

The *Fundamenta compositionis* Jean Kuhnau 1703

Edition, Translation, and Commentary

Frederik Kranemann, Derek Remeš

Until now, scholars have generally doubted whether Johann Kuhnau, J. S. Bach's predecessor as *Thomaskantor* in Leipzig, was indeed the author of the manuscript treatise, *Fundamenta Compositionis Jean Kuhnau 1703*. Nevertheless the *Fundamenta* appears to originate from the *Thomasschule* around 1700, suggesting that it may stem from Kuhnau's broader circle. Moreover, recent research has revealed concordances between the *Fundamenta* and an anonymous manuscript titled *Kurtze Verfaßung* ("Brief Instruction"), in addition to a number of other sources. Thus, regardless of who compiled the *Fundamenta*, this manuscript is significant because it reveals the pedagogical priorities, or "fundamentals" (according to the title), that often lie buried in more discursive, theoretical treatises. Therefore the ultimate value of the *Fundamenta* is not its originality, but rather its explication of topics such as consonance and dissonance, modes, *clausulae*, cadences, invertible counterpoint, and fugue in a highly condensed, practical manner with numerous musical examples. The *Fundamenta* is thus an excellent resource for historically informed analysis and composition at the turn of the eighteenth century, before thoroughbass accompaniment displaced vocal polyphony as the dominant pedagogical paradigm in compositional instruction. Part one of this article explores the *Fundamenta's* provenance in detail; part two provides a transcription and English translation.

Schlagworte/Keywords: archival studies; Archivforschung; compositional theory; Georg Österreich; Heinrich Bokemeyer; Johann Kuhnau; Satzlehre

German Commentary by Frederik Kranemann, translated into English by Derek Remeš.

Edition edited and translated by Derek Remeš

COMMENTARY

The following is the first complete edition of the *Fundamenta Compositionis Jean Kuhnau 1703* ("Johann Kuhnau's Fundamentals of Composition 1703") in the Berlin Staatsbibliothek (RISM signature D-B) under the signature Mus. ms. autogr. theor. Kuhnau, J. 1.¹ This project, which includes an English translation, thus makes a central source for the reconstruction of compositional pedagogy around the year 1700 available to an international readership. Although this treatise has been known at least since Kurt Hahn's discussion of it in 1957 and later via Paul Walker's 2000 dissertation,² the true value of this source has yet to be fully recognized.

It is tempting to view this source as authentic teaching material originating from around the Leipzig *Thomasschule*. Yet, despite the titular reference to Johann Kuhnau (1660–1722), J. S. Bach's predecessor as *Thomaskantor* in Leipzig, there exists neither tangible evidence that Kuhnau actually used the *Fundamenta* nor concrete information

1 A facsimile of the source is available at <https://digital.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/werkansicht/?PPN=PPN788775634> (accessed July 31, 2020).

2 Hahn 1957, 103–105. Walker 2000, 259–267.

regarding its origin. Nevertheless, the *Fundamenta* represents an instructive example of a *musica poetica* compendium that enables insight not only into the design of a course in composition based on the rules of intervallic progressions, but also into the topical priorities of a course on the “craft” of composition at the beginning of the eighteenth century.

At the Berlin Staatsbibliothek there also survives a previously unexamined manuscript: *Kurtze Verfaßung, wie ein musicalisches Stück ohne Fehler zu componieren sey* (“Brief Instruction How to Compose a Musical Piece without Errors”) under the listing Mus. ms. theor. 1640. This manuscript can be traced to a group of sources that can be understood as a sort of “music-theoretical appendix” to the “Österreich-Bokemeyer Collection,” which represents one of the most extensive compilations of music sources from the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.³ This manuscript is in the hand of Heinrich Bokemeyer (1679–1751) and is preserved under the signature D-B Mus. ms. theor. 1640.⁴ Since the *Verfaßung* exhibits a great number of concordances with the *Fundamenta*, not only in the arrangement of its content, but also in exact turns of phrase, the *Verfaßung* will also be discussed below.⁵ And since there are multiple indicators that both the *Fundamenta* and the *Verfaßung* bear a close relationship to Bokemeyer’s teacher, Georg Österreich (1664–1735), the following article aims to reconstruct the plausible circumstances of their origin and to identify shared sources based on Hahn’s and Walker’s research. In this regard, we will also examine the *Praecepta der musicalischen Composition* by Johann Gottfried Walther (1684–1748), the Weimar city organist, lexicographer, and distant cousin to J. S. Bach, the reason being that the *Praecepta* manifests numerous similarities with both the *Fundamenta* and the *Verfaßung*. It is likely that the *Fundamenta* (with Kuhnau as its possible author), the *Verfaßung*, and Walther’s *Praecepta* all draw from a shared older source that is now lost.⁶

The Scribes and Owners of the Manuscripts

The *Fundamenta* survives in a half-leather binding that was probably prepared in the late eighteenth or early nineteenth century.⁷ According to a note on the inside cover, the source stems from a music collection owned by Georg Johann Daniel Poelchau (1773–1836) that was bequeathed to the institution that would later become the Berlin Staatsbibliothek.⁸ Besides the *Fundamenta*, the volume also contains copies of three additional music-theoretical treatises: the extensively-studied *Ausführlicher Bericht vom Gebraucht der Con- und Dissonantien* and the singing manual *Von der Singe-Kunst oder Maniera*, both of which

3 Following Konrad Küster, we employ the new term “Österreich-Bokemeyer Collection” instead of the older “Bokemeyer Collection,” since Bokemeyer likely played only a marginal role in expanding a collection of materials he received from Georg Österreich. See Küster 2015, 131 and 208.

4 A facsimile can be found at <https://digital.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/werkansicht?PPN=PPN1048644707> (accessed July 31, 2020). Frederick Kranemann is currently writing a dissertation on the theoretical writings found in this collection. As part of this project, an online edition of the Bokemeyer manuscript is slated for release on the GLAREAN platform of the Hochschule für Musik Freiburg (Germany).

5 The manuscript associated with Kuhnau will hence be referred to as *Fundamenta*, whereas the one associated with Bokemeyer will be referred to as *Verfaßung*.

6 Hahn 1957, 105, and Walker 2000, 259.

7 This and the following bibliographical information regarding the *Fundamenta* can be found under <https://kalliope-verbund.info/DE-611-HS-2588791> (accessed March 17, 2020).

8 Engler 1984.

are attributed to Christoph Bernhard (1628–1692), together with a treatise by Johann Theile (1646–1724) outlining rules for invertible counterpoint. This third treatise is known under various names, but is here titled *Kurtze, doch gründliche Regeln von den doppelten Contrapuncten*.⁹ Hahn dates all four treatises in this collection to the first third of the eighteenth century.¹⁰ However, the manuscript also contains a biographical sketch of Kuhnau and an index of his theoretical works¹¹ that probably date from the nineteenth century. These sections begin on f.94v of the *Fundamenta*, and the treatises listed in the index are now lost.¹²

Unlike the other three treatises in this volume, the *Fundamenta* exhibits the handwriting of multiple scribes, as is visible from a comparison of the title page, table of contents, and the main body of the text. Already at the time of Hahn's study, Harald Kümmerling, who was the first to investigate the Österreich-Bokemeyer Collection, identified the writing on the title page of the *Fundamenta* as Georg Österreich's hand.¹³ Thus the provenance of the *Fundamenta* may have been as follows: it was likely owned by Österreich (the original scribe remains anonymous), after whom it passed to his pupil Heinrich Bokemeyer, then to his son-in-law Johann Christian Winter, next to the Göttinger musicologist Johann Nikolaus Forkel (Bach's first biographer), then to the above-mentioned G. J. D. Poelchau, and finally to the Berlin Staatsbibliothek.¹⁴

On the title page's verso there appears a brief listing of contents with the heading *Institutio Kuhnnaviensis* ("Kuhnau's Instruction"), which underscores the collection's pedagogical intent. This index could potentially have been added after the pagination, which appears to be in Österreich's hand. However, Kümmerling did not determine whether the index, like the title page, also stems from Österreich. Moreover, different kinds of ink suggest that the index initially remained incomplete and was later completed.¹⁵ Despite the differences in ink, both index and pagination could stem from the same scribe, although one cannot rule out that a later scribe could have imitated the handwriting of the earlier scribe.

