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JOHANN ADOLPH SCHEIBE
(1708–76) and Copenhagen

BY
PETER HAUGE

Johann Adolph Scheibe, a proponent of the galant style and indeed an influential music critic in the late eighteenth century, was a writer on aesthetics, music theory and performance practice, a translator and a composer. Though he wrote a vast amount of music this part of his creative production has to a large extent been neglected by modern scholarship. His reputation today is mainly focused on his famous critique of J.S. Bach’s compositional style which he characterised as ‘bombastic and confused’, and his assertion that Bach darkened the beauty of the music ‘by an excess of art’ (that is, writing and making use of excessive ornamentation) and difficult to perform. It should be kept in mind, however, that though Scheibe admired the music of composers such as G.Ph. Telemann, whom he knew personally and with whom he corresponded, he did indeed respect Bach, in particular his musicianship. Bach never responded personally to Scheibe’s assessment but was defended vehemently by admirers, among others J.A. Birnbaum and Lorenz Mizler. The controversy is basically the archetypal conflict

1 This article is an extended version of a paper presented at the ‘14th Biennial International Conference on Baroque Music’, 30 June–4 July 2010, Queen’s University, Belfast.
4 From the beginning of the nineteenth century, scholars such as Spitta saw Scheibe’s attack on Bach as a sacrilege and due to Scheibe’s disappointment of not having been supported by Bach in his application for the position as organist at the Nikolaikirche in 1729; Scheibe was merely a minor composer of no importance and thus his musical output was relegated to oblivion. For further information on the controversy and its consequences for modern scholarship’s negative evaluation of Scheibe, see in particular Buelow, ‘In Defence of J.A. Scheibe’, pp. 85–100; Günther Wagner, ‘J.A. Scheibe – J.S. Bach: Versuch einer Bewertung’, *Bach-Jahrbuch*, 78 (1982), pp. 33–49; and Michael
between trends in new and old music: contrary to older musicians and composers, Scheibe and his role models, Johann Mattheson and Telemann, argue that music should be comprehensible, engaging and directed towards the rising class of new music consumers – ‘l’homme galant’ – the intellectual, musical amateur and concertgoer.\(^5\) Thus Johann David Heinichen remarks that ‘a composer with good taste is contained solely in the skill with which he makes his music pleasing to and beloved by the general, educated public’.\(^6\) Scheibe’s theoretical writings represent therefore an important transition between Baroque and Classicism and are prominent reflections on the new thoughts on reason and naturalness of the Enlightenment. It is in this context that Scheibe’s critique of Bach should be understood: Bach’s and Scheibe’s approaches towards music and their aesthetical considerations are entirely different and to a very large extent even incompatible.

In order to evaluate a composer’s oeuvre it is of paramount importance to be able to hear and study the music and here lies another serious hindrance for the music scholar today: most of Scheibe’s music remained in manuscript throughout his life and presumably together with other holdings at the royal castle in Copenhagen most of it went up in fire in 1794. No modern edition of his main works, such as the church music including the cantatas and passion music, exists.\(^7\) Even biographical information on Scheibe has only been researched sporadically, relying mainly on his autobiography published by his close friend Mattheson in the *Grundlage einer Ehren-Pforte* of 1740, that is before his move to Denmark where he stayed for the remaining thirty-six years of his life; and no systematic study on Scheibe’s influence on the forming of Danish music history and cultural life in general has ever been published.\(^8\) The evaluation of Scheibe is hence based on his published

---

5 In England known as the ‘Gentleman’.
7 A few of his works have, however, appeared in modern editions, of which most are of a rather mediocre quality.
J.A. Scheibe and Copenhagen

Fig. 1: A small portrait of Scheibe showing that he was blind on the right eye. The accident causing the blind eye is mentioned in Mattheson’s Grundlage einer Ehren-Pforte (Hamburg, 1740). A poem has been added by Scheibe on the back of the portrait: ‘In dieser Schildery stellt / Dir Dein Knecht sich vor, / Der sein getreues Herz durch Deinen Blick vorlor; / Und willst du holds Kind, ihn / deutlichen erblicken / Darfstu mir in Dein Herz / erliebte Seufzer schicken. / J.A. Scheibe.’ Sorø Akademi, gift of the Scheibe family in 1886.

Theoretical writings, in particular the Critische Musikus which appeared in two editions and the lesser well known treatises such as the Abhandlung vom Ursprunge und Alter der Musik, insonderheit der Vokalmusik (Altona, 1754) and Eine Abhandlung von den musicalischen Intervallen und Geschlechten (Hamburg, 1739). As a composer Scheibe seems to be drifting in limbo.

One of the most essential tools for studying a composer’s output is of course an authoritative and a comprehensive list of works. However, the lists provided by modern dictionaries are meagre, heavily relying on nineteenth-century sources such as Fétis and Eitner as well as Scheibe’s above-mentioned autobiography (see Table 2). Thus the list in The New Schouenborg, ‘Kantaten i Danmark o. 1750, en redegørelse i formal og stilistisk henseende for Joh. A. Scheibes danske kantater’, thesis (University of Copenhagen, 1958); Inge Henriksen, ‘Johann Adolph Scheibe og Det musikalske Societet i København’, Dansk Årbog for Musikforskning, 7 (1973–76), pp. 103–124; Inga With, ‘Karakteristiske træk ved musiklivet i København omkring midten af 1700-tallet belyst ud fra J.A. Scheibes karriere’, thesis (University of Copenhagen, 1984). However, the primary sources need to be reassessed and a focus on Scheibe’s position in the cultural life of Copenhagen in general is essential.

