JOURNAL OF Music RESEARCH ONLINE

A JOURNAL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE

THE BASIS OF JOHANN MATTHESON'S MUSICAL AESTHETICS

YOH MURAKAMI

Shinshu University
Nagano
Japan

yoh_murakami@hotmail.com

JMRO
www.jmro.org.au

THE UNIVERSITY of ADELAIDE
www.adelaide.edu.au

The Aim and Scope of this Study

Johann Mattheson (1681–1764) was one of the most versatile figures in the musical scene in early eighteenth-century Germany, and his writings, *Das neu-eröffnete Orchestre* (1713) and *Der vollkommene Capellmeister* (1739) among others, are frequently cited as primary source documents in studies on late Baroque music. Still, because those research topics are usually focused on a particular single matter such as key characteristics (Steblin 1983: 40–53), compositional style (Palisca 1984), music genre (Krummacher 1986), musical rhetoric (Göttert 1986), *Incisionlehre* (Fee 1991)[1], acoustic phenomenalism (Christensen 1994), *Melodielehre* (Petersen-Mikkelsen 2002: 162–75; Matsubara 2018: 162–75), to mention a few, only limited facets from Mattheson's writings have been studied for these narrow topics[2]. Consequently, the whole picture of his own musical aesthetics remains rather unfathomable, in part because he never systematically described his general philosophy and also because many of his assertions superficially seem to contradict each other. This study aims to contour the fundamental philosophical basis of Mattheson's musical aesthetics on which his various views about musical issues were predicated, as it has not hitherto been sufficiently discussed in the literature. In so doing, some of Mattheson's key ideas will be first explained in the study's main sections. The pivotal idea which consistently and coherently joins these wide-ranging ideas is Lutheranism, which will be discussed in later sections.

Introduction

While his regular job was as secretary to the British Ambassador, Sir John Wich, Mattheson was also a talented composer, organist, critic and theorist (if not the best) and a close companion to Händel, Telemann, Keiser, Heinichen and other leading composers of the time. He was somewhat at odds with J.S. Bach.

What has justly made his name most famous, to us as well as to his contemporaries, are the more than twenty books he left. His first published book, *Das neu-eröffnete Orchestre* was addressed not to professional musicians but to dilettantes by supplying necessary knowledge to appreciate music as a *galant homme*. Mattheson herein

justified the sensual judgement on music by those dilettantes according to their knowledge and *bon goût*, widely calling for both favourable and unfavourable responses. Mattheson published his counterarguments in his own bi-weekly music journal, *Criticæ Musicæ* (1722–1725), provoking further discussions. Major opponents include Buttstett, Murschhauser, Bokemeyer and Fux. He was surely one of the most remarkable forerunners in this sort of critical and journalistic activity in the music of the time. In the meantime, he published two more major books, *Das beschützte Orchestre* (1717) and *Das forschende Orchestre* (1721), mainly fortifying his own views disclosed in the first *Orchestre* (1713). The *Capellmeister* (1739) was directed more at professional musicians and thus Mattheson voiced how to be an ideally cultivated musician, focusing on more professional-oriented contents such as the way to write a good tune, musical rhetoric, counterpoint and so on. Note that its Part II, *Teil II*, alone was antecedently published in 1737 with the title of *Kern melodischer Wissenschafft*, with an aim to compete with his contemporary harmonists such as J.-P. Rameau[3]. Melody had, strange to say, seldom been treated in depth in theoretical books on musical composition before Mattheson's, and thus it can be said that his work marked an important point in the history of melody study[4]. The scope of subjects that Mattheson dealt with in these encyclopaedic books ranges widely over compositional styles, musical forms, musical rhetoric, melodic studies, ornaments, counterpoint, harmonic theory, music education, theory and practice for general bass and so on (Mattheson 1731; Mattheson 1735).

Harriss provided a comprehensive review of literature on Mattheson written between 1800 and 1983 (Harriss, 1984: 461–84)[5]. Especially important are two monographs by Schmidt and Cannon (Schmidt 1897; Cannon 1947). *New Mattheson Studies* was the first collection of papers on Mattheson and a milestone in summarising earlier studies (Buelow & Marx 1984). *Johann Mattheson als Vermittler und Initiator* is the next collection of papers which summarises newer studies (Hirschmann & Jahn 2010). Harriss' translation of *Capellmeister* is also indispensable for English readers who wish to access Mattheson's writings (Harriss 1981).

With regard to Mattheson's spiritual life, he had been long thought to be a very secular person, due in part to his deep involvement with Hamburg Opera and also to his relentless debate against ecclesiastical musicians. As a result, Mattheson's religious faith has been so underestimated as to be mentioned neither in Harriss' extensive list of past studies (Harriss 1984), nor in *New Grove Dictionary* (Buelow 2001) and *M.G.G.* (Hinrichsen & Pietsmann 2004–2008). Dammann even insists that we do not have to first read *Capellmeister* 'to know this aggressive person's dogmatic laziness and religious indifference' (Dammann 1995: 480). The same trend remains even among recent studies. For example, Pearson describes Mattheson as 'a former opera singer turned church musician' and considers Mattheson's life 'dichotomous' based on the predication that secular and ecclesiastical activities are incompatible (Pearson 2017: 170). Isoyama made a good point to shed light on Mattheson's orthodox Lutheranism and to consider Mattheson's musical activities as a sort of religious reformation, though rather insufficiently as his study was based only on Mattheson's early works (Isoyama 1985). Mattheson, in point of fact, manifested his Lutheran belief as early as his first publication and became fully engaged in religious writings after the 1740s. It is arguably Irwin's writings that focused on Mattheson's spiritual aspect fully for the first time (Irwin 2011; Irwin 2015).

In this paper, Mattheson's various musical ideas are examined in the following sections: writing style, empiricism, natural philosophy, musical rhetoric, phenomenalism, subjectivism, Galanterie, *Affektenlehre* and so on. It will then be shown that these ideas can be consistently and inherently interlocked to form a well-defined aesthetic system with Lutheran belief as its central core.

Encyclopaedic Style of Writing

The most characteristic trait consistently seen in Mattheson's writings is the encyclopaedic style of description that covers almost every aspect of the music of the time. Cannon says that there was little change in Mattheson's writing style throughout his life (Cannon 1984: 4). This must be a reflection of his having been as much a polymath himself as, more importantly, of his belief that one must be highly learned to appreciate music. Indeed, the idea that a musician must possess all-round knowledge (Seares 2014: 53–63)[6] is concisely manifested in the title of his magnum opus, *Der vollkommene Capellmeister*, which was most likely named after Cicero's *De Oratore*, where Cicero repeatedly places emphasis on universal education for raising an orator (Cicero 1948: 27, 53, 89–91, 137, 220–2, 424–7). It was natural that Mattheson should have applied Cicero's conviction about oratory to music, considering the high standard of education Mattheson received, besides the facts that his compositional theory was based upon rhetoric and that Latin education was much valued in Lutheran Germany of the day. Assuredly, he also mentions *vollkommene Redner* in the preface of *Capellmeister* (Mattheson 1739a: Vorrede 9; Mattheson 1739b: 9; Harriss 1981: 35). Petersen-Mikkelsen (2002: 9) points out that the following statement in *Capellmeister* is a direct paraphrase of Cicero: 'all knowledge and arts are associated with each other like a chain or limbs' (Mattheson 1739a: 103)[7].

Note that the fullest knowledge Mattheson required of a musician to match Cicero in Part I of *De Oratore* (Mattheson 1739a: 100–3) was not to complete the musician's own character but rather to acquire a full command of music to persuade the audience. He clearly defined the purpose of music as being to arouse the affections by pleasing the ear (Mattheson 1739a: 207)[8]. To inspire the affection of the listener and to delectate (delight) the ear are, indeed, congruent with the well-known motto, *docere delectare et movere*, in the German rhetorical tradition of *Musica Poetica* since Burmeister (Bartel 1997: 96).

The heavy intellectualism closely related to the encyclopaedic style of writing naturally entailed thorough classification: Mattheson elaborates the individual characters of seventeen keys (Mattheson 1713: 236–53), national styles (Mattheson 1713: 200–31) and instruments (Mattheson 1713: 253–89)[9], being much more comprehensive in this respect than his contemporaries. Also, he explains three genres of music[10], church, chamber and theatrical music, in *Das neu-eröffnete Orchestre* to know for a *galant homme*, whom he assumed is an ideal music lover. Mattheson later extended this up to nine (Mattheson 1717: 116–8), with fifteen subclasses (Mattheson 1717: 131), during a dispute with Buttstett. Whereas he might have done this rather reluctantly according to Kircher's nine classifications in response to Buttstett (he later went back to the original three in *Kern melodischer Wissenschafft* (1737)) the classification in 1717 was nonetheless one of the most exhaustive studies on music genre, *Gattungslehre*, of the time. In 1739 in *Capellmeister,* Mattheson classified vocal music into sixteen styles (Mattheson 1739a: 210–33)[11].

