The master and his work*. Trans. O. C. Rupprecht. Saint Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House. Reproduced, with an introduction by K. Geiringer; New York: Da Capo Press. Originally published as Johann Sebastian Bach: Der Meister und sein Werk. Kassel and Basel: Bärenreiter.
- Harnoncourt, N. (1975 [1968]). Notes to the original LP release of his first recording of Mass in B minor. Hamburg: Telefunken-Decca, 1968 [reprinted 1975].
- Harnoncourt, N. (1989 [1984]). *The Musical dialogue: Thoughts on Monteverdi, Bach and Mozart*. Trans. M. O'Neill. Portland, Oregon: Amadeus Press. Originally published as *Der musikalische Dialog*. Salzburg and Vienna: Residenz Verlag.
- Hellmann, D. (1973). *Johann Sebastian Bach – Ende und Anfang: Gedenkschrift zum 75. Geburtstag des Thomaskantors Günter Ramin. Gedanken und Berichte aus der Arbeit eines Thomaskantors. Aufsätze zur Arbeit des Thomaskantors von H. H. Jahn, G. Stiller und W. Weismann*. Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel.
- Jones, G. G., & W. Bernd. (n.d.). Kretzschmar, Hermann. *Grove Music Online*. Oxford Music Online. Oxford University Press. Retrieved October 16, 2015, from <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/15523>
- Jochum, E. (c. 1990 [1965]). On the interpretation of Johann Sebastian Bach's St. Matthew Passion. Notes to his 1965 recording of the *Matthäus-Passion* (Philips Classics, re-issued c. 1990), pp. 22-31. Original, Zur Interpretation der *Matthäus-Passion* Johann Sebastian Bachs (*ibid.*, pp. 13-21).
- Kemp, L. (2016). *Sir John Eliot Gardiner returns to Bach's B minor Mass*. <http://www.gramophone.co.uk/feature/sir-john-eliot-gardiner-returns-to-bachs-b-minor-mass>. Originally published in *Gramophone*, November 2015.
- Kirnberger, J. P. (1982 [1771]). *The art of strict musical composition [Die Kunst des reinen Satzes in der Musik]*; Berlin, 1771]. Trans. D. Beach & J. Thym. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Klek, K. (2007). Ergänzung zur Missa tota BWV 232. In R. Ermans & S. Hiemke (Eds.), *Bachs lateinische Kirchenmusik: Das Handbuch* (pp. 312-347). Laaber: Laaber Verlag.
- Knijff, J.-P. (2007a). Performing Bach's B Minor Mass: Some notes by Heinrich Schenker. In Y. Tomita, E. Crean & I. Mills (Eds), *International Symposium: Understanding Bach's B minor Mass: Discussion book* vol. 1 (pp. 239-257). Belfast: Queen's University.
- Knijff, J.-P. (2007b). Performing Bach's Mass in B Minor: Some notes by Heinrich Schenker. *Bach Notes*, 8 , 1-3.
<https://www.americanbachsociety.org/Newsletters/BachNotes08.pdf>
- Kretzschmar, H. (1905). *Führer durch den Konzertsaal, II. Abteilung, erster Teil: Kirchliche*