9 See Grapenthin 2001, 100–107.

10 Hahn 1957, 104. See also the bibliographical information given in the website in note 7.

11 See Müller-Blattau 1963, 12. The index is based on Kuhnau's biography found in Walther's *Lexicon* (1732, 349–350).

12 Harasim 2003.

13 Hahn 1957, 105 (note 6). Kümmerling's assessment is based on a comparison with other title pages known to originate from Österreich ca. 1700. For example, the writing on the title page of Bokemeyer's own composition, "Herr Jesu Christ meins Lebens Licht" (Bok 680, dated to 1698 in Schleswig), which belongs to the writing development stage of which Kümmerling categorizes as "Öc" (see Küster 2015, 240), exhibits similar forms of the letters "F" and "C" (see https://digital.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/werkansicht?PPN=PPN777868512&PHYSID=PHYS_0291&DMDID=DMDLOG_0014, [accessed March 24, 2020]). A specimen of Georg Österreich's handwriting from 1704 can be found under https://digital.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/werkansicht?PPN=PPN78046415X&PHYSID=PHYS_0001 (accessed March 24, 2020). Finally, the writing of the year "1703" in the *Fundamenta* appears to be quite similar to the writing of the year "1704" in Österreich's autograph of his composition, "Herr Jesu Christ, wahr Mensch und Gott" (Bok 679, writing development stage "Ög"; see Küster 2015, 241).

14 See note 7.

15 The writing style of *Kuhnnaviensis* evidences less similarities with other of Österreich's attributions to Kuhnau (for example, in Kuhnau's works "Spiritate clemente" and "Lobet ihr Himmel den Herrn" in the Österreich-Bokemeyer Collection). At the same time, it does resemble the writing of the author's name "Kuhnau" in Kuhnau's cantata "Gott der Vater Jesus Christus" (D-B Mus. ms. 122563; see https://digital.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/werkansicht?PPN=PPN772081557&PHYSID=PHYS_0001, [accessed March 31, 2020]), as well as the "Magnificat in C" in the same collection; both survive in the same binding and originate from Poelchau's collection (see above). Future studies will tell whether Österreich was involved in the copying of these scores.

In any case, the main body of the *Fundamenta* is not in Österreich's hand. And as Hahn has already made clear, the *Fundamenta* cannot be a Kuhnau autograph, despite the work's title. The reason is the existence of some misspellings and factual errors, which suggest that the scribe may not have been completely versed in the material at hand, as one would expect from a musician of Kuhnau's caliber. For instance, § 25 of Chapter V mistakes *cantus mollis* for *cantus durus*, and the heading of Chapter XIV mistakes "bicinio" for "ionico."¹⁶ That the latter error is carried over into the above-mentioned index without correction begs the question whether Österreich merely made a simple copying error, or whether the index was in fact written by another scribe.

According to Daniel R. Melamed's research, the handwriting found in the main body of the *Fundamenta* also appears in two other eighteenth-century manuscripts¹⁷: first, as the header of the motet "Erforsche mich, Gott" by Sebastian Knüpfer (1633–1676)¹⁸; and second, as the header of Kuhnau's "Magnificat in C."¹⁹ These findings suggest that the anonymous scribe was probably affiliated with the Thomasschule or its broader circle.²⁰ Yet neither the title page nor the main score of Knüpfer's motet are in this anonymous scribe's hand.²¹ This suggests that our anonymous scribe's professional work may have been restricted to a more or less official "workshop" that specialized on the copying of texts.²² The existence of such a workshop remains mere speculation, however.

The manuscript of the *Verfaßung* is preserved in the Berlin Staatsbibliothek as a single source with its own binding, which may date from the nineteenth century. In contrast to the volume containing the *Fundamenta*, the handwriting of the *Verfaßung* is more uniform, as it stems from a single scribe. There are no explicit indications regarding his identity or the dating of the source. Georg Österreich is indicated as the scribe in subsequently added annotations in catalogues of the Staatsbibliothek,²³ yet there are hardly any similarities with Österreich's usual handwriting. As Kümmerling determined, the *Verfaßung* is very likely in the hand of Österreich's pupil, Heinrich Bokemeyer, as can be confirmed via a comparison with other Bokemeyer writings.²⁴

16 Hahn 1957, 104 ff.

17 Melamed 1989, 192 (note 9).

18 D-B Mus. ms. autogr. Knüpfer I. Contrary to the library listing, this is not a Knüpfer autograph (Melamed 1989, 192, note 6).

19 D-B Mus. ms. autogr. Kuhnau 2.

20 Poelchau wrote "Part. Von Stölzels Hand" in the "Magnificat" and "Eigenhänd. Par." in the following cantata by Kuhnau (see note 13).

21 The title page was written by the main scribe of the *Altbachisch Archiv*, Ernst Dietrich Heindorff (1651–1724), and seems to be his only activity outside of this collection; this title page was apparently added already in the seventeenth century. The annotation "di Seb. Knüpfer" is in an unknown hand. The work, which was composed in 1673, belonged to J. S. Bach's music collection, since Bach undertook revisions and produced the necessary voice parts in the context of a performance in 1746 or 1747. See https://www.bach-digital.de/receive/BachDigitalSource_source_00018572 (accessed March 31, 2020), as well as Wollny 2015, 130ff).

22 Regarding working methods in the copying of scores in Georg Österreich's circle, see Küster 2015, 191–198.

23 See <https://kalliope-verbund.info/DE-611-HS-3457505> (accessed March 17, 2020).

24 See Kümmerling 1970, 11. An early, datable Bokemeyer manuscript is "Gründlicher Unterricht von den gedoppelten Contrapunten" (D-B Mus. ms. theor. 917), in which Bokemeyer is referred to as "Cantor der fürstl. Schule zu Wolfenbüttel," a post that he took up beginning in 1720, before which he was adjunct organist to the ailing Kantor Bendeler (see Hirschmann 2016).

Comparing the *Fundamenta* and the *Verfaßung*

Both sources share the abbreviation for “with God” at the beginning of the main text – in the *Fundamenta* in Greek, in the *Verfaßung* in Latin (“C. D.”, *cum deo*). This designation does not appear in other music-theoretical manuscripts copied by Österreich or Bockmeyer. Far more common is the abbreviation “I. N. I.” (*In Nomine Iesu*).

The contents of the *Fundamenta* can be summarized thus: the first of the four overarching sections contains three short chapters treating the nature and use of consonances and dissonances; the second section contains four chapters that include an extended description of the modes, their transposition, and cadences; the third section contains detailed instruction on fugues; and the fourth section treats invertible counterpoint at length. This final section is by and large a duplication of Bernhard’s *Anhang von denen doppelten Contrapuncten* (“Appendix on Invertible Counterpoint”) from the *Tractatus compositionis augmentatus*.²⁵

The most significant differences between the *Fundamenta* and the *Verfaßung* occur mostly at the beginning of both manuscripts. While the *Fundamenta* introduces its explanation of interval sizes with the sentence “Was Intervalla seyn, [...] ist ex *Modulatoria* [...] bekandt,” the *Verfaßung* first defines *Sonus* as “sound” and “Grund und Anfang aller Musicalischen Intervallen” (“the basis and starting point of all musical intervals”). Then the *Verfaßung* notes that the method at hand will be limited to simultaneously sounding intervals, since the study of successive intervals belongs to the art of singing, such that it can be excluded for the time being.²⁶ The *Verfaßung* continues with a lucid explanation of all kinds of intervals, as one finds in most *musica poetica* treatises in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. It also describes the difference between simple and compound intervals.²⁷ With a few exceptions, both the *Fundamenta* and the *Verfaßung* are identical beginning at the fourth chapter of the *Verfaßung* (corresponding to chapter one of the *Fundamenta*) until §. 4 of the *Fundamenta*.²⁸ §§. 5–11 of chapter four in the *Fundamenta* on the various kinds of fourth are missing in the *Verfaßung*. The *Fundamenta*’s subsequent division of consonances into *perfectae* and *imperfectae* appears in the *Verfaßung* as noted above. In place of §§. 5–11, the *Verfaßung* has five empty pages that could easily have accommodated the missing material; perhaps they were left blank in order to be completed at a later point. There follows an explanation of the *transitus* (passing note), whose examples stem primarily from Bernhard and which are the same in both treatises. Chapter four (*De Triade harmonica*) and chapters five through seven (modes) of the *Fundamenta* do not appear in the *Verfaßung*.²⁹ In contrast, the subsequent chapters on fugue and invertible counterpoint are almost identical in both sources.