Grove (see Table 1) is somewhat incomplete as it only records very few of those music manuscripts that have survived. Even the list of published works is rather imperfect including works that have been lost while missing those which still exist.\(^\text{10}\) The article in \textit{Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart} is more up-to-date;\(^\text{11}\) there are, however, some shortcomings as one for example finds copies of the same composition listed as being distinct works – an error which apparently arose because some of the original autograph manuscripts with a German title were transcribed in the early twentieth century and provided with a Danish one.\(^\text{12}\)

Table 1: Works & lost works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Works</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Sonate, hpd, vn, op.1 (Nuremberg, n.d.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neue Freymäurer-Lieder mit bequemen Melodien (Copenhagen, 1749)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kleine Lieder fürs Klavier (Flensburg, 1766)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vollständiges Liederbuch der Freymaurer (Copenhagen, 1776)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 sonatas, kbd, in J.U. Haffner, Oeuvres mêlées, iii (Nuremberg, 1757)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Songs pubd in 18th-century anthologies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Auferstehung und Himmelfahrt Jesu (cant., C.W. Ramler), 4vv, insts; Der wundervolle Tod des Welt-Erlösers (orat, Scheibe); 2 Mag, Ps cxvii, 4vv, insts; Die Patrioten (Cramer): all formerly D-Bsb, according to \textit{EitnerQ}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several masses, A-KR; 2 cants. [Wer sich rühmen will; Der Engel des Herrn], D-LEm; Sinfonia à 16, 2 tpt, 2 hn, timp, 2 fl, 2 ob, 2 vn, va, bc, hpd, SWl; Fl Conc., B, B-Bc: all according to \textit{EitnerQ}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 trios; 3 sonatas, hpd, vn; 6 pieces, hpd; Partie, D, hpd; Bc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lost works</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c150 church works, 150 fl concs., c30 vn concs., numerous sinfonias, trios, German and Italian cants., serenades, Passion orats: all cited in Scheibe’s autobiography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artaban (Spl), unperf., lib pubd (Hamburg, 1738)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thusnelde (Spl, \textit{Scheibe}), unperf., lib pubd (Leipzig and Copenhagen, 1749)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Tragische Kantaten, 1/2vv, kbd [Ariadne auf Naxos (Gerstenberg), Prokris und Cephalus (J.E. Schlegel)], lib pubd (Copenhagen and Leipzig, 1765, 2/1779)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^{10}\) However, the \textit{The New Grove} article by Buelow is sympathetic towards Scheibe concluding that ‘as a composer Scheibe is unknown. Much of his music has been lost, but the remainder has not received the study it surely merits, particularly in view of its potential importance in Danish music history in the critical years of style change between the Baroque and Classical periods’, <www.oxfordmusiconline.com> accessed June 2010.


\(^{12}\) E.g. \textit{Der Tempel des Ruhmes, DK-Kk}, Weyses Saml. (autograph score), and \textit{Sinfonia til Berømmelsens Tempel, DK-Kk}, Orkesterbiblioteket, Egne Afskrifter (a transcript made in 1946).
Hence one of the first objectives before editing a selection of Scheibe’s compositions in the Danish Centre for Music Publication is to establish a comprehensive and detailed list of his musical works. The present article includes a preliminary study on Scheibe and his time in Copenhagen in order to establish his influence and importance for the musical life and his association with the German intellectual environment. The German circle – or the Copenhagen circle – played professionally a crucial role in the Danish central administration and through their writings, mostly produced in their leisure time, instigated a growing interest in Danish language and history, thus rousing a national consciousness and eventually strengthening the opposition to foreign influence. Scheibe’s disputes with adherents of Bach will not be dealt with. The second part deals with problems in establishing a comprehensive work list.

**Biography**

With the help of friends, Scheibe was offered the position as chapel master at the court of Margrave Friedrich Ernst of Brandenburg-Culmbach in 1739, the brother-in-law to King Christian VI and the governor of Holstein then part of the Danish Kingdom. However, just a year later Scheibe was requested by the Danish king – or more likely, Count Bernstorff or Count Moltke – to travel to Copenhagen in order to participate in the celebrations taking place late autumn 1740 for which he would receive a substantial remuneration: due to the building of a new castle and church, no chapel master had been employed at that time in Copenhagen, but with the completion Scheibe was asked to lead the celebrations. According to letters Scheibe wrote to Johann Christian Gottsched, a highly influential professor of poetry and rhetoric with whom Scheibe was acquainted, he arrived in mid-October and began

---

13 Neither will the present article in detail deal with Scheibe’s importance for the establishing of the musical societies; for more information, see Henriksen, ‘Johann Adolph Scheibe’, pp. 103–124; and Ravn, *Festskrift*, vol. 1, pp. 32–52, 60–72.