- Werke. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel.
- Leech-Wilkinson, D. (2009). *The changing sound of music: Approaches to studying recorded musical performance*. London: CHARM.
<http://www.charm.rhul.ac.uk/studies/chapters/intro.html>
- Lloyd, R. (2007). Bach: Luther's musical prophet?" *Current Musicology*, 83, 5-32.
- Luongo, P. (2006). *Theodore Thomas's 1902 performance of Bach's B minor Mass: Working within the grand American festival*. Master's thesis, College of Music, Florida State University. <http://diginole.lib.fsu.edu/etd/994/>
- Luongo, P. (2007). Theodore Thomas's 1902 performance of Bach's Mass in B Minor: Working within the grand American festival. In Y. Tomita, E. Crean and I. Mills (Eds), *International Symposium: Understanding Bach's B minor Mass: Discussion book* vol. 1 (pp. 325-327). Belfast: Queen's University.
- Marshall, R. L. (2009). Belated thoughts on Bach's chorus. *Early Music America*, 24-28.
- Mellers, W. (1980). *Bach and the dance of God*. London: Faber & Faber.
- Newton, P. & D. Burgess. (2008). Exploring types of educational action research: Implications for research validity. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 7(4), 18-30.
- Parrott, A. (2000). *The essential Bach choir*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press.
- Parrott, A. (2010a). Vocal ripienists and J. S. Bach's Mass in B Minor. *Eighteenth-Century Music*, 7(1), 9-34.
- Parrott, A. (2010b). Bach's chorus: the Leipzig line – A response to Andreas Glöckner. *Early Music*, 38(2), 215-222.
- Parrott, A. (2010c). Bach's chorus: no change. *The Musical Times*, 151/1913, 4-6.
- Parrott, A. (2015). *Composers' intentions? Lost traditions of musical performance*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press.
- Parry, C. H. H. (1909). *Johann Sebastian Bach: The story of the development of a great personality*. New York: The Knickerbocker Press.
- Prout, E. (1876). Bach's Mass in B minor. *Musical Times*, 17, 487-490, 519-523, 553-555.
- Quantz, J. J. (1966 [1752]). *On playing the flute*. Trans. E. R. Reilly. London: Faber & Faber. Original as *Versuch einer Anweisung die Flöte traversiere zu spielen*. Berlin: Johann Friedrich Voss.
- Rifkin, J. (2002). *Bach's choral ideal*. Dortmunder Bach-Forschungen vol. 5. Dortmund: Klangfarben Musikverlag.
- Rifkin, J. (2010). Bach's chorus: against the wall. *Early Music*, 38(3), 437-439.
- Rifkin, J. (2012). Bach's chorus: more of the same. *Early Music*, 40(1), 165-166.
- Rilling, H. (1984). *Johann Sebastian Bach's B minor Mass*. Trans. G. Paine. Princeton, N. J.: Prestige Publications.
- Rilling, H. (2010). The Rilling discovery lectures: Credo. Lecture-concert delivered at the Beall Concert Hall, University of Oregon, July 2, 2010. Uploaded by the University of Oregon, January 7, 2013. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PZEQwMN2BNk>
- Schering, A. (1986 [1935]). *Musikalische Symbolkunde (The Theory of Musical Symbolism)*. Trans. E. Lippman. In E. Lippman, *Musical Aesthetics: A Historical Reader* (Stuyvesant, New York: Pendragon Press), vol. 3, pp. 185-205. Originally published in *Jahrbuch der Musikbibliothek Peters für 1935*.
- Schmalfeldt, J. (1985). On the relation of analysis to performance: Beethoven's Bagatelles

- Op. 126, nos. 2 and 5. *Journal of Music Theory*, 29, 1-32.
- Schmalfeldt, J. (2011). *In the process of becoming: Analytical and philosophical perspectives on form in early nineteenth-century music*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schmitz, A. (1950 [1976]). *Die Bildlichkeit der wortgebundenen Musik Johann Sebastian Bachs*. Mainz and London: Schott (reprinted by Laaber-Verlag).
- Schweitzer, A. (1911 [1908]). *Johann Sebastian Bach*. 2 volumes. Trans. E. Newman. Berlin: Breitkopf & Härtel.
- Sherman, B. D. (1997). *Inside early music: Conversations with performers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sherman, B. D. (2003). Conducting early music. In J. A. Bowen (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Conducting*, pp. 237-248. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stauffer, G. B. (1997). *Bach: The Mass in B Minor (The Great Catholic Mass)*. New York: Schirmer Books.
- Unger, H.-H. (1941). *Die Beziehungen zwischen Musik und Rhetorik im 16.-18. Jahrhundert. Musik und Geistesgeschichte: Berliner Studien zur Musikwissenschaft* (Herausgegeben von Prof. Dr. Arnold Schering), Band IV. Würzburg: Konrad Triltsch Verlag.
- Wolff, C. (2013). Past, present and future perspectives on Bach's B minor Mass. In Y. Tomita, R. A. Leaver & J. Smaczny (Eds.), *Exploring Bach's B minor Mass*, pp. 3-20. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wollny, P. (2009). *Beobachtungen am Autograph der h-Moll-Messe*. Bach-Jahrbuch 59, 135-147.
- Wood, H. J. (1910). *Analytical notes for the choristers on Bach's Mass in B minor*. Sheffield: J. W. Northend.