25 Müller-Blattau 1963, 123–128, makes note of this concordance.

26 *Verfaßung*, p. 1. The initial definition is reminiscent of the beginning of the *Synopsis musica* by Johann Crüger (1598–1662) in the edition from 1654 (see p. 3), which was part of Österreich’s collection of music-theoretical writings (D-B, Mus. ms. theor. 230; see Kümmerling 1970, 11).

27 *Verfaßung*, p. 8 ff. Perhaps the *Ausführliche Bericht* is intended to replace a detailed explanation of intervals in the *Fundamenta*, which would indicate that the two treatises were used in combination.

28 Due to a different division of chapters, this section is given as §. 3. in the *Verfaßung*.

29 The term *trias harmonica* is mentioned in chapter one of the *Verfaßung*, but unlike the *Fundamenta*, there is no analogous chapter explaining this concept.

A Teaching Document by Johann Kuhnau?

The title page of the *Fundamenta* suggests that this source may represent authentic teaching material from the Leipzig *Thomasschule* in the generation of Johann David Heinichen (1683–1729), Johann Friedrich Fasch (1688–1758), and Johann Christoph Graupner (1683–1760). Yet no evidence survives that confirms Kuhnau’s use of the *Fundamenta* in lessons.³⁰ While Hahn claims that a connection to Kuhnau can neither be proved nor disproved, Melamed’s discovery that the *Fundamenta* and the Knüpfer motet share the same scribe suggests that the *Fundamenta* at least originates from *Thomasschule*’s broader circle. In addition, the words *Institutio Kuhnaviensis* in the heading of the above-mentioned index in the *Fundamenta* imply a didactic function. Paul Walker has cast doubt on the reliability of Österreich’s attribution of the *Fundamenta* to Kuhnau, given that Österreich is known to have misattributed other sources.³¹ Yet given several similarities in Kuhnau’s and Österreich’s biographies, it seems likely that the two, who were nearly the same age, would have met: documentary evidence confirms that after an apprenticeship with the Cantor Johann Scheffler, Österreich was an student at the *Thomasschule* from May 10, 1678 until August 28, 1680, the date of his departure to Hamburg because of the rampant pestilence in Leipzig.³² Johann Kuhnau studied law in Leipzig beginning in 1682 before taking up the post of organist at the *Thomasschule* in 1684.³³ Previously, Kuhnau had been educated as a choir boy for the second court organist, Johann Heinrich Kittel, and had spent several years in Zittau. In the winter semester of 1683–84, Österreich matriculated at the Leipzig University, where he remained for five years. Since these two young, highly talented musicians studied in Leipzig at the same time, it is possible that they had personal contact. Moreover, Österreich’s dating of “1703” on the title page of the *Fundamenta* might have to do with Kuhnau’s professional life. When Kuhnau became *Thomaskantor* in 1701 he would have had to produce teaching materials for the compositional instruction of interested pupils and graduates.³⁴ Teaching might have played a less important role in his previous role as an organist.³⁵

30 While the term *Fundamenta* can be found, for example, in the biography of the *Thomasschule* pupil Johann Friedrich Fasch in Walther’s *Lexicon* (see Walther 1732, 240), this is of little use, since the term only refers to a sort of “elementary compositional instruction” based on interval progressions and counterpoint.

31 See Walker 2000, 267. Walker’s doubts as to Österreich’s reliability have to do with a manuscript with the title, *Regulae Compositi / onis: / Autore Signre Charissimi*. (D-B Mus. ms. theor. 170). Although Österreich attributes this source to Giacomo Carissimi, its contents are ascribed to Antonio Bertali in numerous other sources (see Massenkeil 2016).

32 Lange 2016.

33 Regarding Kuhnau’s education and his interaction with Italian musical culture and music theory, Vincenzo Albrici (1631–1687) should be mentioned as a figure of immense importance for Kuhnau (Harasim 2003).

34 As Ulf Grapenthin has demonstrated regarding the theoretical writings from Reincken’s circle, the French version of Kuhnau’s name seems to indicate an origin at the end of the seventeenth century at the earliest. See Grapenthin 2001, 90.

35 Österreich’s dating leaves uncertain whether “1703” refers to the date the source was copied or whether this was the date given on the source from which the *Fundamenta* was copied. If one assumes that none of the sources in the collected manuscript date before 1700 (see note 7 and Grapenthin 2001, 100–107), then the addition of the date “den 8. Maji. Ad. 1682” on the title page of the *Ausführlicher Bericht* would imply that “1703” was also found on the original. Kuhnau’s own lengthy stay in Dresden was at least two years before 1682 (see Harasim 2003). Poelchau gives the comment “Der Verfasser starb 1692” (“The author died 1692”). See note 7.

Alongside occasional engagements as a singer in the opera houses of Braunschweig and Wolfenbüttel, along with the post of *Schlosskantor* in Wolfenbüttel, Österreich, like his own teacher Johann Theile, probably decided to extend his activities beyond singing instruction and into private composition lessons.³⁶ The time span in question lies close to the year 1703 given on the title page of the *Fundamenta*. From June 14, 1702, Österreich lived in Braunschweig, where he had inherited a brewery from his step-father, Hans Darnecken.³⁷ Up to this point he had held the post of Hofkapellmeister at the court in Schleswig-Holstein-Gottorf, which was inactive due to the chaos of the Great Northern War. After his savings were spent, it seems that Österreich went looking for further employment opportunities, since he never received an official dismissal from his duties in Gottorf, and he had to consider the possibility that the court would not be revitalized.

Moreover, the type of paper used in the *Fundamenta* and the binding could reflect the genesis of the different sections written by Österreich and the anonymous scribe from the Thomasschule circle.³⁸ The textual portions of the *Fundamenta* treatise are (with the exception of the title page) written on what Hahn denotes as “Paper I.” In contrast, the title page to the *Fundamenta* and the remaining treatises by Bernhard and Theile (including the title page to the *Ausführlicher Bericht*), are on what Hahn calls “Paper II.”³⁹ If one assumes that Paper I and II stem from different scribes and were not exclusively available to the above-mentioned anonymous Leipzig scribe, then the following is a plausible hypothesis: Paper I may have been initially available to the Leipzig scribe from the *Thomasschule* circle for the text. If one assumes, on the other hand, that Paper II exhibits some connection to Georg Österreich (since the title page of the *Fundamenta* is Paper II in his hand), then the Leipzig-scribe must have obtained reams of Paper II at the latest by the time the *Ausführlicher Bericht* was copied, since entire body of the main text is in the same hand. Assuming that Österreich’s library included not only writings from his regions of professional activity (Hamburg, Gottorf, Braunschweig, etc.), but also could have included writings obtained through third parties and via letter exchange, then it is at least possible that Österreich was aware of the *Fundamenta* circulating in Leipzig.⁴⁰ The anonymous scribe from the *Thomasschule* circle prepared a copy of the *Fundamenta* (perhaps at Österreich’s behest), which he then sent to Österreich. After receiving the manuscript, Österreich could have added a title page on Paper II and shortly thereafter sent reams of Paper II to Leipzig with the intent of ordering copies of additional works, the next of which would have been the *Ausführlicher Bericht*.⁴¹ Unfortunately, Hahn did not

36 Küster 2015, 174, and Lange 2016.

37 All bibliographical information taken from Lange 2016.

38 This assumes that Hahn’s claim is correct that the complete volume only contains two kinds of paper (Hahn 1957, 105).

39 Hahn 1957, 105.

40 There is no evidence of direct contact between Österreich and Kuhnau at the present, as the relevant documents from Österreich’s life are lost. Hahn cites the work of Müller-Blattau regarding a potential indirect connection between the two men via Stölzel (Hahn 1957, 105), but this remains mere speculation. Whether Österreich obtained writings like the *Fundamenta* via Stölzel cannot be confirmed at present.

