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Abstract

by
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Scholars and performers of seventeenth–century music have long been aware of Sebastian Knüpfer (1633-76) and his place in the history of the city of Leipzig and its famous Thomaskirche. Knüpfer served as the cantor of the Thomasschule and city music director from 1657 to his death in 1676, which places him in a storied lineage that includes such eminent composers as Johann Hermann Schein (1586-1630) and Johann Sebastian Bach (1685-1750). Yet, even though his place in the history of the city and one of the city’s two principal churches is well-established, his music remains virtually unknown, particularly in the United States. To date, only a handful of Knüpfer’s one-hundred twenty known works are available in modern performing editions, and only a handful of recordings of his works have been produced worldwide. Moreover, analytical models for his music are extremely underdeveloped. The general lack of attention to Knüpfer’s work has obscured his rightful place in history as a master of the sacred vocal concerto, the dominant genre of sacred music in the seventeenth century.
To begin to remedy this dearth of study on the music of Knüpfer, I examine a small portion of his oeuvre, the Latin psalm concertos, in the broad context of his entire output, in order to draw out the salient stylistic features of his musical language. From among this collection of works, I closely examine one Latin psalm concerto, *Super flumina Babylonis*, from the perspective of musical language and theological content. Close analysis of this work demonstrates Knüpferʼs exertion of formal control in the sacred vocal concerto as a means of managing dramatic narrative while at the same time suggesting his own theological perspective. My analytical approach further demonstrates the necessity for more focused attention on Knüpferʼs individual compositions and groups of works in the same genre, and for studies that compare his works to the sacred vocal concertos of other prominent composers of the period. Finally, I provide a modern performing edition of Knüpferʼs *Super flumina* with a critical commentary.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Few church music programs have enjoyed as much attention as that of the Thomaskirche in Leipzig, Germany. This is largely due to the broad interest in its most famous cantor, Johann Sebastian Bach (1685-1750). Bach, however, is not the only composer of historical interest who was part of the Leipzig church-music tradition. Johann Rosenmüller (1619-1684), Adam Krieger (1634-1666), Felix Mendelssohn (1809-1847), and Max Reger (1873-1916) are but a few of the composers who took up residence in Leipzig and devoted a notable (if not the primary) portion of their creative activities to church music there.¹ The lineage of cantors at the Thomaskirche alone merits serious attention and has been the subject of focused studies, most recently that of Michael Maul.² The growing interest in the lineage of Thomaskantors is happily bringing long overdue attention to Bach’s predecessors, giving rise to some focus on the compositions of seventeenth-century cantors Johann Hermann Schein (1586-1630),

---

¹ Outside of church music, Leipzig has also enjoyed several noteworthy musical events. Robert Schumann founded his journal, *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, in Leipzig in 1834, and in 1888, Gustav Mahler completed his first symphony there while he was working as conductor of the Leipzig Gewandhaus Orchestra.

Johann Schelle (1648-1701), Johann Kuhnau (1660-1722), and Sebastian Knüpfer (1633-1676), the subject of this study.

A number of factors account for the delay in focused research into these deserving composers. First, many sources from the era, both musical and documentary, simply do not survive. Thus, the resulting paucity of available biographical information often prevents one from constructing full pictures of the life and times of these figures without lacunae. In Knüpfer’s case, his obituary remains the primary biographical source, leaving many details of his life up to reasonable speculation. Secondly, the decline of music publishing in the latter half of the seventeenth century also impacts the availability of works by composers such as Knüpfer. While composers from the early sixteenth- to the mid-seventeenth centuries enjoyed the dissemination of their works largely through print, many composers working after 1650 or so, including Knüpfer, did not publish their music for a variety of reasons, and relied on a network of independent copyists (predominantly cantors and Kapellmeisters) for the dissemination of their works in manuscript. Over the centuries, the majority of these manuscript collections have been lost. This method of dissemination also means that works lists for composers such as Knüpfer must be reconstructed through the laborious process of comparing the contents of all the known inventories of city and court music collections, both extant and lost; as a result, one can never be certain to what extent the resulting works list is complete. In addition, relatively

3 For a discussion of the reasons for the decline in music publishing at this time, see Friedhelm Krummacher, *Die Überlieferung der Choralbearbeitungen in der frühen evangelischen Kantate* (Berlin: Merseburger, 1965), 45-50.
few works from this period are readily available in modern performing editions, making study and performance difficult.

Lastly, the treatment of the genre of the seventeenth-century vocal concerto by scholars of the Baroque is often embedded in an evolutionary discussion favoring the development of the church cantata. Much of the existing scholarship on Knüpfer has thus focused on his works based on German chorales, often in the context of the developing chorale cantata.\(^4\) The inclination to associate Knüpfer’s works with the well-studied chorale cantata can lead to fruitful discussions, but runs the risk of casting Bach’s shadow backward in time, subtly suggesting that one should read the compositions of seventeenth-century composers through the lens of Bach’s expressive vocabulary. While many elements of the seventeenth-century vocal concerto do later become assumed into the chorale cantata genre, the vocal concerto remains a distinct genre with its own evolutionary history.\(^5\) Knüpfer’s works are situated in a period of rapid evolution within the genre of the vocal sacred concerto, and his works well represent acute responses to the musical experimentation of the period and region.

\(^4\) See, for example, Friedhelm Krummacher, *Die Choralbearbeitung in der protestantischen Figuralmusik zwischen Praetorius und Bach* (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1978), 257-84.

\(^5\) George Buelow notes that Knüpfer used compositional techniques such as the motivic fragmentation of chorales, the separation of verses into well-defined structural segments, the use of aria-like vocal writing juxtaposed with fugal choral passages, and the incorporation of expressive recitativo, all of which are hallmarks of the German chorale cantata. He also notes that Knüpfer would frequently pass a chorale melody between different voices in a duo or trio texture, which he identifies as a contrapuntal technique typical of the organ chorale preludes of Bach. See George J. Buelow, “Knüpfer, Sebastian,” in *Grove Music Online, Oxford Music Online* (Oxford University Press), accessed 31 October 2016, http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com. This tossing about of a melodic fragment is referred to as concertato style and will be discussed in Chapter 3.
Although Knüpfer’s works are relatively unknown today, they were extremely popular during his lifetime, and were disseminated broadly throughout Germany. His tenure as Thomaskantor was the first in the seventeenth century to fall completely outside the period of the Thirty Years’ War. Moreover, his appointment as Thomaskantor also included the title of Director musices for the city of Leipzig, which emphasizes the breadth of responsibilities that came with the cantorate, not only teaching Latin but also composing and leading the music for civic events. Arnold Schering, George Buelow, Michael Maul, and Peter Wollny all point to Knüpfer’s tenure as one of successful rebuilding, returning musical acclaim to Leipzig after the devastation of the Thirty Years’ War.

Knüpfer’s life and historical position in the city of Leipzig (and its famous Thomaskirche) have attracted scholarly interest from at least the early twentieth century. His musical output has been the primary subject of at least two dissertations, a major component of at least three others, and the focal point of several articles. In addition, his name is frequently encountered in studies of this period and region; these often mention his popularity in Leipzig. Most recently, Peter Wollny has contributed a major discussion

6 See Chapter 2.

7 Johann Hermann Schein’s tenure falls almost completely during wartime, and stretches from 1615 (three years before the start of the war) until his death in 1630. Knüpfer’s immediate predecessor, Tobias Michael (1592-1657), began his tenure in 1631, thirteen years after the start of the war and seventeen years before the Peace of Westphalia. Only the last six years of Michael’s twenty-six-year tenure fell outside of the Thirty Year’s War.

8 Knüpfer has often been pointed to as the first Thomaskantor to hold the dual appointment as Director musices for the city of Leipzig. As recently as 2009, Steven Sturk repeated this historical misunderstanding in his dissertation, “Development of the German Protestant Cantata from 1648 to 1722” (DMA diss., North Dakota State University, 2009), 4. This false but persistent idea stems from a misreading of Schering’s account of the circumstances surrounding Knüpfer’s hire. See Chapter 2.
of Knüpfer’s compositions in his 2016 monograph on style change in Protestant (Lutheran) music of the mid-seventeenth-century. Of the dissertations that have focused solely on Knüpfer, however, one bears a strong outward similarity to the present study. In his 1974 dissertation, William Krause examined a collection of pieces that at the time was thought to represent the complete body of Knüpfer’s extant Latin works; Krause accompanied his discussion with his own editions of these works. Krause’s work has many strengths. He was the first American scholar to devote a monograph to the life and music of Knüpfer, and his editions are both the first modern editions of the works he considered and the first modern editions of Knüpfer’s music prepared on the American continent. He took care to translate into English what little biographical information exists; because of Krause’s work, Knüpfer’s application letter to the Thomaskirche and his lengthy obituary are available in English. He also took great care to compile primary source material as well as secondary studies on the Thomaskirche and its cantors to produce a detailed biography that remains one of the most comprehensive on Knüpfer to date. In his treatment of the music, he assumed that the works fall into the genre of vocal concerto, and he made no case for an evolutionary consideration of Knüpfer’s works that inevitably leads toward the works of Bach.


11 Wollny notes that a comprehensive biographical study is still lacking (*Studien zum Stilwandel*, 289). Through his various articles on Knüpfer, Wollny has contributed some details to the Knüpfer biography which will be addressed in Chapter 2.
Krause’s work is not without shortcomings, however. In addition to the difficulties presented by the lack of surviving sources, the political circumstances of his own lifetime further limited his work. In 1974, Germany was divided, and most surviving sources lay behind the Iron Curtain; thus obtaining source material for such a project was a remarkable feat in and of itself.\(^1^2\) Without direct access to archives, Krause had to rely entirely on Arnold Schering’s account of the extant sources for Knüpfer’s works,\(^1^3\) which lacks sources now known to be part of the Sherard Collection at University of Oxford’s Bodleian Library, the Düben collection at Uppsala University, and the music library of the Nicholaikirche in Luckau, Germany – all of which contain important manuscripts of Knüpfer’s Latin works. In some cases, this led Krause to believe that only a single source existed for some of these works, when in fact, multiple sources survived.\(^1^4\) He admits that even though Schering’s catalog of sources largely proved accurate, his contacts in Europe were unable to locate sources for Knüpfer’s solo motet, *Quemadmodum desiderat cervus*, and thus he decided to abandon the study of this particular Latin work since it is not a choral work.\(^1^5\)

\(^1^2\) Krause notes several degrees of separation between him and the sources; his advisor led him to Jan LaRue, who led him to Peter Riethus, a Viennese music collector (whose collection of 1,200 books and scores has recently been placed on deposit at Duke University), who obtained microfilm copies of the source material for Krause “for a very small fee.” Krause, “The Latin Choral Music of Sebastian Knüpfer,” 17.


\(^1^4\) This is true for *Super flumina Babylonis*, the work at the center of this study.

\(^1^5\) Krause, “The Latin Choral Music of Sebastian Knüpfer,” 17. Schering’s catalog identified this piece as belonging to a collection in Löbau, Germany. This particular source (now in the SLUB in Dresden) is severely damaged and is missing several pages of Knüpfer’s *Quemadmodum*. Several other sources of
Another problem with Krause’s work lies in his editorial process. Documentation of the editorial policies used to create his editions is virtually nonexistent; he devotes a single page to his editorial policy, which only indicates that tempos, clefs, and dynamics are editorial suggestions. Policies for other aspects of the editions, such as the addition of accidentals, the addition of text underlay absent in the source material, and the distinction between articulations present or absent (particularly slurs) in the source material are not detailed; the absence of critical reports for each work makes it impossible to discern just what Krause has added or changed through editorial prerogative. The editorial suggestions of tempo and dynamics are of limited usefulness to performers since they exist outside the discussion of historical performance practice. Likewise, his continuo realization consists only of realizing the harmonies above the figured bass in standard four-voice texture with no stylistic justification or commentary on the role of the continuo group in these works.

Krause’s analysis of each piece is likewise of limited usefulness. Using Jan LaRue’s methodology for characterizing musical style, Krause provides only an overview of the form of each piece and draws some attention to salient features, conflating the concepts of style, genre, and compositional analysis. This is particularly problematic when considering the breadth of genres present in the sampling of Knüpfer’s works that

---


17 See ibid., 19-21. Krause uses Jan LaRue’s methodology as the foundation for his analysis, which addresses sound, harmony, melody, rhythm, and growth as identifiers of musical style. (See Jan LaRue, Guidelines for Style Analysis [New York: Norton, 1970].) LaRue’s methodology is not designed to serve as the foundation for proposing analytical models of formal structure or rhetorical analysis.
He considers. His adherence to only one analytical model, which is designed to describe style and not structure, does not allow him to convey Knüpfer’s mastery of multiple genres and the diversity of his musical expression, and fails to account for any musical or interpretive measure of Knüpfer’s works based on compositional structure. Given these limitations, Krause’s dissertation is best considered as an important first step in the effort to advance interest in the music of Knüpfer. It fails, however, as an example of modern editorial practice and fails to make an interpretive case for Knüpfer’s music.

Knüpfer’s impressive body of works is slowly also gaining the attention of performers. Three recordings, two of which have been produced in the last decade, have been devoted solely to his works; some of his shorter compositions can be found scattered across an array of recordings. Almost all of the recordings of Knüpfer’s music have been produced by German ensembles that have ready access to the source materials. Since very few of Knüpfer’s works exist in modern performing editions, however, broad awareness of these works remains rather limited. Happily, the absence of modern performing editions is currently being remedied by Paul Walker, Peter Wollny, and Mary Frandsen, who have assembled an impressive group of scholars to produce a complete works edition that will be published in the series *Corpus mensurabilis*

---

18 Krause’s sampling of works contains several Latin psalm concerto, a Kyrie and Gloria, and two cantus firmus hymn settings.

19 See Appendix B for a discography.

20 A recording by the King’s Consort stands as an outlying project in what has otherwise been a largely German-led enterprise. The King’s Consort, *Sacred Music by Sebastian Knüpfer*, Hyperion, HYP 55393, 2000, compact disc.
musicae.\textsuperscript{21} With the publication and broad dissemination of these unknown masterworks, they may soon take their place amidst robust performances and discussions of the music of the Leipzig cantors of the seventeenth century.

Through this study, I intend to advocate for the study and performance of Knüpfer’s music, particularly his Latin-texted works. I will establish the biographical and creative context for Knüpfer’s music within the context of the evolving sacred vocal concerto of the seventeenth century, provide an overview of the Latin psalm concertos, and finally, analyze one work in great detail. My analysis will provide a foundation for musical interpretation from the twin vantage points of musical content and liturgical context. I will focus my study on one psalm concerto, *Super flumina Babylonis*, and will provide a modern performance edition prepared according to current critical editorial practices.

\textsuperscript{21} This study is the result of an invitation extended to the author by editors Paul Walker and Mary Frandsen to join the team producing this complete works edition.
CHAPTER 2: 
BIOGRAPHY AND OVERVIEW OF WORKS

2.1 The Life of Sebastian Knüpfer

Sebastian Knüpfer was born on 6 September 1633 in the modern-day city of Aš (Asch) in Vogtland, on the far-western border of the present-day Czech Republic.\(^2\) He began his musical studies at home with his father, a Lutheran cantor and organist, and continued his education at the Lutheran Gymnasium Poeticum in Regensburg from 1646 to 1653, at which point he moved to Leipzig.\(^2\) He received a substantial scholarship from the town council in Regensburg to attend the university in Leipzig, where he may have begun to study in the winter semester of 1653.\(^2\) In Leipzig, Knüpfer enjoyed the high esteem of university students, faculty, and prominent citizens; he was well regarded for his knowledge of ancient philosophy, and his devotion to the study of philosophy.

\(^{22}\) Krause’s biographical treatment is quite thorough and provides English translations of the biographical material published by Arnold Schering in the early twentieth century. Buelow’s article on Knüpfer in *New Grove Online* contains a useful and succinct biographical summary. Together, they form the principal references for outlining Knüpfer’s biography. See Buelow, “Knüpfer” and Krause, “The Latin Choral Music of Sebastian Knüpfer,” 8-16.


\(^{24}\) Peter Wollny, *Studien zum Stilwandel*, 289. The funeral sermon simply indicates that he came to Leipzig intending to study at the university (Krause, “The Latin Choral Music of Sebastian Knüpfer,” 12).
perdured throughout his life. Throughout his twenty-two years in Leipzig, Knüpfer maintained a profile as a respected vocalist and composer. Before his appointment as Thomaskantor, he was apparently involved in the student *collegium musicum*, and was an active vocal soloist at the Nikolaikirche. Even though he was well-regarded for his musical abilities, his ascendancy to the cantorate of the Thomasschule still resulted from an unexpected turn of events.

