

HARRY WHITE

Johann Joseph Fux and the Musical Discourse of Servitude

Beyond the purview of specialised studies, and indeed of conference proceedings such as these, it is scarcely an exaggeration to remark that the music of Johann Joseph Fux, has, for the most part, remained a stranger to reception history. Insofar as Fux figures at all in the narrative of European art music, he does so as the author of the *Gradus ad Parnassum* (1725), a work whose long afterlife in musical pedagogy has concealed without much further comment the wider historical significance not only of Fux himself but of that vast enterprise of musical service, composition, and performance which characterised and radically shaped the cultural, political and religious life of Vienna during the first half of the eighteenth century. Of course I do not for a moment deny the scholarly transmission of Fux's musical works in this judgement: these proceedings, for example, are an important and welcome manifestation of this abiding scholarship, but the truth remains implacably the case that history—including musical history—has drawn a veil over the Viennese Baroque.¹ This is despite the vigour of the Early Music industry, the meticulous retrieval of individual scholars (some of whom are represented in this publication, but all of whom belong to a veritable tradition of curatorial and bibliographical inquiry that reaches back to the catalogues and biographical studies of Ludwig von Köchel). It is also in spite of an almost insatiable appetite for companions, dictionaries, guides, and handbooks of every conceivable kind devoted to the history of eighteenth-century music. It is by no means an exceptional state of affairs to read in Richard Taruskin's monumental (and comparatively recent) history of western music, for example, a stupendously detailed account of early eighteenth-century music which nevertheless manages to eclipse the Viennese Baroque in its entirety, despite the self-evident magnitude and prominence of music at the imperial court during this period, to say nothing of the prominence of the Viennese court in the political regulation of Europe during the whole of the eighteenth cen-

¹ For an indication of the range and nature of this scholarship, see Ingrid Schubert, 'Bibliographie des Fux Schrifttums/A Fux Bibliography', in H. White (ed.), *Johann Joseph Fux and the Music of the Austro-Italian Baroque* (Aldershot, 1992), 262–319; Harry White, 'Fux, Johann Joseph', in *New Grove II* [with worklist by Thomas Hochradner].

tury.² Carl Dahlhaus (whose own magisterial engagement with the art music of Europe also eclipses the Viennese Baroque) once implied that it is very difficult to write a *history* of music that is also a history of *music*, and in that formulation he touched upon a problem which illuminates the characteristic condition of this neglect.³

Of course, Vienna does occasionally receive its due (if only in those collected volumes and surveys to which I have adverted here),⁴ but I want to argue that the failure of intellectual assimilation (to say little of critical inquiry) with regard to music in Vienna stems in significant measure from a reception history which is shaped by considerations of the individual musical work at the expense of musical meaning on a wider scale, particularly in relation to cultural history. As Dahlhaus himself acknowledged, there is always a tension between our obligations to understand music as a cultural process and our aesthetic impulse to curate, edit, perform, and write about individual compositions. The scholarly transmission of music is one thing; the collective will to rehabilitate and to enjoy musical works is something else. Even where music history is governed by a fundamentally extra-musical idea (for example, the idea that the cultivation of Austro-German music stems from a collective will towards organic idealism), the musical work, the great work, will almost invariably prevail.⁵ Music historians, even when they wish to impugn a tradition, rarely escape the impulse to dwell on a canon of individual and exemplary works. The result of this tendency is that a great deal of music, specifically with regard to its cultural and political meaning, tends to get left in the shade. If this happens on a sufficiently wide scale, our reception and understanding of music in any given historical period is, to say the least of it, diminished.

My own interest in the Viennese Baroque and in the music of Fux in particular, extends back almost thirty years, although my work as a musicologist within the past seventeen years has largely been concerned with the cultural history of music in Ireland. Nevertheless, my interest in Vienna

² See Richard Taruskin, *The Oxford History of Western Music* (New York, 2005). Although Johann Joseph Fux makes a fleeting appearance in Taruskin's narrative, there is no account of Vienna as a centre of musical engagement before the early classic period.

³ See Carl Dahlhaus, *Nineteenth-Century Music* (Berkeley, California, 1989), 7.