41 After concluding that the *Fundamenta* is not a Kuhnau autograph, Hahn remarks that it would indeed have been odd for Kuhnau to have copied rules regarding invertible counterpoint twice in the same volume (i.e., in treatises one and two) (Hahn 1957, 105). This duplicity of content may imply that both treatises were not initially intended to be included in the same collection.

investigate Paper II any further, so for the time being it remains uncertain whether Österreich used Paper II with any regularity.

That the original pagination only includes the *Fundamenta* and the *Ausführlicher Bericht* (not the *Singe-Kunst* or *Kurtze Regulen*) suggests that initially only these two treatises were bound together and were present in this form in Österreich's library for a certain period of time.⁴² The volume would have remained in this form until Österreich also received a copy of the *Singe-Kunst* from the same Leipzig scribe. This would have made necessary the alteration of the title page, *Anleitung zur Composition* ("Instruction in Composition"), which was originally intended only to introduce the *Ausführlicher Bericht*. The oddly compact text "und Sing-Manier," which appears in the margin after the comma of *Composition*, could stem from Österreich's adaptation of the title page.⁴³ The first page of the *Singe-Kunst* apparently lacked an indication of its author at the outset, which is why someone (probably Österreich) added the name *Bernhard* in the narrow margin above the title. For whatever reason, Österreich did not continue the pagination past the *Bericht* and into the *Singe-Kunst*. Ultimately, these three treatises (the *Fundamenta*, *Bericht* and *Singe-Kunst*) were either bound together or Österreich immediately added the copy of Theile's *Kurtzen Regulen* without giving it an independent title page.

The dating of the *Verfaßung* manuscript is much more difficult: here too one finds at least two different kinds of paper. The watermark that appears most frequently can also be found in the Österreich-Bokemeyer Collection; building on Kümmerling's research, Konrad Küster refers to this watermark as *Postreiter-IKB*.⁴⁴ This watermark appears in manuscripts by Georg Österreich,⁴⁵ as well as in a copy Bokemeyer made of Johann Joseph Fux's "Nisi Dominus."⁴⁶ Küster dates the use of paper with this water mark to the time after 1703.⁴⁷ Two manuscripts with the related watermark *Postreiter-NW* can be dated to 1721 and 1723, so Küster assumes that the entire group of writings originated from this relatively late period. Yet such a late origin for the *Verfaßung* is unlikely, since it exhibits significantly more misspellings than the *Fundamenta*. These errors include grammatical mistakes and Latin terminology—types of mistakes that are nearly absent in Bokemeyer sources from the 1710's and 1720's.⁴⁸ Most of these errors have been corrected in what

42 That this pagination was added after the main text is apparent because Österreich occasionally had to adjust the position of a page number to the text. The title *Anleitung zur Composition* directly before the *Bericht* implies that this treatise was understood more explicitly as "Instruction in Composition," in contrast with the more introductory nature of the *Fundamenta Compositionis*. At the same time, the implication is that *compositio* has specifically to do with the deliberate use of consonances and dissonances.

43 In light of its position on the title page of the *Fundamenta*, it cannot be ruled out that Kuhnau's title as "Dir. Mus. Lipsiae." is an addition Österreich made to match Bernhard's designation of "Capellm. / Dresdae" before the *Ausführlicher Bericht*.

44 The other watermarks have yet to be fully identified. On two pages one can make out a sort of wheel.

45 These manuscripts mostly contain writing in development stage "Öh" (Küster 2015, 245).

46 Bok 421, watermark 036, according to Kümmerling's catalogue (Küster 2015, 245). A similar watermark (039) with the letters "NW" also appears in other Bokemeyer sources (Küster 2015, 260). It remains an open question whether Bokemeyer made these works for his own professional use or as a copyist for Österreich.

47 Küster 2015, 210 and 245.

48 The large number of errors is thus unusual for Bokemeyer, since his writings usually demonstrate great care in such matters; see, for example, his copy of Johann Theile's "Grundlicher Unterricht," which dates from 1717–1721 (D-B Mus. ms. theor. 917).

seems to have been a second pass after the initial copying phase.⁴⁹ In light of these corrections, these kinds of errors at such a late date can only be explained through an atypical degree of negligence on the part of Bokemeyer, who was in fact a well-educated cantor fluent in Latin.⁵⁰ Alternatively, insufficient familiarity with terminology that was in fact common knowledge in the early eighteenth century would seem to indicate a sort of juvenile inexperience. This would support the motivation for copying such rudiments, or “fundamentals” and would place the origin of the *Verfaßung* in Bokemeyer’s time as Österreich’s pupil “around 1706.”⁵¹ At this point Bokemeyer was already twenty-seven years old and had held the post as *Martinikantor* in Braunschweig since 1704. His copying of a treatise on composition could thus be explained in the context of his new duties, which included the composition of sacred works. At the same time, composition probably played a less significant role during Kuhnau’s time as organ pupil of Johann Justus Kahle.⁵² Insofar as the date 1703 on the title page of the *Fundamenta* can claim any accuracy as to the origin of this copy, it would appear that it would predate any regular contact between Bokemeyer and Österreich by at least three years. Thus it is possible that Bokemeyer either copied the *Verfaßung* from the *Fundamenta* itself (for a fee) or from another copy thereof. On the other hand, if there was no personal contact between Kuhnau and Österreich, then Kuhnau’s reputation as a teacher must have reached Österreich, who at this point was in search of pedagogical material.

Whereas the main sections of the *Fundamenta* appear to have originated about the same time, differences in the *Verfaßung*’s pagination suggest that individual fragments were later bound together: the first page of text begins with page one, which is continued until page nine. There follow five empty pages with the watermark *Postreiter-IKB* without pagination. A later pagination in pencil in the upper margin (perhaps from the nineteenth century or later) continues the numbering from the next recto page (*Vom Gebrauch der Consonantien*) for the remaining pages. Beginning on folio thirteen of this new sequence in pencil, the earlier sequence that ended with “9” is continued on the lower margin. Presumably these numbers, which are mostly concealed by the binding, also stem from Bokemeyer. If one reconstructs the concealed numbering, there appears to be a continuous pagination after all. This continues from the first texted page after the blank ones, such that the entire volume seems to have lacked any continuous pagination before the appearance of the penciled numbering. These various sets of pagination divide the volume into subsections, the first encompassing chapters one through four, and the second from *Vom Gebrauch der Consonantien* to the end of the chapter on fugue.⁵³

49 Additional corrections in red ink, particularly in the examples, indicate Bokemeyer’s involvement with the material after 1735. See Braun 1986, 81.

50 Mattheson 1739, 410–412.

51 Hirschmann 2016.

52 Küster 2015, 178, and Diehl 2015, 304.

53 Unlike the first part, which is divided into chapters, the second part only contains headers identifying subject areas contained therein. The formulations correspond to the *Fundamenta* only in their general thrust until *Membrum 3*.

