

VOLUME XVII, NO. 3

JULY, 1986

**THE QUARTERLY
JOURNAL OF THE
RIEMENSCHNEIDER
BACH INSTITUTE,
BALDWIN-WALLACE
COLLEGE
BEREA, OHIO**



Bach



**The Quarterly
Journal of the
Riemenschneider
Bach Institute**

Elinore L. Barber, *Editor*

Volume XVII, Number 3, July, 1986

(PSN 716-280)

The monogram on the cover is from J. S. Bach's signet ring.

CONTENTS

ABOUT OUR AUTHORS	2
NOTATIONS ON MATTHESON'S <i>DER BRAUCHBARE VIRTUOSO</i>	3
<i>Jane Ambrose, The University of Vermont, Burlington, Vermont</i>	
BACH'S <i>ST. MATTHEW PASSION</i> : A RUDIMENTARY PSYCHOLOGICAL ANALYSIS	10
<i>Vladimir J. Konečni University of California, San Diego</i>	
THE USE OF RECITATIVE AND THE COMMUNAL STYLE IN THE SOLO CANTATAS OF DIETRICH BUXTEHUDE	22
<i>Kerry L. Bostrom, San Francisco, California</i>	

Bach is published four times a year in January, April, July, and October, by the Riemenschneider Bach Institute, Baldwin-Wallace College. Second class postage paid at Berea, Ohio 44017. ©Riemenschneider Bach Institute, Baldwin-Wallace College, 1986. Reproduction in whole or in part, without written permission of the editor, is strictly prohibited.

CONTRIBUTORS: Previously unpublished articles or papers presenting materials of interest to Baroque scholars and performers will be given careful consideration for publication in *BACH*. The editor will send a copy of the *BACH Style Sheet* to any prospective contributor. In general, *BACH* follows the practice of Kate L. Turabian, *A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations*, 4th ed. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1973). All copy must be typed double spaced on separate sheets.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: All members of the Riemenschneider Bach Institute receive a subscription to *BACH*. Non-members may subscribe to *BACH* for \$12 a year.

ABOUT OUR AUTHORS

JANE AMBROSE, a professor in music at the Redstone Campus of the University of Vermont in Burlington, is a flautist as well as a musicologist. She performs regularly on both modern and Baroque flutes with the University of Vermont's Baroque Ensemble and the Festival of Baroque Music in Saratoga Springs, New York. She is the author of several publications, including an article, "The Bach Flute Sonatas: Recent Research and a Performer's Observations," published in the July 1980 issue of *BACH*.

VLADIMIR KONEČNÍ, professor of psychology at the University of California's San Diego Campus is author or co-author of fifty publications in the areas of psycho-aesthetics, psychology of law, and human aggressive behavior. A recipient of Guggenheim, M.H. Beatty, Canada Council, University of Toronto, and Massey College fellowships, Dr. Konečn^í has read papers before many professional organizations and has lectured throughout the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Great Britain, and Brazil, as well as in India and Hong Kong.

He was a consultant for four films in the CRM Films educational series, "Conflict and Awareness," produced in 1975 and is currently a consulting editor of the quarterly journal, *Music Perception*.

KERRY BOSTROM holds a Masters degree in music history and literature from San Francisco State University. She is a singer and choral conductor, specializing in early music. Together with Professor Sharon Girard and Marla Alt, she is preparing a performance edition of the madrigals of Vittoria Aleotti.

Bach's St. Matthew Passion: A Rudimentary Psychological Analysis, Part I

by
Vladimir J. Konečn^í
University of California, San Diego

EDITOR'S NOTE:

Since it has seemed appropriate to reprint Professor Vladimir J. Konečn^í's necrology for Professor Daniel E. Berlyn (*BACH* wishes to thank the editors of the *American Journal of Psychology*, for permission to reprint these four and one-half pages from its March, 1978 issue), it has become necessary to publish Professor Konečn^í's article "Bach's *St. Matthew Passion: A Rudimentary Psychological Analysis*," in two sections. The first installment includes (in addition to the above mentioned necrology), Professor Konečn^í's summary of work previously accomplished in the area that Professor Berlyne has termed the "new experimental aesthetics" and a brief section of background information concerning the history and scoring of Bach's *Passion According to St. Matthew*.