⁴ The recently published *Cambridge History of Eighteenth-Century Music*, edited by Simon Keefe (Cambridge, 2009) offers a promising assessment of Austrian Catholic church music by Jen-yen Chen.

⁵ Thus an indictment of German idealism and a tendency nevertheless to focus on the individual musical work are both active and continuously present throughout Taruskin's *Oxford History of Western Music*.

during these seventeen years has abided, notwithstanding my time-consuming preoccupation with a very different mode of cultural history, so that I have long wanted to press home an idea I identified as long ago as 1997 in relation to Fux and Bach. It is the exposition of this idea which concerns me in this paper, an idea which I have formulated as ‘the musical discourse of servitude’. I have provided here an outline⁶—a table of contents, really—of the book which I am now (at last) researching in fulfilment of this idea, which if it succeeds might address and even partially resolve the problem of reception history with which I have begun here. It is as well to be brave in writing cultural history (that much I know), and in any case—as I shall explain in a moment—I am already conscious of the fact that the idea itself is somehow in circulation, even if its reception among musicologists is as yet vestigial.⁷

My first inkling that there might be merit in identifying compositional practice in the Viennese Baroque as a musical discourse of servitude, that is to say, as a practice informed or illuminated by a cardinal principle or theory of culture, occurred to me when I wrote an essay (in 1997) in response to Lydia Goehr’s seminal monograph entitled *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works*.⁸ It is hardly necessary for me to rehearse the ideas so brilliantly developed in Goehr’s work in this context, except to remark that one of these ideas, apostrophised in the assertion that ‘Bach did not intend to compose musical works,’ struck me as a serious misreading, however much it contributed to Goehr’s now widely accepted location of autonomy as a governing principle of musical practice after the French Revolution.⁹ I argued instead that the late works of Bach not only affirmed beyond any reasonable doubt his own awareness of a work-based practice which vitally conferred autonomy upon compositions such as the Mass in B Minor, the Musical Offering and the Matthew Passion (to name three obvious instances), but that they also identified by contrast a normative practice which was otherwise, and which I described as the ‘authority concept’, a term derived from Goehr’s ‘work concept’ and used in apposition with it. I then went on to argue that a composer like Fux, whose entire life’s work was governed by principles

⁶ See appendix I below.

⁷ See, for example, Nicholas Cook, *The Schenker Project. Culture, Race and Music Theory in Fin-de-Siècle Vienna* (Oxford, 2007), 189, in which this idea of musical servitude in relation to Vienna is summarised from an unpublished lecture which I delivered in Munich in 2002.

⁸ See Harry White, “‘If It’s Baroque, Don’t Fix It’: Reflections on Lydia Goehr’s “Work-Concept” and the Historical Integrity of Musical Composition’, *Acta Musicologica* 69 (1997), 94–104.

⁹ See Lydia Goehr, *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works* (Oxford, 1991), 8.

vested in such a concept of authority, nevertheless meditated—at least from time to time—on the self-standing authority of his own compositions.¹⁰ Fux did this without violation to those related concepts of license, political authority, generic jurisdiction, and stylistic ordinance which controlled his musical imagination. It was not particularly novel or controversial of me to identify these concepts, but I was curious about the possibility of relating authority and autonomy so that these would remain answerable to compositional practice and the dissemination of music in eighteenth-century Europe, specifically in relation to Fux and Bach. In other words, I was in search of a theory of musical culture that would allow for some degree of continuity between authority and autonomy, rather than insist upon their irreconcilability. I was also in search of a continuity of musical practice between Vienna and Leipzig and between Fux and Bach. I discovered that this theory arose most easily (and persuasively) when it was grounded in musical practice rather than imposed from without. I also began to perceive that continuity between musical servitude and musical autonomy was a more likely (and more durable) perception of cultural meaning with regard to the High Baroque as a whole, rather than some violent disruption between these two.