14 See Scheibe’s brief comment in *Schreiben an die Herren Verfasser der neuen periodischen Schrift* (Copenhagen, 1765), p. 43. Scheibe does not specifically mention the king but only that he was called to Copenhagen by the ‘highest royal order’; it is likely that Count Johan Hartvig Ernst Bernstorff, minister of foreign affairs, played an active role in promoting Scheibe for the position as chapel master at the Danish court, see e.g. Gustav Schilling (ed.), *Encyclopädie der gesammten musikalischen Wissenschaften* (Stuttgart, 1838), vol. 6, p. 396 who also mentions Count Adam Gottlob Moltke as an important promoter.
immediately preparing the works to be performed that not only included a grand cantata for the inauguration ceremony of the new church, Christiansborg Slotskirke, but also cantatas celebrating the birthdays of the king and the queen as well as ‘Taffelmusik’. At his arrival he found the Royal Chapel in disarray and had to use precious time on setting things in order for the festivities, including writing the texts, composing the music and recommending appropriate singers. He had only three weeks to do all the preparations as everything needed to be ready two weeks before the commencement of the festivities. The court enjoyed the music and the orchestra often performed Taffelmusik. The royal couple was impressed by Scheibe and he was therefore offered the position as chapel master beginning officially on 15 December. During the next couple of years Scheibe was so busy with composing new music for the chapel that he did not have time to complete the promised revision of the *Critische Musikus* which he had offered to the publishers Breitkopf in Leipzig. He complained that nobody in the Royal Chapel procured new music and that he had to take care of everything. When he did not attend to his duties at court he worked for the ‘Auswärtigen’ (presumably Bernstorff) in establishing a collection of new foreign music step by step. The highly interesting letters to Gottsched not only mention Scheibe’s obligations in Copenhagen but also that he still kept in contact with his hometown, Leipzig, sending sacred music to Carl Gerlach who was the director of the Neue Kirche.

However, the letters also reveal that Scheibe was associated with members of the German circle of intellectuals in Copenhagen. At that time the court of Christian VI was highly influenced by pietism and many Germans were called to Denmark to positions at court, state administration and church. This continued during the reign of Frederik V though

---

15 The inauguration took place on 27 November; the queen’s birthday was celebrated on 28 November and the king’s on 29 November; and on 15 December Scheibe was appointed chapel master; see letters dated 3 September 1740 and 9 December 1740 in Carl Roos (ed.), ‘Breve til Christoph Gottsched fra Personer i det danske Monarki’, *Danske Magazin*, 6th series, vol. 3 (1923), pp. 84–87. On Gottsched and Scheibe, see Eugen Reichel, ‘Gottsched und Johann Adolph Scheibe’, *Sammelbände der Internationalen Musikgesellschaft*, 2/4 (1901), p. 654–668.

16 See letter to Gottsched, 9 December 1740, in Roos (ed.), ‘Breve til Christoph Gottsched’, pp. 85–87. There has been some confusion as to when Scheibe was employed: Ravn, *Festschrift*, vol. 1, p. 32, indicates 1 December; the king’s resolution, however, is dated 15 December though Scheibe received a salary from 1 October 1740; see also Thrane, *Fra Hofviolonernes Tid*, p. 79.

with a revived, keen interest in the arts and sciences. German intellectuals considered Denmark as a free and open country with a king that they believed was the ‘most enlightened monarch in Europe’. The circle of German-speaking intellectuals was interested in a wide variety of subjects ranging from history (Scandinavian antiquity), over the theory of languages, literature and poetry, school reform and education, to religion and aesthetics. Though many of them found it difficult to speak Danish and at times found life in Denmark difficult they sought nevertheless to promote an interest in the language among talented native writers and poets. Some were very active in establishing journals, such as Der nordscher Aufseher and Samling af adskillige Skrifter, for presenting extensive reviews and studies on their areas of interest. Among the most famous German intellectuals settling in Copenhagen are Johann Elias Schlegel, Friedrich Gottlieb Klopstock, Heinrich Wilhelm von Gerstenberg, Johann Andreas Cramer, Balthesar Münter, Friedrich Gabriel Reyewitz, Mathias Claudius, Gottlieb Friedrich Ernst Schönborn, Gottfried Benedict Funk, Friedrich von Hagedorn, and Johann Bernhard Baselew. Also the minister of foreign affairs, Count Bernstorff, actively supported the ideas and views of the circle which often met in the house of Cramer. As the circle was not an official association with regular meetings as such, it is difficult to assess each member’s influence and contribution to the discussions. Yet their writings, including diaries and letters, reveal a closely knitted web of friendships and common inter-