Only in the October 1986 issue of *BACH*, will the reader be treated to the main body of Dr. Konečn^í's article: seven sections including his thoughts on Bach's (1) "Arousal-Raising Devices: Psychophysical and Collative Variables," (2) "Ecological Variables," (3) "Ornaments," (4) "Expectations," (5) "Symbols," (6) "Arousal-Moderating Devices," and his (7) "Conclusion," together with a brief working Bibliography.

—E.L.B.

DANIEL E. BERLYNE: 1924-1976

(Reprinted from the March 1978 issue of the *American Journal of Psychology* with permission.)

Daniel E. Berlyne, Professor of Psychology at the University of Toronto, died at the age of 52 in Toronto on November 2, 1976, after a prolonged illness and several operations. He fought the disease courageously and stoically to the very end. It was entirely characteristic of Daniel Berlyne that he chaired a meeting of the American Society of Aesthetics in Toronto less than a week prior to his death. He is survived by Hilde Berlyne, his wife of twenty-three years, and three daughters.

Daniel Berlyne was born on April 25, 1924, in Salford, near Manchester, in England. He attended Manchester Grammar School and subsequently went to Cambridge University, where he received his B.A. in 1947 and M.A. in

1949. His first academic position was at St. Andrews University, Scotland. In 1951 he went to Yale University, where he obtained a Ph.D. after two years in residence, although in the second of these years he was already teaching full time at Brooklyn College in New York City. Faced with visa problems, Berlyne returned to Great Britain in 1953 and taught at the University of Aberdeen, Scotland, until 1956, when he became a Fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Palo Alto, California, which had opened only a couple of years earlier. In the following year (1957-58), Berlyne was a Visiting Associate Professor at the University of California, Berkeley. He spent the next year with Jean Piaget as Membre-résident at the Centre International d'Epistemologie Génétique in Geneva, Switzerland. From Geneva, Berlyne returned to North America and was a Visiting Scientist in 1959-60 at the National Institute of Mental Health in Maryland. After a year and a half as Associate Professor at Boston University, he came to the University of Toronto, as Associate Professor, in January of 1962, becoming Professor of Psychology in the following year. Except for a year (in 1968-69) at Institut d'Esthétique et des Sciences de l'Art at the University of Paris as a NATO-Heineman Visiting Professor, Berlyne spent all of the last quarter of his life at the University of Toronto.

Daniel Berlyne's death put a sadly premature end to a highly distinguished scientific career. He had written or been co-author of seven books and some 150 journal articles and book chapters, and had received many honors, including election as Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada, Fellow of the British Psychological Society, and Fellow of several divisions of the American and Canadian Psychological Associations. He had been invited to lecture at universities on four continents, and had been President of the Canadian Psychological Association (1971-72), President of the General Psychology (1973-74) and Psychology and the Arts (1974-75) divisions of the American Psychological Association, and President (since 1974) of the International Association of Empirical Aesthetics. In 1974, Berlyne was also Co-President of the XVIIIth International Congress of Applied Psychology in Montreal and Vice-President for the United States and Canada of the Interamerican Society of Psychology.

Such are the bare facts that reveal little of Daniel Berlyne as a brilliant scientist, an outstanding scholar, and a remarkably erudite man, and reveal even less of his complex and fascinating personality.

Berlyne made important experimental and theoretical contributions to an astounding number of areas in experimental psychology (broadly defined), including exploratory behavior, curiosity, physiological arousal, attention, play behavior, humor, thinking, and experimental aesthetics. However, a good deal of order and several unifying threads underlie this diversity. Berlyne was at his best as a theoretician and integrator, and his life's work can perhaps be most succinctly described as an inspired attempt to achieve understanding of a broad array of human and animal behavior in terms of

a small number of motivational principles. Indeed, Berlyne was above all a motivation theorist. He wanted to know why organisms display curiosity and explore their environment, why they seek knowledge and information, why they look at paintings or listen to music, what directs their train of thought. All of these diverse questions were dealt with in the context of what may be labeled a theory of “collative” motivation. The theory is essentially concerned with the hedonic effects of fluctuations in arousal level induced by exposure to stimuli differing in attributes such as novelty, complexity, surprisingness, and incongruity. Berlyne termed these stimulus dimensions “collative” in part to indicate that their effects are linked to operations that include comparing the currently present stimuli to those experienced in the past and evaluating the discrepancy between stimuli and expectations, but also to distinguish them from the more frequently studied classes of stimuli, notably the “psychophysical” (e.g., loudness) and the “ecological” ones (whose effects are derived from past associations with reward and punishment).