As the stylistic norm was an acute problem at that time[12], it was not only Mattheson who discussed styles and genres of music. Indeed, when he first reduced the number down to three, conservative musicians such as Buttstett thought it disgracefully unconventional. It is interesting that the classification scheme in 1713 was based on the occasion on which a music piece was to be played, but that in 1739 it was based on the orchestration and compositional forms, though Mattheson classified each of them according to the typical occasion on which they should be played. This may have mirrored changes not so much in the way of classification as the cultural climate with the *Gattungslehre* of the day. Firstly, new types of music came to transgress the boundaries between genres such as oratorio, which was born from opera but became popular in church, and the clavier sonata, which was categorised as chamber music. Some pieces of the genre, however, adopted the polyphonic writing that was traditionally associated with vocal ecclesiastical music. Secondly, the distance between music and rhetoric, which had been quite short ever since the dawn of the Renaissance, started to widen around the middle of the eighteenth century (the reason will be discussed later.) Hence, the lexical classification of musical genres and rhetorical figures, which are useful to make music formalistically focused on a specific human affection, came to decrease in value. Petersen-Mikkelsen (2002: 79–80) points out that the reason that Mattheson presented an extensive list of music genres may have been that he disliked mixing different styles in a single piece on the grounds of it being against the principle of the *galant* taste, in which simplicity, clarity and distinctness were, above all, regarded as important. The author, however, cannot be fully convinced of this view because it does not explain why Mattheson presented only three music genres in 1713 despite his strong advocacy of the *galant* taste even around that time. The apparent contradiction can be reconciled by the fact that his three genres in 1713 were addressed to the listener of music, the *galant homme*, but the extensive list of genres in 1739 to the professionals. The radical change in the number must have thus echoed the change not in Mattheson's musical aesthetics but in the readers he targeted. Note that one conspicuous feature of the German tradition of *Musica Poetica* is the thorough catalogue of *Figuren*: from the time that Burmeister introduced music-rhetorical figures in his *Musica Poetica* (1607), the list had been continually enriched by Nucius, Thuringus, Bernhard, Printz, Ahle, Janowka, J.G. Walther, Vogt and others[13]. This inclination to thorough coverage may have had its roots in the Categories of Aristotle, whose philosophy had exerted a great influence on the intellectual tradition in northern Lutheran Germany (Dammann 1995: 15, 18, 93)[14].

In summary, it can be said that Mattheson's encyclopaedic style of writing and thorough classification reflects not only the intellectualism he required in both listening to and making music, but also came in part from the strong tradition of Latin education and Aristotelian logic, both of which formed a vital part of *artes liberales* and were widely shared by northern German musicians of the day[15].

Empiricism and Natural Science

The northern German church music in Lutheran countries had a firm tradition in ratio-based music, resulting in many theoretical writings, some authors who Dammann mentioned: Calvisius, Lippius, Mich, Praetorius, Baryphonus, Bartolus, Kircher, Herbst, Matthaei, Printz, Steffani, Werckmeister, Kuhnau, Buttstett, J.G. Walther, Mizler and Adlung (Dammann 1995: 76–7). The idea that the perfect order of the world, *Harmonia*, is represented by mathematical ratios allegedly had its deep roots in Pythagorean philosophy, music having long

been considered the art that represents *Harmonia* best. This pagan view survived through the medieval time, with the perfect cosmic order identified with God's creation in Christianity. In the tradition of Lutheran church music, the philosophy of *Harmonia* was adroitly merged with the Renaissance natural magic of Kircher, though he himself was a Jesuit, and Lutheran theology chiefly by Lippius, Kepler, Baryphonus and Werckmeister[16], who fully expounded the numerology in his writings. Referring to such names as Paracelsus, Kepler, Ficino, Bruno and Agrippa, Werckmeister says, '[...] the spheres and the whole world are arranged by God in certain musical proportions' (Bartel 2018: 51–150) and 'Music is a mathematical science that shows us through numbers the proper difference and category of sounds, from which we can arrange a skillful and natural *Harmonia*' (Werckmeister 1687: 9–10). Blankenburg (1959: 44) writes, 'No other concept than *Harmonia* reveals the essence of perspective in the Lutheran Baroque music so well'.

Mattheson adopted Locke's empiricism for impugning this metaphysical tradition, his job as secretary to a British ambassador, Hamburg's geographical position and his excellent command of English made it possible for him to access the newest British thought (Christensen 1994: 4–5). In *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1689), Locke defined everything that can be a direct object of human perception as an idea and postulated that to know is to have an idea. He consequently proposed a program that human intellect should be fully clarified through studies on various ideas, positing that the human mind is, at birth, a blank state [*tabula rasa*], by denying all innate ideas and proposing that all ideas could only be empirically attained through senses and reflection. This epistemology was regarded as hugely profane by the contemporary religious circle because it would indicate even such absolute ideas as God, good and the immortality of the soul are only empirically forged through mortal senses and reflection alone[17]. Thus, Mattheson's empiricism presented in 1713 must have also appeared blasphemous. Christensen illustrates, '[Mattheson] … would lambaste *musica theoria* as a discredited remnant of unenlightened prejudice' and 'With the weapons of empirical philosophy bequeathed by Locke, writers such as Mattheson could militantly hoist the Aristoxenian flag of *sensus* over that of *ratio*' (Christensen 2002: 8).

In response to the *sensus-ratio* debate that Mattheson sparked off by the first *Orchestre*, he published *Das beschützte Orchestre* (1717) and *Das forschende Orchestre* (1721) in quick succession to support his view. The subtitle of the latter is '*Sensus vindiciæ, oder der vertheidigte Sinnen-Rang*' and its first chapter is filled with a large number of authoritative names, invoked from both ancient and contemporary times, including Locke, together with their citations. Chapter I alone, entitled '*Von den Sinnen*', is 135 pages long and Mattheson mentions some of the newest ideas from Collier and Berkeley too (Mattheson 1721: 127–8). Chapter II, '*Von den Rationibus*', expounds in over 130 pages the basis of philosophy of senses, beauty in music, mathematical beauty, the physiological function of ear and so forth. Mattheson presents, here again, a good number of citations from Pythagoras, Boethius, Ptolemy, Werckmeister, Steffani, Printz, Kuhnau, Aristotle, Anaximandros, Democritos, Wolff, Hypocrates, Galen, Aristoxenos, Pliny, Locke and many others in original languages such as Latin, Greek, English and French. He presents, moreover, even rather vulgar examples to show that virtues are empirically formed and thus can vary depending on the culture (Mattheson 1721: 37–8), possibly with an intention to enrage conservative ecclesiastical musicians. Mattheson's phenomenalism is well epitomised in the following: 'Cassiodorus named music the most pleasant and very useful science that heightens our sense after what is aloft as well as delectates the ear' (Mattheson 1721: 185). Petersen-Mikkelsen (2002: 55–6) cites from the third *Orchestre* a statement by Mattheson which shows Locke's influence most clearly:

> Not the judgement by sensory organs, mere perception (*nudæ perceptionis*), recognition nor feeling but that by senses call I a judgement by soul itself, which founds itself solely on the perception that stands by (Mattheson 1721: 9–10).

Mattheson herein radically denies *a priori* the judgement of human minds at all. (Importantly, he associates sensual judgement with not body but soul.) In *Capellmeister*, he declares that 'everything must sing properly' (Mattheson 1739a: 2; Harriss 1981: 82) and thereafter repeatedly emphasises his sense-based view on music; for example, 'the sound is neither good or bad in itself; it becomes good or bad after man hears it'.(Mattheson 1739a: Vorrede 19; Harriss 1981: 51; Mattheson 1722: 338). Note that, unlike Locke who developed his theory about complex ideas from simple ideas and senses, Mattheson did not step further into such philosophical discussion. It was probably enough for his interest, restricted as it is to music, to show that human recognition is empirically formed through the senses.

Regarding ratios, Mattheson discusses in the first *Orchestre* whether the perfect fourth, represented by the ratio of 3:4 is a consonance (Mattheson 1713: 126–7), because this interval used to be considered a consonance in medieval treatises but has long been practically regarded as a dissonance ever since the Renaissance[18]. His conclusion was that it depends on the sense of hearing for each occasion (Mattheson 1713: 55). This simple assertion is enough to utterly deny the *Harmonia*-based traditional view[19].

Opposed as Mattheson was to church musicians by denying such number-based music, *numerus sonorus*, and refuting the concept of innate idea even for God, does not mean he was a very secular person. But that has long been his public image due in part to the empiricism, his seeming inclination towards secular music, his ruthless polemics against church musicians and his contrasting character to J.S. Bach, who is often regarded as a highly theological musician. Mattheson had, in point of fact, a sincere and fervent belief in orthodox Lutheranism and a sound knowledge of theology, as will be discussed later. It must also be remembered that German early Enlightenment thought was firmly rooted in Lutheran theology (Irwin 2015: xxxiii). In contrast to French Enlightenment thought, in which *l'Académie des sciences* played a significant role in advocating the deistic trend and many *philosophe*s favoured Lockean epistemology for this purpose, early German Enlightenment thinkers, such as Reinbeck and Canz, applied Wolffian philosophy to defend Lutheran theology (Irwin 2015: xxxiii).