The Significance of the *Fundamenta*

The fact that the *Fundamenta* borrows material from a variety of sources makes it a significant document for contemporaneous music-theoretical discourse. Yet the precise relationship between the sources remains an open question at this point. Thus it is possible that both the *Fundamenta* and the *Verfaßung* contain material taken from a yet-unidentified common source. Moreover, it is by no means certain that the *Verfaßung* was copied from the *Fundamenta*. For instance, each source contains unique errors in spelling and content: for example, the swapping of *bicinio* for *ionico* (mentioned above) is not found in the *Verfaßung*, which has the correct header.⁵⁴ If the *Verfaßung* is in fact an early Bokemeyer source copied from Österreich's copy of the *Fundamenta*, then one must assume that such mistakes either were left uncorrected in the text but were corrected when dictated orally, or that an as-yet-unidentified intermediary treatise served as a source.⁵⁵

Like Hahn, Walker has investigated the *Fundamenta*'s relationship to other sources. Both authors note the obvious parallels between the *Fundamenta* and Walther's *Praecepta* (completed 1708). Both sources borrow from Bernhard's *Anhang von den doppelten Contrapuncten* from his *Tractatus*, as well as in their treatment of fugue.⁵⁶ Thus Hahn posited the notion that the *Praecepta* might be based on the *Fundamenta*, given that it was completed some five years after 1703. Yet Hahn favored the hypothesis that both sources could be based on a lost intermediary, since there is little direct evidence that the *Praecepta* is based directly on the *Fundamenta*.⁵⁷ At the same time, contrary to Walker's assertion, the fact that Walther's biography of Kuhnau in the *Lexicon* does not mention the *Fundamenta* does not necessarily mean that Walther did not know of it.⁵⁸ The reason is that "Fundamenta" (including its variants) can be understood to imply a relatively broad blanket term for basic instructional material and thus may never have been intended to claim status as a mature *musica poetica* treatise, as for example Bernhard's *Ausführlicher Bericht* or Walther's *Praecepta* do, and thus may not have been understood as a source worth mentioning in Walther's bibliography. In addition, it is possible that the term *Fundamenta* stems from Österreich, so that Kuhnau's instructional originally had a different name (or no name at all), in which case Walther could not have mentioned the *Fundamenta*.

54 *Verfaßung*, p. 22v (according to the pagination in pencil). However, Bokemeyer incorrectly writes *quartuor* instead of *quatuor* (later corrected).

55 Variants of phrasing that only reproduce the general thrust of an idea occur often with Österreich, for instance in various excerpts of the writings of Wolfgang Caspar Printz (1641–1717) in the collection in D-B Mus. ms. theor. 1038 (see note 78). Similar alterations can be found in various versions of Walther's *Praecepta* (see Rathert 2001, 89).

56 Hahn 1957, 104; Walker 2000, 259.

57 Hahn 1957, 105. The *Praecepta* only contains one reference to Kuhnau via his novel, *Der Musicalische Quack-Salber* from 1700. In the case that Walther's text represents an expansion of the text of the *Fundamenta*, Walther would have multiplied its length by a factor of four, since the *Fundamenta* and the *Verfaßung* are much more compact and praxis-oriented than the *Praecepta*. Moreover, the musical examples in the *Praecepta* would have to be understood as longer versions of the much shorter examples in the *Fundamenta* and *Verfaßung*.

58 Walker 2000, 267, and Hahn 1957, 105.

Yet assuming there is a connection to Kuhnau, the source situation cannot support the theory that the *Fundamenta* and *Verfaßung* are truncated versions of Walther's *Praecepta*. This is because Kuhnau apparently first learned of the *Praecepta* many years later. In a letter dated May 3, 1720, Kuhnau confirmed that he received a copy of the *Praecepta*, which he judged to be of high value to both theorists and practitioners.⁵⁹ Thus Kuhnau could not have produced the *Fundamenta* as a summary of Walther's *Praecepta* around 1703, since he first became familiar with Walther's work via Gottfried Ephraim Thiele after 1720. In this case, Österreich's dating of 1703 on the *Fundamenta* would have no relationship to the source's origin.

At the same time, it is highly unlikely that Bokemeyer's *Verfaßung* is based solely on Walther's *Praecepta*, since it has much more in common with the *Fundamenta*. Moreover, Bokemeyer apparently first encountered Walther's work on January 28, 1734. In a letter carrying this date, Walther mentions that he would send his "compiled *Musical Poëticam*" to Bokemeyer.⁶⁰ Such a late date would indeed correspond with the dating of the paper employed in Bokemeyer's *Verfaßung*, yet it would assume that Bokemeyer, who was more than fifty years old, made several basic writing mistakes.⁶¹

Influences, Possible Predecessors, and W. C. Printz's *Phrynus Mitilianaeus*

For these reasons it is likely that all three sources share an unknown intermediary source. If this be the case, then the questions of their relationship to each other, as well as of Kuhnau's authorship, become of secondary importance. While the *Fundamenta* does not directly mention which sources it is based on, Walther reveals a variety of influences on his *Praecepta* in a letter to Bokemeyer dated August 3, 1731, including Wolfgang Schonsleder and Bernhard.⁶² In addition, Hermann Gehrmann,⁶³ Georg Schünemann,⁶⁴ and Pe-

59 "Dem Herrn Pagen Hofmeister Thielen diene ich mit dieser kurzen Nachricht, daß mir des Hrn. 8 Organisten Walthers Werkgen, so er *Musicam Peticam* nennet, und deßen *Partem generalem* ich gelesen, sehr woll gefallen, und daß solches vor einem in der *Musica Poetica*, oder *Composition* so woll was die *Theoriam*, als auch *Praxis* anbelanget, was sonderliches tun will, sehr dienlich und nützlich sey" (quoted in Schünemann 1933, 112). Unfortunately Schünemann does not describe the context of the letter in any more detail, only noting the Berlin Staatsbibliothek as its location; the letter may belong to the collection under the listing "Mus. ep. Walther, J. G." (see Walther 1987, 259). The phrasing in Schünemann implies that Kuhnau made personal contact with Walther. The *Pagenhofmeister* who Kuhnau mentions is Gottfried Ephraim Thiele (died August 18, 1726), who was a bassist in the Weimar court (*ibid.*, 298). The formulation in Kuhnau's letter suggests that Thiele was responsible for forwarding the *Praecepta* to Kuhnau and for securing his appraisal thereof. According to a letter dated January 25, 1731, Walther received several works from Thiele's inheritance that Walther had composed for Thiele (*ibid.*, 153). Kuhnau's letter probably belonged to Thiele's estate.

60 Beckmann and Schulze, ed. 1987, 172. This source can be found under the listing D-B Mus. ms. theor. 950. The excerpt of the *Praecepta* that Walther mentions has not been located.

61 In this case, Bokemeyer would have received two copies of the same content from Kuhnau at two different times.

62 Walther habe seine *Praecepta*, "deren ich mich bey der *Information* bediene, [...] aus des Jesuiten, Wolffg. Schonslederi, *Architectonice Musices universalis*, [...] aus des Bernhardi teütschen *Mst.* Und andern entlehnet u. zusammen getragen" (Walther 1987, 140).