This question of continuity between Fux and Bach would become vital (at least for me), but before I address it here, I need to acknowledge, however briefly, other ideas about music at the Habsburg court which led me to pursue the concept of musical servitude. Three books in particular appeared to prompt and then validate the general currency of this concept. The first was Robert Freeman, *Opera with Drama: Currents of Change in Italian Opera, 1675–1725* (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1981); the second was Ivan Nagel, *Autonomy and Mercy, Reflections on Mozart's Operas* (Cambridge, Mass., 1991); and the third was Steven Saunders, *Cross, Sword and Lyre: Sacred Music at the Imperial Court of Ferdinand II of Habsburg, 1619–1637* (Oxford, 1995), which I read and reviewed in 1996.¹¹ In all three cases, but especially in Freeman and Saunders, I could detect what amounted to a general principle of servitude insofar as the production and performance of music at the Habsburg court were concerned. The impact of this principle, was, unsurprisingly, differently read in each case: for Freeman, the top-down structure of musical drama as a rigidly hierarchical mode of civil service produced a state of affairs in which ‘musical drama would remain in a comatose condi-

¹⁰ Fux does precisely this in the *Gradus ad Parnassum* (Vienna, 1725), when he adverts (in the character of the teacher, Aloysius) to certain of his own compositions as exemplars of technique, style, and expression in church music.

¹¹ *Music and Letters* 77/ 4 (November 1996), 601–603.

tion for decades'.¹² For Saunders, by contrast, sacred music in the early seventeenth century could be read as 'the eloquent embodiment of Ferdinand II's entire belief system',¹³ a more positive reading, certainly, although one that did not attempt to eclipse the same subordination of musical discourse to political and religious propaganda. In both books, moreover—and here one might also enlist a more general knowledge of music at the imperial court which dates from the late nineteenth century—the corporate nature of Habsburg musical discourse, its public, social and (proverbially) imperial essence was an unmistakably fundamental consideration. No less fundamental was the intimacy between political and religious authority, a point to which I will return.

But it was Nagel's book, in which the whole culture of the Viennese Baroque is viewed, as it were, from the retrospective position of the Enlightenment, which finally persuaded me, when I read it again in relation to Goehr, that a concept of musical servitude might be sufficiently strong to characterise the nature of Habsburg baroque musical culture without distorting the specific quality of its genius. The suggestive quality of Nagel's insights, particularly with regard to what he terms 'the baroque cosmos of power', 'the chalice of innermost meaning', and 'the virtuoso of submissiveness' has without question licensed my own deliberations on how the music of Fux and his composer colleagues in Vienna might speak more clearly to our reception of the High Baroque than has hitherto been the case.¹⁴ Such phrases, moreover, also prompted me to undertake the challenge of defining more narrowly the concept of a European musical imagination in the first half of the eighteenth century.

It is this question of musical imagination that returns me to the continuity which a discourse of musical servitude affords to Fux and Bach. A social

¹² Robert Freeman, *Opera without Drama: Currents of Change in Italian Opera, 1675 to 1725, and the Roles Played therein by Zeno, Caldara, and Others* (Ph.D. thesis, Univ. Princeton, 1967), 225. This is Freeman's drastic conclusion with respect to the impact of Apostolo Zeno in particular on the development of musical drama at the imperial court in Vienna.

¹³ Steven Saunders, *Cross, Sword, and Lyre: Sacred Music at the Imperial Court of Ferdinand II of Habsburg (1619–1637)* (Oxford, 1995), 224.

¹⁴ Ivan Nagel, *Autonomy and Mercy: Reflections on Mozart's Operas* (Cambridge, MA, 1991), 10, uses the first of these phrases to characterise the world-view to which Mozart returned (perforce) in his setting of *La Clemenza di Tito*, a libretto written in 1734 by Metastasio; 'the chalice of innermost meaning' (4) denotes for Nagel the value-system of a 'high culture' which restricts its repertory to masterpieces, and 'virtuoso of submissiveness' (9) is Nagel's description of the imperial poet in general (and Metastasio in particular).

theory of music, even when it is firmly grounded in historical awareness, will not last very long if it is contradicted at every turn by the music itself or if it stands aloof from any real engagement with the nature of musical discourse as this is manifested in a given period, and in my case in the period 1700–1750.