Though active as a vocalist in the city and presumably known as a composer, Knüpfer apparently held no leadership role in Leipzig’s church-music establishment before his appointment to the Thomaskirche. Johann Rosenmüller (1619-84), who was educated in Leipzig and held the esteemed position as organist at the Nikolaikirche, was assured of succession to the cantorate of the Thomaskirche, but was imprisoned in 1655 for alleged sexual misconduct. Rosenmüller’s successor, Adam Krieger (1634-66), had studied under Samuel Scheidt (1587-1654) and had founded Leipzig’s *Collegium musicum*. After Rosenmüller, Krieger was the clear heir-apparent to the positions at the Thomaskirche and Thomasschule; he was even encouraged to apply for the post by Johann Georg II (1613-80), Elector of Saxony. At first, the town council considered dividing the position between Knüpfer and Krieger, and giving Knüpfer the teaching

---

25 Knüpfer’s obituary notes that his personal library contained several books of philosophy and that he even made his own copies of Boethius and Guido d’Arezzo from the University’s library (Krause, “The Latin Choral Music of Sebastian Knüpfer,” 125).


27 In addition to Krieger, the other candidates included Elias Nathusius, the Nicolaikantor; Gerhard Preisenin, the organist at the Thomaskirche; Andreas Unger, the cantor in Naumburg; and Werner Fabricius, a young freelance organist in Leipzig. Krause, “The Latin Choral Music of Sebastian Knüpfer,” 13.
duties in the school, while making Krieger the director of the choir; ultimately, however, they awarded the entire position to Knüpfer, as Krieger had refused both to teach children and to maintain an active schedule of composing church music.  

Knüpfer did not seem to have the same reservations about teaching children or actively composing. On the contrary, he was in great demand as a Latin tutor for the children of municipal dignitaries. Johann Philippi (1607-74), a prominent lawyer on the Leipzig City Council whose son was among Knüpfer’s private pupils, personally advocated for Knüpfer’s hire. Knüpfer’s reputation as a musician, his sharp intellect and mastery of Latin, as well as the high regard in which he was held by city dignitaries, formed the perfect combination of desirable traits for his hire, even if this did cause an apparent upset in the expected line of succession. Thus, on 17 July 1657, at the tender age of twenty-three, Sebastian Knüpfer was appointed Thomaskantor, a position he held until his death nineteen years later. The following year, he married Maria Sabina, with whom he fathered five children.

---

28 Schering, “Introduction,” 10, and John H. Baron, “Krieger, Adam,” Grove Music Online, Oxford Music Online (Oxford University Press), accessed 31 October 2016, http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com. Peter Wollny further specifies that Krieger’s inability to teach Latin hindered his further consideration by the city council. He goes on to explain that the title of Director musices was used in an effort to “describe the true nature of the Thomascantorate – since the early 17th century it was not merely a teaching position at a Latin school, but a leading municipal music position, similar to a Kapellmeister at a court” (email correspondence, 31 October 2017). Thus, the dual appointment was already held by his predecessors. See Chapter 1.

29 In his application letter, Knüpfer praises the school leaders for their commitment to high educational standards, and concludes his letter by promising “diligence and faithfulness in educating the youth of the schools”; Krause, “The Latin Choral Music of Sebastian Knüpfer,” 121.

30 Peter Wollny calls this hire a “decided leap” in Knüpfer’s professional profile (Studien zum Stilwandel, 289).

31 Krause, “The Latin Choral Music of Sebastian Knüpfer,” 12. His oldest child, Sebastian Magnus, also spent his career as a church musician, studying organ with Johann Christoph Bach in Eisenach and eventually assuming the position of organist at the Wenzelskirche in Naumburg in 1705; see
Knüpfers appointment as Thomaskantor included a joint appointment as the city’s director of music, which included composing works for local commemorations of historic events and composing works for local occasions, such as the funerals of city dignitaries. Knüpfer took an active role in the city’s musical life, and under his leadership, the cultivation of music in the city’s churches experienced tremendous growth. The Thirty Years’ War had ended nearly a decade before his appointment, and Knüpfer capitalized on the city’s resilient economy for his creative endeavors. The sheer volume of concerted works for large performing forces in Knüpfer’s output compared to the small number of such works in the oeuvre of his predecessors underscores the health of the vocal and instrumental ensembles under his direction. His local network of performing colleagues included Johann Christoph Pezel (1639-1694), a city Stadtpfeifer and renowned virtuoso clarino player, whose collection of five-part brass music may have influenced Knüpfer’s own writing for brass. Knüpfer also cultivated a circle of

Peter Wollny, introduction to Sebastian Knüpfer, *Lustige Madrigalien und Canzonetten*, ed. Bernd Baselt (Madison: A-R Editions, 1999), xi. His youngest child, Johann Sebastian, lived only eight months and was apparently buried the same day as his father (Krause, “The Latin Choral Music of Sebastian Knüpfer,” 14). Krause notes a curiosity in the timeline of Schering’s account: Knüpfer’s funeral program does not mention the passing of his son, though city records indicate the child’s burial. If Johann Sebastian died shortly after his father, it is possible that the funeral program had already been published by the time the child died.

32 Laura Roderic Nash, “Aspects of an Evolving Tonal Language: A Study of the Chorale-Based Compositions by the Leipzig Thomaskirche Cantors 1618 – 1722” (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1990), 68. Nash notes the importance of Leipzig as a trade hub even during the Swedish occupation that ended in 1650. This, combined with the influx of immigrants, Nash argues, fueled the relative stability of Leipzig during the war and its rapid restoration in the years following the war.

33 David Albert Uber, “The Brass Choir in Antiphonal Music” (Ed.D. diss., Columbia University, 1965), 62-69. Uber makes note of how both Pezel and Knüpfer adapt the polychoral technique of Gabrieli by dividing a single instrumental choir into a sort of faux double chorus. This technique, Uber argues, is both one of instrumental efficiency as well as an homage to the musical style of the turn of the century. It is unclear from Uber’s argument whether he believes this to be a stylistic trend in post-war Leipzig reflecting a hesitation to return to full-blown polychoral works, an evolution in stylistic preferences, or some nuanced combination of multiple influences.
church music composers in Leipzig that included Elias Nathusius, the cantor of the neighboring Nikolaikirche, and the organists of the Thomaskirche, Jacob Weckmann and Gerhard Preisenin. The circle also included the amateur composer Johann Caspar Horn (c1630-c185), a physician in Leipzig whose two-volume publication of music for the church year was broadly disseminated. Knüpfer apparently also mentored Georg Ludwig Agricola (1643-76), a philosophy student from the University of Leipzig who would go on to serve as Kapellmeister in Gotha, a city approximately 160 kilometers east of Leipzig. Knüpfer even maintained a presence in the broader community of Saxon composers, actively disseminating the work of his colleagues and serving as a Leipzig-based sales agent for Heinrich Schütz (1585-1672).

Knüpfer’s acclaim spread beyond the boundaries of the city of Leipzig. He maintained a regular presence, for example, in the musical life of neighboring Halle. He composed a work for the dedication of an organ at Halle’s Marktkirche on 15 February

---


36 Stephen Rose, “The Composer as Self-Publisher in the Seventeenth-Century Germany,” in *The Dissemination of Music in Seventeenth-Century Europe: Celebrating the Düben Collection*, ed. Erik Kjellberg (Bern, Berlin, etc.: Peter Lang, 2010), 257. The title page of Schütz’s 1664 print of the *Weihnachtshistorie* (SWV 435), which included only a few of the parts, indicates that manuscript copies of the remaining (unpublished) parts could be acquired (through purchase) from either the “Cantor in Leipzig” or Alexander Hering, organist of the Kreuzkirche in Dresden.

37 The presence of his works in a significant number of inventories and collections and the records of performances of Knüpfer’s works during the decades following his death also attest to his renown beyond Leipzig. See the discussion below.
1664, and another in 1675 for the dedication of the organ at the Ulrichskirche. On 17 August 1665, Knüpfer led a program for the centenary celebration of the Halle Gymnasium which included a performance of his German psalm concerto, *Jauchzet dem Herrn*.\(^{38}\) The surviving libretto of the 1664 program for the service in the Marktkirche indicates that the text of the work comprised a series of madrigalistic texts and a setting of *Nun danket alle Gott*.\(^{39}\) This relationship to the churches in Halle was a cherished one for Knüpfer; he regularly set texts of Johann Goffried Olearius (1635-1711), a friend from his early days in Leipzig and *Director musices* at the Marktkirche from 1661 to 1672.\(^{40}\) Knüpfer also composed a cycle of concertos with aria on the librettos of David Elias Heidenreich (1638-88), a Leipzig-born poet active at the Halle court whose cycle of texts was first set by Halle court composer David Pohle (1624-95).

Knüpfer’s musical contributions to Halle would become memorialized after his passing; in 1678, Balthasar Speckhun, the pastor of the Ulrichskirche in Halle, purchased a substantial collection of Knüpfer’s works for his church’s collection.\(^{41}\) But Knüpfer’s reputation reached well beyond the state of Saxony. In 1663, he was a candidate to replace the recently deceased Thomas Selle at the Johanneum in Hamburg, in the far north of Germany. Knüpfer was passed over for the position, however, which went to

\(^{38}\) Wollny, *Studien zum Stilwandel*, 292. Wollny notes that three other large-scale works by Knüpfer were also performed at this event.

\(^{39}\) Ibid.

\(^{40}\) Ibid., 291-93.

\(^{41}\) Ibid., 293: Speckhun purchased this collection for 30 thaler.
Christoph Bernhard. His reputation throughout Germany continued to advance nevertheless, and when Christoph Bernhard returned to the Dresden court in 1674, Knüpfer was offered Bernhard’s post in Hamburg. Knüpfer declined the offer, however, and stayed in Leipzig for a rise in salary.

The profound appreciation for Knüpfer’s contributions to the musical and spiritual life of the Leipzig community is well underscored by the circumstances surrounding his death and burial. On 10 October 1676, Knüpfer died after suffering from a fever and stomach cramps for several weeks. The university honored him with a faculty burial, and the university rector invited the faculty and students to attend the funeral, urging the Leipzig community to “honor a musician such as Leipzig has never seen before and probably never will see again.” Knüpfer was succeeded by his former Thomasschule student Johann Schelle (1648-1701), who assumed the cantorate on 31 January 1677.

Knüpfer was recognized not only for his musical ability, but as a man of religious devotion; according to the author of the Lebenslauf in the funeral program, “throughout his life he showed himself to be a faithful Christian.” This praise of his Christian character should be taken as significant, as Leipzig was a center of Lutheran orthodoxy,

---

43 Ibid., xvii.
44 Ibid., xvii-xviii.
45 Schelle and Knüpfer were evidently fond of each other; Schelle won the cantorate in Eilenburg upon Knüpfer’s recommendation, and Knüpfer later became godfather to one of Schelle’s children; see A. Lindsey Kirwan and Peter Wollny, “Schelle, Johann,” Grove Music Online, Oxford Music Online (Oxford University Press): accessed 30 August 2017, http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com.
where religious devotion was considered an indispensable moral characteristic. For those of us who study his musical legacy today, it is worthwhile to keep in mind that Knüpfer’s works stand not only as monuments of the seventeenth-century sacred vocal concerto, but also as personal affirmations of his faith. Choosing to highlight music as Knüpfer’s public profession of faith, the author of his obituary depicts the beloved cantor’s passing as a musical occasion, where “the people attending him were singing songs of faith […] and, according to his wish, [Sebastian Knüpfer] entered the communion of saints that praise the choirs on high.”

2.2 Overview of Works

By Arnold Schering’s count, published in 1918, Knüpfer composed 134 sacred works for voices and instruments. More recent surveys of inventories, however, bring the total number of works closer to 200. Of these works, only about eighty-five are extant in manuscript or published form. These surviving compositions consist largely of concerted works, which account for seventy-four of the known compositions. Knüpfer’s works are overwhelmingly sacred, composed for the Lutheran liturgy, with only the set of twenty madrigals published in 1663 and a few other works standing as secular outliers. While most of his works belong to the broad category of the vocal sacred concerto, he also composed dialogues, Latin hymn settings with cantus firmus, chorale-based

---

47 Ibid., 128.
49 See Appendix A for a list of surviving works.
concertos, motets, and three short Missae. He evidently worked on a set of solo vocal concertos intended for publication, though he apparently never finished this project.\(^{50}\)

Knüpfer’s works enjoyed very broad dissemination in Germany in particular, and appear in a number of contemporaneous inventories of lost collections, among them those from Brandenburg-Ansbach,\(^{51}\) Braunschweig,\(^{52}\) Danzig,\(^{53}\) Freyburg/Unstrut,\(^{54}\) Halle,\(^{55}\) Lüneburg,\(^{56}\) Querfurt,\(^{57}\) Rudolstadt,\(^{58}\) Schweinfurt,\(^{59}\) and Weißenfels.\(^{60}\) The dissemination

---

\(^{50}\) Peter Wollny, liner notes to The King’s Consort, *Sacred Music by Sebastian Knüpfer*, Hyperion, HYP 55393, 2000, compact disc, 5.


\(^{60}\) Klaus-Jürgen Gundlach, ed. and annot., *Das Weissenfelser Aufführungsverzeichnis Johann Philipp Kriegers und seines Sohnes Johann Gotthilf Krieger* (1684-1732) (Sinzig: Studio Verlag Schewe, 2001), 277-78.
and performance of his music continued even decades after his demise; performance dates on the covers of some of his works in the Grimma collection (now on deposit at the Sächsische Landesbibliothek – Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Dresden) document performances there between the years 1682 and 1722 (forty-six years after Knüpfer’s death), and the Weißenfels performance calendar of Johann Philipp Krieger attests to performances of Knüpfer’s works at that Saxon court between 1685 and 1705. Surviving sources are scattered across Europe and are found in major collections in England, Sweden, and Germany. None of Knüpfer’s autographs survive, and thus scholars today must rely solely on copies, many of which were produced after his death. This presents some difficulties, most notably in the establishment of a solid chronology.

Fully aware of the difficulties in establishing a chronology for Knüpfer’s output, Peter Wollny has proposed three broad periods of compositional activity, and groups works both by stylistic similarities and proximity to other datable points of reference. The works of the first period, composed before 1665, consist primarily of small-scale concertos, strophic arias, and scriptural dialogues.

61 Wollny, “Introduction” to Lustige Madrigalien, xi. Wollny suggests that Knüpfer’s oldest son, Sebastian Magnus, was instrumental in ensuring the longevity of his father’s music.

62 Gundlach, Das Weissenfelser Aufführungsverzeichnis, 277-78.


64 Wollny, Studien zum Stilwandel, 289.

65 As a point of reference for dating, Wollny points to a collection of works compiled by the Berlin Nikolaikantor Hermann Koch during his student days in Leipzig (1667-68), indicating that these works likely all date from Knüpfer’s first decade at the Thomaskirche. He notes that some works of this first stylistic period may even date as far back as Knüpfer’s student days at Leipzig University. Wollny suggests that these student works are the likely the smallest scale the works from this first period, postulating that
Wollny suggests that Knüpfer set many madrigalistic texts. Works from this period were typically composed for four-part vocal forces and an instrumental ensemble consisting of four or five strings, often without parts for violins. The second period spans the years between 1665 and 1670. These works are marked by greater experimentation in style and form, demonstrating the influence of the Italian composers Vincenzo Albrici (1631-87) and Giuseppe Peranda (1626-75), who worked in the Dresden court. This is most notable in Knüpfer’s concertos with aria, a genre pioneered by Albrici and Peranda. Knüpfer was evidently an early German adopter of this genre, introduced by his Italian counterparts in Dresden, and his cycle or works on librettos of David Elias Heidenreich are exemplars of his work in the genre of the concerto with aria. Knüpfer’s use of instruments also shifted during this middle period toward a greater emphasis on instruments likely only had opportunity to compose for larger ensembles after his appointment to the Thomaskirche (ibid., 107).

66 Albrici’s true death date was recently discovered by Matteo Messori; see “Albrici, Vincenzo,” in MGG Online (https://mgg-online.com).


68 Frandsen points out that though introduced by the Italians Albrici and Peranda, the concerto with aria genre became so popular with German composers that the genre was long looked upon as a German innovation. David Pohle (a contemporary of Knüpfer in nearby Halle) was the first German composer to adopt the new genre; see Frandsen, Crossing Confessional Boundaries, 230. Wollny contrasts Pohle’s and Knüpfer’s approach to this new genre, pointing out that they both set the texts of Heidenreich (Pohle’s settings predate those of Knüpfer). Wollny considers the compositional superiority of Knüpfer’s approach to the Heidenreich texts as one of the decisive factors in the development of compositional interest in this genre among German composers (Studien zum Stilwandel, 310-311).
instruments in high tessituras; works of this period are marked by the regular inclusion of violins and cornettos, and avoid dense instrumental writing in the middle tessitura.\textsuperscript{69}

Knüpfer’s third period consists of works composed after circa 1670. Wollny identifies works of this period as exhibiting a “fundamentally new style” that avoided madrigalesque and strophic poetry in favor of scripture (usually Psalms), Latin hymn texts, and German chorales. These works generally require substantial performing forces comprising five or more vocal soloists, vocal ripienists, a five-part string choir, and a large wind contingent.\textsuperscript{70} Contrapuntal writing takes on what Wollny calls “style-forming” importance in Knüpfer’s writing, as canons and double counterpoint pervade extended formal divisions.\textsuperscript{71} During this period, Knüpfer also composed a handful of smaller works without instruments in \textit{stile antico}.\textsuperscript{72} The impetus for such a creative evolution is unclear. Wollny suggests these latter works are a sort of “re-Protestantization’ of the repertoire” after a period influenced by Catholic models.\textsuperscript{73} He proposes a happy circumstance of “cultured” mayors as the supporting force behind Knüpfer’s vastly expanded performing

\textsuperscript{69} Wollny also points to this scoring as an influence of Albrici and Peranda on Knüpfer (\textit{Studien zum Stilwandel}, 294).