Although some aspects of the concept of arousal can be considered analogous to some aspects of the concept of drive, and although Berlyne has often been represented as one of the principal heirs of the Hullian school in learning and motivation, he had, in fact, repeatedly criticized many of the basic tenets of Hull’s theory (e.g., the reinforcing properties of drive reduction in the influential 1967 paper in the *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation*), and had generally gone a long way beyond the Hullian position through the many original ideas underlying the concept of collative motivation. (There is good evidence that Berlyne had had an intimate knowledge of the work of C. L. Hull and other learning theorists of the 1930s and 1940s well before he came to Yale University in 1951. At that time, Hull was ailing, and he died the following year. Berlyne’s thesis advisor was Carl I. Hovland and the other committee members were Irvin L. Child and Neal E. Miller.) The concern with collative variables and with human and animal behaviors that do not necessarily lead to the gratification of the hunger, thirst, and sex drives has been a notable feature of Berlyne’s work spanning twenty-seven years, as evidenced in a simple way by the titles of his first published paper (“‘Interest’ as a psychological concept,” *British Journal of Psychology*, 1949), his doctoral thesis (“Some aspects of human curiosity”), and some of the papers that will be published posthumously (e.g., “Motivation of the quest for knowledge,” in J. R. Royce, ed., *Inquiries into psychological theory of knowledge*).

Berlyne’s most important single work is undoubtedly his 1960 book, *Conflict, arousal and curiosity*. This *tour de force*—which has since influenced so many in psychology and other disciplines—integrated Berlyne’s and others’ work in the areas of exploratory behavior, arousal, and curiosity with the classical behavior-theory approaches, laid the foundation of the theory of collative motivation, and gave a preview of later applications to art,

intellectual processes, and humor. In the book, Berlyne made a serious effort to link collative motivation to the latest advances in neurophysiology and information theory. In many ways, the topics covered in the book and the new research directions suggested by Berlyne's views were ahead of their time. Although the book was well received and widely read from the start, its influence seems to have grown with the passage of years; casual inspection of the literature leads one to the impression that the book has had considerable delayed impact and has been more frequently cited in the 1970s than the 1960s.

In 1965, Berlyne published *Structure and direction in thinking*, a joint application of the S-R (Berlyne preferred the term "neoassociationist") position and of the collative-motivation views to "epistemic" behavior (e.g., directed thought and knowledge-seeking). This book has been translated into five languages, but has not had, in the English-speaking world, the impact that it deserves, probably because its "Hullian" and insufficiently "cognitive" flavor conflicted with the trends and taste of the times. This is quite unfortunate, since the book raised, and partly provided answers to, some important questions concerning the motivation and dynamics of directed thought. Motivational aspects of thinking have been largely ignored by most of the present-day cognitive psychologists, in part because a structuralist bias is inherent to the "flowchart" approaches that characterize so much of the current work on information processing.

In the late 1960s, Berlyne's attention increasingly turned toward the application of the collative-motivation model to aesthetic phenomena, and in 1971 he published *Aesthetics and psychobiology*, which many regard as the best and most influential work published so far on the psychology of art. Perhaps the key aspect of Berlyne's "new experimental aesthetics" is a careful consideration of both the factors that govern choice between aesthetic stimuli and the effects of exposure to such stimuli. Another important aspect of the work is a detailed and illuminating analysis of the relationship between specific components of works of art and artistic "devices," on the one hand, and collative variables and fluctuations in arousal level, on the other. Berlyne followed the 1971 book by an edited work, *Studies in the new experimental aesthetics* (1974), which is a collection of experimental reports by Berlyne, his students, and colleagues on a variety of topics relevant to the application of the collative-motivation theory to aesthetics.

Overall, Berlyne was probably the most important single source of inspiration for the current wave of psychological interest in experimental aesthetics. He expended a great deal of energy during the last decade of his life on the task of carving out a respectable place for experimental aesthetics within psychology; moreover, he contributed more than perhaps anyone else to the gradual (and grudging) acceptance by artists, art historians, and aestheticians of the *possibility* of a rigorous, scientific, psychological approach to aesthetic phenomena. Toward the very end of his life, Berlyne

was able to secure a first-rate English-language publication outlet for experimental esthetics by becoming co-editor (with Robert Francès) of *Scientific Aesthetics/Sciences de l'Art*, the predecessor of which had been published only in French. The first issue of the new bilingual version of the journal appeared in 1976.