It is comparatively easy, I think, to adduce the servile condition of musical production as a norm in Europe during the High Baroque, given the plain evidence which the imperial music chapel in Vienna affords, with its corporate retinue of poets, composers, singers, instrumentalists, and stage designers, and its no less corporate approach to the transmission and preservation of musical works through the agency of its copyists and other personnel. It is likewise fair comment to advance the direct line of succession, as it were, from emperor, to *Musik-Oberdirektor*, to *Hofkapellmeister* in the production of this music, and to argue the central importance of music in the embodiment of an entire belief system, right down to specific considerations of genre, style, and musical content which, in Vienna at least, governed the nature of musical discourse in every conceivable respect. But if these considerations do amount to a discourse of servitude, we should expect to find copious evidence of this in the music itself. A hint of this discovery was intimated by Hellmut Federhofer when he observed many years ago that Italian innovations, once introduced into the imperial court, were tenaciously retained.¹⁵ Indeed, one of the most prominent features of musical servitude which Vienna affords during the High Baroque is precisely grounded in the Court's approach to musical style, as when Leopold I radically reformed and repopulated the imperial music chapel between 1693 and 1700, with the result that a sea-change occurred in the kind of music it produced, after decades of conservatism.¹⁶ Thereafter, however, the new dispensations of contemporary Italian practice would remain unchanged for almost 50 years. Something very similar, indeed, had happened with the appointment of Antonio Draghi to the court in 1658 (although he did not succeed as *Hofkapellmeister* until 1682). Rudolf Schnitzler has remarked that throughout the course of his lengthy career at court, Draghi showed little interest in stylistic development or innovation, particularly within the framework of his sacred dramatic works. Schnitzler significantly adds that this feature can be

¹⁵ See Hellmut Federhofer, 'Austria', *New Grove*.

¹⁶ The appointment in particular of younger composers to the imperial court, including Carlo Agostino Badia (1694), Giovanni Bononcini (1697), Johann Joseph Fux (1698), and Marc'Antonio Ziani (1700) in the closing years of Leopold's reign was the cause of this striking modernisation.

imputed to the Emperor's enduring preference for a musical status quo (at least until he replaced it with another one).¹⁷

But of course a status quo in musical terms is by no means unique to Vienna during the High Baroque. On the contrary, it is this very condition of generic and stylistic conservatism which allowed the production of so much music across Europe, even if we are more inclined today to diagnose regional variations and personal interventions in the matter of style (as in the case of Bach), rather than sacrifice the concept of an individual musical imagination to a social theory of musical production. I don't think we should make that sacrifice either, but I do think that the concept of a musical imagination gains in historical force when it is informed by considerations of discourse, especially when these considerations obtain so strongly in the very *raison d'être* of the music itself.

The music itself: in Vienna, certainly, the sheer magnitude and volume of musical production is so overwhelming that one might be forgiven for resigning the search for principles of musical discourse in favour of a more contained mode of musicological inquiry, such as the production of a *Gesamtausgabe* that preserves this magnitude intact.¹⁸ I don't believe, in truth, that there is any inherent tension between such empirical enterprises and whatever value may attach to the kind of cultural history I am embarked upon, provided the differences between them are recognized, and, I might add, respected. But I do believe that in either case the music takes precedence, so that a monograph which seeks to understand the Viennese Baroque as a formative expression of generic and stylistic servitude specifically in relation to concepts of authority, autonomy, and imagination, requires a musically grounded dialectic (as between, for example, Fux and Bach, Vienna and Leipzig, authority and autonomy, servitude and imagination). In order to construct this dialectic, I have identified the domain of sacred music as one which allows me to survey the behaviour of generic, formal, and stylistic categories in Vienna in relation to Leipzig. It almost goes without

¹⁷ See Rudolf Schnitzler and Herbert Seifert, 'Draghi, Antonio', *New Grove II*.

¹⁸ The desirability of complete editions, which often take decades to conclude (as in the *Johann Joseph Fux Gesamtausgabe*, begun in 1959 and as yet unfinished) must be set against the apparent incapacity of such editions to stimulate a cultural history equal to the amount of music which these editions represent. In the case of Vienna, this contrast is especially striking. Nevertheless, we must contrast in turn the rich availability of the music in Fux's case (which his *Gesamtausgabe* allows) with the dearth of modern editions in respect of composers such as Antonio Caldara, Giuseppe Porsile and Francesco Bartolomeo Conti, to name three very important contemporaries of Fux at the imperial court.

saying (but I had better say so in any case), that many of these categories also obtain with central force in other domains of musical practice (so that the musical relationship between sacred and secular drama in Vienna, which is very intimate in any case, extends to a notable degree of intimacy between the Viennese oratorio and the Lutheran cantata, for example).