\textsuperscript{70} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{71} Buelow praises Knüpfer’s contrapuntal mastery, comparing it to that of Schütz, and notes that this high opinion of Knüpfer’s contrapuntal prowess was held by his contemporaries (Buelow, “Knüpfer”).

\textsuperscript{72} One of these motets, \textit{Erforsche mich, Gott}, can be dated to 1674 as an occasional composition for the funeral of Johanna Lorenz von Adlershelm, the wife of Leipzig’s mayor, and is one of the few of Knüpfer’s works to have been published during his lifetime. The motet evidently had a long performance life in Leipzig: Bach copied the piece, arranging it to include instruments. See Daniel R. Melamed, \textit{J. S. Bach and the German Motet}, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 189-97. Wollny draws attention to this handful of surviving works, pointing out that these experiments in the \textit{stile antico} run contrary to the spread of the arioso style in works from the Saxon court (\textit{Studien zum Stilwandel}, 294).

\textsuperscript{73} Ibid., 311.
forces.\textsuperscript{74} In these later works, Knüpfer’s creative output reaches its zenith. While adhering to a rigorous style of composition rooted in disciplined counterpoint, he continues to use the full expressive range of the vocal sacred concerto. These later works are perhaps most illustrative of Knüpfer’s most distinctive compositional voice, which was unfortunately unable to flourish over a long lifespan. Felicitously, a great number of these later works survive alongside many treasured gems of his earlier periods and may soon again enjoy abundant performances and profound appreciation.\textsuperscript{75}

\textsuperscript{74} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{75} Knüpfer’s \textit{Super flumina Babylonis} belongs this late period; it is analyzed in detail in Chapter 4.
CHAPTER 3:

ELEMENTS OF MUSICAL STYLE IN KNÜPFER’S LATIN PSALM CONCERTOS

He composed passages from the Psalms and other Biblical books with such loveliness and artistry that even the saddest hearts were edified.76

3.1 Introduction

Most of Knüpf’s Latin psalm concertos likely belong to what Wollny considers the third and most mature period, that of works composed after 1670.77 They exhibit many of the stylistic markers that Wollny holds up as most closely associated with these later works: the “style forming” use of counterpoint, the preference for scriptural texts over poetic sources, the use of expanded string choirs and vocal forces, and the vast expansion of winds and other instruments that results in grand tutti forces of considerable size. Of the extant Latin psalm concertos, however, two stand out as works that may not entirely belong to the period of later works. One of these, Quemadmodum desiderat cervus, exists in three versions, the earliest of which likely dates to Knüpfer’s student days at Leipzig University. The solo concerto was originally scored for solo bass,

76From Knüpfer’s obituary; see Krause, “The Latin Choral Music of Sebastian Knüpfer,” 125.

77Wollny points to works in the Grimma collection, which holds almost forty works of Knüpfer, the majority of which are from his late period. Three of Knüpfer’s Latin psalm concertos that belong to this period, Super flumina Babylonis (D-DI Mus. 1825-E-516), Quare fremuerunt gentes (Mus. 1825-E-514), and Ecce quam bonum (Mus. 1825-E-504) form part of the Grimma collection.
accompanied by two violins and continuo. In later versions, Knüpfer expanded the string choir to five parts, reworked some of the melodic writing, and completely recast the second portion of the concerto, omitting the devotional texts found in his first version in favor of purely scriptural texts. Another work, De profundis, is difficult to associate with one of the stylistic periods Wollny proposes. The work is a complete setting of Psalm 130, which may suggest it belongs with Knüpfer’s later works. However, the instrumental scoring contains no violins, and the contrapuntal writing does not exhibit the same “style forming” approach clearly present in the later works. Thus stylistically, the work bears a strong outward appearance to the works of Knüpfer’s early period. The presence of a string choir combined with the five-voice solo group accompanied by a four-part ripieno group may suggest that the work was composed after 1657, when Knüpfer had the resources of the Thomaskirche at his disposal and could experiment with expanded performing forces. In the absence of compelling evidence to suggest a later date, the compositional style suggests that Knüpfer composed the work between 1657 and 1670, with a likelihood that it belongs to a time early in his tenure at the Thomaskirche.


79 The only surviving source for De profundis is part of the Sherard Collection, held at the Bodleian Library of the University of Oxford (GB-Ob Ms. mun. Sch. C. 31, fol. 104-122).

80 In De profundis, there are no lengthy passages which are purely contrapuntally contrived. Short passages of concertato writing account for most of the contrapuntal writing in the work. A few places contain canonic imitation, but these passages are rather short and usually appear as an embellishment to draw attention to a short melodic motive rather than to build contrapuntally contrived formal divisions.
Describing Knüpfer’s style proves to be a difficult task. Among scholars and performers, descriptions of Knüpfer’s musical style vary widely. Krause suggests that Knüpfer was the “chief fulfiller of the hopes of Caspar Ziegler, who urged that Germany accept the madrigal form.”

Buelow, on the other hand, is more satisfied broadly to categorize Knüpfer’s works as “serious and profoundly devout.” The more recent assessment of conductor Robert King describes Knüpfer’s works as having an “impressive, dramatic quality.” The variety of impressions of Knüpfer’s sound may have to do with the variety of styles in which he composed as he responded to and experimented with the rapidly changing approaches to the vocal concerto genre. It is important to establish from the outset that the vocal concerto is a genre rather than a form; in fact, diversity of form abounds within the genre. In the middle decades of the seventeenth century, the genre underwent a period of rapid evolution and experimentation. The range of styles and forms Knüpfer employed throughout his creative life suggest that he reveled in this creative atmosphere. In his later works, Knüpfer synthesized the diversity of approaches to the vocal concerto genre in his own compositions, composing works of refined craftsmanship and extraordinary expressivity. These works are marked by a preference for arcane styles of writing, with counterpoint

82 Buelow, “Knüpfer.”
83 Martin Anderson, “Sebastian Knüpfer, Rediscovered Forerunner of Bach,” Fanfare - the Magazine for Serious Record Collectors, 9 (2000), 84. King is specifically referring to Knüpfer’s Christmas work, Vom Himmel hoch. Imagining how worshippers at the Thomaskirche may have reacted to hearing Knüpfer’s music, he suggests they all must have thought, “Blimey, this guy’s good!” Ibid.
84 See Frandsen, Crossing Confessional Boundaries, especially Chapter Five, “Roma trapiantata: The New Sacred Concerto in Dresden,” 172-244.
playing an elevated role in the structure. Textual material, too, moved away from the
poetry of Heidenreich and Olearius to chorale texts, psalms, and composite scriptural
texts. Incorporating earlier compositional strategies, styles, and forms into his later works
gave Knüpfer enormous creative potential that allowed him to respond to text setting with
affective and even theological insight. This new, synthetic style presents an analytical
challenge, however. Since each work is built according to its own design, an analytical
model that is broadly applicable is difficult to design. Thus, I have endeavored to separate
out a discussion of stylistic identifiers in Knüpfer’s works from an analysis of one of his
works.

3.2 Vocal Style in Knüpfer’s Compositions

Knüpfer’s preferred style of vocal composition, often termed “concertato” style, is
typical of the vocal concerto genre during the first half of the seventeenth century.\(^{85}\) Anne
Kirwan-Mott describes concertato style as “the interplay of short and rhythmically
precise motifs which are tossed between the voices in a fashion which suggests
contention between them.”\(^{86}\) Knüpfer’s works often exemplify this definition, as they
contain a series of vocal passages of only a few measures each in which a single motive
is tossed about before another melodic idea is introduced and also tossed about freely.
The opening vocal statements of *Quare fremuerunt gentes* provide a good example of this

---

\(^{85}\) Mary E. Frandsen, “The Sacred Concerto in Dresden” (Ph.D. diss., University of Rochester,
1997), I:126.

\(^{86}\) Anne Kirwan-Mott, *The Small-Scale Sacred Concertato in the Early Seventeenth Century* (Ann
Concertato style is not, however, the only style of vocal writing present in Knüpfer’s works. Knüpfer’s lifespan encompasses a period of changing taste in style-forming melodic writing, and many of his works contain arias. Latin psalm concertos, however, comprise their own sub-genre within his overall creative output, and while they may occasionally include passages that bear melodic similarities to his works with aria, these passages tend to be rather short and do not amount to a style-binding force that unifies a composition. While his melodic writing in the Latin psalm concertos often represents a synthesis of melodic approaches, it is most clear to categorize the diversity of melodic styles under the umbrella of concertato style.

---

87 For works with aria, see Appendix A. Mary Frandsen discusses the transformation of the sacred concerto at the Dresden court in *Crossing Confessional Boundaries*, 172-244. See “Styles in the Dresden Repertoire” and its section, “The Problem of ‘Arioso’” for a discussion of identifying different vocal styles and the taxonomic problems associated with the terminology of works that fall within this transformational period (ibid., 198-203). In his dissertation, “The Protestant Cantata,” Sturk points to a dialogue between an alto/tenor duo and a solo bass in what he terms “dramatic recitative”, 44-45. This style of melodic writing is rather declamatory at first, but gradually becomes more embellished with florid melismas to emphasize the rising drama in the text setting. A discussion of how this declamatory style relates to the ‘arioso’ style Frandsen discusses is unfortunately absent in Sturk’s consideration.
Example 3.1: Knüpfer, *Quare fremuerunt gentes*, mm. 25-30
Knüpfer prizes the virtuosity of solo vocalists. His vocal writing often includes extended passages of long melismas that extend through the extremes of the vocal range. These virtuosic solo passages are not only for soloistic display, but usually depict the text. Two solo passages in *Quare fremuerunt gentes* serve as excellent examples. In a bass solo, Knüpfer sets the text “Ask of me, and I will give you the ends of the earth” in a passage that literally reaches both ends of the bass vocal range (Example 3.2). Similarly, in a tenor solo, Knüpfer sets the text “Zion, my holy mountain” in a brief, jagged vocal line depicting the peaks and valleys of a mountain range (Example 3.3). Knüpfer also uses vocal soloists as a sort of vocal obbligato or descant, tossing about soloistic melodies against the ripieno voices to dazzling effect. In his *De profundis*, for example, Knüpfer sets five vocal soloists against a four-part ripieno ensemble, taking the opportunity to have one of the vocal soloists rise out of the counterpoint with an ornamental melody before falling back into the tutti ensemble to make way for another vocal flourish (Example 3.4).

---

88 Peter Wollny has compared the long flowing lines in Knüpfer to the writing style of Carissimi. See his liner notes to The King’s Consort, *Sacred Music by Sebastian Knüpfer*, Hyperion, HYP 55393, 2000, compact disc, 5.

89 Krause also points to these examples as evidence of Knüpfer’s command of vocal writing. Krause, “The Latin Choral Music of Sebastian Knüpfer,” 72-73.
Example 3.2: Knüpfer, *Quare fremuerunt gentes*, mm. 181-184

Example 3.3: Knüpfer, *Quare fremuerunt gentes*, mm. 112-115
Example 3.4 (pages 32-33): Knüpfer, *De profundis*, mm. 93-97, soprano I rising out of the choral texture, followed by soprano II doing the same
Knüpfer does not rely on virtuoso vocal writing and concertato treatment of motives to the exclusion of more lyrical vocal writing, however. One of Knüpfer’s Latin psalm concertos, *Lauda Jerusalem*, contains a brief solo that recalls the arioso style of his earlier works (Example 3.5). In more lyrical melodic writing, it is not unusual to see small ornaments written into the melody itself. These short ornamental figures keep a sort of rhythmic vitality in Knüpfer’s melodic writing and perhaps demonstrate the sort of melodic embellishments he would have preferred. Knüpfer also contributed to the rhythmic vitality of his lyric vocal writing by frequently concluding vocal solos with a so-called “Florentine comma,” in which the final cadential point is approached with a melodic suspension, and moves to the final syllable of the word before the resolution of the chord (Example 3.6). Knüpfer was an accomplished vocalist and active as a bass soloist before assuming the responsibilities of the cantorate. Certainly, his facility as a vocal soloist influenced his vocal writing, which even in its most demanding passages follows strong melodic design, agreement with text stress, and phrase lengths well-paced for breathing.
Example 3.5: Knüpfer, *Lauda Jerusalem*, mm. 161-170

Example 3.6: Knüpfer, *Super flumina Babylonis*, mm. 105-109, the “Florentine comma” on the word “Edom”
3.3 Counterpoint

Knüpfer was highly regarded as a composer of counterpoint\(^{90}\); his works attest to his expert design of massive contrapuntal structures that take on increasing formal
significance in his late works. The concertato style itself is typified by its short points of imitation. Knüpfer’s nuanced approach to imitation in this style reveals his approach to

text setting; as means of drawing attention to a particular word, Knüpfer will temporarily
abandon the typical use of sequential imitation in favor of short imitations at the unison
or octave. In his *Quare fremuerunt gentes*, for example, Knüpfer uses this imitation at the
union between the bass soloist and violins as a means of focusing attention on the
sentence “Ask it of me, and I will deliver you nations as your inheritance and make the
ends of the earth your possession” (Example 3.7). The imitation draws attention to the
words, “ask,” “inheritance,” “possession,” and “earth.”

\(^{90}\) Buelow, “Knüpfer.”
Example 3.7 (pages 38-39): Knüpfer, *Quare fremuerunt gentes*, mm. 170-184
Some of Knüpfer’s Latin psalm concertos contain short points of fugal imitation, often achieved through short canonic points of imitation. The choral opening of his *Lauda Jerusalem* demonstrates this technique; a canonic pairing of vocal entries between soprano and alto (emphasizing a tonic/dominant relationship) is answered by the same canonic pairing between tenor and bass (Example 3.8). The presence of fugal writing demonstrates Knüpfer’s mature control of contrapuntal textures within clear tonal boundaries. However, fugal passages in Knüpfer’s works do not yet resemble the fugues of Bach with multiple entrances of subjects and countersubjects separated by episodes. That is to say that Knüpfer does not create formal designs around this contrapuntal technique. Rather, these short-lived points of fugal imitation in Knüpfer’s works seem to function similarly to the use of imitation at the unison or octave, drawing focused attention to a phrase within a larger text segment.

---

91 See Kerala J. Snyder, “Dietrich Buxtehude’s Studies in Learned Counterpoint,” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 33, no. 3 (October 1980), 544-564, for a discussion of the technique of cultivating fugal counterpoint through exercises in canonic imitation in the works of Buxtehude.


93 For a discussion of vocal fugues in this period, see Paul Walker’s discussion of the vocal fugues of Johann Rosenmüller in “Johann Rosenmüller and the Rehabilitation of Vocal Fugue in the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century” (forthcoming in A Festschrift for Prof. Kerala J. Snyder (http://www.goart.gu.se/publications/festschriftkjs ).
Example 3.8: Knüpfer, *Lauda Jerusalem*, mm. 62-72
By contrast, in order to build extensive contrapuntal tapestries, Knüpfer often combines multiple points of imitation in passages of well-controlled free counterpoint. In his *Quare fremuerunt gentes*, for example, he creates such a superstructure to set the text “And in his rage, he terrifies them.” Knüpfer controls his dense six-part counterpoint through a steady bass line that provides a clear harmonic context. Each point of imitation presents only one-half of the text, and their combination into such a dense contrapuntal texture poses great challenges to the intelligibility of text. To meet these challenges, Knüpfer employs a clever artistic solution; at the conclusion of the imitation, he sets the motive from each point of imitation in homophonic declamation (Example 3.9). This technique also serves to provide contrapuntal passages with a strong conclusion by emphasizing the two points of imitation that together formed the preceding event – a sort of musical exclamation point.
Example 3.9 (pages 44-46): Knüpfer, *Quare fremuerunt gentes*, mm. 85-104
3.4 Instrumentation

While the Latin psalm concertos largely belong to the last period of Knüpfer’s creative output, they do not, overall, require the colossal performing forces that mark other works from this period. The largest of the Latin psalm concertos, *Quare fremuerunt gentes*, calls for twenty-three parts: six-part brass (two cornetts and four trombones), five-part strings, six vocal soloists, four ripienists, and a continuo group including bassoon. Though this is undoubtedly a large ensemble, it is dwarfed by that of another Latin work, *Surgite populi*, which calls for a thirty-part ensemble, including a massive eleven-part brass choir (three cornetts, five trumpets, and three trombones), five-part strings, four vocal soloists, a double chorus of ripienists, timpani, and a continuo group including bassoon. The majority of Knüpfer’s Latin psalm concertos, by contrast, utilize the just string choir as the core instrumental ensemble. In his Latin psalm concertos, Knüpfer utilizes instruments in four primary ways: first, to perform independent ritornellos; second, to perform instrumental obbligatos over vocal soloists; third, to provide an orchestrated continuo realization; and fourth, to play *colla parte* as reinforcement in tutti passages. Of these four uses of instrumental forces, two deserve brief attention.