Daniel Berlyne belonged to the rare breed of psychologists who are equally comfortable with humans and rats as research subjects, equally knowledgeable about the work of Aristotle, Michelangelo, Freud, Pavlov, or Piaget, and equally familiar with the American and European (including—or perhaps, especially—Soviet) psychological literature. He was a highly cultured, versatile, and immensely erudite man. Within psychology, he could talk equally informatively and intelligently about the meaning of the “golden section,” the meaning of a light increment to the rat, and the meaning of humor (all of these issues are, of course, relevant to collative motivation and are discussed in Berlyne’s publications). It is not surprising that he was frequently asked to contribute entries on a variety of topics to the major encyclopedias (e.g., on Piaget, on theories of thought).

While having an incredible command of the psychological literature, as well as of the literature in the sciences and humanities in general, Berlyne was a very independent thinker. Both his choice of research topics and many aspects of his theorizing are highly original. It is interesting to note how little he appears to have been influenced by some of the major figures of his time. For example, Berlyne’s year with Piaget resulted in several joint publications and in some writing about Piaget, but had almost no discernible influence on Berlyne’s subsequent experimental and theoretical work. In his day-to-day activities also, Berlyne apparently had no strong need for a sounding board for his ideas, despite the fact that many colleagues and students were available. He was an efficient worker and writer, able to interrupt the task of dictating an article in order to give a lecture, and then effortlessly to resume dictating the article immediately after class. Typically, the dictated version and one revision were all an article of his needed; he was in complete command of the subtleties of the English language and very fussy about its correct use. It is interesting that despite his great productivity, he apparently seldom worked at night or on weekends.

Berlyne’s versatility in psychology was matched perhaps only by the versatility of his interests in private life. He gradually acquired a working knowledge of ten or eleven ancient and modern languages, fluently spoke six or seven, and had a close to encyclopedic knowledge of philosophy, art history, and the general history of ideas, in all of which he read heavily and regularly. Berlyne was an accomplished pianist, an unaccomplished occasional jogger at the University of Toronto’s Hart House, a walker in parks, and a pacer in his office and in seminars. He went to see films at least once a week (often silent ones) and was an avid collector—of books, of paintings, of jokes, of subways (one of his many goals being to ride on every subway in the world).

With his colleagues and students, Berlyne was invariably kind, considerate, and perhaps a little shy—a gentle man and a gentleman. His fine sense of humor, subtle witticisms, and skillful telling of anecdotes were appreciated by all who knew him. He was a highly esteemed teacher and his many graduate students could always count on his friendship, loyalty, and support.

Daniel Berlyne was undoubtedly a brilliant and important figure in experimental psychology. His original and penetrating theoretical contributions have opened new research areas, introduced a fresh perspective on some old problems, and brought about a major integration of seemingly divergent issues in various areas of human and animal motivation. Judging by some prominent current research trends in several fields within psychology (including human motivation, social psychology, experimental aesthetics), the influence and stature of the theory of collative motivation is likely to continue to grow. As an outstanding scientist, scholar, and teacher, Daniel Berlyne is missed by all in psychology and related disciplines in many countries of the world. Those of us who had the privilege of knowing this extraordinary human being personally have an ever deeper sense of loss.

Vladimir J. Konečni, *University of California, San Diego*

Author's Note:

I would like to thank Hilde Berlyne, George Mandler, and Fergus Craik for their help. Copies of a list of Daniel Berlyne's publications can be obtained by writing to Vladimir J. Konečni, Department of Psychology, University of California at San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093, or to Robert S. Lockhart, Department of Psychology, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5S 1A1.

“When I was at Harvard, Professor Birkhoff had just published a system of aesthetic measure—actually trying to evolve a mathematical system whereby any object of art could be awarded a beauty-rating on a given continuum of aesthetic worth. It was a noble effort; but when all is said and done, it comes to a dead end . . . If the *Eroica* earns a grade of 3.2, what mark do you give *Tristan*? Or a one-page Bach prelude?” (Leonard Bernstein, 1967, p. 12).

Indeed, which grade does one give the *St. Matthew Passion*, a work resembling the “tumult of the sea roaring from afar” (C.F. Zelter, quoted in Friedrich Blume, 1950, p. 47), “the deepest expression of devotional feeling that the art of music affords” (Terry, 1926, p. 6), “the music [that] seems embroidered with tears and coloured with flames and blood: (André Pirro, quoted in Terry, 1926, p. 6), to quote just a few restrained descriptions; and composed by Sebastian Bach, who “ought not to be called Bach [brook] but ocean” (Beethoven, quoted in Blume, 1950, p. 61), whom “musical historians began to interpret . . . as the centre of gravity of the whole history of music” (Blume, 1950, p. 61).