Natural Philosophy

It seems that Mattheson nearly equated the world with nature, God's creation, as is often typical of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century French classicism in which *l'imitation de la nature* formed the principle. This view being widely shared, the point of argument lay in how to appreciate nature: for Buttstett it was through mathematical ratios, for Mattheson through human senses. Mattheson called ratio-based musicians *Rationisten* and vehemently decried them (Petersen-Mikkelsen 2002: 61; Mattheson 1739a: 9) because 'God is not to be measured mathematically or divided by numbers' (Irwin 2015: 27). He also emphasised the importance of psychology over mathematics (Mattheson 1739a: 9). Note that what Mattheson denied was not mathematics itself but the prioritising of mathematics over senses. It is thus not contradictory at all that he took up much space in his books in expounding some mathematical aspects with music such as consonances and dissonances (Mattheson 1739a: 41–55; Mattheson 1713: 39–57). Mattheson thought that mathematics dealing only with purely metaphysical objects must be contraposed against physics and physiology, *Naturlehre*, which deals with actual phenomena (Mattheson 1739a: 19, 21). His view is unequivocally expressed: 'Mathematics is a human art; but nature is a divine power' (Mattheson 1739a: 21; Harriss 1981: 55). Note also that, though mathematics and physics are often regarded as adjacent subjects today, they were sometimes rather seen as mutually exclusive at the beginning of eighteenth century in parallel with the growing preponderance of Newtonian empiricism over Cartesian deductivism in natural science (though this view is too simplistic). Mattheson's idea, therefore, was not bizarre at all at that time. Mattheson, in order to bolster his view, introduces many practical examples that indicate some physiological relationship exists between music and the human body: such examples include music therapy and the musical edification of ancient Greece (Mattheson 1739a: 14–15). He also introduces the newest findings in acoustics such as vibration of a sounding body, harmonic overtones and resonance, quoting contemporary German and French scientists instead of ancient Greek thinkers, to fortify the physics-music relationship. Certainly, he strenuously objects to the static view of the world (Mattheson 1739a: 9), which has an affinity with prescribed *ratios* and the idea of divine perfect creation. The dynamic view of the world was, on the contrary, a relatively new way of understanding the world, partly triggered by the appearance of supernovas observed in 1572 and 1604, which then led to the core ideas of Newtonian mechanics published in 1687[20]. In metaphysics, dynamism was chiefly formulated and developed by Leibniz and Wolff. Mattheson seems, in this regard, to be a typical German early Enlightenment thinker. He must not be mistaken, though, for a mechanistic materialist for his anti-metaphysical view[21]: Mattheson devoutly believed in divine creation and the afterlife. His point is that it is hubristic to think that mortals can represent nature through limited human inventions such as mathematics.

Melodielehre

Mattheson's penchant for melody over harmony closely pertains to his phenomenalism and thus must be understood in relation to sense-ratio, dynamic-static antagonisms. He claims that 'Melody alone moves hearts with its noble simplicity, clarity and distinctness in such a way that it often surpasses all harmonic artifices' (Mattheson 1739a: 137–8; Harriss 1981: 306)[22]. Mattheson's vituperation against Rameau, who privileged harmony over melody, can also be understood in this perspective, though Rameau differed from *Rationalist*s in that he tried to construct a systematic theory of harmonic progression after science, based not upon metaphysical ideas but upon such newest acoustical findings as overtones and sounding body theory (Rameau 1726). Rameau's view towards natural phenomena, in this regard, appears typical of French Enlightenment thought and thus seemingly close to Mattheson's in a sense. Yet, for Mattheson, scientific findings must serve only to buttress his Lutheran theology, not vice versa: it must be melody, not harmony, that is associated with heavenly music, because melody is the department of the soul's affections (Irwin 2015: xxxiii), while harmony is artificially governed by reason[23].

Note that Mattheson's having placed primacy on melody is sometimes interpreted as a reflection of the change in compositional principle from the Baroque to the Classical period (Broyles 1983: 215)[24], partly because of his polemics with contrapuntists. This view is, however, off the mark because he assigned the entire part of *Teil III* of *Capellmeister* to contrapuntal composition and boasted about his own work on double counterpoint, *Die wolklingende Fingersprache* (Mattheson 1739a: 441). The point of argument for Mattheson lay only in the priority of naturalness over artifice (Matsubara 2015: 167; Mattheson 1722: 239; Mattheson 1725: 297). Thus, he was very susceptible to contrapuntal work insofar as it sounds natural. Matsubara (2015: 168) correctly points out that the concept of *Symphoniurgie*, which Mattheson advocated in *Capellmeister* (Mattheson 1739a: 245–6), best represents his idea that voices in polyphonic writing should sound natural as much synchronically as diachronically. This criterion of naturalness can dissolve the apparent contradiction between Mattheson's relentless argument against learned contrapuntal genres, such as canon and double counterpoint, during the dispute with Bokemeyer (Mattheson 1722: 236–68) and his promotion of his own contrapuntal works. Note that ratio-based contrapuntists, like Buttstett and Bokemeyer, held the hermeneutic view that four voices in counterpoint represent the four elements and their motion embodying *Harmonia* correspond to that of heavenly bodies (Yearsley 2002: 20) according to the alchemic principle 'As above, so below'[25] which Mattheson had no room to tolerate because of his orthodox Lutheran view.

Mattheson's preference of melody in the above view must be distinguished from that of J.J. Rousseau, who later also advocated the predominance of melody but on completely different grounds. It is noteworthy that Mattheson's contrapuntal works, his challenge rather explicitly directed to J.S. Bach (Mattheson 1739a: 441), and *Teil III* of *Capellmeister* may have provoked Bach to produce his contrapuntal works in the 1740s such as *Clavier-übung III, Das wohltemperarirte Clavier II* and some pieces of *Die Kunst der Fuge* (Butler 1984: 295), which Mattheson lauded in 1752.

The Imitation of Nature

Mattheson repeatedly insisted that nature is the source of spring, of beauty, and that art must imitate nature, declaring 'Natural models yield the artistic. Art is a servant of nature, and serves to imitate it' (Mattheson 1739a: 135; Harriss 1981: 303). This idea of art as imitation of nature can be traced back to Plato, Aristotle and Stoic thinkers, having influenced Renaissance theorists particularly through their reading of Aristotle's *Poetica*, first translated into Latin in 1546 in Venice. With this idea espoused as the central tenet, classicism was theoretically developed in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Batteux, who was also heavily influenced by Locke via Voltaire, centred the idea of *l'imitation de la nature* in his treatise, one of the most influential theoretical writings in French classicism. Among Mattheson's contemporaries, Bodmer and Breitinger developed their Wolffian art theory based on the idea of the imitation of nature. Petersen-Mikkelsen (2002: 63) points out that the concept of *l'imitation de la nature* came to be discussed also in Germany from around 1700 onward. Note that Mattheson expressed his idea above as early as 1713, while Batteau wrote *Les beaux arts réduits à un même principe* in 1746. Note also that Winckelmann's classicism described in *Gedanken über die Nachahmung der griechischen Wercke in der Malerey und Bildhauer-Kunst* (1755) is best known for the concepts of '*edle Einheit*' and '*stille Größe*', but Mattheson used and emphasised the words, *edle Einheit*, as early as in 1737 (Mattheson 1737: 36)[26]. Mattheson must thus be regarded as one of the leading harbingers, if not an originator, of eighteenth-century German classicism.

It should be noted that artistic *imitation* should be distinguished from a mere copy of an object, *copié*: while the latter is often seen as inferior in quality to the original, the function of the former is to capture the essence of nature in rather an intensified manner by means of the artificial skills of artists (Mattheson 1739a: 143) that should be well hidden (Mattheson 1739a: 35), as their only function is to reveal the beauty of nature. Verisimilitude in art, therefore, must be judged not by graphic fidelity but by the degree to which the essential characteristics of the object are captured. Mattheson knew this difference well and maintains that what is shown within a play should not necessarily be identical to that in reality because the audience well knows that they are seeing a stage which is artificially created and decorated. This is clear from Mattheson's translation of Saint-Évremond's *Lettre à Mr. Le Duc de Buckingham* (1677/1678) in the first *Orchestre* (Mattheson 1713: 165–7). This letter has often been inappropriately cited as criticising opera for being remote from reality, though Saint-Évremond's original point concerns only the extravagance, specifically casting doubt on the all-sung opera where a man persists in singing even as he dies. It is worth emphasising again that, as nature is divine creation, its artistic imitation is, for Mattheson and his Lutheran belief, equal to praise of the omnipotent Creator.