These preliminaries take me, at last, to the design of my argument which is outlined in the section headings provided in appendix I. There are seven of these in all, and each of them is intended to apostrophise (in one case rather cryptically) the stages of this investigation as it is intended to unfold. The first of them, 'The Apparatus of Reception: Reading the High Baroque' (appendix I, heading 1), designates the elaboration of a context for this argument which derives (albeit selectively) from reception history, and more particularly from a European reception history which has had a lot to say about Bach but very little about Fux. Appendix II below offers three characteristic examples of this reception history over a very long span of time.¹⁹ The trajectory of these readings, which can be grasped by contrasting Charles Burney's conviction in 1789 that Bach would have been a much better composer had he sacrificed the 'unmeaning art and contrivance' of his music to popular taste with Tim Blanning's assertion in 2008 that 'No art for art's sake was to be found in the Karlskirche, or any other Baroque building for that matter. Nor was it to be found in the Church of St Thomas in Leipzig when Bach's St Matthew Passion was being performed,' rather graphically illustrates the motivations for a study such as this one.²⁰ Burney's Bach is an introverted obscurantist who could have been so much better if he had accommodated himself to public taste, and Blanning's Bach is not much more than a gifted servant of Lutheran orthodoxy. But in any case, what I would draw your attention to here is not so much Blanning's Bach, as Blanning's Fux. If ever I received a wake-up call to attend without further delay to this book, it was when I read Blanning's *The Triumph of Music* early in 2009. To discover Johann Joseph Fux in the same company as Robbie Williams and Leona Lewis (winner of the *X Factor* [a very popular British television talent contest] in 2006) was a strange surprise. To find them in the same *chapter*, where Fux is the musical agent—indeed, the slave, no less—of absolutism,

¹⁹ It is perhaps necessary to add that Burney, Goehr, and Blanning here represent a much wider tradition of reception history in relation to early eighteenth-century music which collectively throws my own argument for a continuity of discourse between servitude and autonomy into sharp relief.

²⁰ See Charles Burney, *A General History of Music* (London, 1789), iv, 595 and Tim Blanning, *The Triumph of Music* (London, 2008), 122–172, at 123.

and Williams the musical embodiment of emancipation, the very triumph of popular culture, rather sharply suggested to me that the significance not only of Fux but of the Viennese High Baroque was long overdue for recognition in terms of early eighteenth-century musical discourse. Slaves and servants Fux and Bach may be, at least in the context of a cultural history such as Blanning's,²¹ but in relation to each other, they give evidence of a vigorous and supremely well-defined musical practice that establishes a continuum between servitude and autonomy. That continuum is the preoccupation of the book outlined here.

The second section (see appendix I, heading 2) seeks to establish Vienna as the *locus classicus* for a discourse of musical servitude through the evidence which the records of the imperial music chapel so copiously afford. The strictly occasional nature of musical practice in Vienna, the adoption of a highly prescriptive relationship between generic categories and the requirements of the church service (to look no further than that), and the profoundly hierarchical nature of allocation, composition, and performance of music, produced a corporate style of musical discourse which is reflected in the pre-eminence of generic requirements and achieved forms through which this music was expressed. In pursuing the relationship between the tyranny and exactitude of formal prescription and the prestige of corporate expression which shaped musical practice in Vienna, a typology of servitude begins to emerge. One obvious (if neglected) example of this typology lies in the almost complete disappearance of Fux's autograph scores in the transmission of his music. Fux's music was meticulously preserved through the agency of court copies, deposited in the imperial library and retrieved again and again for subsequent performances. The corporate nature of this preservation and transmission is itself strongly suggestive of the subordination of individual style to the requirements of imperial and religious propaganda. The contrast with the transmission of Bach's music, in which autographs are the norm rather than the exception, could scarcely be stronger.²² This typology of servitude finds its keenest expression in the construction of sacred musical drama, above all in the jurisdiction of the *Da Capo* aria, a formal

²¹ Blanning's opening chapter begins with a section entitled 'The Musician as Slave and Servant' (*The Triumph of Music*, 7–16).