Bernstein’s verdict reflects the resentment, or at best, the amusement expressed by artists and the general public alike with respect to efforts to subject art to objective analysis. All is well as long as the analysis is confined to its conventional poetic form. For a scientist, however, such an approach is hardly more than a long string of arbitrary assumptions. The public seems never to be sated by descriptions of an artist’s alleged feelings, motives, and inspirations, or by piquant details of his personality and habits. Too often, conventional aesthetic analysis is only a sophisticated mirror-image of prevailing norms and value-judgments, which may serve a useful purpose, but is of limited scientific interest. Considering the rather special place reserved for art and artists in most societies and systems of values, past and present, the submission of the creative process and works of art, or their psychological impact, to rigorous scientific scrutiny is often liable to provoke displeasure—even if, as in the case of Birkhoff, the analysis hardly progresses beyond polygons, vases, and tilings as its objects, or perhaps for this very reason.

Looking back, as valuable as Birkhoff’s contribution was, it was indeed rather naive. His work was the culmination of an optimistic early phase of development of the field that one may call, with Gustav Fechner, “aesthetics from below.” Rather than join the art critics in the exploration of phraseological labyrinths, many researchers took Fechner’s advice and resorted to the study of people’s reactions to single lines, simple shapes, tones, and patches of colour, for such material could be experimentally controlled and varied. Birkhoff (1933) went a step farther and thought of aesthetic experience as consisting of a phase of attention that increased in

proportion to the complexity of the object, of a feeling of value (aesthetic measure) that rewarded the attentive effort, and of a realization of an essential order in the object that was presumably necessary for the esthetic effect to take place. Although Birkhoff's emphasis on order and complexity merely echoed earlier dual-factor hypotheses of aesthetic appreciation, and although his $M = O/C$ formula could not accommodate the results of subsequent experiments (e.g., Eysenck, 1942), his work started an important trend that was based on control and quantification, and that led eventually, after many synapses, to what Daniel Berlyne (1971) has called the "new experimental aesthetics." In the meantime, it was recognized that psychology could promote the understanding of art through the study of aesthetic behavior, behavior of both the artist and the appreciator (cf. Vladimír J. Konečnǐ, 1979, 1982, 1985; Heidi Gottlieb & Vladimír Konečnǐ, 1985). Important contributions to the analysis of the communicative aspects of art came from the semiotic and information-theory approaches, while Gestalt-psychology clarified many issues with respect to perceptual organization and processing. Animal research on exploratory behavior and curiosity (e.g., Berlyne, 1960) brought about an interest in the study of why people seek to expose themselves to works of art, whereas ethology has raised the important issue of the survival-value of this activity. Novel views on the controversial question of the role of meaning and emotion in art, by people such as Leonard B. Meyer (1956) and Susanne Langer (1942) brought many a traditional myth tumbling down. Moreover, psychologists as well as non-psychologists interested in an objective study of art have come to realize the importance of factual, as opposed to normative, inquiry in this area.

There is no doubt, however, that the most significant contribution came from the field of motivation, or rather, motivational research "with art in mind," which, when closely knit together with neurophysiological research, made possible major integrative attempts concerning the relationship of psychology and art, such as Berlyne's (1971). Human beings have been found to possess, at any given moment, a certain amount of activation, or arousal, the control over which could be tentatively traced to the reticular formation, the lateral and medial hypothalamus. Three distinct mechanisms have been identified with respect to arousal: the primary reward, the aversive, and the secondary reward systems. This is important because it provides the connection between phenomena such as pleasure, reward value, positive feedback, capacity to elicit approach, and positive incentive value, jointly postulated as hedonic value, and physiological phenomena such as arousal. It has been found that both a moderate arousal increment, governed by the primary reward system, and an arousal decrement following aversively high arousal, governed by the secondary reward system, have positive hedonic effect. On the one hand, a link is thus provided between emotions, which are in most systems classified along the pleasantness-unpleasantness, excitement-calm, and tension-relaxation dimensions, and the physiological