The first type of instrumental use will be discussed below for its implications for formal structure. It should be pointed out here, however, that in the instrumental ritornellos present in the Latin psalm concertos, Knüpfer displays a clear preference for the string choir over the brass. In *Super flumina*, for example, the opening sinfonia and all

---

94 *Surgite populi* is also part of the Grimma collection and survives in manuscript as D-D1 Mus. 1825-E-517.
subsequent ritornellos are given solely to the string choir, reserving the brass for tutti passages. This may simply reflect the fact that in Super flumina, the brass choir is optional and thus may be used either in place of or in addition to the ripieno voices, leaving the strings to serve as the primary instrumental choir. By contrast, the brass in Quare fremuerunt gentes are not an optional instrumental chorus. Even in this case, however, the majority of instrumental ritornellos belong to the string choir, while the brass joins only for the opening sinfonia and an instrumental repetition of a triple-time passage for double chorus. Here, Knüpfer may be using the string choir as a sort of transitional chorus between the massive forces of full ensemble and a vocal solo.

The use of instruments to provide an orchestrated continuo realization is present in almost all of the Latin psalm concertos; Knüpfer often uses the violas for this purpose. This technique is reserved solely for the accompaniment of vocal soloists. The technique also apparently transcends Knüpfer’s creative periods. In his De profundis, a work that likely belongs to his middle period, every vocal solo is accompanied by the viola choir. In this work, the constant use of the viola choir ensures textural density throughout the work, and perhaps represents Knüpfer’s intentional depiction of the depth of the pit from which the psalmist cries out to God. It is also possible that in this earlier work, Knüpfer was simply experimenting with the instrumental forces available to him for the first time as the newly-appointed cantor of a renowned musical ensemble. In a later work, Quare fremuerunt gentes, Knüpfer employs a more discriminating creative tactic in his

95 De profundis contains no instrumental ritornellos, for example. The form is delineated entirely by the alternations between vocal solos; Knüpfer pairs a vocal trio and a tutti passage to signal the conclusion of larger formal units. The viola choir plays almost constantly, except in vocal trios.
orchestrated continuo realization technique. In this work, an alto solo and a bass solo are accompanied by a pair of high solo instruments (cornetts and violins, respectively). By contrast, he bolsters a tenor solo delivering the text “you shall rule them with an iron rod and break them like a potter’s jar” with the viola choir, the only such viola accompaniment in the lengthy composition (Example 3.10).
Example 3.10 (pages 51-52): Knüpfer, *Quare fremuerunt gentes*, mm. 184-194
Reges e - os in vir - ga fer - re - a et tan - quam vas fia - li con - frin -
figurati con frin - ghes ve - os.
Knüpfer apparently preferred a reduced role for the instruments in his Latin psalm concertos. Lengthy instrumental solos are essentially nonexistent, and the instrumental choir primarily supports the voices. This is not the case for his entire body of compositions, however. Some of his German works, such as *Vom Himmel hoch*, contain extended passages of instrumental solo writing in a style that reflects the vocal concertato.\(^{96}\) It is possible that these Latin psalm concertos, especially those with brass, are among his earliest large-scale works, and that the absence of special instrumental passages derives from the fact that Knüpfer was new to composing for such mammoth ensembles. Just as likely, however, is that Knüpfer’s rhetorical approach to setting these texts did not require huge flashes of instrumental fireworks in order to convey his musical argument.

3.5 Use of Ritornello

Knüpfer demonstrates a mature sense of managing form in his compositions. In her study of chorale-based works by the Leipzig cantors, Laura Nash specifically argues that the control of formal design within the concerto style was integral to Knüpfer’s artistic success.\(^{97}\) She contends that in Knüpfer’s music, “structural prolongation is a result of the increased importance [placed] on contrast. […] Contrasting elements can be juxtaposed to create larger but also more integrated structures.”\(^{98}\) She specifically points

\(^{96}\) *Vom Himmel hoch* also forms part of the Grimma collection and survives in manuscript as D-Di Mus. 1825-E-520.


\(^{98}\) Ibid., 127.
to Knüpfer’s varied use of ritornello as a means of integrating contrasting elements. Within the Latin psalm concerti, Knüpfer employs three types of ritornellos: repeated musical episodes that create clear structural divisions throughout a composition; instrumental prolongations of thematic material; and independent musical events designed to separate verses or establish a new tonal center. The first type, repeated musical material repeated throughout the composition, typically signals the start of a formal grouping, giving a sense of return to a common head motive throughout the unfolding of the piece. The second type, the instrumental prolongation, is the most flexible in delineating formal structure. This sort of ritornello serves as a bridge between contrasting sections and may signal either the end of a large structural unit or may simply signal the end of a smaller section, like the conclusion of a vocal solo. The last type, free musical material, is the type least used in the Latin psalm concertos. It bears a great similarity to the sinfonias present at the start of Knüpfer’s compositions. Like the sinfonia at the start of a composition, these free ritornellos primarily emphasize a tonal area and reflect some musical affect. The distinction between sinfonia and the third type ritornello, however, is that the sinfonia starts a composition and a ritornello delineates form within the unfolding of a composition.

The first type of ritornello binds together contrasting musical sections into a single formal unit. In his Lauda Jerusalem, Knüpfer uses this type of ritornello to signal the beginning of a new group of verses in his setting of Psalm 147 (Example 3.11 and Figure 3.1). This use of ritornello orients the listener within the extensive and complicated musical structure of this piece. It also serves a tonal function, as the musical events within each group of verses journey away from the piece’s primary tonal area of G
major. The ritornello returns the tonality to G major as a new formal grouping begins. Knüpfer also uses this first type of ritornello to draw attention to a central text through repetition. For example, Knüpfer’s Ecce, ecce quam bonum et quam jucundum is rather lengthy work of almost seven minutes, despite the fact that his textual material comprises only three verses (the shortest of all the psalms). In this work, Knüpfer uses a choral ritornello not only to lengthen the work but to divide the text into independent statements, each framed by the psalm’s first verse, “How good and pleasant it is when brothers live in unity.”
Example 3.11: Knüpfer, *Lauda Jerusalem*, mm. 7-19, first statement of instrumental ritornello
Figure 3.1: Formal divisions of Knüpfer's Lauda Jerusalem

Just as the first type of ritornello often signals the start of a section, the second type, that which prolongs or extends musical material, typically signals the end of a formal unit. This is most frequently the case when Knüpfer uses counterpoint in the concluding tutti of a formal division. In his setting of *Quare fremuerunt gentes*, for example, Knüpfer uses this sort of ritornello to act as a sort of bridge between the density of tutti counterpoint and the more transparent texture of the following vocal solo (Example 3.12). Sometimes, however, Knüpfer uses this sort of ritornello to separate contrasting sections of a larger formal unit, such as the alternation between two soloists. In this case, he tends to prefer to use a subset of the instrumental ensemble to create a subtle bridge between two sections, rather than to signal the conclusion of formal unit. A transition between a soprano solo and a tutti passage in Knüpfer’s *Lauda Jerusalem* illustrates this technique (Example 3.13).
Example 3.12: Knüpfer, *Quare fremuerunt gentes*, mm. 105-109

---

99 This ritornello concludes the contrapuntal passage illustrated in Example 3.9. .
The third type of ritornello, in which free musical material is used to separate verses or to establish a new key area, is rarely encountered in the Latin psalm concertos; this is perhaps due to the typically non-repetitive and unmetered nature of the text. Said another way, since the text may not fit an immediately recognizable poetic form (like the verses of a chorale, for example), the musical structure built around the text will function, at least in part, to guide the listener through the formal design of the psalm text. An example of this third type of ritornello appears in Knüpfer’s *Quare fremuerunt gentes* as a transition point between the work’s first large contrapuntal tapestry and its first vocal solo passage (Example 3.14).

---

100 This ritornello concludes the soprano solo illustrated in Example 3.5.
Example 3.14 (pages 61-62): Knüpfer, *Quare fremuerunt gentes*, mm. 65-71
3.6 Conclusions

This sampling of compositions is admittedly a limited pool from which to discern Knüpfer’s style-forming musical language and should be considered with this limitation in mind. The majority of these works stem from his final creative period and represent the use of some of his most mature creative tactics. Within these late Latin-texted works, some of the salient features, such as the predominance of contrapuntal tapestries, are present throughout Knüpfer’s German-texted works from the same period, while some elements, especially instrumentation, are reflective only of this small sampling of works. That is to say that Knüpfer’s approach to instrumentation varied in substantial ways between periods of creativity and between compositions in different genres. Apparent throughout the totality of Knüpfer’s compositions is a keen approach to vocal composition; he undoubtedly drew upon his own vocal virtuosity as part of his creative process. The identification of style-forming elements in these works should prove useful to future studies of Knüpfer’s compositions, such as his dialogues or concertos with aria.\textsuperscript{101} Wollny has proposed a reasonable chronological grouping of Knüpfer’s works, though a precise dating of works within those periods may prove challenging. A close examination of style-forming musical elements across genres and creative periods may provide some clues into the maturation of Knüpfer’s creative process.

\textsuperscript{101} See Appendix A for a complete works list grouped by genre.
CHAPTER 4:
SUPER FLUMINA BABYLONIS

4.1 Introduction

Sebastian Knüpfer’s setting of Psalm 137, *Super flumina Babylonis*, serves as an exemplary point of reference for a more focused study of his approach to the vocal concerto genre. The only known manuscript sources for this piece are a score and set of parts copied by Samuel Jacobi (1652-1721), the cantor of the Fürstenschule in nearby Grimma (the town lies approximately 30 kilometers to the southeast of Leipzig). Jacobi’s copies form part of the music collection of the Fürstenschule Grimma, which is now on deposit at the Sächsische Landesbibliothek – Staats und Universitätsbibliothek Dresden. Though Jacobi’s copy was produced from a Leipzig source, the copy is not contemporaneous with Knüpfer’s tenure at the Thomaskirche; Jacobi assumed the cantorate of the Fürstenschule in Grimma in 1680, four years after Knüpfer’s passing. The title page includes performance dates for the Tenth Sunday after Trinity, the first in


103 The Fürstenschule in Grimma acquired this and several other works by Knüpfer from the Leipzig city council during the tenure of Johann Schelle, who served as Thomaskantor from 1677 until 1701. Wollny, *Studien zum Stilwandel*, 290.

1683, and it is likely the piece was copied near the time of its first performance in Grimma.\textsuperscript{105} The piece was evidently popular in Grimma. After its first performance there, Jacobi performed the work again in 1688 and 1699, each time on the same liturgical occasion.\textsuperscript{106} The piece is substantial, despite the relative brevity of the nine-verse psalm; Knüpfer calls for large performing forces, including two violins, three violas, two cornetts, three trombones, four vocal soloists, a four-part vocal ripieno group, and a continuo group including bassoon. A performance of the work lasts approximately ten minutes.

As a complete setting of Psalm 137 calling for large performing forces, Knüpfer’s \textit{Super flumina} is unusual. In Knüpfer’s time, very few settings of this psalm text existed, and even fewer complete settings of the text had been composed either in Latin or German, or as the German chorale, \textit{An Wasserflüssen Babylon}.\textsuperscript{107} The dearth of Latin settings of Psalm 137 suggests that neither Catholics nor Lutherans in this period found frequent occasion to set this text. In addition, of the settings that were composed, very few included instruments of any kind; both Catholics and Lutherans often assigned

\textsuperscript{105} Krummacher, “Zur Sammlung Jacobi,” 329. Krummacher argues that the cost of paper limited the possibility of leisure or archival score copying, and that copy production was reserved for imminent performances. He emphasizes that Jacobi’s record of performance dates should not be taken to imply a chronology of composition.

\textsuperscript{106} This text in the context of this liturgical day is discussed below. Steude notes that most of Jacobi’s copies bear performance dates, which is immensely helpful in determining the church music culture in Grimma during Jacobi’s tenure there (Steude, “Jacobi.”). Knüpfer’s works were evidently quite popular with Jacobi, who performed them regularly. For example, one of Knüpfer’s works, a setting of the Christmas hymn \textit{Dies est laetitiae}, was performed on Christmas Day eight times over the course of Jacobi’s forty-year tenure; Jacobi’s manuscript copies of \textit{Dies est laetitiae} survive as D-DI Mus. 1825-E-503, no. 1, and Mus. 1825-E-503a.

\textsuperscript{107} Franz Tunder’s setting of the first verse of the chorale text for solo soprano with five violas is an example of a setting of part of the chorale text. It survives in manuscript form as S-Uu VMHS 36:13.
this text to penitential days, which often involved the suppression of musical instruments in liturgical settings. Thus, Knüpfer’s *Super flumina* represents a sort of historical anomaly.

The complete psalm text is highly dramatic. While the psalm is perhaps best known for its verses of lament, it concludes with a violent curse: “Blessed shall he be who throws your children against the rocks.” Settings of this psalm, however, rarely include the curse. Victoria, Vulpius, and Lasso all conclude their unaccompanied settings with the fourth verse, “How could we sing the song of the Lord in an alien land?” Palestrina’s setting of this text includes only the first two verses. It is possible that Roman Catholic composers never set the entire the psalm because of its liturgical use. The first few verses of *Super flumina* appear in various forms as a Matins Responsory and Vespers Responsory during the Easter season, and the first verse appears as the Mass Offertory for the twentieth Sunday after Pentecost. Otherwise, the entirety of the psalm belonged only to Catholic liturgy when it was part of the *cursus* of chanted psalms at

108 “Parvulos,” here translated as “children,” can also be translated as “little ones.”


110 Psalm 137 usually appears as a Matins Responsory for the fourth Sunday after Easter, though some manuscript sources indicate that it was considered as a common for the Easter season.
Vespers.\textsuperscript{111} The dearth of complete settings of this text for the Catholic or Lutheran context is doubly striking considering that perhaps the only complete vocal setting of this psalm text before Knüpfer’s is Salamone Rossi’s, a Jewish composer of Mantua, whose setting is in Hebrew.\textsuperscript{112}

Within the Catholic tradition, Giacomo Carissimi (1605-74) departs from the tradition of unaccompanied, four-verse settings of \textit{Super flumina} in his concerted dialogue motet that uses Psalm 137 as the foundational text.\textsuperscript{113} Drawing additional texts from Psalms 68 and 80 as well as from the Book of Job, Carissimi compiles a text that emphasizes the giving up of instruments and the resulting silence. He rearranges the verses of the psalm to emphasize the third verse, “how could we sing?,” setting it as a ritornello. He concludes the piece by combining the third verse of Psalm 137, “we hung up our harps,” with Job 30:31, “our harps are tuned for sorrow,” a verse used in the Office for the Dead. Because of the composite nature of the text, it is unlikely that Carissimi’s \textit{Super flumina} would have been performed in an official liturgical service such as Vespers. Rather, it would likely have been performed in a paraliturgical service, a devotional service inspired by an official liturgy that does not conform to official texts and rubrics. The action of hanging up harps may have been a reference to the practice of suppressing musical instruments in liturgical celebrations during the penitential season of

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Psalm 137 was proper to Vespers for ferial Thursdays in preparation for the typically penitential observance of Fridays. Amid the cycle of saints’ days, however, a ferial Thursday otherwise unencumbered with another mid-week liturgical day or the Office for the Dead would be a rare occurrence.
\item S-Uu VMHS 12:3, 78:8.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Lent. The parallel between the Israelites hanging their harps and tuning them for sorrow and the suppression of instruments during the Lenten season may have been a devotional expression of the penitential sensibilities expressed in liturgical contexts.

Knüpfer’s *Super flumina*, however, was composed for a liturgical context. In Lutheran liturgical practice, Psalm 137 was most frequently encountered as the German chorale *An Wasserflüssen Babylon* by Wolfgang Dachstein (1487-1553). This German versification of the psalm text included the curse at the psalm’s conclusion, so it is likely that Lutherans were far more familiar with this part of the Psalm than their Catholic counterparts. Knüpfer’s setting of the text in Latin, however, is still unusual in the context of the Lutheran liturgy. By the mid-seventeenth century, the use of Latin in Lutheran worship had declined significantly in favor of German-texted works, even in churches served by Latin-school choirs, such as the one in Leipzig. Among Knüpfer’s contemporaries, few approached this text as material for their Latin-texted works.

Augustin Pfleger’s (1635-1686) concerto on *Super flumina* is possibly contemporaneous with Knüpfer’s, but unlike Knüpfer, Pfleger scores the concerto for three vocal soloists with continuo, and concludes with the fourth verse. Pfleger’s shortened and subdued setting of *Super flumina* is not surprising in the Lutheran liturgical context. Lutherans frequently associated Psalm 137 with the tenth Sunday after Trinity, which was frequently observed as a penitential Sunday. This was certainly the case for the court

---

114 Pfleger’s setting of Psalm 137 was published in *Psalmi, Dialogi et Motetae* (Hamburg: Rabenlein, 1661); manuscript copies also survive in S-Uu (VMHS 46:4; 77:76).

church in Dresden, for example, which in the mid-seventeenth century did not include concerted music on this Sunday (See Table 1). This same liturgical practice, however, was evidently not observed in Leipzig or Grimma, where Knüpfer’s lengthy composition for large performing forces was performed on this penitential Sunday with relative frequency.