19 Schlegel, among others, found it difficult ‘living on the outskirts of Europe’; see Johann Heinrich Schlegel (ed.), J.E. Schlegel. Werke (Copenhagen & Leipzig, 1770), vol. 5, p. xxxviii. It has been said that the upper classes in Denmark could neither speak nor read Danish: the learned used Latin; the ladies French; the gentlemen German; and finally the common people Danish; see Eaton, German Influence, pp. 12 (n. 6), 23.
20 On the meetings at Cramer, see Helfrich Peter Sturz, Erinnerungen aus dem Leben des Grafen Johann Hartwig von Bernstorff (Leipzig, 1777), pp. 64–66, 71, 101. See also Jaikyung Hahn, Helfrich Peter Sturz (1736–1779): Der Essayist, der Künstler, der Weltmann (Stuttgart, 1976), pp. 19–21, 42–43; and Eaton, German Influence, p. 162. On the intellectual circle, see also Gottfried Benedikt Funk, Schriften (Berlin, 1820), Paul Döring, Der nordsche Dichterkreis und die Schleswiger Literaturbriefe (Sønderborg, 1880), and Leopold Magon, Ein Jahrhundert geistiger und literarischer Beziehungen zw. Deutschland und Skandinavi (Dortmund, 1926), vol. 1, pp. 60–82. The daughter of Münter, Frederikke Brun, also writes about the circle and its environment; see Louis Bobé, F. Brun og hendes Kredu, hjemme og ude (Copenhagen, 1910). For an overview of the circle and their interest in music, see e.g. O. Fischer, Zum musikalischen Standpunkt des Nordischen Dichterkreises, Sammelbände der internationalen Musikgesellschaft, 572 (1904), pp. 245–252.
ests which most likely served as a dynamic and inspiring environment. The circle had also close connections to various literary environments in Germany; on the musical side, C.P.E. Bach played an important role, and other composers often mentioned are G.Ph. Telemann, J.A. Hasse and C.H. Graun.²¹

Though there is no direct statement in Scheibe’s writings on the circle of German intellectuals there are signs that he was actively participating in the debates. When arriving in Copenhagen in 1743, Schlegel only brought very few books with him and had to borrow ‘some German ones from Scheibe, the chapel master’;²² from his acquaintance with Gottsched, Schlegel had received a letter of introduction which he presented to Scheibe who arranged that Schlegel gained access to ‘Gram’s library’.²³ Through Gottsched, Scheibe and Schlegel had become friends, and in 1746 Schlegel wrote a couple of texts which he presented to Scheibe (Der Tempel der Ehre and Prokris und Cephalus) who then composed the music; the cantatas were performed in Copenhagen as well as ‘in other places’.²⁴ Later Prokris und Cephalus was rearranged for solo voice and keyboard instrument and published in 1765. The publication also included the cantata, Adriadne auf Naxos, with text by Gerstenberg, another very close friend of Scheibe’s and a central participant in the meetings of the circle. Gerstenberg not only wrote poetry but also showed a keen interest in music and, in particular, in the relationship between text and music; he was also interested in children’s education, played the keyboard instrument, had a ‘good voice’ and held musical evenings at his home in Lyngby.²⁵ Reading the detailed introduction to the published cantatas there is no doubt that Gerstenberg and Scheibe had intense discussions on the connections between poetry and music (metre, syllables and rhythm, for instance) and how to express the sentiments inherent in the text. Especially the fine but very important distinction between recitation and declamation – and how the aria is employed as a transi-

²¹ Also Telemann’s De danske Norske og tydske Undersaatters Glæde (Hamburg, 1757), was reviewed; see Fortgesetzte Nachrichten, 3 (1758), pp. 240–241.
²³ Possibly The Royal Library (Gram was head of The Royal Library during the period 1730–48), see Roos (ed.), ‘Breve til Christoph Gottsched’, p. 97.
²⁴ See Scheibe, Ariadne auf Naxos (Copenhagen, 1765), introduction, sig. **v.
²⁵ Albert Malte Wagner, Heinrich Wilhelm von Gerstenberg und der Sturm und Drang (Heidelberg, 1920), vol. 1, p. 84.
tion between these two styles – is thoroughly explained in the introduction analysing large sections of the cantatas. The publication of the cantatas received overwhelming attention, and reviews were published in many journals and mentioned by several writers.\footnote{See e.g. Johann George Sulzer, \emph{Allgemeine Theorie der Schönen Künste... Erster Theil. Neue vermehrte zweyte Auflage} (Leipzig, 1792), p. 449.} Also Klopstock experimented with ‘deutschen Sylbenmaße’ and ‘Klang der Sylben’ in his writings, and in a letter addressed to the composer and writer Just Friedrich Wilhelm Zachariae, he sought advice on the subject since ‘Scheibe ist beynach so eigensinnig als Pedant, u Gerstenberg, der gut spielt u singt, gesteht mir, daß er sich mit der Theorie der Musik nicht bekannt genug gemacht habe, um mir richtig antworten zu können’.\footnote{Helmut Riege and Reiner Schmidt (eds.), \emph{Friedrich Gottlieb Klopstock: Briefe, Nachträge, Stammbucheinträge, Einträge auf Albumblättern} (Berlin & New York, 2007), vol. 11, p. 46, letter undated but presumably written between 1768 and 1769.} Thus Klopstock knew both Scheibe and Gerstenberg personally, and most importantly his interest in the subject can be dated to 1764,\footnote{Cf. Riege and Schmidt (eds.), \emph{Friedrich Gottlieb Klopstock} (1759–66), vol. 4.1, pp. 756–757.} that is around the same time that Scheibe and Gerstenberg were discussing the subject resulting in the publication of \emph{Ariadne auf Naxos}. It seems therefore highly likely that Scheibe would have participated in the social and musical gatherings.\footnote{See Johann Martin Lappenberg (ed.), \emph{Briefe von und an Klopstock} (Braunschweig, 1867), pp. 190–193, letter from Klopstock to Caecilie Ambrosius, 1767; Wagner, \emph{Heinrich Wilhelm von Gerstenberg}, vol. 1, pp. 85–86; Döring, \emph{Der nordische Dichterkreis}, p. 23; and Eaton, \emph{German Influence}, p. 182.} Eventually Gerstenberg and Scheibe also included their close friend, C.P.E. Bach in Hamburg, in their debates.\footnote{Scheibe, \emph{Ariadne auf Naxos}; see also Scheibe’s two articles on recitative, ‘Abhandlung über das Recitativ’ in \emph{Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften und freyen Künste}, 11/2 (1764), pp. 209–268, and same journal 12/1 (1765), pp. 1–41. On C.P.E. Bach, Scheibe and Gerstenberg, see in particular Hans Mersmann, ‘Ein Programmtrio Karl Philipp Emanuel Bachs’, \emph{Bach-Jahrbuch}, 14 (1917), pp. 137–170. \emph{Ariadne auf Naxos} seems to have been performed under the direction of another Bach son, Christian Friedrich Bach, in Bückeburg in 1771 though with changes, see Wagner, \emph{Heinrich Wilhelm von Gerstenberg}, vol. 1, p. 85. One of Scheibe’s pupils, Niels Schiørring, was sent to Hamburg and studied with C.P.E. Bach becoming one of his best friends; see Stephen L. Clark (ed. & tr.), \emph{The Letters of C.P.E. Bach} (Oxford, 1997), p. 271.} In addition, Scheibe lived with Gerstenberg for a while, thus – if not invited to participate in the gatherings – at least making it unavoidable for him to notice them. J.Chr. Bock, a writer who was well-acquainted with the Bach sons and J.A.P. Schulz, wrote to Gerstenberg in 1765 ask-
ing: ‘was macht Ihr Hausgenosse, Herr Kapellmeister Scheibe? Ist er noch unter den schönen Geistern?’ Bock continues joking about two very different reviews of some of Scheibe’s works in Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften and Allgemeine deutsche Bibliothek. While Scheibe was staying at the Gerstenberg family residence, he was presented with a new cantata text, Clarissa, but when Scheibe left he was apparently unable to compose the music and the text was discarded by Gerstenberg.