EDITIONS OF THE MASS IN B MINOR CONSULTED FOR THIS PAPER

- Damrosch, F. (c. 1927). Vocal score. New York: Schirmer.
- Goldschmidt, O. (1885). Choral parts. Prepared for the Bach Choir, London.
- Kretzschmar, H. (1899). Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel. Vocal score edited by J. Spengel.
- Rifkin, J. (2006). Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel.
- Smend, F. (1954). *Neue Ausgabe Sämtlicher Werke II/I*. Kassel: Bärenreiter.
- Sullivan, A. (1908). Vocal score. London: Novello.
- Volbach, F. [n.d.]. London: Eulenberg.
- Wolff, C. (1997). Frankfurt: C. F Peters.

DISCOGRAPHY

- Brüggen, F. (1989). Netherlands Chamber Choir, Orchestra of the 18th Century. Vredenburg, Utrecht. Philips 426 238-2; two CDs, issued 1990.
- Butt, J. (2009). Dunedin Consort & Players/ John Butt. Greyfriars Kirk, Edinburgh; 13-17 September 2009. Linn Records CKD 354; two SACDs, issued 2010.
- Gardiner, J. E. (1985). Monteverdi Choir, English Baroque Soloists/John Eliot Gardiner. All Saints' Church, Tooting, London; February 1985. Archiv Produktion 415 514-2; two CDs, issued 1985.
- Gardiner, J. E. (2015a) Monteverdi Choir, English Baroque Soloists/John Eliot Gardiner. LSO

- St. Luke's, London; 28-31 March 2015. Soli Deo Gloria SDG722; two CDs, issued 2015.
- Gardiner, J. E. (2015b) Monteverdi Choir, English Baroque Soloists/John Eliot Gardiner. Live concert. Philharmonie de Paris; 3 April, 2015. Produced by Ozango Productions and broadcast on Mezzo TV. Audio excerpt from this performance used with permission of Ozango Productions.
- Harnoncourt, N. (1968). Wiener Sängerknaben and Chorus Viennensis, Concentus Musicus Wien/ Nikolaus Harnoncourt. Casino Zögernitz, Vienna; April and May 1968. First catalogue number: Telefunken Das Alte Werk 3-Tel. SKH-20; three LPs, issued 1968. LP re-issue: Telefunken-Decca 6.35019-00-501; three LPs, issued 1975. CD re-issue: Teldec Das Alte Werk 4500-95517-2; two CDs, issued 1994.
- Harnoncourt, N. (1986). Arnold-Schönberg-Chor, Concentus Musicus Wien/Nikolaus Harnoncourt. Konzerthaus, Vienna; April 1986. Teldec Das Alte Werk 6.35716; two CDs, issued 1986.
- Hengelbrock, T. (1996). Balthasar-Neumann-Chor, Freiburger Barockorchester/Thomas Hengelbrock. Evangelische Kirche Gönningen; 4-10 October 1996. Deutsche Harmonia Mundi 05472 77380 2; two CDs, issued 1997.
- Herreweghe, P. (1988) Chorus and Orchestra of the Collegium Vocale Ghent/Philippe Herreweghe. Minderbroederskerk, Ghent; April 1988. Virgin Veritas VCD 7 90757-2; two CDs, issued 1989.
- Herreweghe, P. (1996) Chorus and Orchestra of the Collegium Vocale Ghent/Philippe Herreweghe. Abbaye aux Dames, Saintes; July 1996. Catalogue number: Harmonia Mundi France HMC 901614.15; two CDs, issued 1998.
- Hickox, R. (1992). Collegium Musicum 90/Richard Hickox. St. Jude's Church, London; 11-13 and 15-16 June 1992. Chandos Chaconne CHAN 0533; 2 CDs, issued 1992.
- Jochum, E. (1955). Chor des Bayerischen Rundfunks, Symphonie-Orchester des Bayerischen Rundfunks/Eugen Jochum. Live recording. Munich; June 9, 1955. Gala GL-100661; four CDs, issued 2008.
- Jochum, E. (1957). Chor des Bayerischen Rundfunks, Symphonie-Orchester des Bayerischen Rundfunks/ Eugen Jochum. Munich; December 1957. First catalogue numbers: Epic (S)C-6027/Fontana CFL1028-9; two LPs, issued 1958. CD re-issue: Philips Duo 438 379-2; two CDs, issued 1993.
- Jochum, E. (1980). Chor des Bayerischen Rundfunks, Symphonie-Orchester des Bayerischen Rundfunks/ Eugen Jochum. Herkulesaal, Munich; March and April 1980. First catalogue number: EMI-Angel DS-3904; three LPs, issued 1980. CD re-issue: EMI Double Forte 5 68640 2; two CDs, issued 1995.
- Junghänel, K. (2003). Cantus Cölln/ Konrad Junghänel. St. Osdag Church, Neustadt-Mandelsloh; February 2003. Harmonia Mundi HMC 01813.14; two SACDs, issued 2003.
- Karajan, H. v. (1952). Chor der Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde, Wien; Orchester der Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde, Wien (choruses), Philharmonia Orchestra (arias and duets)/ Herbert von Karajan. Musikvereinsaal, Vienna (choruses) and London (arias and duets); 26 October – 5 November 1952. First catalogue number: EMI-Angel 3500 C (35015-6-7); three LPs, issued 1954. CD re-issue: EMI Classics 5 67207 2 5; two CDs, issued 1999.
- Karajan, H. v. (1974). Wiener Singverein, Berliner Philharmoniker/Herbert von Karajan. Philharmonie, Berlin; September and November 1973, January 1974. First catalogue number: Deutsche Grammophon 2709049; three LPs, issued 1974. CD re-issue: Deutsche