With all of this in mind, Knüpfer’s complete setting of the psalm represents an enigma. It belongs outside of a compositional tradition of setting this text in both Lutheran and Catholic contexts. Nonetheless, Knüpfer’s *Super flumina* exists as an extraordinary artistic achievement and testimony to his compositional merits. In order to appreciate Knüpfer’s compositional approach to this text and form an informed interpretation, it will be valuable to further explore the composition’s liturgical context and construct a theological framework for it.

cantatas, Dürr also compiled a comprehensive list of Epistle and Gospel readings for the Lutheran liturgical year.
TABLE 1

ORDER OF WORSHIP FOR THE MORNING SERVICE ON

TRINITY 10 IN 1662 AND 1666 ACCORDING TO DRESDEN COURT DIARIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 August 1662</th>
<th>19 August 1666</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. An Waßerflüßen Babylōn [chorale]</td>
<td>5. An waßerflüßen Babÿlon,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Collect und der Seegen [Collect and Blessing]</td>
<td>12. Collect und der Seegen,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4.2 Theological Context

Knüpfer’s *Super flumina* was most likely performed as special music following the Gospel or the sermon at the morning service (*Hauptgottesdienst*). On this Sunday, the Gospel was Luke 19:41-48, which recounts Jesus weeping for the sins of Jerusalem – literally weeping for Zion – as he predicts the city’s future destruction, including the execution of children. Upon entering the city, Jesus’ sadness boils over into anger as he expels from the Temple the money changers and vendors who were exploiting the poor by capitalizing on Jewish laws of sacrifice. A performance of Psalm 137 directly following the reading of this Gospel passage would pose a striking comparison between the Israelites, who weep when they remember Zion and desire violent retribution against their captors, and Jesus, who weeps for the sins of Jerusalem and acts against those who advance a sinful agenda in a forceful outburst.

In the Lutheran exegetical tradition, a common homiletic interpretation of this Gospel passage regards the Roman Siege of Jerusalem that resulted in the destruction of the Temple in approximately 70 CE as the fulfillment of Jesus’ prophecy. In Lutheran

---


117 Luke 19:44, “and they will level you to the ground and your children within you.”

118 For a discussion of the liturgical and homiletic practices surrounding the Tenth Sunday after Trinity in the Lutheran tradition, see Irene Mildenberger, *Der Israelsonntag – Gedenntag der Zerstörung Jerusalem in Studien zu Kirche und Israel*, vol. 22. (Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, Humboldt University, 2004). The most recent scholarship dates the Gospel of Luke to sometime between 90 and 110; it was certainly composed after the siege, suggesting that this account of Jesus was composed in the genre of prophecy in order to reconcile the destruction of the Temple, which would have been of recent memory to the Jews first receiving Luke’s Gospel, with the agenda of conversion. See James H. Charlesworth, *The Historical Jesus: An Essential Guide* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2008), 42.
sermons, the destruction of the temple is usually interpreted along one of three lines: first, as a punishment of the Jewish people for the death of Jesus; second, as the fulfillment of a prophecy, and therefore as evidence of the truth of Christianity; third, as a means of establishing the superiority of Christianity to Judaism.\textsuperscript{119} Music associated with this Sunday often emphasizes the urgency of fidelity to the laws of faith. For example, “Ach Gott vom Himmel, sieh darein,” Luther’s paraphrase of Psalm 12, is commonly associated with the Tenth Sunday after Trinity and brings the points of Christian superiority and observance to the law to convergence in its final verse: “And let us be preserved by Thee/From all contamination: The wicked walk about at ease, when loose ungodly men like these/Are in the land exalted.”\textsuperscript{120} Luther also emphasized these points in his sermons, using this Gospel passage to preach on the “severity of faith.”\textsuperscript{121} He drew parallels between Israel and sixteenth-century Germany, warning that the moral

\textsuperscript{119} Mildenberger, \textit{Der Israelsonntag}, 85-86.

\textsuperscript{120} R. Massie, ed. and trans., \textit{Martin Luther’s Spiritual Songs} (London: Hatchard and Son, 1854), 34. Mildenberger notes that this chorale paraphrase of Psalm 12 was often associated with the Tenth Sunday after Trinity throughout the seventeenth century (\textit{Der Israelsonntag}, 165-166).

\textsuperscript{121} In a sermon of 1525, Luther delivered his sermon on Luke 19:41-48, issuing the sermon in several printed pamphlets with the title, “A sermon on the destruction of Jerusalem. In like manner will Germany also be destroyed if she will not recognize the time of her visitation.” Luther takes the position that the destruction of Jerusalem is due to the infidelity of the Jewish people, who placed their trust in the “false delusion […] of their own glory.” He uses Flavius Josephus’ account of the destruction of Jerusalem to build his argument, pointing out that even as Jerusalem was under siege by foreign invaders, “some Jews were such rogues as to swallow their money so it could not be taken from them.” Luther contends that “no officer of the government is thankful for the Gospel” and “the great majority [of Germans] persecute and blaspheme it.” Fearful that Germans “will act just like the Jews” and trust in their glory, he warns of the Lord’s “powerful hand” bringing “affliction and misfortune.” See Martin Luther, \textit{Sermons of Martin Luther}, trans. by John Nicholas Lenker (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1988), vol. 4, 316-336.
degradation and infidelity among sixteenth-century Lutherans would ultimately usher in the demise of German society.\textsuperscript{122}

Like Luther, Lutheran pastor Valerius Herberger (1562-1627) emphasizes the severity of sin and the fortitude necessary to live a life of religious fidelity.\textsuperscript{123} Herberger’s rhetorical strategy, however, greatly departs from Luther’s. Luther’s rhetorical strategy lies in establishing a history of infidelity in the Jewish people, beginning with the infidelity that led to the ancient destruction of the temple and their persistent infidelity that led to the sacking of Jerusalem. For Luther, a Christian understanding of the past informs the present; thus, what Luther considers as moral failing among the Israelites, Christians should supersede with their fidelity and morality or suffer the destruction of their society. Herberger’s approach, however, lies somewhere between history and allegory, as he urges his congregation to consider the scene of Jesus purifying the temple as a present-day event.\textsuperscript{124} This allows Herberger the freedom to shift between the past and the present, reflecting upon what this Gospel lesson means for the Christian heart.

Herberger examines this Gospel passage from three perspectives, forming three short parables for the Christian heart. The first perspective focuses on “the bitter tears

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{122} Ibid.\\
\textsuperscript{123} See Mildenberger, “Die Israelsonntag,” 240-243 for a brief biography. Mildenberger points out that Herberger’s sermons were published and broadly read as devotional writings; his preaching was so well known by his contemporaries that some referred to him as “little Luther.” Herberger’s sermon on Luke 19:41-48 was included in his Evangelische Hertz-Postilla, published in Leipzig in 1613-14; the work was reprinted a number of times throughout the century in Leipzig, Braunschweig, and Hamburg; during Knüpfer’s lifetime, editions appeared in Leipzig in 1668 and 1674.\\
\textsuperscript{124} Mildenberger points out that for Herberger, devotion does not imply distance, “as if observing a painting or watching a play.” Because the events depicted in scripture are of immediate and eternal relevance to practicing Christians, reflection upon these events of the past is an exercise of action rather than a passive recollection. See Mildenberger, Die Israelsonntag, 245-246.
which the Lord Jesus shed for the downfall of Jerusalem,” from which he expounds on “the beautiful comfort [Jesus’] tears bring [the Christian] heart.” The second perspective shifts emphasis from Jesus’ tears to his prophecy: “the calamity of the city of Jerusalem that the Lord Jesus proclaimed.” From this perspective, he draws a lesson of “what [the Christian] heart has to learn.” Lastly, Herberger turns his attention to the Israelites and “the great sins of Jerusalem, for which she deserves her misfortune.” From this, he stresses “why this is what our hearts should know.”

Mildenberger identifies these perspectives as themes of consolation, warning, and example. For Herberger, each of these perspectives demands a response within the Christian heart. This is especially true when considering this Gospel from the perspectives of warning and example; like the people of ancient Jerusalem, Christian hearts are just as vulnerable to infidelity and will suffer according to their failings.

Neither of these Lutheran sermons addresses Psalm 137 or the troubling curse at its conclusion, a point that must be examined, given its unusual presence in Knüpfer’s setting. In his study of Psalm 137 in historical, cultural, and artistic contexts up to the

---

125 Ibid., 249-251 (summary of Herberger’s three-fold goal of the sermon). Herberger’s final point falls well within Mildenberger’s point that Lutheran homiletics on this Gospel support the moral superiority of Christianity over Judaism. However, she points out that Herberger’s concern with the infidelity of the ancient Israelites has to do with the conversion of the Christian heart. Mildenberger explains that for Herberger, “understanding the sins of Jerusalem and the fate of Jerusalem are not independent interests. The behavior of the Jews is considered negative, and Jerusalem has earned their misfortune.” She points out that in referring to Jerusalem, Herberger prefers the plural as a means to emphasize conversion of heart, summarizing that “learning is the business of the individual, and therefore each must individually discern what should be changed.” When addressing how consideration of the past affects the Christian heart, Herberger uses the singular, “our heart.” Mildenberger considers this to be Herberger’s rhetorical strategy for turning attention away from the outside actions of others (the plural used for Jerusalem) to the inward actions of the Christian heart (the singular heart).

126 Ibid., 250.
present day, David Stowe discusses the diverse nuances in readings of the psalm, especially surrounding the perplexing final verse.\(^{127}\) He argues that the provocative nature of the verse lies not in the violence it suggests toward children, but rather in its literary genre. This verse belongs to the genre of beatitude, a laudatory blessing.\(^{128}\) The inclusion of a beatitude in this psalm is “intended to be deliberately shocking and jarring, since in the Hebrew Bible it is nearly always used in reference to the satisfaction of trusting in, learning from, and being forgiven by Yahweh.”\(^{129}\) It is important to recall that the Babylonian conquest of Israel and the resulting displacement of the Jewish people from their homeland are viewed in the eyes of the Psalmist as God’s punishment for Israel’s infidelity. How then can the person who takes vengeance into his own hands be praised as one who trusts in, learns from, and is forgiven by God? Christian Psalm exegesis poses a possible answer.

This beatitude/curse appears in the homiletic writings of Augustine of Hippo. Preaching on Psalm 137, Augustine frames the psalm as an allegorical discussion of conversion. For Augustine, Jerusalem and Babylon become symbolic places respectively representing “the City of God […] which will ultimately triumph in the fullness of time,”


\(^{128}\) It is important to emphasize here that the term “beatitude” refers to a formulary of a laudatory saying and not only the litany of beatitudes in Jesus’ Sermon on the Mount in the Gospel of Matthew 5:3-12. Beatitudes are found throughout the Old and New Testaments.

and “an archetype of an earthly city” tinged with sinful temptations and injustice. For Augustine, even the fruitless willow trees on which the Israelites hang their harps take on allegorical representation as the Babylonians, “nonbelievers unprepared to accept the Gospel of Christ.” For Augustine, the curse is not about violence against children but is indeed a blessing of hope for the salvation of the Babylonian children. Augustine suggests it is the responsibility of the faithful to save Babylonian children from their parents’ “depraved custom[s].” Turning the allegory toward the immediate relevance of his Christian audience, he depicts the speaker of the beatitude as the faithful Christian and the Babylonian child as the sinful person who has yet to convert to Christianity. He emphasizes this point by combining the final verse of Psalm 137 with a reference to I Corinthians 10:4, and writes, “make sure [the child] does not survive your violent treatment: dash it on the rock. And the rock is Christ.” For Augustine, the violence in the Psalm is not against bodies, but against souls, and the use of such strong imagery emphasizes the strength necessary to defeat sin.

How, then, might Knüpfer have understood Psalm 137, especially in the context of the Gospel of Luke? As a well-read student of philosophy and person of known

130 Stowe, *Song of Exile*, 134-136

131 Ibid.

132 Ibid. Augustine considers the Babylonian children independently of the sinfulness of their homeland, going so far as to call them “children of Jerusalem.”

133 Ibid, 135.

134 Ibid. (emphasis in Stowe). In I Corinthians 10, Paul accosts the people of Corinth, who are tempted to celebrate feasts of idols over the celebration of the Lord’s Supper. In verse 4, he urges the people of Corinth to call to mind Moses and Israel wandering in the desert, who “drank from the spiritual rock that accompanied them, and that rock was Christ.”
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devotion, he would presumably have developed some sort of theological interpretation of this text, one that might possibly manifest itself in the design of the composition itself.\textsuperscript{135} The underscoring of sorrow in the work suggests that Knüpfer is not dismissive of the plight of the Israelites in captivity, and does not appear to use their circumstance as evidence of their weakness of moral character. On the contrary, Knüpfer’s musical depiction of the captive Israelites is strikingly poignant, and depicts an affect of honest, profound sorrow; if any characters are depicted as moral degenerates, it is undoubtedly the Babylonians.\textsuperscript{136} But the underscoring of sorrow at the opening of the work does not prevent Knüpfer from creating a dramatic presentation of the latter verses of the psalm. Analysis of the work also reveals a deliberate heightening of energy and tension, which ultimately draws attention to the final verse. The presence of the final verse may suggest that Knüpfer wishes to build a sort of Christian allegory along the lines of Augustine. If this is the case, then who are the actors and what do they represent? On the other hand, the transformation from the somber and sorrowful to the agitation of heightened drama in the psalm setting may suggest that the work represents Knüpfer’s own parable of example and warning to the Christian heart, along the lines of Herberger. Perhaps Knüpfer believed it is important to remember the Babylonian captivity in the same way Herberger believed it is important to remember siege of Jerusalem, drawing the lesson of why it is important for the Christian heart to remember. If this is true, then why might Knüpfer think that the Christian heart should remember the Babylonian exile, especially

\textsuperscript{135} See Chapter 2 for a summary of Knüpfer’s academic interests and religious devotion.

\textsuperscript{136} See section 4.3.2 below.
on a liturgical day when sermons typically called to mind the crucifixion of Jesus at the hands of the Jewish people, or the destruction of Jerusalem as the result of infidelity? Analysis of the large-scale formal design and the musical treatment of the text in smaller formal groups in his Super flumina will provide some insight into the question, “why should the Christian heart remember?”

4.3 Structural Analysis

In his Super flumina, Knüpfer uses a well-defined structure to present an unfolding drama that progresses from melancholic remembrance to spiteful retribution. His expert delineation of text over the passage of time reveals an acute dramatic sensibility and compositional discipline, and achieves stunning musical impact. Knüpfer designed a three-part macro structure to delineate the unfolding drama of the psalm. The first large section (mm. 1-35) presents solely the first, and perhaps most recognizable, verse of the psalm, “By the rivers of Babylon, we sat down and wept when we remembered you, Zion.” This single-verse setting functions as a preamble, framing the discourse of the piece in a context of profound affection for Zion and an inconsolable sorrow in exile from it. The second section (mm. 36-137) is the most substantial. In it, Knüpfer underscores the sentiments of smoldering anger and resentment that transforms lament into a call for retribution. He manages this transformation by telescoping the length of the micro formal elements of his macro form, beginning with long series of musical events and gradually removing elements until only a single musical event from the original series remains. As a result, the psalm’s dramatic narrative is thrust forward through an ever-telescoping formal design. The final section of the work (mm. 138-171)
counterbalances the first. It, too, contains only a single verse: the infamous curse, “He shall be blest who takes your children and throws them against the rocks.” Here, Knüpfer uses highly-structured imitation to depict the relentless delivery of this retribution. This large macro-structure is controlled through the alternation of performing forces that are grouped together within larger formal units. Within these small-scale episodes, Knüpfer displays creativity and nuance in text setting, coloring the affect of the piece in each unfolding section, while the larger form accelerates the drama to its shocking conclusion.

4.3.1 The First Formal Section

The first formal section (Figure 4.1) is divided into four smaller segments: a sinfonia, a homophonic alternation between full ensemble and soloists, a passage of initiative counterpoint, and a concluding ritornello. The six-measure string sinfonia is made up of three short two-measure phrases emphasizing the work’s principle tonal center, E minor. Knüpfer constructed the second segment as an alternation between the full ensemble and solo groups made up of various members of the full ensemble. The opening tutti entrance of instruments and voices already commands attention, as Knüpfer almost always preferred to begin his works with a soloist. The bold and energizing effect of this tutti entrance must have taken by surprise the listeners in Leipzig, who

137 Peter Wollny describes the affect of this fugal passage as depicting “relentless rage.” The King’s Consort, Sacred Music by Sebastian Knüpfer, Hyperion, HYP 55393, 2000, compact disc, liner notes, 5.