²² This contrast in musical transmission, as between court copy and autograph, is one which vitally extends to the question of compositional voice in Vienna (and Leipzig). Jen-yen Chen's recent work on the 'virtue' masses of Fux and Caldara at the imperial court (q.v. Chen's contribution to these proceedings) encouragingly supports my own reading of musical servitude in relation to Fux's sacred-dramatic works, as below.

category which occupies a central place in this study (see appendix I, headings 3 and 4). When I borrow Ivan Nagel's term for the imperial court poet, 'The Virtuoso of Submissiveness,' to describe Fux's musical practice in the third section, I do so specifically in relation to this form. I once described the Da Capo aria as the black hole in the baroque musical universe, because its ubiquity as a musical consideration, and its extraordinarily far-reaching formal presence throughout the High Baroque both stand in inverse proportion to the very limited scholarly attention it has received. (There is a wider argument about the reception of the Da Capo in musicology which stands behind this study, but that is for another day).²³ As a form, the Da Capo inevitably involves us in literary as well as musical considerations (it is prescribed in the first instance by the court poet), but it also needs to be restored (as it is here) to the centre of musical gravity. There are two reasons for this: it is the principal conduit of vocal music in sacred drama in Vienna; it is also the principal solo vocal form with which Bach engages in his church cantatas (and elsewhere, of course). In the Da Capo aria lies, I think, strong evidence for the continuous nature of servitude in relation to autonomy, as the form travels outwards from the imperial centre, as it were, to the civic provinces. But in contrasting 'the Virtuoso of Submissiveness' (Fux) to the 'Virtuoso of Wilfulness' (Bach) through the agency of this central musical practice, I want to emphasise the 'Virtuoso' in either case, as well as the difference between them. Lawrence Dreyfuss has described Bach's musical practice as one which *intervenes* against the ideas of style which he receives, and there is little doubt that as a composer Bach's interventions in the *Urform* of the Da Capo are extremely wilful indeed.²⁴ But the converse is also true: if Fux invariably submits to the formal jurisdiction of the full Da Capo (and he does), this does not prevent him from exercising an expressive degree of autonomous practice within the form. My evidence for this lies fairly securely—if very selectively—in the *Sepolcro* oratorios which Fux wrote between 1716 and 1728. And in both cases (i.e. Fux and Bach), the abiding presence of the form as an exemplary structure controls the musical

²³ Insofar as the Da Capo aria *has* received attention, the work of scholars such as Norbert Dubowy, Stephen Crist, and Michael Talbot has proved vital to my own understanding of this pervasive and crucial form.

²⁴ See Laurence Dreyfuss, *Bach and the Patterns of Invention* (Cambridge, MA, 1996). Stephen Crist has observed that of 700 extant arias by Bach, only 170 adhere to the full-blown Da Capo repeat. See Crist, 'J. S. Bach and the Conventions of the Da Capo Aria, or How Original was Bach?', in Patrick F. Devine and Harry White (eds.), *The Maynooth International Musicological Conference 1995: Selected Proceedings, Part One* (Irish Musical Studies, 4) (Dublin, 1996), 71–85, at 73.

imagination and delimits it. This presence, too, supports the case for a continuity between servitude and autonomy. For Fux, the Da Capo is the terminus of musical authority: he invariably submits to its formal jurisdictions. For Bach, it is an *Urform*, a point of departure, and a springboard for his own musical imagination.

I will pass over the fifth heading in appendix I, *Barrabam*, almost in silence (it is good to hold something back). But I would remark that this Bachian reference is meant to connote a decisive moment of transition between servitude and autonomy which allows us to distinguish one from the other in a defining way.