The promotion of Danish language and literature meant also that members of the German circle associated with Danes. Through Gottsched, Schlegel was introduced to Holberg and in spite of the age difference they became good friends. Also Scheibe was an intimate friend of Holberg’s and in his biography of Holberg, Scheibe mentions an incident in order to prove that Holberg was not an insensitive person as most thought:

‘When I – following the death of his majesty, King Christian VI – in Trinitatis Kirke, held public rehearsals on the music of mourning which I had composed for the solemn funeral service, Holberg was constantly a keen listener; and at each rehearsal he was touched to tears by a particular, very emotional passage sung by the whole choir. The participants, of which there were more than eighty, were placed in the shape of a half moon in front of the entrance to the church choir, and Holberg and some other music lovers stood between the singers and the altar. As soon as we came to the section, which moved him so strongly, he constantly hid behind the altar with a handkerchief in his hand. Many noticed it with surprise since it did not concur very well with his usual insensitiveness.’

Of course Scheibe might be inferring some sort of self-appraisal, too. The rehearsals of the work in question, the cantata Klage-Sang over Kong

---

Christian den Siette, took place in autumn 1746 and was performed several times, not only in Christiansborg Slotskirke but also in The Musical Society (‘Det musikalske Societet’). Scheibe also promoted Holberg in Germany by translating Peder Paars. Poema Heroico-comicum. Tredie Edition (1720; to Peter Paars ein comisches Heldengedicht (1750)) and Moralske Tanker (1740; to Moralische Fabeln mit beygefügten Erklärungen (1752));\(^{34}\) and he was in fact the first to publish a biography on Holberg. On the other side, Holberg encouraged and strongly supported Scheibe in his work establishing and administrating the newly founded Musical Society.\(^{35}\)

Gerstenberg was living a while in the house of Johannes Ewald’s step-father when King Frederik V died in January 1766, and it was most likely he who encouraged the young up-coming poet Ewald to write a suitable cantata text for the funeral; later it was also Gerstenberg who persuaded Scheibe to compose the music to Ewald’s text. Thus Scheibe and Ewald were introduced to each other and started a fruitful collaboration. Later Ewald, in his collected works of 1780, describes their relationship in a footnote:

‘This is the best place which I can make use of to testify – if possible – to posterity my gratitude to this most deserving (and I fear too little) appreciated person. For me, he was a father and it is certain that if there is anything in my poetic work which in purpose as to music may deserve applause then I have only to thank the instructive relationship with him and his loving lessons.’\(^{36}\)

\(^{34}\) Holberg wrote on the translations of his works in ‘Epistel 447’ of 1754, see <http://gandalf.uib.no/Holberg/tekster/epistler/tomus-v-447-539/epistel-447> accessed August 2011. Among other works that Scheibe translated or wrote are Erik Pontoppidan’s Versuch einer natürlichen Historie von Norwegen (Flensburg & Leipzig, 1769) and his Dänischer Atlas oder Beschreibung des Königreiches Dännemark nach seiner politischen und physikalischen Beschaffenheit (Hamburg & Copenhagen, 1766–67); Friedrich Wilhelm Hastfer, Goldgrube eines Landes in der Verbesserung der Schaafszucht: nebst einem zuverlässigen Mittel und Rath gegen die Schaafspocken. Aus dem Dänischen übersetzt (Copenhagen, 1756); Casper Peter Rothe, Leben und Thaten des berühmten Königlichen Dänischen Vice-Admirals Peter Tordenschilds: Aus dem Dänischen übersetzt (Copenhagen, 1753); Scheibe also wrote Misogynis: Wohlgegrundete Ursachen, das weibliche geschlecht zu verachten, besonders aber die, von Arglist, Bosheit,… und andern unzähligen Lastern angefüllte böse Weiber (n.p., 1750), and Die Allerneueste erfundene Art, nach Morgenländischer Weise, mit guter Manier ein Böser Weib los zu werden (n.p., 1753).