138 In fact, this is the only one of the Latin Psalm concertos to begin with a tutti vocal passage. It is not, however, Knüpfer’s only departure from his typical opening structure of sinfonia followed by a vocal solo and concluded with a tutti passage: Surgite populi, another large Latin work from the Grimma collection, surprisingly begins with an unaccompanied bass solo which quickly builds to a massive tutti dramatically emphasizing the opening text of this Easter work, “people, arise!” Surgite populi survives in manuscript as D-Dl Mus. 1825-E-517.
would have almost certainly expected a vocal soloist to set the scene of Babylonian captivity. Regardless of how this first tutti passage might defy expectations, the immensity of sound unquestionably sets a tone of severity for the piece and calls attention to the importance of the text. But as quickly as the energy of this tutti rises out of the sinfonia, which lasts only two measures, it then quickly dissolves into the first solo passage.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Sinfonia Segment II</th>
<th>Segment III</th>
<th>Ritornello I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>9-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>18-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocal Forces</td>
<td>(tacet)</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>SAT Solo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Forces</td>
<td>Strings</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texture</td>
<td>Homophonic</td>
<td>Homophonic</td>
<td>Homophonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Super flumina…</td>
<td>illic sedimus…</td>
<td>Super flumina…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalm Verse</td>
<td>Verse 1</td>
<td>Verse I</td>
<td>Verse I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonal Areas</td>
<td>E minor</td>
<td>E minor</td>
<td>B major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.1: Structural segments of first formal division in Knüpfer’s *Super flumina Babylonis*
In the subsequent solo passages (mm. 9-15), Knüpfer divides the ensemble, and assigns material alternately to the vocal soloists and the string choir. These alternations are marked by two motives that depict the text musically: one in which the pitch is repeated statically for the words “there we sat,” and another that represents the words “and we wept” with stepwise vacillations (Example 4.1). Throughout this soli passage, Knüpfer juxtaposes the vocal and instrumental forces against each other, and inserts a small-scale alternation of motives within the larger scheme of alternations between soloists and the full ensemble that exemplify the vocal concerto genre. In just seven measures, Knüpfer alternates between a vocal trio (soprano, alto, and tenor), a bass solo accompanied by the full string choir, and another vocal trio (soprano, alto, and bass). After another tutti repetition of the text “super flumina” (mm. 15-17), Knüpfer creates another soli passage (mm. 18-23), and juxtaposes a vocal trio (soprano, alto, and tenor) with a bass solo accompanied only by violins. Knüpfer echoes the sitting and weeping motives as in the instruments; when the instruments imitate the motives established by the vocalists, they, too, sit and weep. These two motives are bound together through a pedal tone in the bass that maintains the stasis of each short passage until the concluding cadence on the words, “and we wept.”

139 In her study of chorale-based works of Knüpfer, Laura Nash refers to this technique of dividing the choir of instruments and the vocal soloists into varying subsets as Knüpfer’s tripartite structural design. Through this technique, she argues, Knüpfer expands the length of his structural divisions through an economic management of motives. This design, by its nature, is derived from the concertato style of tossing a single musical item about among a group of soloists. Nash argues that in Was mein Gott will, the large German chorale concerto she analyzes, Knüpfer’s formal plan is structured around this technique. In his Super flumina, this technique is used to unify a rather lengthy structural segment. This technique is not found in this style-forming fashion in other Latin psalm concertos. See Nash, “Evolving Tonal Language,” 68-127.
Example 4.1: Knüpfer, *Super flumina Babylonis*, mm. 9-15
The concluding cadential figure (mm. 22-23) of this segment again demonstrates Knüpfer’s sensitivity to dramatic text setting. The tutti setting (sans violins) of the final “et flevimus” of this segment departs from the expected formal series (another statement of “super flumina” would reasonably be expected) and is as surprising as the opening tutti statement it balances. The emphasis provided by repetition is underscored with an example of harmonic text painting. Here, the circle of fifths progression he used to design this segment reaches a great distance from its home tonality, landing on a C-sharp major chord as the choir sings the word “flevimus” (m. 23). Since this work was likely performed in quarter-comma meantone, this chord would have an extremely high major third, producing a rather bitter quality that emphasizes the bitterness of weeping.\textsuperscript{140}

At this cadence, Knüpfer signals the start of a new structural segment (mm. 24-32) through a tertial shift, dropping the tonality by a major third to A major. At this point, the text “cum recordaremur tui Sion” unfolds in poignant counterpoint. The point of imitation is first introduced as a duet between the solo alto and soprano, with the tenors leading in the full forces of the ensemble only three measures later. In his counterpoint, Knüpfer marries modal mixture to subtle harmonic progression in order seamlessly to shift the tonal center from A major back to the original tonality of E minor (Example \textsuperscript{140} Composers of this period frequently used various instabilities of temperament systems as means of expression. The journey away from chords more closely tuned to just intonation to chords of sometimes extreme dissonance was broadly utilized to manage the discourse of instrumental music. Knüpfer does take care in his instrumental writing to ensure the best possible tuning of this chord: the third (which would be extremely high in quarter-comma meantone) is only present in the choir, string parts, and alto trombone, which can easily make subtle tuning adjustments. The tempered continuo instruments can simply leave out the third of the chord. This does not avoid the instability of the root C-sharp, which is usually a modified note in Baroque temperaments. See John Koster, “Questions of Keyboard Temperament in the Sixteenth Century,” in Andrew Woolley and John Kitchen, eds., \textit{Interpreting Historical Keyboard Music: Sources, Contexts, and Performance} (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2013), 115-130.}
4.2). The counterpoint produces a series of suspensions, which Knüpfer uses to postpone a tonicizing cadential figure until the ultimate bassline gesture that leads into the instrumental ritornello concluding this formal group. This contrapuntal section is structurally impressive; thought it lasts only eight measures, Knüpfer manages to balance the preceding sixteen measures of alternating performing forces with two brief phrases of counterpoint.

Example 4.2: Knüpfer, *Super flumina Babylonis*, mm. 27-32, choral parts.

---

141 The effect of modal mixture and its relationship to harmonic planning is especially apparent when one compares the tonic/dominant relationships Knüpfer establishes between A and E. At the start of this excerpt (m. 27), Knüpfer uses the fifth relationship between E and A clearly to establish an A-major tonality. The next time this same fifth relationship occurs in the anacrusis to measure 31, the cadence produces an A-minor tonality. Rather than conclude this passage in A-minor, he then uses this A-minor cadence as part of a longer cadential figure establishing an E-minor tonality.
The shape of these first three segments illustrates Knüpfer’s sensitivity to representing human emotion. While the short opening instrumental sinfonia establishes a somber affect, the alternations of performing forces in the second segment dramatically manifest weeping in music. Not only do the musical motives paint the texts of sitting and weeping, but the rise and fall in the number of performers represents the unpredictable fluctuations between quiet sobbing or full-throated wailing in the face of extreme sadness or distress; the stasis of the bass line allows the entire ensemble to stay in this state of weeping, moving only to start another river of tears in a new tonal center in a passage that becomes ever more tonally distant from the object of desire: home. Yet, when a single voice interrupts this self-perpetuating process of sitting and weeping with the memory of Zion, the entire ensemble is inclined to follow, quickly melting away the distance of Babylon from Zion, and restoring, if only for a fleeting moment, the sense of a homeland – even returning to the work’s home tonality. The extended length of this first section is undoubtedly part of Knüpfer’s strategy for dramatic effect. The starting point of the violent and retribution-seeking anger expressed at the end of the psalm is not, in fact, hatred, but rather a profound sadness and longing for the freedom of a homeland. Emphasizing this sadness and longing, Knüpfer devotes thirty-five measures (a little over twenty percent of the work’s overall length) just to setting the first verse of the psalm.

Using the Baroque convention of a Picardy third to conclude a passage in minor, the concluding ritornello of the first formal section signals a clear conclusion through a cadence on an E-major chord. The stability and finality of this tonality might suggest that the sorrow of foreign captivity can be assuaged by recalling Zion. Unwilling to let down the momentum of his dramatic presentation of this psalm, Knüpfer uses this E-major
cadence as the dominant for the A-minor tonality that begins the next formal section. This dovetailed transition already points to the subtle way Knüpfer depicts the gradual bittering of the sorrowful. Over the course of the second formal section, Knüpfer transforms this sadness (with even the hope of consolation) into an uncompromising call to action.

4.3.2 The Second Formal Section

The second formal section (measures 36 -137) is the most substantial. Spanning one-hundred one measures, it comprises almost sixty percent of the work. The section is divided into four smaller segments, each begun by vocal solos. The vocal solos throughout this section are sequentially arranged from high to low, beginning with the solo soprano and ending with the solo bass. The first two of these segments follows a consistent progression of vocal solo (accompanied by violas) followed by a contrapuntal vocal trio, a tutti section, and a concluding ritornello. In the third of these segments, Knüpfer removes the vocal trio and concluding ritornello from this structural progression. The final segment consists only of a bass solo, this time accompanied by two violins (Figure 4.2). By removing elements from his structural pattern, Knüpfer builds a sense of agitation and unease by accelerating the passage through the entirety of this formal section.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>36-51</th>
<th>52-57</th>
<th>58-67</th>
<th>68-69</th>
<th>70-79</th>
<th>79-92</th>
<th>93-100</th>
<th>100-104</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vocal Forces</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soprano</td>
<td>Soprano</td>
<td>ATB</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>(tacet)</td>
<td>Alto</td>
<td>SAT soli</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>(tacet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>Soli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Solo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instrumental Forces</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violas</td>
<td>(tacet)</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>Strings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Violas</td>
<td>(tacet)</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>Strings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Texture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>Imitative Counterpoint</td>
<td>Homophony</td>
<td></td>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>Imitative Counterpoint</td>
<td>Homophony with Imitative Counterpoint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto Style</td>
<td>Concerto Style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concerto Style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text</strong></td>
<td>In salicibus…</td>
<td>Hymnnum cantata…</td>
<td>Quomodo cantabimus…</td>
<td></td>
<td>Si oblitus fuero…</td>
<td>Adhereat…</td>
<td>Si non proposuero…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalm Verse</td>
<td>Verse 2</td>
<td>Verse 3</td>
<td>Verse 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Verse 5</td>
<td>Verse 6</td>
<td>Verse 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tonal Areas</strong></td>
<td>A minor</td>
<td>G Major</td>
<td>E Major → G Major</td>
<td>G Major</td>
<td>G Major</td>
<td>E minor/B minor</td>
<td>A Major</td>
<td>D Major/G Major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.2: Structural divisions of the second formal unit in Knüpfer’s *Super flumina Babylonis*
The first formal group begins in an A-minor tonality with a soprano delivering the text, “it was there that we hung up our harps.” The melody is lyrical and plaintive, marked by melodic simplicity, save a florid passage emphasizing the word “suspendimus.” At the midpoint of the solo (m. 43), the violas enter with lines that function as a sort of written-out continuo realization. The entrance of the viola choir and the shift in tonality from A minor to G major occurs as the soprano introduces the Babylonians into the narrative with the text, “there, our captors asked us for songs, our tormentors demanded songs of joy.” The presence of the viola choir (and their persistence in the subsequent vocal solos of this formal section) is perhaps a subtle representation of

---

142 See Chapter 3.4 on instrumental scoring. Before the entrance of the viola choir, the solo soprano is accompanied only by the continuo group.
the constant presence of the Babylonian captors. The soprano solo ends rather abruptly, passing the speakership of the text over to the trio of alto, tenor, and bass, who depict the taunting of the Babylonians through a florid melismatic figure treated in imitative counterpoint (Example 4.3). Knüpfer also calls for a change in tempo with the entrance of the vocal trio, marking the passage *poco allegro*. The tutti entrance at measure 58 again shifts the speakership back to the Israelites. Knüpfer signals this change through a tertial harmonic shift, leaving the G-major harmony to begin this segment on an E-major chord, and through the entry of the tutti.

The combined effect of this harmonic shift at a tutti entrance characterizes the Israelites’ resilience as they respond to the Babylonians’ taunts with the bold statement, “How could we sing the song of the Lord in an alien land?” Knüpfer underscores the emphatic unwillingness of the Israelites to sing a song of the Lord while in captivity by repeating a shorter question drawn from the full verse, “How could we sing?” (Example 4.4). Stressing their exile as the cause of their unwillingness to sing, Knüpfer paints the word “aliena” in a striking, extended passage of shifting harmonies. The passage is essentially an extended cadential figure in G major that first cadences on a D-major chord (the local dominant) and then on a G-major chord (local tonic). Knüpfer builds a sense of unease into the text setting by surrounding this cadential figure with a sequence of secondary dominants. He effectively obscures this harmonic motion, however, and softens the journey around the circle of fifths by pitting a stepwise descending bass line against tonicizing leading tones in the soprano line (Example 4.5). This cadential figure
may point toward a sort of harmonic rhetoric in Knüpfer’s writing; this entire tutti passage darts about a circle of fifths, never settling until this final cadence in measure 70. The passage concludes in G major, the key of the Babylonians’ taunting. This formal section concludes in the key of Babylonian exile, even though it began a step higher in A minor. A two-measure ritornello repeating the “aliena” chord progression concludes this sequence of four segments.

Example 4.3: Knüpfer, *Super flumina Babylonis*, mm. 52-57
Example 4.4: Knüpfer, *Super flumina Babylonis*, mm. 58-62, choral parts

Example 4.5: Knüpfer, *Super flumina Babylonis*, mm. 62-67, choral parts
Just as Knüpfer dovetailed the start of this formal section with the work’s opening, he overlaps the start of the second segment of this formal unit with the ritornello that precedes it; the alto solo begins just as the string choir cadences. This four-part series sets verses 5 and 6. Literary scholars point to this verse as utilizing a specific poetic device which does not translate well into other languages. Literally reading the text, it could appear as though the Israelites are reflecting on why they do not wish to sing: they do not want to desecrate the memory of Jerusalem by singing a song of the Lord to the perpetrators of the Temple’s destruction. Scholars of poetic form suggest an alternate reading; some suggest that these verses should be read, in fact, as a song. In the Hebrew text, the text unexpectedly shifts into a stable poetic meter. David Freedman describes these verses as “an artfully designed chiastic couplet.” This short chiasm associates forgetting Jerusalem with the loss of the ability to perform music: “If I forget thee, Jerusalem, let my right hand forget its skill. Let my tongue cleave to my palate if I do not remember you, O Jerusalem.” Scholars who suggest that these verses form a song also suggest that a subtle irony exists in this couplet: the Babylonians asked for a song and are given a melodic couplet in Hebrew in reply. The Babylonians enjoy the satisfaction of controlling the Israelites, completely unaware that the Israelites are singing a song of

144 Stowe, *Song of Exile*, 64. Stowe notes that the Hebrew texts for these verses have a chiastic syllabic structure: 9, 5, 5, 9.

145 Ibid., 64.

146 Ibid., 65. Stowe points out that the right hand is typically considered the musical hand used to play instruments. The loss of speech may also prevent singing. He also points out that the loss of refined motor function and clarity of speech can be the result of stroke. Thus, this couplet could be referencing a known malady understood as the result of infidelity to the sacred memory of the Jewish homeland.
remembrance and fidelity to their homeland. The chiastic sentence structure is well preserved in translations, though the sudden metrical chiasm does not translate well.

Judging by Knüpfer’s setting of this text, it seems unlikely he was aware of this shift in poetic form. Rather, Knüpfer uses the same four-part series as before. However, the musical material takes on a different, more plaintive character. Knüpfer does not call for sudden tempo changes in this section, and transitions between alternating forces that smoothly overlap in contrast to the sharp contrasts in the previous section. Six shifts in tonal center pass almost unnoticed in Knüpfer’s harmonic planning, their subtlety revealing a growing fervor over an outburst of emotion. Like the soprano solo of the previous section, the alto solo is divided into two parts, but in contrast, the viola choir accompanies the entire solo and the alto solo delivers two statements of a single line of text, “If I forget thee, Jerusalem, let my right hand forget its skill.” In the first setting of this line (mm. 70-74), Knüpfer sets the text in a rather straightforward and unaffected way, beginning in G major and concluding in D major. Only in the repetition of the phrase does Knüpfer affectively draw attention to sentiment of the text. The repetition starts in an A-minor tonality, which is both a step higher and in a contrasting mode to its antecedent, marking the earnestness of the psalmist’s expressed desire that he would prefer physical handicap to forgetting Jerusalem. At the midpoint of the repetition, Knüpfer employs a modal shift so that the word “oblivioni” is set to a minor arpeggio (Example 4.6). The following vocal trio begins in the soprano just as the alto finishes the solo section (m. 79). The trio continues with imitation between the soprano, alto, and tenor. The use of the three upper voices contrasts this passage with the trio of the three lower voices in the previous section. In the trio, Knüpfer depicts the text, “let my tongue
cleave to its pallet” in a brief passage of fugal imitation that produces a series of suspensions, breaking only to move to the next line of text, “if I do not consider thee as my joy.” The full ensemble immediately continues in agreement with the text, “If I do not consider Jerusalem as my first joy.” An instrumental ritornello concludes the section.