indices of arousal, in terms of hedonic value. On the other hand, a link is also provided between physiological and perceptual processes, also in terms of hedonic value: perceptual effort may cause a moderate arousal increment, or, as in the case of perceptual difficulties, drive arousal high, thus making possible a pleasing decrement. What is of still greater importance from the point of view of art, however (and this follows from the above statements), arousal, and consequently hedonic value, has been found to be affected by external stimulus patterns. Three major classes of properties of external stimuli as regards arousal have been postulated: psychophysical, ecological, and collative. These stimulus properties that are known to affect arousal have been subsumed under the term "arousal potential." The analysis of hedonic and physiological effects of collative stimulus properties, such as novelty, surprise, complexity, ambiguity, and so on, is, in fact, the area of the "new experimental aesthetics" mentioned earlier. Numerous studies, many of which were carried out in Berlyne's laboratory, have to a large extent supported the notion that the relationship between the arousal potential of properties of external stimuli (among these the collative properties being of primary importance) and hedonic value may be conceptualized in terms of the Wundt curve.

The purpose of this brief outline was to show that although many of the above conclusions are tentative, there are glimmers of a solid theory, backed by research, that makes possible a scientific study of psychological processes involved in the creation and appreciation of art. One is now entitled to analyse the motivational emotional and cognitive-perceptual aspects of the artist's behavior, and of the corresponding processes in the appreciator, in terms of hedonic value that characterizes the relationship between the constituent elements of a work of art. Such an analysis, based on the arousal and de-arousal systems' control of a hedonic state, as a result of the arousal-potential characteristics of external stimuli, may clarify the nature of the psychological external impact of works of art. A detailed study of the devices commonly used in the arts, conceptualized as sets and patterns of stimuli of certain arousal potential, and consequently as arousal-raising and arousal-moderating devices, may provide an answer to old dilemmas concerning "unity-in-variety," the "sublime," the "harmonious," and the "beautiful"; in fact, many a controversy has already turned out to be a pseudo-issue. Therefore, what was said earlier about conventional aesthetic analysis was not meant to underrate the contribution that art history, art criticism, philosophical aesthetics, and artists like Bernstein have to make, but merely to emphasize the fact that art and the processes connected with it are a legitimate field of study for psychology and the behavioral sciences in general. As Berlyne (1971) himself was first to point out, this is just one of the possible approaches to art, but definitely an important one.

Although there is no doubt that this is a very fruitful line of thinking and research, and although a stage of development has been reached where it is possible to explain the reasons for, and the effects of, the inclusion of certain elements or combinations of elements in a work of art, from both

the artist's and the appreciator's angles, this is only a preliminary stage. The task of science is not only to describe and explain, but also to subject phenomena to measurement, to establish functional relationships, and thus to predict. It is true that the experiments carried out in recent years, using a variety of dependent measures ranging from verbal responses to exploratory behavior to psychophysiological indices, have shown a definite relationship between variables such as novelty, complexity, surprise, and incongruity, on the one hand, and pleasingness and interestingness on the other, and that this relationship can be, at least in part, accounted for by the Wundt curve. It is also true that the information theory has provided us with workable formulae by which one can compute the amount of information transmitted by a pattern (sample space), relate various sources of information reflected in a work of art (semantic, expressive, syntactic information), discuss art styles and periods in terms of uncertainty, redundancy, and positive interaction uncertainty, which have Gestalt-Psychology counterparts, and account for certain characteristics of various art "isms" (abstraction, distortion) in terms of completeness of information transmitted. However, in spite of this multidisciplinary approach to art, one is far from being able to tell whether the *Eroica* should indeed earn a grade of 3.2. Many a region of the Wundt curve needs further exploration, and it remains to be seen whether the curve will be able to accommodate interactions of several collative variables plotted on the abscissa, the first step toward which would have to be the definition of a common unit of measurement for these variables, perhaps in information-theory terms. An adequate empirical classification of emotional states continues not to be available, not to mention the lack of sober attempts to bridge the gap currently existing between motivational research and personality theories. These requirements are hardly likely to be fulfilled in the near future; yet, continuous integrative efforts may eventually make it possible for psychologists to dissect a complex work of art meaningfully and to pronounce a competent "synthetic" judgment.