63 Gehrmann 1891, 468–578.

64 Schünemann 1933, 112.

ter Benary⁶⁵ have been able to identify the influence of Wolfgang Printz, Antonio Bertali, and Andreas Werckmeister in the *Praecepta*, and that of Giovanni Maria Bononcini in the chapter on canon and fugue.⁶⁶

This kind of inference as to Walther's sources can also be applied to the *Fundamenta* and the *Verfaßung*, to the extent that these share textual congruities in certain chapters. As Walker has shown in his discussion of the largely identical sections on fugue in the *Fundamenta* and *Praecepta*, a fourth source containing partially concordant material provides important evidence in this regard: a manuscript (D-B Mus. ms. theor. 1595) that bears a relationship to the Nordhausen cantor, Christian Demelius (1643–1711), and can be dated to ca. 1701,⁶⁷ since it contains a reference to the *Bellum musicum* of Johann Beer (1655–1700) from 1701.⁶⁸ Like the *Fundamenta*, the second part of this source consists of a complete copy of Bernhard's *Ausführlicher Bericht*; the first part, on the other hand, is a veritable "greatest hits" of seventeenth century music theorists, including material by Sethus Calvisius, Johann Crüger, Johann Andreas Herbst, Athanasius Kircher, and Andreas Werckmeister, along with other works by Bernhard.⁶⁹

Yet another author is of particular interest in this regard: Walker has noted that the explanation of *repercussio* in Mus. ms. theor. 1595⁷⁰ names the now-lost fourth part of Printz's (1641–1717) *Phrynis Mitilinaeus* as its only source.⁷¹ Since precisely this same material can be found in the *Fundamenta* (without any mention of its source),⁷² it is possible that large portions – if not the entirety – of the concordant material on fugue were taken from the *Phrynis*.⁷³ In any case, this material appears in more abridged form in the *Fundamenta*, *Verfaßung*, and Mus. ms. theor. 1595 than it does in the *Praecepta*. This suggests that Walther's version, which would seem to be more faithful to Printz's surviving three volumes in its retention of more extensive descriptions and its frequent use of Greek and Latin terminology, may represent a less heavily edited version of Printz's work, such that at least parts of Printz's lost fourth volume might be reconstructed via Walther's *Praecepta*. Insofar as the date 1703 is reliable for the *Fundamenta*, one would assume that Printz's fourth volume appeared somewhere between 1696 and 1703, since a collected edition of Printz's first three volumes appeared in 1696 published by Johann Christoph Mieth in Dresden. In addition, by 1703 the fourth volume must have already been disseminated in various contexts.⁷⁴ Printz's influence is also supported by the similarities

65 Benary 1960, 30–36.

66 Walther's probable source was the second part of Bononcini's treatise, *Musico pratico*, which Paul Treu translated as *Musicus practicus* in 1701. See Walther 2000, 265–266.

67 Braun 2002 and Rose 2019, 52.

68 Walker 2000, 260.

69 Walker 2000, 260. *Ibid.* 264 gives a detailed description of the material on fugue.

70 As Walker has shown, the term *repercussio* undergoes a significant shift in meaning in Printz's writings. In the fourth part of *Phrynis*, Printz describes the phenomenon of tonal answer in relation to the *fuga soluta*. See Walker 200, 260 ff.

71 Walker 2000, 267. Walther's biography of Printz in his *Lexicon* mentions this fourth part of the *Phrynis*.

72 In contrast to its location in the *Fundamenta*, this material is located before the section on fugue in the *Praecepta*, as Hahn has shown (1957, 104).

73 Walker 2000, 267.

74 The term *Fundamenta* also appears in Printz's earlier work, *Musica modulatoria vocalis* of 1678, which represents a typical example of elementary music education and vocal training in the context of Lutheran *Lateinschulen*.

between the subtitle of the *Verfaßung* “wie ein musicalisches Stück ohne Fehler zu componiren sey” and Printz’s *Phrynis*. The latter contains the phrase “...wie ein Musicalisches Stück rein, ohne Fehler, und nach dem rechten Grunde zu componiren und zu setzen sey,” such that it is likely that Bokemeyer based his formulation on Printz.⁷⁵

For Walker, the fact that Kuhnau did not mention the similarities between the *Fundamenta* and the *Praecepta* in the above-mentioned letter suffices to cast doubt on Kuhnau’s authorship of the *Fundamenta*.⁷⁶ According to Walker, Kuhnau would not have refrained from pointing out the similarities between “his” *Fundamenta* and Walther’s *Praecepta*.⁷⁷ Yet in light of a common source between the two sources, the letter could also be understood as Kuhnau merely judging the value of Walther’s compilation of music-theoretical materials. Indeed, Walther’s treatise takes part in the common practice of excerpting from others’ works, as Kuhnau too apparently did when borrowing from Printz and Bernhard (as in *Mus. ms. theor.* 1595).

After Bernhard, one is tempted to see Printz as perhaps the most widely received and most influential German-speaking music theorist in the second half of the seventeenth century. Yet Printz’s theories are somewhat inaccessible today because they are embedded within the genre of the satirical novel. Should the *Fundamenta* and its related sources indeed be in essence a synopsis of selections from Printz’s now-lost fourth volume, then it would seem that the problem of accessibility to Printz’s theories was already recognized around the turn of the century and to a certain extent solved through the omission of unnecessary ornamental material. This “purging” of anecdotal “baggage” with the intent of focusing on core concepts can be seen in the volume D-B *Mus. ms. theor.* 1038 from the Österreich-Bokemeyer Collection,⁷⁸ which contains various compiled excerpts from Printz’s *Phrynis*. Perhaps the *Fundamenta*’s condensed nature was its primary attraction for Österreich, being the reason he preferred it to the fourth part of the *Phrynis*.⁷⁹

Contrapuntal Theory vs. Thoroughbass in the Early Eighteenth Century

As is the case with many treatises around 1700, the *Fundamenta* and its partially concordant sources document a phase of both theoretical development and reorientation of foundational concepts in compositional pedagogy. One particular strength of the treatise lies in its extensive descriptions of clausulae and cadences in relationship to modal teachings based primarily on Printz. Yet hints of the modes’ coming demise can already be

75 The complete title of Printz’s treatise in the edition from 1696 is *Wolfgang Caspar Printzens von Waldthurn Phrynis Mitilenaeus, oder Satyrischer Componist: Welcher, Vermittelst einer Satyrischen Geschichte, Die Fehler der ungelehrten, selbgewachsenen, ungeschickten, und unverständigen Componisten höflich darstellt, und zugleich lehret, wie ein Musicalisches Stück rein, ohne Fehler, und nach dem rechten Grunde zu componiren und zu setzen sey.*

76 See note 59.

77 Walker 2000, 267.

78 The source material is the first part of Printz’s *Phrynis* from the edition 1696 (Chpt. XIII, page 52, §. 2.). Printz’s writings are also frequently mentioned in other treatises, for example in the marginalia of Johann Philipp Förtsch’s *Musicalischen Compositions-Tractat*.

79 Since Printz’s fourth volume is lost and thus unavailable for comparison, it would also be possible that the *Verfaßung* is merely Bokemeyer’s copy from the fourth part of Printz’s treatise. The missing chapter, *De Triade harmonica*, in the *Verfaßung* can be completed via the corresponding excerpt in *Mus. ms. theor.* 1038.

seen, for example when Phrygian is understood in terms of Dorian, or when the modal system is opened up to include any transposition.⁸⁰ Such points could be understood as early manifestations of a critical, “progressive” music theory of the sort that Heinichen, a Kuhnau pupil, formulated in a polemic in his 1711 treatise: “And with such a [thoroughbass-centered] method it is also not necessary to instruct one’s pupils in the discant, tenor, or fistulating [i.e., contrived] clausulae and other unnecessary things.”⁸¹ It is not difficult to read Heinichen’s commentary as a critique of his teacher’s Kuhnau’s instruction, in which thoroughbass did not receive enough emphasis in Heinichen’s opinion.

In contrast, the following is one of the few direct descriptions of Kuhnau’s instruction, found in Walther’s biography of Johann Friedrich Fasch (1688–1758) from his *Lexicon*. Walther wrote that Fasch “learned the first *fundamenta* of music, especially in thoroughbass, from the departed Herr Kuhnau in Leipzig; he solidified his knowledge of composition with Herrn Capellmeister Graupner [...].”⁸² Here we learn that Kuhnau did indeed teach thoroughbass, yet it was probably not yet the tool of central importance for conveying basic concepts in the craft of composition that it would later become with Heinichen and others. Moreover, it was the case that not all pupils at this time received instruction in keyboard playing (which was essential for thoroughbass practice), since this had to be paid for separately.⁸³

At the beginning of the eighteenth century, a composition was still legitimized above all through its conformity with standard contrapuntal principles. The foundation remained the teaching of intervallic progressions, expanded to include new rules and licenses. A composition’s ultimate legitimization came through the dictates and numerous licenses of the traditional teachings of intervallic progression, as Jean-Philippe Rameau’s restoration attempts reveal.⁸⁴ The ongoing didactic significance of traditional intervallic thinking is witnessed by the fact that both the *Fundamenta* and the first part of *Mus. ms. theor.* 1595 both include portions from Bernhard’s *Ausführlicher Bericht*. Thus one can establish that, regarding the relationship between “vocal contexts” and thoroughbass for the pivotal time at the beginning of the eighteenth century (to which the *Fundamenta* belongs), the field of composition does not necessarily seem separate from thoroughbass, but to a certain point and in certain styles composition can operate relatively independently from thoroughbass.