Grammophon 459 460-2; two CDs, issued 1999.

Klemperer, O. (1967). BBC Chorus, New Philharmonia Orchestra/ Otto Klemperer. Kingsway Hall, London; September and October 1967. First catalogue number: EMI-Angel SC-3720; three LPs, issued 1968. CD re-issue: EMI CMS 7 63364 2; two CDs, issued 1990.

Kuijken, S. (2008). La Petite Bande/ Sigiswald Kuijken. San Lorenzo de El Escorial, Spain; 16-19 March 2008. Challenge Classics CC72316; two SACDs, issued 2009.

Parrott, A. (1984). Taverner Consort & Players/Andrew Parrott. St. John Smith's Square, London; 4-5 and 10-15 September 1984. EMI Reflexe 7 47293 8; two CDs, issued 1985.

Shaw, R. (1960). Robert Shaw Chorale & Orchestra/Robert Shaw. Manhattan Center, New York; 6, 7, 9, 12-17 June 1960. First catalogue number: RCM Victor LM 6157 (mono) LSC 6157 (stereo); three LPs, issued 1961. CD re-issue: RCA Victor Living Stereo 09026 63529 2; two CDs, issued 1999.

Rifkin, J. (1982). Bach Ensemble/Joshua Rifkin. Rutgers Presbyterian Church, New York; 31 December 1981—11 January 1982. Nonesuch 9 79036-2; two CDs, issued after 1982.

Rilling, H. (1977). Gächinger Kantorei Stuttgart, Bach-Collegium Stuttgart/Helmuth Rilling. Stuttgart; April 1977. CBS 79 307; three LPs, issued 1977. CD re-issue: CBS Odyssey MB2K 45615; two CDs, issued 1989.

Rilling, H. (1988). Gächinger Kantorei Stuttgart, Stuttgarter Kammerorchester/Helmuth Rilling. Ludwigsburg, Kirche der Karlshöhe; May 1988. Intercord INT 885 855; two CDs, issued 1988.

Rilling, H. (1999). Gächinger Kantorei Stuttgart, Bach-Collegium Stuttgart/ Helmuth Rilling. Stadthalle Sindelfingen; March 1999. Hänssler Edition Bachakademie, vol. 70 (CD 92.070); two CDs, issued 1999.

Uri Golomb studied at Tel Aviv University (BA), Levinsky College of Education, Tel Aviv (M-Teach), King's College London (MMus) and Cambridge University (PhD). He wrote his doctoral dissertation, *Expression and Meaning in Bach Performance and Reception: An Examination of the B minor Mass on Record*, under the supervision of Prof. John Butt (now at Glasgow University) and Dr Geoffrey Webber; his doctoral research was partly supported by the British Library Sound Archive's Edison Fellowship. He later returned to Cambridge under the auspices of a British Academy Visiting Fellowship, hosted by Prof. Nicholas Cook, to commence a research project currently titled *The Fifth Evangelist, the Abstract Mathematician and the Compleat Musician: Re-Creating Bach's Vocal Music in the Age of Recordings*. Dr Golomb is an editor and presenter at 'Kan Voice of Music' – the classical music radio station of Kan – Israel Broadcasting Corporation. For more details, see: <http://cantab.academia.edu/UriGolomb>
Email: uri.golomb@cantab.net