Because of such difficulties, it is not surprising that attempts of detailed treatment of individual works of art are singularly lacking. Just about the only monographs written by non-aestheticians have been the psychoanalytically oriented studies (e.g., Sigmund Freud's *Moses*; Ernest Jones's *Hamlet*). Apart from the fact that these studies employ principles which are presently unverifiable, they are selective with respect to the aspects upon which they elaborate and thus do not satisfy the completeness criterion of analysis. Although many works of art, or some fragments or extracts of such works, have been used for experimental purposes, there has been a noticeable neglect of individual analysis, experimentally approached. It should be emphasized that while the title of this paper specifies that its objective is neither a musicological nor a conventional aesthetic analysis of Bach's *St. Matthew Passion*, it is nevertheless somewhat misleading in that it promises a psychological analysis, rudimentary or not. The writer of this paper may perhaps manage to exploit the *St. Matthew Passion* profitably for the purpose of illustrating some of the principles discussed above.

* * * * *

Bach seems to have premiered his *Passion According to St. Matthew* on Good Friday (15 April) of 1729 at the *Thomaskirche* in Leipzig, where he served as Cantor from 1723 until his death in 1750. The musical settings of ten of the 78 numbers or movements of the Passion had been performed by Bach earlier in 1729 at Cöthen as a part of the *Trauermusik* Cantata (*BWV* 244a) sung at the funeral of his ex-patron and admirer Leopold von Anhalt-Cöthen. The Matthew Passion libretto, based on chapters xxvi and xxvii of St. Matthew's Gospel, was written by the poet C.F. Henrici (alias Picander), most likely under Bach's direction. After being performed two or three additional times by Bach himself, the Passion fell into neglect until 1829 when Mendelssohn revived it in Berlin—the occasion about which Zelter spoke so enthusiastically (quoted in Blume, 1950). This century-long neglect of Bach's *St. Matthew Passion* coincided with the budding of the post-Baroque Enlightenment period, which in its infancy had little sympathy for the contrapuntal intricacies of "old-fashioned" Bach. Mendelssohn's so-called "Bach-revival," on the other hand, coincided with the beginning of Bach's posthumous fame that has been steadily growing ever since. The twentieth-century view of Bach need not be reviewed here; suffice it to say that a very special place is reserved for him in the history of music. To quote Hans David (1966, p. 30), ". . . without any break with the past—in fact, as the great conservator of its legacies—Bach took what was handed down to him and treated it with a boldness that often seemed almost revolutionary."

While the Cöthen years were devoted largely to the composition of secular and chamber pieces (cf. Manfred Bukofzer, 1947; Terry, 1928), the Leipzig period signified a definite return to the idea that obsessed Bach all his life—church music. Leo Schrade (1946, pp. 9-10) quotes from Bach's letter of resignation to the municipal council of Mülhausen in 1708 (he was twenty-three): "It was my intention to advance the music in the divine service toward its very end and purpose, a regulated church music in honor of God" and "to persevere in working for my very end which consists in organizing church music well." So, the Leipzig years were the years of the composition of innumerable cantatas and of his great Passion music which has a special significance for a complete understanding of both his musical and non-musical personality. As C.H.H Parry (1909, p. 231) puts it, "this branch of composition [Passion music] is the most copious manifestation . . . of the essential qualities of pure Teutonic devotionalism; its sentiment, its love of symbolism, its reflective absorption in mystical fancies, its human qualities, and the peculiar conception which Teutonic [Lutheran] Protestants had established as their ideal of the relation between man and Christ."

The *St. Matthew Passion* is scored for two separate choirs each supported by its own orchestra of strings, recorders, flutes, oboes, English horns, bassoons, and organs. For the "reflective" arias and *ariosos*, soprano, alto, tenor, and bass soloists are required. In the case of the "dramatic" roles,

the words of Jesus are sung by a bass soloist and the part of the Evangelist by a tenor soloist. The lesser dramatic parts (Peter [bass], Judas [bass], Pilate [bass], the two Priests [basses], Pilate's wife [soprano], and the two Maids [soprani]), were, in Bach's time, given to members of the choirs. The Bible recitatives are allotted to Choir I, while the only Biblical characters in Choir II are the two False Witnesses, [alto, tenor]. According to Terry's speculations (1926), Bach had eighteen singers in Choir I and sixteen in Choir II. There are indications that additional boy soprani were used to carry the chorale *Cantus firmus* in the opening number. It is important to realize that Bach did not use women in his church choirs. Therefore, unchanged boy voices sang the soprano and alto parts in both Choirs I and II.

Editor's Note:

Part II of Professor Konecni's article will be published in the October 1986 issue of *BACH* journal.