Galanterie

Mattheson contends that, in order to imitate nature, one must do away with conspicuous artificial gimmicks, unnecessary decorations or show-off techniques (Mattheson 1722: 245). This idea is fully sketched in the first *Orchestre* in 1713, featured by an adjective on loan from French, *galant*. The title page, in fact, reads: *Das Neu-Eröffnete Orchestre, Oder Universelle und gründliche Anleitung / Wie ein Galant Homme einen vollkommen Begriff von der Hoheit und Würde der edlen MUSIC erlangen / seinen Gout darnach formieren / die Terminos verstehen und geschicklich von dieser vortrefflichen Wissenschafft raisonniren möge*.

In this lengthy title, important key words such as *edlen*, *vollkommen*, *Gout* [sic] and *galant homme*, can be seen. Cannon points out that the word, *galant*, was a buzzword used to describe things in fashion at the beginning of the eighteenth century in Hamburg (Petersen-Mikkelsen 2002: 10), where people were more open to international cultures than in other German cities, partly because of its geographical location, commercially-oriented atmosphere and its status as a Free Imperial City. The word, *galant*, first appeared in the middle of the seventeenth century in France and originally meant courtly virtues. Gjerdingen well summarised the connotation:

> *Galant* was a word much used in the eighteenth century. It referred broadly to a collection of traits, attitudes and manners associated with the cultured nobility. If we imagine an ideal *galant* man, he would be witty, attentive to the ladies, comfortable at a princely court, religious in a modest way, wealthy from ancestral land holdings, charming, brave in battle and trained as an amateur in music and other arts (Gjerdingen 2007: 5).

The meaning was, however, soon vulgarised to imply a sexual connotation and then the word itself became obsolete in France. According to Petersen-Mikkelsen, the word was introduced in Germany in the 1670s to describe a cutting-edge gentleman cultivated in the French courtly manner (Petersen-Mikkelsen 2002: 11). Thomasius defined, in 1687, *galanterie* nearly as *politesse*, and maintained that, if a *galanten Mensch* attains *honnéte Gelehrsamkeit*, *beaté d'esprit, bon gôut* and *galanterie*, he would then be a *parfait homme Sâge* or *vollkommener weiser Mann* (Petersen-Mikkelsen 2002: 13). In the period from 1690s to 1710s, the word, *galant*, became rapidly obsolete also in Germany, possibly because of the vulgarised new meaning. According to the observation of the author, Mattheson used the word, *galant*, at least thirty times in the first *Orchestre* in 1713 but only six times in *Capellmeister* in 1739[27]. Though he never further explicated what *galant* exactly meant, in reference to the long list of composers in fashion as *galant* composers in 1721 including Kaiser, Marcello, Vivaldi, A. Scarlatti, Lotti, Händel and Telemann, Mattheson (1721: 276), he does briefly explain that they depend on '*musikalishe (nicht mathematische) Wissenschafften*'. This indicates that *galant* composers meant, at least at the point of 1721, those whom Mattheson thought were on his side in the *sensus-ratio* debate. A *galant homme* also meant for him an ideal music lover who is fully cultured and has *le bon goût* to appreciate music[28]. Considering the close connotation between *galant homme* and *vollkommener weiser Mann*, a *vollkommene Capellmeister* should be considered a similar figure to a *galant homme* in that he has universal culture and *le bon goût*.

It is noteworthy that Mattheson used the adjective, *galant*, almost always in the form of *galant homme* and never wrote *galanter Stil*. Thus, the music style Mattheson advocated should not be rashly interpreted as the *galant* style, which today refers to a theatrical style fashionable in the late Baroque era and is 'not subject to rules (except those of *le bon goût*)' (Heartz 1980: 92), with simplicity featured in contrast to polyphonic intricacies. The *galant* style, admittedly, has much in common with the style that Mattheson loudly advocated, but it refers to a wider category of music. For example, Sheldon includes the *Empfindsamer Stil* in the *galant* style (Sheldon 1975: 269–70), though its fundamental idea of expressing a musician's subjective feelings and its features, such as a sudden change in mood, is completely at odds with Mattheson's aesthetics. Petersen-Mikkelsen (2002: 34) appositely points out that what Mattheson called *galant* was not a specific compositional style, but that which would be to the taste of the *galant homme*. It can be summarised that a *galant homme* is a sense-oriented person who can properly appreciate nature imitated in music (not jarred by complexity) by means of his universal knowledge and *le bon goût*.

Affektenlehre and Musical Rhetoric

The study on human affections, *Affektenlehre*, forms the core part of Mattheson's musical thoughts because it pertains to the ultimate purpose of music, that of edifying virtues and praising God. He says:

> Music is a science and an art of placing proper and pleasing sounds prudently, uniting them correctly with one another, and presenting them sweetly, to promote God's honour and all virtue through their euphony (Mattheson 1739a: 5; Harriss 1981: 88).

He also asserts, mentioning Saint Augustine, that music which merely entertains cannot be appreciated if it lacks natural philosophy, *Naturlehre*, and ethics, *Sittenlehre* (Mattheson 1739a: 20; Harriss 1981: 111). For the above purpose, he insists that music must be properly founded on natural philosophy and ethics in order to appropriately arouse the affections of the audience. He thus extensively deals with human affections in Chapter 3 of *Capellmeister*'s *Teil I*, the subtitle of which is *Vom Klange an sich selber, und von der musikalischen Naturlehre*[29] [Where there is no passion (*Leidenschafft*), no affect (*Affect*) to be found], says he, 'there is also no virtue'[30] (Mattheson 1739a: 15; Harriss 1981: 104). Note that, compared with Kircher and Werckmeister, who prescribed the causal relationship that the praise of God would result in appropriate affection aroused, the relationship assumed from Mattheson's statements above may appear inverted. The point, for Mattheson, is that they are not linked by causation but indivisibly overlap, based on his belief that music must be the best gift from God, saying in defence of cantatas in church and the phenomenalism,

> [...] the soul enjoys the important contents and the heart the pleasant form. [...] Luther calls the New Testament "the pleasant Testament". Then the enjoyment, especially for God's honour, is, on our side, the ultimate goal of all acts, the Creation, Salvation and Praise. A pleased heart is the best gift of God (Mattheson 1727: 3–4).

Irwin (2011: 83) even states that, for Mattheson, 'theology will be of no value when God can be known directly' after death, but 'music will remain.'

With regard to the affect a musician wants to arouse in his audience, Mattheson repeatedly emphasises the importance of the musician first experiencing the affect himself (Mattheson 1739a: 16, 17, 132). Still, it must be understood that the affection that a musician has subjectively felt is not the goal of musical expression but a mere means to better depict human affections in general, since the expression of affection elaborated through personal experience can be shared with others insofar as the musician follows nature. Mattheson's aesthetics, regarding this point, must be clearly distinguished from modern subjective ones, whereby an artist expresses his or her personal emotions and feelings. He says that the performer is someone who portrays a certain person other than himself (Mattheson 1739a: 37), just as Diderot expressed the same idea about actors (Diderot 1773). In order for a personally experienced affection to be shared with others, all human beings are supposed to have a common physiological mechanism. Mattheson once mentioned Descartes' *Les Passions de l'âme* (1649) (Mattheson 1739a: 15), but never explored the theory. It is thus not possible to assess how much Mattheson practically relied on the Cartesian model. The author assumes that Mattheson probably borrowed from Descartes only limited fragments of ideas such as the separation between the acoustical action of music, *klingenden Kräffte* and the listener's affection, *Gemüther der Zuhörer* (Mattheson 1739a: 15). For Mattheson, unlike Kircher and many other theorists in the seventeenth century, hardly discussed the theory of animal spirit and humour, with which the Cartesian model had high compatibility. He must have, rather, opposed a mechanistic description of human affections, which he thought of as not a bodily but a spiritual faculty.

Mattheson made much of rhetoric in order to arouse the affections of the audience most efficiently. Lippman, regarding this, correctly points out the parallelism between the Florentine monodists in the early sixteenth century and *galant* music in the 1720s, in that both are based on rhetoric as a result of repulsion to number-based church music (Lippman 1992: 60). It can also be argued, in this respect, that Mattheson followed the old rivalry between trivium and quadrivium in a sense[31].