80 My thanks goes to Florian Edler for pointing this out. This matter also has consequences for the section on fugue: while Bernhard’s term *aequatio modorum* is taken up regarding so-called “tonal” and “real” answers, his term *consociatio modorum* is nowhere to be found, which could be due to Printz’s apparently heavy influence. In this regard, Walker has noted the extension of the term *consociatio modorum* in *Mus. ms. theor.* 1595 (2000, 264). One wonders whether the material on modes could have been purposefully omitted from the *Verfaßung*.

81 “Und bey solcher *Methode* [Generalbass] hat man auch nicht nöthig gehabt, daß man seinen Untergebenen von denen *Discantisirenden*, *Tenorisirenden*, oder *Fistulirenden Clausuln* und andern unnöthigen Zeugen hätte viel vorschreiben, oder vorsagen sollen” (Heinichen 1711, 64). See also Holtmeier 2017, 269 ff.

82 “[Fasch] hat in Leipzig unter dem seel. Herrn Kuhnau die ersten *fundamenta* in der Music, und besonders im *G. Basse* geleet; bey dem Herrn Capellmeister Graupner aber in der Composition sich feste gesetzt [...]” (Walther 1732, 240).

83 For example, Fasch was initially self-taught at the keyboard, since he could not afford lessons (Blaut 2016). A letter from Kuhnau dated September 2, 1710 also reveals that his pupils sometimes substituted for him at the organ: he mentions his “auff der Orgel wohl exercierten Scholaren und Studenten, die mir alle mahl zur Music accompagniren” (Fontana 2014, 32).

84 Holtmeier, Menke, Diergarten 2013, 272.

It would be anachronistic to judge the *Fundamenta* by Heinichen's standards, which would view a preference for purely contrapuntal explanatory models over thoroughbass as inferior. That is, such a view would be to project a later pedagogical tradition backwards onto the turn from the seventeenth to eighteenth century.

At the same time one must also consider that, in setting priorities between thoroughbass-centered and "vocally-oriented" and "counterpoint-focused" instruction, we are dealing not only with a generational divide but also with the question of educational milieu.⁸⁵ Institutions like the Thomasschule belonged squarely to the tradition of Lutheran *Lateinschulen* in which keyboard lessons and individual instruction were not offered to all pupils, but where daily communal singing in the service was of central importance. In such settings, a pedagogical tradition developed that could seamlessly tie in with the vocal basis of *musica modulatoria*. The beginning chapters of the *Fundamenta* and the *Verfaßung* cover precisely this sort of material in their introductory chapters in an impressive manner. Early adopters of thoroughbass as a compositional tool, like Werckmeister and Friedrich Erhard Niedt, intended their instruction primarily for "handcraft-oriented" organists who presumably learned music-theoretical concepts in a more physical manner at the keyboard than through vocal music.

It was first in the 1720's that central and northern Germany witnessed a stronger influence of practical compositional instruction based on thoroughbass accompaniment. This led to compositional instruction's increasing reliance on thoroughbass, as seen in the first "popular" thoroughbass treatises such as those by Johann Mattheson (who helped popularize Niedt's theories), Georg Philipp Telemann, and David Kellner.

Nevertheless, traditional modes of explanation remained in force far into the eighteenth century, as can be seen in the writings of Gottfried Heinrich Stölzel,⁸⁶ Georg Friedrich Kauffmann,⁸⁷ and the canonic experiments of Christoph Graupner show.⁸⁸ Yet their reception was increasingly restricted to an audience of experts.

85 Here there is the danger we might overgeneralize by associating the older generation exclusively with "counterpoint" and the newer one with "thoroughbass."

86 Stölzel, Gottfried Heinrich, *Practischer Beweis, wie aus einem nach dem wahren Fundamente solcher Noten-Künsteleyen gesetzten Canone perpetuo in hypo dia pente quatuor vocom, viel und mancherley, Theils an Melodie, Theils auch nur an Harmonie, unterschiedene Canones perpetui à 4 zu machen seyn* (Berlin) 1725.

87 Mattheson's *Critica Musica* (Band 2, Pars V, page 31f) announces an unpublished and now lost treatise by the Merseburg organist, Georg Friedrich Kauffman, with the title *Introduzione alle Musica antica & moderna, d.i. eine ausführlich Einleitung zur alten und neuen Wissenschaft der edlen Music [...] mit den allermolandesten 2. 3. 4. Und mehrstimmigen Exemplis illustriret, mit Fugen und gedoppelten Contrapunten gezieret* (see Wagner 2016). This may be the same unpublished treatise that Walther mentions in a letter to Bokemeyer dated August 4, 1736 (see Beckmann and Schulz 1987, 195–197). Moreover, the title contains the description: "daß man das gute und / annoch brauchbare aus der Antiquität behalten / das / unnütze und überflüssige abgesondert / das neue aber / gesichtet / das beste davon recommandiret / und / das übrige eines jeden Libertät / überlassen hat."

88 See Cahn 1986, 129–137.

References

- Benary, Peter. 1960. *Die deutsche Kompositionslehre des 18. Jahrhunderts*. Leipzig: Breitkopf.
- Blaut, Stephan. 2016. "Fasch, Johann Friedrich." *MGG Online*, edited by Laurenz Lütteken. Kassel, Stuttgart, New York. <https://www.mgg-online.com/mgg/stable/15449> (3 April 2020)
- Bononcini, Giovanni Maria. 1701. *Musicus practicus, welcher in kurtze weiset die Art, wie man zu vollkommener Erkänntniß aller derjenigen Sachen, welche bey Setzung eines Gesangs unterlauffen, und das die Kunst des CONTRA-PUNCTS erfordert, gelangen kan*, Stuttgart: Paul Treu.
- Braun, Werner. 1986. "Theile-Studien." In *Festschrift Arno Forchert zum 60. Geburtstag*, edited by Gerhard Allroggen and Detlef Altenburg. Kassel: Bärenreiter 1986, 77–85.
- Braun, Werner. 2002. *Die Kompositionslehre des Christian Demelius*. Nordhausen: Friedrich-Christian-Lesser Stiftung.
- Cahn, Peter. 1986. "Christoph Graupners *Kanons* als Versuch einer systematischen Imitationslehre." *Musiktheorie* 1/2: 129–137.
- Crüger, Johann. 1654. *Synopsis musica*. Berlin: Runge.
- Engler, Klaus. 1984. *Georg Poelchau und seine Musikaliensammlung: ein Beitrag zur Überlieferung Bachscher Musik in der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts*. PhD diss., University of Tübingen.
- Fontana, Eszter. 2014. "Telemann und die Leipziger Studiosi." In *Komponisten im Spannungsfeld von höfischer und städtischer Musikkultur*, edited by Carsten Lange and Brit Reipsch. Hildesheim: Olms, 25–44.
- Diehl, Jürgen. 2015. "Die Conduite des Heinrich Bokemeyer." In *Zwischen Schütz und Bach: Georg Österreich und Heinrich Bokemeyer als Notensammler (Gottorf/Wolfenbüttel)*, edited by Konrad Küster. Stuttgart: Carus, 303–380.
- Gehrmann, Hermann. 1891. "Johann Gottfried Walther als Theoretiker." *Vierteljahrschrift für Musikwissenschaft* 7, 468–578.
- Grapenthin, Ulf. 2001. "Sweelincks *Compositionsregeln* aus dem Nachlass Johann Adam Reinckens." In *Beiträge zur Musikgeschichte Hamburgs vom Mittelalter bis in die Neuzeit*, edited by Hans-Joachim Marx. Frankfurt am. Main: Lang 2001, 71–110.
- Hahn, Kurt. 1957. "Johann Kuhnau *Fundamenta compositionis*." In *Bericht über den internationalen Musikwissenschaftlichen Kongress Hamburg 1956*, edited by Walter Gerstenberg, Harald Heckmann, and Heinrich Husmann. Kassel: Bärenreiter, 103–105.
- Harasim, Clemens. 2016. "Kuhnau, Johann." *MGG Online*, edited by Laurenz Lütteken. Kassel, Stuttgart, New York. 2016. <https://www.mgg-online.com/mgg/stable/57280> (2 April 2020)
- Heinichen, Johann David. 1711. *Neu erfundene und Gründliche Anweisung [...] Zu vollkommener Erlernung des General-Basses*. Hamburg: Schiller.
- Heinichen, Johann David. 1728. *Der General-Bass in der Composition*. Dresden: [Selbstverlag].