Example 4.6: Knüpfer, *Super flumina Babylonis*, mm. 75-79, alto solo

The third sequence consists of only two segments: a seven-measure tenor solo followed by a fifteen-measure tutti passage in triple meter. Here Knüpfer accelerates the structure of the piece in a manner that contrasts with the previous acceleration through a change in tempo. In this segment, no vocal trio separates the solo and tutti passages, and no instrumental ritornello concludes the section. The entrance of the full ensemble at measure 112 is shocking: first, it counters expectations, as it departs from the arrangement of forces already established, and second, it is the only passage in triple meter in the entire work. This creates a great musical sense of unease; the absence of a vocal trio and the metric acceleration of the triple meter draw a further contrast between the comparatively nonchalant tenor solo and the dramatic setting of the words of the Edomites: “destroy it all the way to the ground!” Knüpfer boldly presents the text “exinanite” in rhythmic and repetitive homophony, painting the text “usque ad fundamentum” in a descending scalar pattern repeated across the ensemble to illustrate the slow tumbling of the Temple walls (Example 4.7). In Jewish history, the Edomites
were accused of being complicit in the destruction of the Temple. The shift rapidly to accelerate the unraveling of the work at this point dramatically emphasizes the surprise that members of the Jewish faith would be complicit in the destruction of the Temple and underscores the extreme sentiment of anger toward the same people. The lack of a concluding ritornello underscores this sentiment; after the destruction of the Temple, the instruments cannot repeat the song of the Edomites, lest they be considered co-conspirators of the Temple’s demise.

Example 4.7: Knüpfer, *Super flumina Babylonis*, mm. 112-119
The final segment of this extended formal division of the work is the shortest of the four, consisting only of a bass solo accompanied by violins. The text here is ominous, and contains the first of the psalm’s two beatitude-structured curses: “You miserable daughters of Babylon, blessed is he who delivers your repayment in kind.” The four statements of “beatus” in the setting of the text emphasize the certainty that the person who delivers retribution will do so in the name of God. Knüpfer depicts the delivering of retribution in brief imitation at the octave on the word “retributionem” between the violins, bass, and continuo group (Example 4.8). Through these text repetitions and text painting, Knüpfer well characterizes this text as a beatitude of retribution.

Example 4.8: Knüpfer, *Super flumina Babylonis*, mm. 132-137

147 “Retributionem” can also be translated as “retribution” or “recompence.”
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Because this solo does contain a statement of a curse and is the only one of the vocal solos to be accompanied by the violins and not the viola choir, it might be possible to consider this as the start of a new formal division (consisting of solo and tutti passage). Indeed, such an analysis could be rhetorically convincing, turning the last two verses into a combined curse. Such an analysis, however, would fail to acknowledge the way this bass solo relates to the preceding material. Structurally, it completes the pattern of high to low in the ordering of vocal solos. The use of violins instead of violas could simply be a practical matter of orchestration, ensuring that the instrumental texture allows for clear intelligibility of the soloist’s text rather than obscuring the solo in counterpoint with low-register strings. The bass solo is also tonally related to the material that precedes it; the previous section ends in A major and the vocal solo begins in A minor. The bass solo also tonally completes the section with a strong concluding cadence in E – the central tonality of the work. This all points to the bass solo as a conclusion rather than a new beginning. Even the exegetical tradition tends to overlook this verse’s relationship to the final verse, focusing instead on the unmistakable severity of the final curse.\footnote{Stowe, \textit{Song of Exile}, 128-129. Stowe points out that the curse of the penultimate verse is perplexing in its own right; the Israelites understand their exile as punishment for infidelity to God, but they still seem justified in calling for recompense for how they were treated during this exile.}

4.3.3 The Third Formal Section

The final formal section of Knüpfer’s \textit{Super flumina} (mm. 138-171) consists of the psalm’s final curse: “Blessed is he who takes your children and throws them against the rocks.”\footnote{“Parvulos,” here translated as “children,” may also be translated as “little ones.”} The formal section is divided into three segments, each scored for the full
ensemble (Figure 4.3). The structural design of this formal section both presents a heightened reading of this dramatic text and also focuses the climax of the composition on this striking conclusion. Through the progress of the second formal division, as we saw, Knüpfer accelerated the progress through formal divisions by removing constituent elements from a series pattern he introduced at the start of the formal division. By the end of the second formal division, the potential energy of the entire composition that has been building up to this point seems to be nearing an explosive kinetic release. Yet, Knüpfer temporarily suspends the building of energy with the first segment of his final formal division (mm.138-143): a slow-moving, homophonic proclamation of “Beatus!” The section is marked adagio, which further suspends the energy that has been building to this point (Example 4.9).

Example 4.9: Knüpfer, *Super flumina Babylonis*, mm. 138-143, choral parts

150 The exclamation point after “beatus” appears in Jacobi’s manuscript. While this may not have appeared in Knüpfer’s manuscript, Jacobi evidently intended to suggest a heightened emotion in the presentation of this text.
Figure 4.3: Segment division of the third formal division, illustrating entrances of subject I and subject II
The relative serenity of this text setting demonstrates Knüpfer’s keen awareness of the unusual presentation of a curse in the form of a beatitude. The use of this slow homophonic choral declamation disarms the listener. It suggests a dramatic change in which the drama has been building to this point. Perhaps after the building rage, the Israelites would choose to bless and forgive their captors rather than delve fully into their festering resentment. Perhaps the Israelites are about to be forgiven the infidelity that led to their exile by the virtue of their fidelity to the memory of Jerusalem while in captivity. In another Latin work, *Quare fremuerunt gentes*, Knüpfer uses the same style of text setting dramatically to emphasize the journey undertaken in the psalm from nations at war to peoples united in their fear of the Lord (Example 4.10). The musical similarity between Knüpfer’s settings of these two beatitudes is so striking that it might suggest that in his *Super flumina*, Knüpfer was simply responding to the unfolding of the text, setting the word “beatus” in serene homophony because that seemed an appropriate way to convey the meaning of the word. However, such a consideration overlooks the fact that Knüpfer has already presented a curse in his *Super flumina*, and it was presented as a bass solo with a musical character that can hardly be described as serene. Equating Knüpfer’s similar text setting in two different beatitudes also fails to recognize the context in which these words appear. In his *Quare fremuerunt gentes*, Knüpfer depicts the fear of God as a laudable virtue and sets the body of the beatitude, “blessed are they who fear the Lord,” in a rather short and triumphant setting lasting only seven measures. By contrast, Knüpfer sets the conclusion of the beatitude-structured curse in Psalm 137 in the most highly-structured part of his *Super flumina.*
The second segment of this formal unit (mm. 144-162) restarts the suspended energy of the piece with an extended passage of imitative counterpoint with two subjects. The segment resembles a fugue, especially in the pacing of voice entries with the subjects. Though highly structured, the passage is not a true fugue.\textsuperscript{151} Entrances of the subject do not emphasize the tonic/dominant relationship of a single tonal center, but rather spin around the circle of fifths with each new entrance of the subject.\textsuperscript{152} This rapid movement around tonal centers is a clear dramatic decision; it electrifies the energy in this segment, bestowing a sense of urgency on this contrapuntal passage. Each of the contrapuntal subjects presents one thought of the curse and portrays it with striking word

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
  \item Knüpfer does use vocal fugue in some of his works. See Chapter 3.3.
\end{itemize}
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painting. The first subject presents the text, “who holds your children,” and draws
attention to the word “tenebit” in a 4-3 suspension.\(^{153}\) The second subject, which depicts
the text “and smashes them against the rocks,” is more active, with a long, rhythmic
melisma on the word “smashes” (Example 4.11). Pushing the counterpoint toward a
strong conclusion, Knüpfer presents both subjects in stretto, first the second subject, and
then the first. Ensuring the intelligibility of the psalm text, Knüpfer briefly presents the
first subject in the bass and tenor voices with the text of the second subject. In measure
162, the fugal counterpoint converges on a B-major chord (a half-cadence in the work’s
primary E-minor tonality) (Example 4.12).

Example 4.11: Knüpfer, Super flumina Babylonis, mm. 144-145, alto and tenor

\(^{153}\) This phrase may also be translated as “who takes your children.”
Throughout this contrapuntal passage, Knüpfer increases the contrapuntal density through use of the instrumental forces in the highest range, the cornettos and the violins. Often, these high instruments present melodic material independent of the fugal counterpoint that stands as the foundation of this segment. At other times, these high instruments switch between independent melodic material, doubling one of the points of imitation at the octave (or even at the fifteenth!), and briefly embellishing the statement of a point of imitation through parallel tenths (Example 4.13). In contrast, Knüpfer has the remainder of the ensemble play *colla parte*. Jacobi’s score draws attention to this use of instruments. In this extended contrapuntal passage, Jacobi used “etc.” as copyist shorthand to indicate instrumental and vocal doublings, making the distinction between the roles of the cornettos and violins from the rest of the ensemble immediately recognizable (Figure 4.4).
Example 4.13 (pages 106-107): Knüpfer, *Super flumina Babylonis*, mm. 144-150, cornetts, violins, choral parts
Figure 4.4: Knüpfer, *Super flumina Babylonis*, mm. 144-150, manuscript copy of Samuel Jacobi
Often, Knüpfer concludes a passage of double counterpoint by presenting a single statement of the entire text that restates the contrapuntal motives in a more homophonic texture. The conclusion of this particular contrapuntal tapestry is highly representative of this technique. Bringing this work to its climactic conclusion, Knüpfer presents the psalm’s final curse in its entirety with no interruption: “blessed is he who holds your children and smashes their heads against the rocks.” The repetition of the homophonic “beatus” deserves particular attention. In contrast to the first statement of “beatus” that began this final formal unit (both in a major mode and marked adagio), this statement of “beatus” is in a minor mode, in a low tessitura, and in the allegro tempo of the fugal passage. This dramatic restatement of “beatus” unapologetically embraces the poetic form of this curse (Example 4.14). If any doubt remains that Knüpfer was unaware of the striking use of a curse presented in the form of a beatitude in the psalm text, this dramatic conclusion confirms his mastery in managing rhetoric. From this second statement of “beatus” to the work’s conclusion, Knüpfer decisively maintains the tonality in E-minor, firmly emphasizing this tonality in a clear dominant/tonic cadence leading to the work’s final E-major chord.

---

154 See Chapter 3 for a discussion of this technique.

155 The musical setting of this beatus should be performed at the same allegro tempo as the fugal passage, as the single statement of beatus is directly followed by the completion of the psalm text using the melodic motives of the fugal passage, suggesting the entire sentence is now one musical unit. One might also consider the lack of any noted tempo alteration at this point as a tacit indication that tempo between the beatus and the rest of the curse should match.
Example 4.14: Knüpfer, *Super flumina Babylonis*, mm. 163-171, choral parts
4.4 Conclusions

Analysis of Knüpfer’s *Super flumina* demonstrates the composer’s conscious and structured approach to managing the unfolding of this psalm text in a highly dramatic musical reading. Working at both a macro and a micro level, Knüpfer’s attention to text setting in the context of accelerating form gives the work large-scale unity and rhetorical intention. Knüpfer’s *Super flumina* is without question the work of a highly disciplined composer with subtle and nuanced dramatic sensibilities. But how does this analysis provide insight to the spiritual dimension of Knüpfer’s *Super flumina*? Does it form a parable in the vein of Herberger or an allegory in the style of Augustine? In a liturgical context, an understanding of this work would undoubtedly be shaded by the sermon that followed it. Even with that shading, the positioning of this work between the reading of Luke 19:41-48 and the sermon does give Knüpfer a sort of homiletic first word on the Gospel.

Viewed through the lens of allegory, the tonal planning of Knüpfer’s *Super flumina* emphasizes the separation between Jerusalem and Babylon. The composition begins and ends strongly in an E-minor tonality, but rarely stays in that tonality throughout the majority of the composition. Even the first formal section quickly departs from this home tonality, rapidly spinning out the circle of fifths to reach a harmony as distant as C-sharp major. When the first formal unit concludes on an E-major chord, Knüpfer turns that conclusion into a dominant that launches the next formal unit in A minor. Much of the work is in G major and its closely related keys. G major is first introduced as the key of the Babylonian’s taunting, and its recurrence suggests a tonal allegory that the song of the Lord has been consumed into the song of alien captors. This
tonal alienation lasts so long, in fact, that a clear tonicizing cadence in E-minor is essentially avoided until the conclusion of the second formal unit.\textsuperscript{156} The final formal unit immediately departs from E minor, briefly returning to a G major tonality. This tonality is short-lived, however, as the contrapuntal writing ultimately pushes the tonal center back to the work’s home key of E minor. This final arrival back in E minor, however, no longer carries with it the somber sense of lament of the work’s opening. Rather, this return to E minor delivers a bold statement of the psalm’s concluding curse, magnified by the release of the buildup of energy that Knüpfer focused on this final formal unit through the telescoping formal planning that preceded it.

Who are the characters in this tonal allegory and what are they saying about the Christian life? Perhaps E minor, the “homeland” key of Jerusalem, represents Augustine’s eternal city of heaven – a city glimpsed even in the throes of profound sorrow and separation. In this allegory, G major, the key of the captors, represents the earthly city. It is closely related to the home key of E minor, and yet is substantially different from it. This key relationship may perhaps emphasize how easily a citizen of the eternal city of heaven might choose citizenship in the earthly city. The “beatus” at the start of the final formal division emphasizes this. The preceding bass solo boldly curses the earthy city of Babylon and leaves it behind with a clear cadence in E minor. Yet, when the full ensemble wishes to join the bass solo, it is still in G major, the key of

\textsuperscript{156} A brief E-minor cadence may be found in measure 79, though it is quickly followed by an A-minor cadence just two measures later.
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Babylon. Only by pushing through a harrowing deluge of counterpoint can the full ensemble finally arrive at the home tonality of the heavenly city.

But what might a tonal allegory tell the Christian heart? Perhaps that the distance between being a citizen of heaven and a citizen of earth appears more similar than different to common perception. Inward focus on the wrongs committed by others against the self can blind the self to how quickly citizenship can be moved from Jerusalem to Babylon. When the realization of Babylonian citizenship does come to mind, a single phrase cursing the citizens of the earthly city will not be sufficient to abandon the sinful ways of Babylon. It will take relentlessly smashing sins against the rock of Christ, assured that with the destruction of the sinful self, a new “blessed” self will be born even from the rivers of a once sinful city.

It is also possible that Knüpfer is presenting his own parable of example and warning. Remembering and forgetting is central to this psalm text. The exiled Israelites weep when they remember Zion. The chiastic verses at the center of the psalm focus on the cost of forgetting. The captive Israelites ask God to remember their horror at the sight of the Edomites encouraging the destruction of the Temple. Even retribution against the Babylonians contains an element of memory; for the Babylonians to receive their recompense for the injustice they committed against the Israelites, that injustice must be known and remembered. If this is a parable of example and warning, then what does this emphasis on memory form in the Christian heart? What should the Christian heart remember? It is a citizen of Zion and holds the great responsibility of living in accordance with the law of God in order to preserve the presence of the city of God among the people of earth. Why should the Christian heart remember this? Because
forgetting will wither the hands and obscure speech. When Christians forget their homeland, they lose the means to work for the kingdom of God or preach the Gospel. In Knüpfer’s *Super flumina*, forgetting seems to come without warning, chipping away little by little at the total fabric of the Christian heart until the severity of forgetting comes from a God who was unafraid to banish members of his own religion from the Temple.

It is not possible definitively to determine the precise theological lens through which Knüpfer viewed Psalm 137 when he chose to compose this extraordinary work. However, it is fair to presume that the work contains a certain spiritual dimension that is just as alive and dynamic as the underlying drama in the composer’s control of the work’s macro form through acceleration of the micro form. This presumption is not only supported by the words of Knüpfer’s contemporaries, who viewed him as a man of piety, but also through analysis of the work. Even a short foray into the theological discourse surrounding the Tenth Sunday after Trinity or Psalm 137 provides a lens through which performers today might find that a theological statement appears within the well-controlled drama of the work. Without question, analysis of the work’s construction will cause one to form an opinion about its performance; the composition is so intentionally constructed that observant performers will have ample opportunity to work within Knüpfer’s formal design to produce a powerful musical performance. The development of an opinion about what Knüpfer may have to say about the Christian heart, however, may help to shade a performance in varying palettes of colors and draw attention to different elements of this unfolding drama, in accordance with what a performer sees as Knüpfer’s underlying theological statement.
EPILOGUE

Truly, ours is the task “to honor a musician such as Leipzig has not seen before and probably will never see again.” Indeed, Knüpfer was highly regarded in his lifetime, but today his music remains a testament to that renown. A master of the genre of the sacred vocal concerto, Knüpfer created an impressive body of compositions exploring all the creative facets of that idiom. In focused musical events, his music displays both the virtuosic predilections of an accomplished vocalist and the remarkable sensitivity to text setting of a philosopher. His use of large-scale formal design within the quick alterations of the concerto genre displays his mastery of managing drama and the perception of unfolding time. Taken together, these features reveal Knüpfer to be undoubtedly a composer whose profound artistic and theological vocabulary merits further analytical and musicological attention as well as robust musical performance.

Much is still left to do. This study represents only one possible entry point for seriously engaging with Knüpfer’s creative output. Many of Knüpfer’s other Latin works deserve the same close analytical and theological attention given his Super flumina in this study, and one must also consider the treasure trove to be found in Knüpfer’s

157 Krause, “The Latin Choral Music of Sebastian Knüpfer,” 128. This epitaph is taken from Knüpfer’s obituary.
immense output of German-texted works. Smaller studies may group together some of the shorter works, such as dialogues or motets, while close comparative studies may provide fundamental insights into how the legacy of composers like Albrici and Peranda may have influenced Knüpfer’s creative output. And while musical analysis of Knüpfer’s works proves to be a worthy task, establishing a solid theological framework for his music provides the opportunity for rich interpretive possibilities.