In *Capellmeister*, Mattheson remarks that there are four types of proportions in music: natural, moral, rhetorical and mathematical (Mattheson 1739a: Vorrede 16). Mattheson asserts that a composer should follow rhetorical proportions in structure (Mattheson 1739a: Vorrede 20) and fully elaborates on his musical view based on rhetoric in the rest of the preface, the tenth chapter of *Teil I* and, most extensively, *Teil II*, *Darin die wirckliche Verfertigung einer Melodie* (Mattheson 1739a: 180–1). In its Chapter 14, he deals with the

rhetorical method of composition, in which the initial idea, *inventio*, is developed through steps of disposition, elaboration and decoration (Mattheson 1739a: 235). Of these, Mattheson thought most of disposition. His reluctance to accept lexical description of *Figuren* in *Teil II* of *Capellmeister* quite likely reflects his view that human passions are unfathomable[32]. He says that the emotion is never especially fixed in one word or another: it reigns throughout the discourse, like the soul in the body (Mattheson 1725: 348; Flaherty 1984: 86). Helpful as it is to have the clear recognition of connecting affections to music (Mattheson 1739a: 19), the emotional reaction of the listener cannot be fully determined by the performer in Mattheson's phenomenalism. Thus, all performers can do is only to try their best to delectate (*delectare*) and move (*movere*) the listener and, for this purpose, Mattheson adopted the old traditional art of the oratory of Cicero and Quintilian[33].

The change in the sensual relationship between music and the listener also requires an essential change in how rhetoric is applied in music. Petersen-Mikkelsen cited Martin Geck's paper that points out that composers in the Age of Enlightenment preferred a rhetorically simple structure because the less ambiguous it is, the more effectively music can move the listener. This preference matches up with empirical phenomenalism, where the listener can be better guided with less ambiguity, though a *galant homme* is also supposed to be sufficiently highly cultured to have *le bon goût* to guide him (Petersen-Mikkelsen 2002: 48). Note that rhetoric had been close to theatrical art ever since ancient times, and thus Mattheson's emphasis on rhetoric in music further indicates the proximity between music and drama. This is, indeed, manifest as much in his involvement in opera making as in the idea of *theatrum mundi* that this world is somewhat created like a theatre and there is always something theatrical in all human activities including the Liturgies (Flaherty 1984: 78; Mattheson 1728: 111; Mattheson 1754–1756: 432). This idea fully legitimises rhetorical applications to any type of music including church music, hence oratorio and cantata. Note also that there was a change inside rhetoric as well. While the didactic effect, *docere*, was thought important in rhetoric in the seventeenth century, rhetoric in the time of Enlightenment came to be focused on moving the audience, *movere*, and thus the point shifted from external forms such as metre and rhyme to the internal: the meaning of words (Petersen-Mikkelsen 2002: 49). It can therefore be considered that Mattheson's disposition-oriented and *movere*-based rhetoric perfectly fits music in the transitional time, thanks in part to the flexible nature of the discipline that had survived since ancient times for varied purposes.

Phenomenalistic but not Subjectivism

Blume placed Mattheson at the apogee of the lineage of the German tradition of *Musica Poetica*, assuming a gap in the attitude towards rhetoric between Mattheson and the ensuing generation (Blume 1974: 185). Blume's view may have come from the fact that the description of musical rhetoric in German theoretical works shrank rapidly after Mattheson, as can be seen in those of Scheibe and Forkel. Still, the author does not fully agree with Blume, because Mattheson, being familiar with the French classic poetics via Racine, Corneille and Molière, had little reason to stick to the old German tradition. The author thinks rather that Mattheson's musical rhetoric may have just exemplified the transitional form in the era when typological *Figurenlehre* was gradually decreasing in value and the mechanistic image of human emotions, such as the Cartesian humour model was replaced with empirical phenomenalism. In Mattheson's phenomenalism, as music is judged by the listener's senses, the ideal listener, *galant homme*, is to be trained to have a good taste and sufficient knowledge to rightly appreciate music by avoiding subjective and fallacious appreciation[34]. This objectivity ensured by the listener's own training was later lost in late eighteenth- and nineteenth-century aesthetics after Kant's Copernican Revolution, where one's subjectivity became the criterion to recognise the world, hence the subjectivism in the Romantic era. In Mattheson's aesthetics, however, phenomenalism and subjectivism must be essentially distinguished, otherwise ontological purposes, such as the praise of God (Mattheson 1739a: 15, 20) and edification of virtues, cannot hold. Buelow called Mattheson's phenomenalism and intellectualism a dichotomy (Buelow 1984: 400) but this simply evinces the confusion between phenomenalism and subjectivism from the modern point of view: unlike the absolute positivity with Romantic subjectivity, the *tabula rasa* of Mattheson's *galant homme* should be fully supported by proper knowledge in order to fully appreciate nature. The distinction between phenomenalism and subjectivism is also important to distinguish Mattheson from the next generation. For example, Quantz, who must have been much influenced by Mattheson, manifested a largely similar taste in music to Mattheson's in his treatise in 1752, yet he wrote that a player should be absorbed in the prescribed feeling whilst playing (Quantz 1752: 93–4; Quantz 2001: 163). This unequivocally indicates the subjective direction. C.P.E. Bach more expressly enunciates his idea about self-expression in his *Versuch* (Bach 1753: 122–3) that the audience is supposed to be moved not through the contact with nature but by the player through the person-to-person emotional relationship, *Mit=Empfindung*. The audience's subjective direction was basically in accord with the *Empfindsamer Stil* in Berlin, the *Sturm und Drang* movement in literature, Baumgartian and Kantian philosophies and the later nineteenth-century Romanticism. In Mattheson's aesthetics based upon Lutheran belief, objectivity in the imitation of nature

must be ensured, but it can be done only through the listener's cultural sophistication; it could be practically expected only of a limited number of upper-class wealthy citizens. It was therefore natural that this type of aesthetics could not survive civil society after the French Revolution[35]. Interestingly, Krause, who was a contemporary of Quantz and C.P.E. Bach and was also hugely influenced by Mattheson, looked in a different direction: he persevered with the early *galant* style to make the most of simplicity and lightness but gave up expecting listeners to have been as well educated as Mattheson's *galant homme* was supposed to be. As a result, he seems to end up accepting a kind of hedonism, which was arguably in line with later popular music (Krause 1752: 28–31).

The Whole System

All aspects of the ideas discussed so far can be correlated to each other to illustrate one system of aesthetics: the ultimate purposes of music are for the praise of God and edification of virtues. In so doing, music must imitate nature, God's creation. Nature is to be best imitated not by reason but by the senses, with proper affections aroused. Though sense organs are bodily, hence inherently sinful, the faculty of sense belongs to the soul (Mattheson 1721: 95–104): thus, it is immortal and never inferior to reason (Irwin 2011: 76–7). The sense-based empiricism, therefore, is not profane at all in this rationale. The ability to properly appreciate music is *le bon goût*, which is partly fostered through universal knowledge (Mattheson 1722: 250), hence Mattheson's encyclopaedic style of writing. What links intellectualism and *le bon goût* is Lockean empirical philosophy. If one has *le bon goût* (such a person is called a *galant homme*) he can then appreciate music by his senses, with the right affection aroused. Arousal of affections is regarded as almost tantamount to praise of God in Lutheranism. Artificial skills aimed at the imitation of nature must be well hidden, hence no unnecessary decoration, showy gimmicks or complexity (Mattheson 1739a: 135). Melody is given primacy over harmony (Mattheson 1739a: 135), because melody is to harmony what sense is to reason. Mattheson employed rhetoric in composition in order to arouse the affections of the audience most efficiently. Latin education in Lutheran areas in Germany had a strong tradition in rhetoric, as can be seen in *Musica Poetica*, but Mattheson so applied it as to appropriately fit his musical aesthetics.

Overall, it is evident that he was profoundly influenced by French classicism, the doctrines of which Bray has summarised according to the following five principles (Bray 1945: 355–6)[36]:

1. The objective of poetry is the moral instruction (*l'instruction morale*) of human society.
2. In so doing, a poet must be a born poet with the natural disposition to deserve the name of genius (*génie*), but a genius alone can do nothing without art that is conceived as a code of rules (*un code de règles*), dictated by an immanent reason. Submission to the rule is essential to the classical creed.
3. The first of the rules is that of imitation (*l'imitation*), with its double application: the one is the imitation of nature (*l'imitation de la nature*). That is of a transposed and chosen nature or an ideal nature (*nature idéale*) and not of real nature (*la nature réelle*). The other is the imitation of models created by genius predecessors. The latter must be followed with taste (*goût*), without servility.
4. In imitation, there are two precepts to observe: verisimilitude (*vraisemblance*) and propriety (*bienséances*). Both will free poetry from the yoke of history and lead it towards Romanesque conventions and universal types (*les types universels*).
5. This direction is also pointed by the laws of the disposition, which aim at the concentration of art works on a psychological problem and divert the poetry of materials and the picturesque poetry, in order to found itself (the direction) on the study of passions (*l'étude des passions*).