- Hirschmann, Wolfgang. 2016. "Bokemeyer, Heinrich." *MGG Online*, edited by Laurenz Lütteken. Kassel, Stuttgart, New York. 2016. <https://www.mgg-online.com/mgg/stable/15533> (31 March 2020)
- Holtmeier, Ludwig. 2017. *Rameaus langer Schatten. Studien zur deutschen Musiktheorie des 18. Jahrhunderts*. Hildesheim: Olms.
- Holtmeier, Ludwig, / Johannes Menke / Felix Diergarten. 2013. *Solfeggi, Bassi e Fughe. Georg Friedrich Händels Übungen zur Satzlehre*. Wilhelmshaven: Florian Noetzel.
- Kümmerling, Harald. 1970. *Katalog der Sammlung Bokemeyer*. Kassel: Bärenreiter.
- Küster, Konrad. 2015. "Georg Österreichs Musiksammlung". In *Zwischen Schütz und Bach: Georg Österreich und Heinrich Bokemeyer als Notensammler (Gottorf/Wolfenbüttel)*, edited by Konrad Küster. Stuttgart: Carus, 117–276.
- Lange, Carsten. 2016. "Österreich, Georg." *MGG Online*, edited by Laurenz Lütteken. Kassel, Stuttgart, New York. 2016. <https://www.mgg-online.com/mgg/stable/28450> (31 March 2020)
- Massenkeil, Günter. 2016. "Carissimi, Giacomo." *MGG Online*, edited by Laurenz Lütteken. Kassel, Stuttgart, New York. 2016. <https://www.mgg-online.com/mgg/stable/57281> (2 April 2020)
- Mattheson, Johann. 1725. *Critica Musica*, vol. 2. Hamburg: Thomas Wierings Erben.
- Mattheson, Johann. 1739. *Der vollkommene Capellmeister*. Hamburg: Herold.
- Melamed, Daniel R. 1989. "Eine Motette Sebastian Knüpfers aus J. S. Bachs Notenbibliothek." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 75: 191–196.
- Müller-Blattau, Josef. 1963. *Die Kompositionslehre Heinrichs Schützens in der Fassung seines Schülers Christoph Bernhard*. Kassel: Bärenreiter.
- Niedt, Friedrich Erhard. 1717. *Musicalische Handleitung*, 3 vol. Hamburg: Schiller, 1700–1721.
- Neidhardt, Johann Georg. c. 1715. *Compositio harmonice problematice tradita*. Ms. Universitätsbibliothek Lund, Sammlung Emanuel Wenster, Lit. G. Nr. 1.
- Praetorius, Friedrich Emanuel / Derek Remeš. 2019. "Kurtzer doch fründlicher Unterricht vom General-Baß. Brief Yet Fundamental Instruction in Thoroughbass Edited and Translated by Derek Remeš." *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Musiktheorie* 16/2: 109–114. <https://doi.org/10.31751/1014>
- Printz, Wolfgang Caspar. 1678. *Musica modulatoria vocalis*. Schweidnitz: Okel.
- Printz, Wolfgang Caspar. 1696. *Phrynus Mitilenaeus oder Satyrischer Componist*. Complete edition of parts I – III. . Dresden: Mieth.
- Rathert, Wolfgang. 2001. "Zur Überlieferung der ›Praecepta der musicalischen Composition‹ von Johann Gottfried Walther." In *Ständige Konferenz Mitteldeutsche Barockmusik, Jahrbuch 2000*, edited by Wilhelm Seidel. Eisenach: Wagner, 83–92.
- Rose, Stephen. 2019. *Musical Authorship from Schütz to Bach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schünemann, Georg. 1933. "J. G. Walther und H. Bokemeyer. Eine Musikerfreundschaft um Sebastian Bach." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 30: 86–118.

- Stölzel, Gottfried Heinrich. 1725. *Practischer Beweis, wie aus einem nach dem wahren Fundamente solcher Noten-Künsteleyen gesetzten Canone perpetuo in hypo dia pente quatuor vocum, viel und mancherley, Theils an Melodie, Theils auch nur an Harmonie, unterschiedene Canones perpetui à 4 zu machen seyn*. Berlin. No Publisher.
- Wagner, Undine / Friedrich Wilhelm Riedel. 2016. "Kauffmann, Georg Friedrich." *MGG Online*, edited by Laurenz Lütteken. Kassel, Stuttgart, New York. 2016. <https://www.mgg-online.com/mgg/stable/27909> (2 April 2020)
- Walker, Paul. 1986. "From Renaissance *Fuga* to Baroque Fugue: The Role of the 'Sweetlinck Theory Manuscripts'." *Schütz-Jahrbuch* 7: 93–104.
- Walker, Paul. 2000. *Theories of Fugue from the Age of Josquin to the Age of Bach*. Rochester: University of Rochester Press.
- Walther, Johann Gottfried. 1955. *Praecepta der musicalischen Composition*. Edited by Peter Benary. Leipzig: VEB.
- Walther, Johann Gottfried. 1987. *Briefe*. Edited by Klaus Beckmann and Hans-Joachim Schulze. Leipzig: VEB.
- Walther, Johann Gottfried. 1732. *Musicalisches Lexicon oder musicalische Bibliothec*. Leipzig: Deer.
- Werckmeister, Andreas. 1702. *Harmonologia musica*. Frankfurt am Main: Calvisius.
- Wollny, Peter. 2015. "Vom ›apparat der auserleßten kirchen Stücke zum Vorrath an Musicalien, von J. S. Bach und andern berühmten Musicis‹ – Quellenkundliche Ermittlungen zur frühen Thüringer Bach-Überlieferung und zu einigen Weimarer Schülern und Kollegen Bachs." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 101: 99–154.

© 2020 Frederik Kranemann (frederik.kranemann@web.de), Derek Remeš (derekremes@gmail.com)

Kranemann, Frederik / Derek Remeš (2020), »The *Fundamenta compositionis Jean Kuhnaus 1703*: Edition, Translation, and Commentary« [Die *Fundamenta compositionis Jean Kuhnaus 1703* - Edition, Übersetzung und Kommentar], *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Musiktheorie* 17/2, 163–180. <https://doi.org/10.31751/1086>

Hochschule für Musik Freiburg, Hochschule Luzern [Lucerne University of Applied Sciences and Arts]

Dieser Text erscheint im Open Access und ist lizenziert unter einer Creative Commons Namensnennung 4.0 International Lizenz.

This is an open access article licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.



eingereicht / submitted: 07/02/2019

angenommen / accepted: 07/06/2020

veröffentlicht / first published: 23/12/2020

zuletzt geändert / last updated: 19/02/2021