\(^{36}\) Christian Gottlob Prost (ed.), Johannes Ewalds samtlige Skrifter (Copenhagen, 1780), vol. 1, pp. 235–236. The public’s dissatisfaction with the work provoked Ewald to add this footnote.
The note implies that Ewald received some sort of tuition which might indeed have been related to one of Scheibe’s main subjects of interest: the relationship between music and text, metre, rhythm and the expression of emotions. Thus Scheibe’s interest in the Danish language and his association with native poets and writers is clearly in agreement with the overall views of the circle. Scheibe sought in every respect to promote the use of Danish among the native poets and other writers and indeed argued that Danish was particularly fit to express emotions such as love and sorrow, even far superior to French in terms of musical setting.37

During his first period in Copenhagen, Scheibe also played a central role in the development of The Musical Society and many of his works were performed at events arranged by the society. Also when he returned to Copenhagen in 1761, he quickly became an honorary member of the newly established ‘musikalske Selskab’.38 The associations were key institutions in the musical life of Copenhagen during the reigns of the pietistic kings Christian VI and Frederik V when theatrical performances and operas were banned; instead sacred music and in particular music to be performed during Passion Week was emphasised. Thus due to religious restrictions, passion music became very popular and was performed in the music societies. Holberg explains in one of his epistles of 1745 that in Copenhagen

‘we have music concerts regularly ... at these concerts one usually merely sees a small audience throughout the whole year, as long as only merry symphonies are performed; however, during the Passion Week when the sacred concert takes place, the concert hall swarms with people, in particular women. This I haven’t noticed anywhere else, not even in the holy city of Rome’.39

37 Scheibe, Abhandlung vom Ursprung und Alter der Musik, insonderheit der Vokalmusik (Altona, 1754), pp. 177–178.
38 On the societies and Scheibe’s influence, see Ravn, Festschrift, vol. 1, pp. 32–80; and Henriksen, ‘Johann Adolph Scheibe’, pp. 103–124; Scheibe deals with the musical societies in his Abhandlungen vom Ursprunge und Alter der Musik (Altona, 1754), p. 63. Scheibe’s importance for the musical societies in Copenhagen was also noted internationally, see e.g. Johann Carl Conrad Oelrich, Historische Nachricht von den akademischen Würden in der Musik und öffentlichen musikalischen Akademien und Gesellschaften (Berlin, 1752), p. 50.
39 ‘Epistel 262’ of 1750, see <http://gandalf.uib.no/Holberg/tekster/epistler/tomus-iii-1750/epistel-262>: ‘Vi have her i Staden reglerede Musicalske Concerter; paa samme Concerter sees gemeenligen ikkun faa Tilhørere det heele Aar igiennem, saa længe der ikkun spilles lystige Symphonier. Men udi Fasten, naar den geistlige Concert forestil-
Among those composers whose passion music was performed are Scalabrini, Pergolesi, Lasnel (pseud. Naselli), Hasse, Keiser, Graun, Telemann, Stölzel and C.P.E. Bach; hence it is not surprising that a large part of Scheibe’s production included passion music, either oratorios or cantatas, for large orchestra, choir and vocal soloists.

Though Italian opera was officially counteracted, the general public was passionately attracted to it. Scheibe, who opposed this style strongly, criticised both Italian music and Italian musicians.\(^{40}\) When Christian VI died, and with the accession of the new king Frederik V in 1746, musical taste at court changed direction towards favouring Italian opera. Mingotti and his Italian troupe arrived in 1747 and with Paolo Scalabrini as their chapel master, they staged operas in the same building where the musical society had been housed. Scheibe could not contain his rage against the new company, complaining in public; he was dismissed in July 1748 and the Italian Scalabrini took over the position as chapel master.\(^{41}\) However, Scheibe’s views on Italian opera reflect not only those of Holberg but more importantly also those of the German circle. Certainly, Gerstenberg agreed entirely with the composer as is evident from the introduction to the cantatas *Ariadne auf Naxos* and *Prokris und Cephalus* though first published nearly twenty years later. In 1749, Scheibe published a German opera text, *Thusnelde*, so as to prove that it was indeed possible to write a libretto in a language other than Italian.\(^{42}\) He did not set the text to music but it did create a stir among composers and intellectuals in connection with the discussions of the forming of German opera, even though the libretto by some was considered mediocre.\(^{43}\)

\(^{327}\) J.A. Scheibe and Copenhagen

\(^{40}\) See e.g. Scheibe’s introduction to the second revised edition of *Critische Musikus* (Leipzig, 1745).