It is clear that, with the exception of the second article, Mattheson's aesthetics have much in common with these principles: Mattheson replaced the *règles* with senses. This is, however, really a point of departure for him, with phenomenalism occupying the central place, and thus his aesthetics cannot be simply reducible to French classicism, though acceding to the basic frame. Note that a similar trend towards phenomenalism emerged also in France, chiefly advocated by such thinkers as Crousaz and DuBos, to later result in the *Querelle des Bouffons*. Mattheson must have kept up with such philosophy *au courant*. Note also that Mattheson studied French music extensively and was influenced not least by Lully on instrumental music, opera and dance music together with the classical aesthetics up to the 1720s, though he opposed what he saw as the inactivity and dullness of the French style (Flaherty 1984: 86). From the 1720s on, he strongly advocated the mixed style, *vermischter Geschmack*, of French and Italian compositional styles (Mattheson 1713: 208–10; Mattheson 1722: 91–232; Mattheson 1728: 148–9)[37].

The Core Idea

It was shown above that Mattheson's key ideas fit with each other to form a system of musical aesthetics that well deserves the name of a consistent and comprehensive music theory in the early eighteenth century. Next, the author shows that not only these major ideas but also more the peripheral, seemingly scattered, issues Mattheson discussed can be consistently and deductively derived from a pivotal determining idea: heavenly music. This indeed ontologically ensures Mattheson's purposes of music and objectivity in the appreciation of music discussed in the previous sections. Mattheson firmly believed that worldly music is just the foretaste of heavenly music (Mattheson 1713: 303; Mattheson 1747: 65–6, 107–8; Irwin 2015: 98, 119), which jubilant angels, the elect and blessed souls in the Heavenly Jerusalem are uninterruptedly singing and playing, both vocally and instrumentally, for God's honour, and is extremely rich in sonorities because in eternal life 'we will lack nothing' (Mattheson 1747: 68–9; Irwin 2015: 100) and the Almighty should be 'praised with all possible means' (Irwin 2015: xli). This explains why Mattheson rejected reducing human affections down to discrete elements or listing formalistic stock rhetorical figures as counterparts, why he associated key characters with old church modes and ancient *ethos* theory[38] for much more variety, why he opposed the Guidonian hexachord solfege system (Mattheson 1717: 480), why he rejected reducing the characters of major-minor tonality down to simple happy-sad bipolarity (Steblin 1983: 46), notwithstanding that he insisted that modern music needs only major-minor tonality (Mattheson 1713: 232), why he disliked the seemingly rationalist twelve equal temperaments (Mattheson 1739a: 79, 220; Mattheson 1731: 111), why he was against the castrato[39], and why he acclaimed the newly invented fortepiano for being rich in its dynamic range[40].

The belief that the Creator created mankind, the world and heavenly music likewise elucidates why Mattheson justified musical phenomenalism, why he could approve of theatrical music as much as church music, and why he believed that the art should be the imitation of nature. What he believed heavenly music should sound like explains why he was against artificial intricacies in music, why he was for female voices in church music in contrast to the Pauline silence rule (Mattheson 1713: 206), why he was for such instrumental music in church as cantata and oratorio (Mattheson 1739a: 482), why he supported the mixed style and why he stuck to pure intervals in irregular temperaments[41].

Yearsley (2002: 26–41) provided a detailed description of Mattheson's religious faith in his book. Irwin's writings also focused exclusively upon it, with important works translated into English. Irwin (2011: 73) maintains that both Mattheson and Buttstett basically shared the same idea that 'music is eternal, foretaste of heavenly pleasure and the occupation of angels' in addition to the moral, didactic and godly purposes of music, but Mattheson could not tolerate number-based compositional theory because 'the mysteries of God are not attainable through human wisdom' (Irwin 2011: 74). The argument between Mattheson and Buttstett was thus not so much one between an old-religious-conservative versus a new-rationalistic-secular theorist as one within the orthodox Lutheran eschatology. Such a number-based hermeneutic view seemed profane to Mattheson, and he tried literal interpretations of biblical references to music and musical instruments, such as trumpets in Revelation and harps in Psalms, ignoring the metaphorical and allegorical interpretations that were widely accepted in the contemporary hermeneutics, to verify the reality of heavenly music (Irwin 2011: 78). In a sense, Mattheson's interpretation of the scriptures was more fundamentalistic and thus more faithful to Luther's original teaching. Considering that the supreme *artifex* in music, canon, is to Bokemeyer comparable with the philosopher's stone in alchemy (Yearsley 2002: 66–9), Mattheson's refutation of such *artifex* can be interpreted as a reformational movement designed to purge mystical relics. After *Oper am Gänsemarkt* was closed down in 1738, he retired from the front line and devoted himself mostly to religious writings for the rest of his lifetime, including *Behauptung der himmlischen Musik* in 1747, asserting the reality of heavenly music, and *Bewährte Panacea* in 1750, defending his belief in heavenly music against opposition raised in the meantime. His belief in heavenly music was, though, not forged in his later life: he had mentioned it already in his first writings in 1713 (Mattheson 1713: 301–8; Mattheson 1717: 300; Mattheson 1739a: 10–15). He also published the Stralsund organist Raupach's essay about heavenly music as early as in 1717 as a supplement to Niedt's *Musikalische Handleitung*[42], appending the preface[43]. Mattheson's erudition on the scripture of the Bible was already overwhelming during early disputes with Buttstett and Bokemeyer. The author concludes that the idea of heavenly music can most consistently and coherently integrate Mattheson's musical thoughts into a united system.

Concluding Remarks

In the preceding Section, the whole view of Mattheson's aesthetics was presented as a system, by interlocking his key ideas with the Lutheran belief in heavenly music as the core basis. The distinction between phenomenalism and subjectivism is also important to dissolve many seeming contradictions and confusions. As Mattheson never explicitly articulated his aesthetics in a systematic manner, it must be remembered that the whole picture of his theory presented here cannot be free from erroneous interpretations and selective citations by the author. Still, the consistency underpinned may indicate the high fidelity of the reconstruction and thus it is hoped that this study would as much reinforce Irwin's thesis that Mattheson was chiefly religiously motivated in his musical activities, as it would induce further studies on focused aspects of his aesthetics.

Finally, the author would like to point out three inherent limitations in Mattheson's aesthetics. Firstly, his theory about the imitation of nature stating only what not to do was naturally difficult to use as a principle of practical music making, though he himself succeeded in achieving 'a style of melodic simplicity.' (Harriss 1981: 4.) Secondly, the rhetoric-based music became outmoded in the age of German Romanticism when instrumental music found its own autonomous expression that was independent of any verbal language. Lastly, Mattheson codified necessary conditions for a good tune (Mattheson 1739a: 133–60) but not sufficient conditions: he confessed he gave up the task (Mattheson 1739a: 142). Though we cannot blame him for this because nobody has hitherto succeeded in presenting anything of the sort, this nonetheless remains a flaw in his aesthetics for technically correlating human affections, human senses, nature and music. It can be argued that not only the key features discussed in this paper but also those inherent limitations together well-reflect the characteristic traits of aesthetics in eighteenth-century thought.

ENDNOTES

1. Note that *Incisionslehre* is a study on how to punctuate musical phrases as in the art of reading.
2. Petersen-Mikkelsen provides a well-summarised list of the literature (Petersen-Mikkelsen 2002: 1–7). Kivy's study (Kivy 1984) is a rare example of a discussion of Mattheson's aesthetics, but this study is narrowly focused on Mattheson's expression as in *Capellmeister*.
3. At the beginning of the third chapter, which is subtitled as '*Von der Kunst eine gute Melodie zu machen*', it is declared that writing a good tune is most important and that it is impossible to make rules to write a tune, explicitly criticising Rameau (Mattheson 1737: 29).
4. Mattheson expresses a personal comment here: 'es ist dannenhero höchstens zu verwundern, daß ein solcher Haupt-Punct, an welchem doch das grösseste gelegen ist, bis diese Stunde fast von iedem Lehrer hintangesetzet wird' (Mattheson 1739a: 137). He says it was Doni alone who talked about the importance of melody before Mattheson (Mattheson 1739a: 137).
5. Harriss (1984: 461–2) says, '... their studies of Mattheson's contributions have yielded a wide range of conclusions ... The reader will find that it is possible to think almost anything about Mattheson, as a person and as a scholar'.
6. Seares (2014) argues that Mattheson's universalism is presented in music, most manifestly in *Pièces de Clavecin* (Mattheson c. 1714).
7. Note that all citations from non-English sources hereinafter were translated by the author unless otherwise noted.
8. Interestingly, this definition is almost the same as that which Descartes defined, 'Hujus objectum est Sonus. Finis ut delectet, variosque in nobis moveat affectus' [The basis of this [music] is sound. Its purpose is to delectate and to move various affections in us] (Descartes 2011: 2–3).
9. Orchestral instruments are also likened to military ranks in *Kleine General-Baß-Schule* (Mattheson 1735: 56–7).
10. Palisca points out these three genres originated in Marco Scacchi (Palisca 1984: 413).
11. Almost the same categories are found in *Capellmeister* (Mattheson 1737: 93–127).
12. Classification was generally a characteristic with disciplines in the eighteenth century. Examples include Linnaeus in botany and Winckelmann in art history.
13. In the middle of the twentieth century, some articles misled many music students and musicologists to believe that there used to be a universal formalistic music-rhetoric theory, *Figurenlehre* and *Affektenlehre*, once widely shared among Baroque composers. Buelow outlines the background of this widespread misconception (Buelow 1984: 393–407).
14. Also, Palisca provided a list of such predecessors to Mattheson. (Palisca 1984: 409–23)
15. Regarding the school education of the time, Kirkendale wrote

    > Music of renaissance and baroque composers, who had been immersed in the study of Latin rhetoric while in school, cannot be adequately understood on the basis of our twentieth-century curricula, where rhetoric hardly exists any longer as an

academic discipline and where instruction in music theory is too often limited to mere descriptive analysis of sounds in a vacuum (Kirkendale 1980: 131).