The penultimate section, ‘The Autonomy of B Minor: Fux, Bach, and the Mass Ordinary’ (appendix I, heading 6) returns us to the question of genre. We have about 100 settings of the Mass ordinary by Fux (Thomas Hochradner will confirm or correct this number in his forthcoming catalogue, but not, I hope, to the extent that it disturbs my argument).²⁵ We have one setting by Bach.²⁶ We also have some 200 cantatas, of course, to say nothing of at least 100 lost works in this genre. The sheer number of works in any given genre is expressive of that genre’s behaviour (locally and across time: witness the general law of diminishing numbers and extended forms which governs the symphony between 1760 and 1820, for example), but in the case of Fux and Bach the numerical contrast matters for a different reason. The generic behaviour of Fux’s masses *in toto*—including (once again) their occasional status, their careful adherence to pre-ordained categories of style and scoring, and (for the most part) their expressly liturgical function—is almost (but not entirely) irrelevant to the compilation and composition of the Mass in B Minor. Indeed, the contrast between Fux and Bach in this regard is so striking and obvious that this contrast itself might be used graphically to indicate the difference between a musical discourse of servitude and of autonomy, to say nothing of the difference between 100 and 1. But the student of Fux’s masses will also know that the symbolic and expressive autonomy of Bach’s mass does not exist in some kind of mystical vacuum, but rather *that it achieves this autonomy precisely through the agency of compositional techniques which are already latent in Fux*. The extremity, and hence the autonomy, of Bach’s musical imagination depends at every

²⁵ See Professor Hochradner’s report on his forthcoming catalogue of the works of Johann Joseph Fux in this volume.

²⁶ I exclude here the four ‘Lutheran’ masses (settings of the Kyrie and Gloria), all of which are re-workings of cantata originals, as well as earlier versions of individual movements later combined in the Mass in B Minor.

turn on its acknowledgement of a musical discourse with which it so radically engages. When Bach exhausts a genre to breaking point—and he does this systematically in the later phases of his career—his various departures throw into sharp relief those musical practices which he leaves behind. Autonomy is a relative concept: without a corresponding servitude it doesn't count for much. But the scale, compositional accumulation, and even the *key* of B minor in Bach's single setting collectively speak to a musical discourse which is significantly distinct from the corporate practice which Fux (and his composer colleagues in Vienna) define.

My final section, with its Fuxian flourish (appendix I, heading 7), I will also leave without much comment, but I cannot close this brief overview without admitting that the challenge of constructing a theory of musical culture that holds Fux and Bach in apposition and establishes a continuum of servitude and autonomy without denigrating one or exaggerating the other is very much alive in my mind. Considerations of space prevent me here from exposing this challenge further. So let me close instead on a humorous note: with a Limerick that Reinhard Strohm composed for me impromptu when I first told him about this project over ten years ago:

There once was a scholar of Fux
 Who had written some very good books.
 Now he has an idea
 Which we should not fear:
 Let's just hope it's as good as it looks.

Amen to that.

APPENDIX I

*The Musical Discourse of Servitude.
Fux, Bach, and the European Musical Imagination, 1700–1750*

Outline

1. The Apparatus of Reception: Reading the High Baroque
2. The Tyranny of Genre and the Lustre of Servitude: Vienna
3. The Virtuoso of Submissiveness: Fux and the Da Capo Aria
4. The Virtuoso of Wilfulness: Bach and the Da Capo Aria
5. *Barrabam*
6. The Autonomy of B minor: Fux, Bach, and the Mass Ordinary
7. Steps to Parnassus: Authority, Autonomy, and the European Musical Imagination

APPENDIX II

Readings

1. If Sebastian Bach and his admirable son Emanuel, instead of being musical directors in commercial cities, had been fortunately employed to compose for the stage and public of great capitals, such as Naples, Paris, or London, and for performers of the first class, they would doubtless have simplified their style more to the level of their judges; the one would have sacrificed all unmeaning art and contrivance, and the other been less fantastical and *recherché*, and both, by writing in a style more popular, and generally intelligible and pleasing, would have extended their fame, and been indisputably the greatest musicians of the present century. (Charles Burney, *A General History of Music*, 1789)
2. Bach did not intend to compose musical works. (Lydia Goehr, *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works*, 1991)
3. No art for art's sake was to be found in the Karlskirche, or any other Baroque building for that matter. Nor was it to be found in the Church of St Thomas in Leipzig when Bach's St Matthew Passion was being performed [...]. In just three centuries we have gone from Fux's *Missa San Carlo* [sic] in the Karlskirche in Vienna to *Angels* [the name of Robbie Williams 'biggest hit to date'] at Knebworth. The religious terminology of these two musical illustrations is more than coincidence. Sticking with

our earlier conclusion that music is the religion of the people, we can go further now and state that the stadiums and arenas used for rock concerts are the cathedrals of the modern age. (Tim Blanning, *The Triumph of Music*, 2008)