Most importantly, promotion of modern-day performances of Knüpfer’s music remains the preeminent task. Although this task is already underway with the preparation of modern performing editions and the forthcoming complete works edition, Knüpfer’s works remain a peripheral subject in both the spheres of scholarship and performance. In the coming years, a complete works recording will also be necessary to advance awareness of this impressive body of compositions. North America holds great promise for such an enterprise with its burgeoning early music performance ensembles eager to revive lesser-known works of the repertoire. But regardless of where his music is heard, I am certain that contemporary audiences, like the worshipers in Leipzig in the seventeenth century, will find that Knüpfer’s can gladden even the saddest of hearts.

---

158 Nash’s proposal of the establishment of tonal and formal control through tripartite ensemble divisions could be tested and expanded by using a broader sampling of Knüpfer’s German-texted works (see Nash, “Evolution of Tonality,” 68-127). And by combining the three stylistic periods proposed by Wollny, it may be possible to trace an evolution of the compositional technique that Nash presents.
APPENDIX A:

EXTANT WORKS OF SEBASTIAN KNÜPFER

Psalm Concertos in Latin: 159

De profundis - SSATB, 4 violas, violone, bassoon, basso continuo

Dies est laetitiae - SSATTB, 2 violins, 3 violas, 3 trumpets, 2 clarinos, 4 bombardes, timpani, basso continuo

Ecce quam bonum / Sieh, wie fein - SATTB, 2 violins, 3 violas, bassoon, basso continuo

Lauda Jerusalem - SATB, 2 violins, 3 violas, violone, bassoon, basso continuo

Quare fremuerunt gentes - SSATTB, 2 violins, 3 violas, 2 cornettini, 4 trombones, bassoon, basso continuo

Quemadmodum desiderat cervus - B, 5 violas, basso continuo / B, 2 vln, basso continuo

Super flumina - SATB, 2 violins, 3 violas, 2 cornettini, 3 trombones, bassoon, basso continuo

Psalm Concertos in German:

Ach Herr, strafe mich nicht - SSATB, 2 violins, 2 violettas, 2 flutes, 2 clarinos, timpani, bassoon, basso continuo

Der Herr ist König - SSAATTBB, 2 violins, 5 violas, 7 trombones, basso continuo

Der Herr ist mein Hirt - B, violin, 3 violas, organ

Der Herr sprach zu meinem Herren - SATTB, 2 violins, 4 trombones, organ

159 This complete works list reflects the list compiled by Paul Walker, Mary Frandsen, and Peter Wollny for the forthcoming complete works edition in the series Corpus mensurabilis musicae.
Dies ist der Tag, den der Herr macht - SSATB, 2 violins, 2 violas, 2 clarinos, 2 trombones, bassoon, basso continuo

Gott sei mir gnädig - SSATB, 4 violas, violone, bassoon, basso continuo

Herr, strafe mich nicht - SATB, 3 violas, violone/bassoon, basso continuo

Herr, wer wird wohnen in deinen Hütten - SAB, 3 violas, 2 cornettos, basso continuo

Ich will singen von der Gnade - SATB, 3 violins, 2 violas, bassoon, organ

Jauchzet dem Herrn - SATB, SATB, 2 violins, 3 violas, 2 cornettini, trumpet, 2 clarinos, 2 trombones, bassoon, basso continuo

Kommet herzu - SSATB, 2 violins, viola, basso continuo

Nicht uns, Herr, sondern deinen Namen (uncertain attribution) - SATB, 2 violines, 3 violas, bassoon, organ

Sende dein Licht - SATB, 2 violins, 2 violas, bassoon, basso continuo

Wohl dem, der in der Gottesfurcht - SSATB, 2 violins, 3 violas, 2 cornettos, 3 trombones, bombarde, bassoon, basso continuo

Wohl dem, der nicht wandelt - SSATB, 2 cornettos, 4 violas, organ

Chorale Concertos and Hymns:

Ach Herr, laß deine lieben Engelein - SSATB, 2 violines, basso continuo

Ach mein herzliebes Jesulein - SSATB, 2 violins, 2 violas, 2 oboes, 2 cornettos, 3 trombones, 2 taille, violone, bassoon, basso continuo

Christ lag in Todesbanden (anon., attr. by F. Krummacher) - SSATB, violin piccolo, violin, 3 violas, cornettino, 3 bombardes, basso continuo

Erstanden ist der heilige Christ - SSATB, 2 violins, 4 violas, 2 trumpets, 2 clarinos, bombarde, timpani, bassoon, basso continuo

Es spricht der Unweisen Mund wohl—SSAATTBB, 2 violins, 3 violas, 2 cornettos, 3 trombone, bassoon, basso continuo

Herr Christ, der einig Gottes Sohn - SSATB, 2 violins, 3 violins, 2 cornettos, 3 trombones, bassoon, basso continuo

Herr Jesu Christ, wahr Mensch und Gott - SSTTB, 2 violins, violone, basso continuo
Ich bitt, o Herr, aus Herzensgrund - ATB, [2 violins, 2 violas, violone], basso continuo

Jesus Christus, unser Heiland - SSATB, 2 violins, 3 violas, bassoon, basso continuo

Komm, du schöne Freudenkrone - SSATB, 2 violins, 3 violettas, 2 clarinos, timpani, 3 trombones, violette/bassoon, basso continuo

Nun freut euch, lieben Christen gmein - SSTTB, 2 violins, 2 violas, bassoon, basso continuo

O benignissime Jesu - ATB, 2 violins/cornettini, gamba/bombarde, basso continuo

Veni Sancte Spiritus - SSATB, 2 violins, 2 violas, 2 cornettini, 4 clarinos, timpani, 3 trombones, bassoon, basso continuo

Vom Himmel hoch - I: SSS, 3 violins; SSS, 3 violins; II: ATB, 3 bombardes; III: SATB, 2 clarinos, timpani, harp, basso continuo

Was mein Gott will, das gescheh allzeit - SSATTB, 2 violins, 3 violas, 2 cornettos, 3 trombones, bassoon, basso continuo

Wenn mein Stündlein vorhanden ist - SATB, 2 violins, 2 violas, violone, basso continuo

Other Biblical Settings:

Surgite populi - SATB, SATB, 2 violins, 3 violas, 2 cornettini, cornetto, 5 trumpets, timpani, 3 trombones, basso continuo

Dies ist der Tag des Herren - SSATB, 2 violines, 2 violas, 2 clarinos, timpani, 3 trombones, bassoon, basso continuo

Die Turteltaube läßt sich hören - SSATB, 2 violins, 2 violas, 4 clarinos, timpani, bassoon, basso continuo

Est ist eine Stimme eines Predigers - SATB, 2 violins, 3 violas, bassoon, basso continuo

Machet die Tore weit - SSATB, 2 violins, 4 violas, 2 cornettos/bombarde, 3 trombones, basso continuo

Wer ist, der so von Edom kommt - SAB, 4 violas, basso continuo

Wer ist, der so von Edom kommt - SSATB, 2 violins, 2 violas, 2 clarinos, 2 trombe, 4 trombetta, timpani bassoon, basso continuo

119
Dialogues:

Ach daß Messias, Gottes Sohn - SSATB, ATB, 2 violins, 2 violas, violone, organ
Es haben mir die Hoffärtigen - SATB, 2 violins, 3 violas, bassoon, basso continuo
Herr, es sind Heiden in dein Erbe gefallen - SSATB, 2 violins, 2 violas, bassoon, organ
Herr, hilf uns, wir verderben - SATB, 2 violins, 2 violas, bassoon, basso continuo
Meine Sünden sind schwer - 5 voices, instruments
Verflucht sei dir - SSATB, 2 violins, 2 violas, basso continuo
Was werden wir essen - SATB, 4 violas, basso continuo
Wie hör ich das von dir - SSATTB, 2 violins, 2 violas, basso continuo

Concertos with Aria:

Der Gerechte wird grünen - SSATB, 2 violins, 2 violettas, 2 cornettos, 3 trombones, violne, basso continuo
Der Herr schaffet deinen Grenzen Friede - ATB, 2 violns, trombone, basso continuo
Der Segen des Herrn - SAATB, 2 violins, 3 violas, basso continuo
Herr, ich habe lieb die Stätte - ATB, 2 violin/cornetto, viola/trombone, basso continuo
Herr, lehre mich tun - SATTB, 2 violins, 2 violas, bassoon, basso continuo
Herr, lehre uns bedenken - SSATTB, 2 violins, 3 violas, bassoon, basso continuo
Ich habe dich zum Licht - SATTB, 2 violins, 3 violas, 2 cornettini, 3 trombones, bassoon, basso continuo
Mein Herz hält dir für dein Wort - SAT, 2 violins, bassoon, basso continuo

Secular Works:

Madrigals 1663
Glück zu, dieweil der milde Sachse
Laßt uns den fürnen Wein - SATB, 2 violins, basso continuo
Miscellaneous Works:

Ach, wenn kommst doch die Stunde - A/T, 3 violas, violone, basso continuo

Erhöre, Jesulein, mein sehnsüchtig - S, 4 violas, basso continuo

Victoria, die Fürsten sind geschlagen - SSATB, 2 violins, 2 violas, 3 trombones, bassoon, basso continuo

Komm, Heiliger Geist, zeuch - SATB, 3 violas, 3 trombones, violone, basso continuo

Welt Vater, du! O Adam - SS, 3 violas, violone, basso continuo

Wen seh ich bei Jerusalem dort stehen (uncertain attribution) - SATB, violin, 2 violas, bass, org

Missa (brevis) super Freu dich selig - SSAATTB, 2 violins, 5 violas, basso continuo

Missa (brevis) super Herr Jesu Christ - SSATTB, 2 violins, 5 violas, basso continuo

Missa (brevis) super O Welt ich muß dich lassen - SSAATTB, 2 violins, 5 violas, basso continuo

O Traurigkeit, o Herzeleid - SATB

Justus ut palma florebit - SATB, basso continuo

Asche, die des Schöpfers Hände - SSATB

Erheb dich, meine Seele - SATB, basso continuo

Mein Gott, betrübt ist meine Seele - SSATTB, basso continuo

Was sind wir Menschen - SATB, basso continuo

Weichet von mir, ihr Boshaften - SSATTB, basso continuo

Instrumental Works:

Suite in d - vln, 2 vla, basso continuo
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APPENDIX C:
EDITORIAL POLICY FOR MODERN PERFORMING EDITION

The following editorial policy is an abbreviated form of the editorial policies prepared by Paul Walker, Mary Frandsen, and Peter Wollny for the forthcoming complete works edition of Knüpfer’s works to be published in the series Corpus mensurabilis musicae. This abbreviated version is designed to address only the editorial policies which applied to the edition of Sebastian Knüpfer’s Super flumina Babylonis included here.

Part Designation:

Soprano vocal parts are generally labeled “Canto.” This vocal designation is retained. String parts not in treble clef are generally labeled “Viola,” including those in soprano or other clefs. The instrumental designation is retained.

Ordering of Parts:

Standard score ordering is used: winds on top (with the exception of bassoon), then strings, then voices, then bassoon, and finally figured continuo parts on the bottom.
Key Signatures and Accidentals:

Key signatures are as they appear in sources. Three levels of accidentals are used: (1) those in the original sources; (2) those which appear in some but not all copies of a part (e.g., when instrumental and vocal parts double); and (3) those added by the editor. Type (2) accidentals are notated without comment on the score, but are listed in the critical commentary. Type (3) accidentals appear above the staff. Sharps used to cancel a flat are rendered as a natural without commentary.

Note Values, Time Signatures, Barring:

These are all as in the original, with the exception that barring should remain regular. Notes that extend beyond standard barring are represented with ties without commentary.

Cleffing, Beaming, Slurring and Trills:

Modern clefs are used in vocal parts (including transposing treble clef for the tenor). Instrumental parts retain their original clefs (including soprano clef). In vocal parts, notes with beams or flags are broken to fit text underlay and otherwise beamed according to modern convention. Instrumental beaming is generally adjusted to follow modern convention. This is done without commentary.

Editorial slurs are illustrated using dotted slurs. Generally, slurs are not added to indicate text unless required for clarification of text underlay. When parts are rhythmically identical but only some parts have slurs, dotted slurs may be added. Slurs that appear in one but not all copies appear as a solid slur in the score and are identified.
in the critical report. Numerous editorial slurs are generally avoided. Trills are indicated in the source as “tr.” Editorial trills appear in brackets.

Continuo and Figures:

Multiple continuo parts exist both with and without figures. These may be conflated into one using the same editorial guidelines above for discrepancies between parts. Some instrumental parts (such as violone) are identical to the continuo part. Though figures appear above the staff in the sources, figures are included below the staff in the edition. This is done without commentary. Editorial figures are added when an editorial accidental affects figures. Otherwise, a “full figuring” is generally avoided. Editorial figures are indicated with brackets.

Ripieno/Capella Parts:

In the source, separate parts are included for soloists and capella singers. These have been conflated into single parts, with “solo” used to indicate what is sung by concertists, and “capella” indicating the addition of the capella to the texture.

Other Editorial Policies:

Rubrics, such as “Sinfonia,” are kept as in the source. Tempo indications are also retained. Text is presented in modern spelling of Latin where applicable without commentary. Text that appears in one but not all copies is indicated in the critical report. Text that does not appear in any copy is indicated with italics. Capitalization and punctuation are normalized without commentary.
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Psalms 137
Psalmus 137

Canto. 1
Canto. 2
Tbn. 1
Tbn. 2
Tbn. 3
Vln. I
Vln. II
Vla. I
Vla. II
Vla. III
C
A
T
B
Fg.
Bc.
Psalmus 137

Cn. 1

Cn. 2

Tbn. 1

Tbn. 2

Tbn. 3

Vln. I

Vln. II

Vla. I

Vla. II

Vla. III

C

A

T

B

Fg.

Bc.

tri - u - et, be - a - nas, qui re - tri - bu - et ti - bi_ re - tri - bu - ti - o - nem - tu - _
Psalmus 137

Canto. 1

Canto. 2

Tbn. 1

Tbn. 2

Tbn. 3

Vln. I

Vln. II

Vla. I

Vla. II

Vla. III

C

A

T

B

Fg.

Bc.
Psalmus 137

Beatus!

et alii

Beatus!

et alii

det ad pe-

Beatus!

qui te-ne-

bit

Beatus!

qui te-ne-

bit

Psalmus 137

Beatus!

et alii

Beatus!

et alii

det ad pe-

Beatus!

qui te-ne-

bit

Beatus!

qui te-ne-

bit

Psalmus 137

Beatus!

et alii

Beatus!

et alii

det ad pe-

Beatus!

qui te-ne-

bit

Beatus!

qui te-ne-

bit

Psalmus 137

Beatus!

et alii

Beatus!

et alii

det ad pe-

Beatus!

qui te-ne-

bit

Beatus!

qui te-ne-

bit

Psalmus 137

Canto 1

Canto 2

Tbn. 1

Tbn. 2

Tbn. 3

Vln. I

Vln. II

Vla. I

Vla. II

Vla. III

C

A

T

B

Fg.

Bc.

146

146

146

146

146

146

146

146

146

146

146
Psalmus 137

149

Canto. 1

Canto. 2

Tablature for the musical composition.
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At ali det ad petram qui te ne bit par vu-los tu-

Li det qui te ne bit par vu-los tu os, qui te ne bit

Det ad petram, et ali det ad petram. et ali-

Det, ali det ad petram, et ali det

6 1 6 4 1 7 1 6 4 1
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qui tenetibus parvulos tuos, et alii...
APPENDIX E:
CRITICAL REPORT

m. 1 – Vln I, note 4, appears as B in part and C in score.

m. 16 – Tenor, note 1, # absent in solo part, but present in capella and score

m. 19-20 – Continuo part lacks one measure here; see score and organ part for full figures.

m. 23 – Continuo, note 1, # in organ part only

m. 23 – Canto, note 3, appears as B in solo part and A in capella part. A matches viola I part.

m. 58 – Continuo, figure absent in continuo part, but present in organ part and score

m. 60 – Cornetto 2 and Soprano, eighth note removed from last beat. Note 7 changed to full quarter note.

m. 62 – Vla I, note 3, part shows a quarter note

m. 69, Vla I, dot removed from beat 2

m. 69 – Vla II, last eighth note changed to D.

m. 92-93 – Tenor, text in solo and capella parts conflict; taken from capella part

m. 94 – Cnto. 1, note 2 changed from C to D.

m. 96 – Vla II, dot on beat 1 removed

m. 98 – Alto, note 2, # absent in solo, present in capella and score

m. 101 – Tbn II has what appears to be a “solo” designation in the part; does not appear in score. Omitted here.

m. 102 – Vln II, last two eighth notes changed from F-sharp to G.

m. 103 – Vla III, first three notes changed from B to C.
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m. 114 – Tbn III, part missing last eighth note.
m. 114 – Bc, note 4, figure absent from continuo part, present in organ
m. 118 – Tbn III, dot removed from half note
m. 120 – Tbn II, measure is written out twice in the part.
m. 135 – Bass, note 3, # absent in solo part, appears in score
m. 154 – Tenor, slur appears only in capella part.
Musical Scores:
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