Dammann also points out,

> Einerseits hat sich der Musiker des deutschen Barock von der spätantik-mittelalterlichen Vorstellung getrennt. Er hat das boethianische „fingere“ durch das „diiudicare“ untermauert. Aber das ist nur eine vordergründige Distanz. Denn in Wahrheit bestätigen die Musiklehrbücher des deutschen Barock das aristotelische Denken (Dammann 1995: 20).

16. Dobbs pointed out that Baryphonus, Grimm and Werckmeister exerted a strong influence on northern German Lutheran church music in the seventeenth century (Dobbs 2015).
17. Mattheson (1713: 39–40) explicitly asserts that those concepts are also only empirically formed.
18. For example, Fux, unlike Zarlino, categorised the perfect fourth as a dissonance (Fux 1965: 15).
19. Mattheson (1739a: 246) later claimed in *Capellmeister* that the perfect fourth is a dissonance.
20. Christensen (1993: 106–7, 185–190) wrote that Rameau's theory of harmonic progression may have been partly inspired by Newtonian mechanics, which Voltaire introduced in France in the 1730s.
21. 'The sound ... is nothing material but much all spiritual, ... Music hides in itself a godly wisdom' (Mattheson 1713: 320–1).
22. The combination of clarity and distinctness can be related to the Cartesian key terms, *clarus et distinctus*.
23. Similarly, Mattheson repeatedly argues that vocal music is superior to instrumental music for the same reason that he prefers natural things to artificial ones. He also says the true aim of music is the expression of the verbal affections (Cannon 1984: 9).
24. Broyles (1983) writes, 'From the first half of the eighteenth century well into the nineteenth, melody was recognized as the principal means of expressing sentiment or character'.
25. This principle is contained in an alchemical text known as the *Emerald Tablet*, which Bokemeyer and Walther knew (Yearsley 2002: 69).
26. Lippman (1992: 81) wrote that Mattheson and Krause, who also used the words, *edle Einheit*, before Winckelmann in 1752, owed the idea to Boileau.
27. In *Capellmeister*, *galant* is associated with *natürlich* as opposed to *künstlich* (Mattheson 1739a: 73, 217) or, without any negative meaning, by French composers such as Lully and Campra (Mattheson 1739a: 218). He still used the word with favourable connotation in 1747 (Mattheson 1747: 42).
28. Heartz (1980: 92–3) pointed out that Mattheson's *galant homme* includes both sexes.
29. Buelow (1984: 399) pointed out that it was perhaps Descartes' influence that Mattheson placed *Naturlehre* and *Affektenlehre* adjacent to each other.
30. Interestingly, Mattheson uses three different words for affection here: *Leidenschaft*, *Affekt* and *Passion*. This indicates that these words should be clearly distinguished in meaning and usage, though some musicologists think these words were not strictly distinguished at that time. In Latin, *affectus* and *passion* means active and passive affections respectively, though both originated from a single Greek word, παθος. The former was translated into German as *Affekt*, *Gemüths-Bewegung* and *Gemüths-Neigung*, and the latter as *Passion* and *Leidenschaft*.
31. Lippman (1992: 59–60) says,

> ... two contrasted groups of studies of the liberal arts — the quadrivium and the trivium. It was the conflict between these two principles that produced the first documents of the modern history of musical aesthetics [...] "the conflict of new and old is grounded in a contrast of secular and religious, of an urbane, basically international style and a specifically German, more provincial, contrapuntal complexity. [...] Thus, in *galant* aesthetics, rhetoric is connected with melodic style and contrasted with the mathematics of polyphony as good taste is to bad.

32. This view is also collaterally underpinned by the fact that, although Mattheson relied on Bernhard's *Tractatus* (ca. 1657) about composition in the first *Orchestre* almost verbatim in some places, he did not adopt Bernhard's detailed classification of *Figuren*, as Petersen-Mikkelsen (2002: 204–8) has pointed out.
33. Kirkendale (1980: 94–5) wrote that Mattheson relied on *Rhetorica ad Herennium* rather than Quintilian.
34. Mattheson was the first person who wrote detailed information about music for amateurs. Before him, all the arcane lore was only shared by professionals more or less under the influence of the hermeneutic tradition typically seen in Bokemeyer's statements. Since codifying rhetorical figures was meaningful only within the closed circles of guilds, Mattheson's phenomenalism was so defiant as to challenge such mystical tradition.

35. Snedeker (1985: 10–28) pointed out that, while Mattheson's music was directed only to cultivated people, the *Empfindsamer Stil* was much easier for the public to accept and thus the latter was more favoured by the middle-class bourgeoisie that gradually gained power in society. It was probably related to to the contemporary literature movement, driven by Lessing, Klopstock, Nikolai, M. Mendelssohn, Sulzer, Goethe, Herder and others, used to describe the emotions of people from various social strata.

36. This old treatise still provides valid criteria about French classicism.

37. Mattheson translated the writings of Raguenet and Le Cerf de La Viéville, with commentaries (Mattheson 1722).

38. These key characters were repeatedly cited in the nineteenth century (examples include Schumann's *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* (1834)) to inspire Romantic composers. Steblin (1983: 41, 44) points out that Mattheson was the first who had associated key characters with church modes and ancient Greek *ethos* theory.

39. Mattheson (1713: 223) writes '... weil unsere Religion die in Italien gewöhnliche Castirung nicht permittirt'.

40. Mattheson translated Scipio Maffei's essay on the invention of the fortepiano and positively estimated its range of dynamics (Mattheson 1725: 335–43).

41. The mixed style is justified because the better music is, the more praise the it offers: '... his perfection requires that he be praised with all possible means' (Irwin 2015: xli).

42. As Niedt died three years before, Mattheson edited and published the book on his behalf.

43. Irwin (2015) contains its full translation in English.

REFERENCES

1. Bach, C. P. E. 1753. *Versuch über die wahre Art das Clavier zu spielen*. Berlin: 122–3.
2. Bartel, Dietrich. 1997. *Musica Poetica*. Lincoln NB: Nebraska Press.
3. Bartel, Dietrich. 2018. *Andreas Werckmeister's Musicalische Paradoxal-Discourse: A Well-Tempered Universe*. London: Lexington.
4. Blankenburg, Walter. 1959. 'Der Harmonie-Begriff in der lutherisch-barocken Musikanschauung'. *Archiv Für Musikwissenschaft* 16 no. 1/2 44–56.
5. Blume, Friedrich. 1974. *Epochen der Musikgeschichte*. Kassel: Bärenreiter-Verlag.
6. Bray, René. 1945. *Formation de la Doctorine Classique*. Paris: Libraire Nizet.
7. Broyles, Michael. 1983. 'The Two Instrumental Styles of Classicism'. *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, Summer, 36 (2): 210–42.
8. Buelow, George and J. Marx, eds. 1984. *New Mattheson Studies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
9. Buelow, George. 1984. 'Johann Mattheson and the Invention of the Affektenlehre'. In *New Mattheson Studies*. 393–407.
10. _____. 2001. 'Mattheson, Johann'. In *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 2nd edn. Stanley Sadie and J. Tyrell, eds. London: Macmillan.
11. Butler, Gregory. 1984. 'Der vollkommene Capellmeister as a Stimulus to J.S. Bach's Late Fugal Writing.' In *New Mattheson Studies*. 293–305.
12. Cannon, Beekman. 1947. *Johann Mattheson: Spectator in Music*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
13. _____. 1984. 'The Legacy of Johann Mattheson: a Retrospective Evaluation'. In *New Mattheson Studies*. 1–12.
14. Christensen, Thomas. 1993. *Rameau and Musical Thought in the Enlightenment.* Cambridge NY: Cambridge University Press.
15. _____. 1994. 'Sensus, Ratio, and Phthongos: Mattheson's Theory of Tone Perception'. In *Musical Transformation and Musical Intuition*. Boston: Ovenbird Press. 1–16.
16. _____. 2002. *The Cambridge History of Western Music Theory*. Cambridge NY: Cambridge University Press.
17. Cicero. 1948. *De oratore*, revised edn. Jeffrey Henderson, ed., E.W. Sutton and H. Rackham, transl. Edward W. Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
18. Dammann, Rolf. 1995. *Der Musikbegriff im deutschen Barock,* 3rd edn. Laaber: Laaber-Verlag.
19. Descartes, René. 2011. *Musicae Compendium*, 3rd edn. J. Brockt, transl. Darmstadt: WBG.
20. Diderot, Denis. 1773. *Paradoxe sur le comédien*. Paris.
21. Dobbs, Benjamin. 2015. *Seventeenth-Century Musiklehrbuch in Context: Heinrich Baryphonus and Heinrich Grimm's Pleiades Musicae*. PhD diss., University of North Texas.
22. Fee, Konrad. 1991. *Die Incisionslehre bis zu Johann Mattheson*. Freiburg: Pfaffenweiler.
23. Flaherty, Gloria. 1984. 'Mattheson and the Aesthetics of Theater.' In *New Mattheson Studies*. 75–99.