\(^{41}\) It has often been argued that it was because of his criticism that Scheibe was dismissed though there is no proof of that; see Thrane, *Fra Hofviolonernes Tid*, pp. 84–86. Scheibe still maintained a close contact with the court and was on friendly terms with Scalabrini who sent copies of Scheibe’s *Abhandlungen* to Padre Martini in Bologna; see Anne Schoebelen, ‘The Growth of Padre Martini’s Library as Revealed in His Correspondence’, *Music and Letters*, 57/4 (1976), p. 396.

\(^{42}\) Scheibe’s purpose of writing a libretto was not to have it set to music and then staged as an opera as is implied in *The New Grove*, ‘Scheibe, Johann Adolph’ <www.oxfordmusiconline.com> accessed August 2011.

\(^{43}\) See e.g. Johann Gottfried Eichhorn, *Geschichte der Litteratur* (Göttingen, 1808), vol. 4, p. 1003, who – in his section on the history of German opera – mentions ‘Scheibe the Danish chapel master’; see also reviews in Friedrich Wilhelm Marpurg (ed.), *Historisch-
Following his dismissal, Scheibe moved to a small town far away from the capital where he – besides translating various literary works to German – founded a music school for children and became involved in writing children’s songs. The collection of children’s songs which he later published are highly interesting and important in the history of that repertoire; they are appended an extensive introduction explaining aspects of language (syllables, rhythm), education and even performance practice. That Scheibe founded a music school for children is not surprising when seen in the context of the interests of the intellectual circle. One of its members in particular, the educationalist Basedow who taught at Sorø Academy, was highly influential taking his point of departure mainly from Rousseau’s *Émile* (1762) as well as employing the ideas of John Locke who argued that the objective of education is the well-being and prosperity of the nation. But also Scheibe’s acquaintances, Schlegel, Gerstenberg and Cramer, showed great interest in education and the reform of educational methods, and Scheibe was from an early stage clearly inspired by their discussions. Later the views were published through the circle’s mouthpiece, *Der nordischer Aufseher*, during its existence 1758–61 under the editorship of Cramer. In the 1770s, when Resewitz was in Copenhagen and had joined the German circle, educational reform was very much in the forefront and Resewitz’s ideas and detailed plans laid the foundation for the proposal of the reformed educational system in Denmark. Unfortunately, no research on Scheibe’s music school has been carried out, but it is possible that it was an early practical outcome (even an experiment perhaps) of the discussions taking place among the German intellectuals.

Yet Scheibe retained contact with Copenhagen and provided music for many occasions whether at court or musical societies; and in 1761 he and his family moved to the capital again. The two Italian chapel

kritische Beyträige zur Aufnahme der Musik, 1 (1754), pp. 93–141; 4 (1757), pp. 523–543; and Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften und der freyen Künste, 1 (1757), pp. 57–90, at p. 87, mentions Scheibe’s *Thusnelde* in a review of Basedow’s recently published ‘Lehrbuch’.

44 The songs were published as *Kleine Lieder für Kinder zur Beförderung der Jugend* (Flensburg, 1766), and *Kleine Lieder für Kinder... Zweyter Theil* (Flensburg, 1768).

45 Johann Bernhard Basedow, *Vorstellung an Menschenfreunde und vermögende Männer über Schulen, Studien und ihren Einfluss in die öffentliche Wohlfarth mit einem Plane eines Elementarbuchs der menschlichen Erkentniss* (Hamburg, 1768).

46 See, for instance, Johann Andreas Cramer (ed.), *Der nordischer Aufseher* (Copenhagen, 1762), vol. 2, pp. 239–251.

47 Adresseavisen, 2 February 1761; see Ravn, Festskrift, pp. 57–60.
masters, Scalabrini and Sarti who were employed at that time, were often away thus giving Scheibe an opportunity to compose music for many official events during the 1760s. One of the largest projects during this decade was supplying music for the funeral of King Frederik V in 1766.48

There is no doubt that at times Scheibe was a difficult person to get on with and very fast in replying to critiques, even positive ones; but he was also respected as a composer, both by the royal family and among the bourgeoisie.49 Often the same work was given several performances reflecting its popularity. The reviews, too, were often positive towards the composer mentioning for example that he once again ‘has shown a fortunate sample of his abilities as regards both writing poetry and music which was applauded by all connoisseurs and lovers of music’.50 Scheibe was enthusiastically participating in various aspects of cultural life. In his early years he was also a member of the newly established society of freemasons, the ‘Zorobabel’ of 1744, and played an active role by composing and publishing a collection of songs for their meetings. The Neue Freymäurer-Lieder (1749) created international interest and was reviewed in several German journals inspiring other composers to write music for the Masonic societies throughout Europe.51


49 Klopstock, for instance, describes Scheibe as a somewhat obstinate person; see Riege and Schmidt (eds.), Friedrich Wilhelm Klopstock, vol. 11, p. 46. The performance of his cantata dedicated to the prince consort in March 1765 received a positive review in Samling af adskillige Skrifter til de skønne Videnskabers og det danske Sprogs Opkomst og Fremtarv (Sorø, 1765), vol. 1/2, pp. 177–180; however, the anonymous reviewer did have a very few minor objections. Scheibe reacted promptly by having a 51-page reply published later that same year (Schreiben an die Herren Verfasser der neuen periodischen Schrift (Copenhagen, 1765)), scolding the reviewer for not approaching Scheibe who would gladly have lent him the score so he could study the music. Scheibe’s angry response is highly interesting, revealing details on processes establishing a compositional framework, relationship between text and music, a composer’s work process as well as views on rehearsals and performance practice.