24. Fux, Johann Joseph. 1965. *The Study of Counterpoint*. Alfred Mann, transl. Alfred. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
25. Gjerdingen, Robert. 2007. *Music in the Galant Style*. New York: Oxford University Press.
26. Göttert, Karl-Heinz. 1986. 'Rhetorik und Musiktheorie im frühen 18. Jahrhundert — Ein Beitrag zu Johann Mattheson'. *Poetica* 18: 274–87.
27. Harriss, Ernest. 1981. *Der vollkommene Capellmeister: A Revised Translation with Critical C-commentary*. Ann Arbor MI: UMI Research Press.
28. _____. 1984. 'Johann Mattheson's Historical Bibliography: an Evaluation.' In *New Mattheson Studies*, New York: Cambridge University Press: 461–84.
29. Heartz, Daniel. 1980. 'Galant' In *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians,* Vol. 7, 92–3. Stanley Sadie and J. Tyrell, eds. London: Macmillan.
30. Hinrichsen, Hans-Joachim and K. Pietschmann. 2004–2008. 'Mattheson, Johann'. In *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 2nd ed. Kassel: Bärenreiter.
31. Hirschmann, Wolfgang and B. Jahn. 2010. *Johann Mattheson als Vermittler und Initiator: Wissenstransfer und die Etablierung neuer Diskurse in der ersten Hälfte des 18.* Jahrhunderts, Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag.
32. Irwin, Joyce. 2011. 'The Orthodox Lutheranism of Mattheson and Bach'. *Bach* 42 (1): 70–83.
33. _____. 2015. *Foretastes of Heaven in Lutheran Church Music Tradition*. London: Rowman & Littlefield.
34. Isoyama, Tadashi. 1985. '主に捧げる新しい歌'. [A New Song to the Lord] *Bigaku* 36 (1): 26–38.
35. Kirkendale, Ursula. 1980. 'The Source for Bach's "Musical Offering": The "Institutio Oratoria" of Quintilian'. *J. Am. Musicol. Soc*. 33 (1): 88–141.
36. Kivy, Peter. 1984. 'Mattheson as Philosopher of Art'. *Musical Quarterly* 70 (2): 248–65.
37. Krause, Christian Gottfried. 1752. *Von der Musikalischen Poesie*. Berlin.
38. Krummacher, Friedhelm. 1986. 'Stylus versus Genus: Zum systematischen Denken Johann Matthesons'. In *Festschrift Arno Forchert zum 60. Geburtstag am 29 Dezember 1985*. Kassel: Bärenreiter. 86–95.
39. Lippman, Edward. 1992. *A History of Western Musical Aesthetics*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska.
40. Matsubara, Kaoru. 2015. 'マッテゾン『完全なる楽長』における旋律論 : 数学的音楽観批判と対位法理論の調停' *Bigaku* 66 (1): 161–72.
41. _____. 2018. ‚Zwischen Kontrapunkt und Kritik an der mathematischen Musikanschauung: Johann Matthesons Melodielehre im Vollkommenen Cappelmeister'. *Aesthetics* (21): 162–75.
42. Mattheson, Johann. 1713. *Neu-eröffnete Orchestre*. Hamburg.
43. _____. c. 1714. *Pièces de Clavecin*. Hamburg.
44. _____. 1717. *Das Beschützte Orchestre*. Hamburg.
45. _____. 1721. *Das forschende Orchestre*. Hamburg.
46. _____. 1722. *Critica Musica Bd. 1*. Hamburg.
47. _____. 1725. *Critica Musica Bd. 2*. Hamburg.
48. _____. 1727. *Der Göttingische ... Ephorus*. Hamburg.
49. _____. 1728. *Der musicalische Patriot*. Hamburg.
50. _____. 1731, *Grosse General-Baß-Schule*. Hamburg.
51. _____. 1735. *Kleine General-Baß-Schule*. Hamburg.
52. _____. 1737. *Kern Melodischer Wissenschaft*. Hamburg.
53. _____. 1739a. *Der vollkommene Capellmeister*. Hamburg.
54. _____. 1739b. *Der vollkommene Capellmeister*. Rept. 1999. Friedrike Ramm, ed. Kassel: Bärenreiter.
55. _____. 1747. *Behauptung der himmlischen musik aus den gründen der vernunft, kirchen-lehre und Heiligen Schrift*. Hamburg.
56. _____. 1754–1756. *Plus Ultra*. Hamburg.
57. Palisca, Claude. 1984. 'The Genesis of Mattheson's Style Classification'. In *New Mattheson Studies*. 409–23.
58. Pearson, Ian. 2017. 'What Mattheson Said About the French Royal Academy of Sciences'. *International Review of the Aesthetics and Sociology of Music* 48 (2): 169–186.
59. Petersen-Mikkelsen, Birger. 2002. *Die Melodielehre des ‚Vollkommene Capellmeisters' von Johann Mattheson*. Norderstedt: Eutin.

60. Quantz, Johann Joachim. 1752. *Versuch einer Anweisung die Flöte traversiere zu spielen*. Berlin.
61. _____. 2001. *On Playing the Flute.* Edward Reilly, transl. Chicago: UPNE.
62. Rameau, Jean-Philippe. 1726. *Nouveau Système de Musique Théorique*. Paris.
63. Schmidt, Heinrich. 1897. *Johann Mattheson*. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel.
64. Seares, Margaret. 2014. *Johann Mattheson's Pièces de Clavecin and Das Neu-eröffnete Orchestre*. Farnham: Ashgate.
65. Sheldon, David. 1975. 'The Galant Style Revisited and Re-Evaluated'. *Acta Musicologica* 47 (2): 240–70.
66. Snedeker, Jeffrey. 1985. *Empfindsamer Stil and the Music of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach*. Master's Degree diss., Ohio University.
67. Steblin, Rita. 1983. *A History of Key Characteristics in the Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries*. Rochester: UMI Research Press.
68. Werckmeister, Andreas. 1687. *Musicæ Mathematicæ Hodegus Curiosus*. Leipzig. Rept. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1972.
69. Yearsley, David. 2002. *Bach and the Meanings of Counterpoint.* Cambridge NY: Cambridge University Press.

ABSTRACT

This paper aims to capture the overview of Johann Mattheson's musical aesthetics. Mattheson's writings have often been cited in studies on music in the eighteenth century. Any particular topic, such as performance practice, musical rhetoric, acoustic sensationalism, *Incisionlehre*, *Melodienlehre*, has been given a wide range of interpretations. As a consequence, his own musical aesthetics have rarely been discussed. His public image, moreover, as a relentless Enlightenment disputant was so widely disseminated that his musical thought has often been viewed from rather biased perspectives. For example, his religious aspect has been unduly downplayed. As a result, these partial views have led to narrow if not completely wrong interpretations of his musical thought. The author elucidates selected key concepts, with some misleading views corrected, to show consistent interrelations between them and to show that Mattheson's musical ideas can form a consistent and coherent system of musical aesthetics in the age of classicism, even though he never articulated his views in a fully systematic manner. The author also argues that the idea of heavenly music in Lutheranism must have played a pivotal role in integrating Mattheson's musical ideas into the system.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank my anonymous reviewer and the editor, Jula Szuster, for their valuable comments and suggestions. I am also grateful to Dr. Yoshihiko Tokumaru and Dr. Masafumi Aoyama for their helpful advice and insights. Last but not least, I am much obliged to my wife, Supika, and daughters, Kai and Kei, for their bountiful understanding of expanding bookshelves for my music study.

Keywords. Johann Mattheson, rhetoric, Affektenlehre, Baroque music, aesthetics

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Yoh Murakami received a Ph.D. in aerospace engineering from the University of Glasgow in 2008. He also completed a Master's degree in aesthetics at the Open University of Japan in 2017. He is currently at Shinshu University as Assistant Professor in aeronautical systems. Murakami is also in high demand as a chamber musician both on the modern and baroque cello. He recently translated Johann Mattheson's *Das Neu-eröffnete Orchestre* into Japanese, at this point the only translation available of the book in a modern language.

Received by the editors 23 February 2022. Accepted for publication (in revised form) 29 January 2024.