51 See, for instance, Wöchentliche Nachrichten und Anmerkungen die Musik betreffend, 3/10 (1768), p. 78.
1770s, when Struensee had been appointed prime minister and had introduced the freedom of the press (‘trykkefrihedens indførelse’, that is, the abolishment of censorship) thus creating international attention from among others Voltaire, Scheibe participated in the debates by anonymously publishing a pamphlet entitled *En reisende Russers Anekdoter over den danske Statsforfatning*.\(^{52}\) Scheibe criticised many of the conditions and created a rather heated debate resulting in several replies.\(^{53}\) Struensee’s rescript did not have the promised effect and was revised in 1771 and abolished the following year. Throughout his life Scheibe felt a strong urge to participate in debates and publicise his opinions whether that be on music history, aesthetics, music theory or even politics; and writers concerned with music aesthetics as well as music history sought Scheibe’s advice and his eminent knowledge on music history and Danish cultural life.\(^{54}\) His publications also drew international attention, in particular in Germany, and many of his works and ideas were reviewed, some were discarded and others approved of.

**Work list**

In order to establish a detailed list of Scheibe’s compositions, it is important to consider 1) whether it should include surviving documents only, or 2) take into account all those works which are known to have existed. Since not much research on Scheibe’s music has been published, and in order to include the possibility that lost works might emerge, it has been decided that references to missing works are to be included. Such a database will also assist music historians in establishing a better and a broader picture of Scheibe placing him in a context which is not only focused on his accomplishments as regards music theory and aesthetics but also on Scheibe, the composer. Furthermore, due to the fire of Copenhagen in 1794 and the loss of a large part of the music

---

52 Two editions appeared, one in German and one in Danish: *Anekdoten eines reisenden Russen über die Staatsverfassung, Sitten u. Gebräuche der Dänen, in Briefen an seine Freunde* (Copenhagen, 1771), and *En reisende Russers Anekdoter over de Danskes Statsforfatning, Sæder og Skikke, i Breve til sine Venner* (Copenhagen, 1771).


54 Thus, for his extensive and detailed study, *De cantu et musica sacra* (St. Blasien, 1774), Martin Gerbert corresponded with Scheibe on the conditions in Scandinavia; see Georg Pfeilschifter (ed.), *Korrespondenz des Fürststubes Martin II. Gerbert* (Karlsruhe in Baden, 1934), vol. 2, p. 60.
collections, it is important that the musical life in Copenhagen may be documented in other ways than just through the surviving scores. Studying only the surviving music reveals a rather false picture of the musical environment since their survival is probably more or less arbitrary. This also makes research more complex as – besides the usual library catalogues – other sources of information also need to be consulted, such as literary journals, newspaper reviews and advertisements, in addition to sales and auction catalogues, printed libretti and other publications of texts to which Scheibe might have composed music. Though the intended work list includes both surviving and lost musical works, it has been decided that also Scheibe’s theoretical writings, literary works, and translations might be added in the future, drawing on the experience gained by the initial work on his musical output.

The basis of the database is Scheibe’s own list as it appears in his autobiography published in Mattheson’s *Grundlage* of 1740 (see Table 2). The list is indeed impressive if one can trust the 32-year old Scheibe.

Table 2: Scheibe’s list of works in Mattheson, *Grundlage* (1740):

- 150 church works
- 150 concertos for the flute
- 30 concertos for the violin
- 60–70 sinfonias
- keyboard pieces and other vocal and instrumental music:
  - trios, solos, Italian and German cantatas, serenatas and song poems (‘Singgedichte’)
  - two passion oratories
  - one opera

It is obvious that many of the works mentioned in Table 2 are lost. Thus all 30 violin concertos are apparently nowhere to be found and of the 150 flute concertos only a small handful seems to have survived and they might not even be those mentioned in Mattheson’s *Grundlage*. The one opera listed, however, does create a problem since it cannot be his *Thusnelde* (1749) but must be *Artaban*, a ‘Singspiel’, of which the libretto was published in Hamburg in 1738 clearly indicating that it was performed there in that year; the music to *Artaban* has not survived. Unfortunately, Scheibe’s list is not very detailed which creates prob-

---

56 *Artaban ein neues Singspiel auf der hamburgischen Schaubühne aufgeführt* (Hamburg, 1738).
lems when trying to identify the surviving works or those documented in other sources. Among the music collections of The Royal Library are several of Scheibe’s sinfonias which might be of an early date and hence included in Scheibe’s list above or, just as likely, they might have been composed after his move to Denmark in 1739. Hence a complete work list, employing secondary sources such as reviews referring to musical works by Scheibe, might result in a list of items of which some are identical. It is therefore important to ascertain whether each entry embodies a physical object representing a work or is a reference to a work of Scheibe’s; only in those instances when two or more entries can positively be identified as representing the same musical work will the two distinct entries be merged into a single one: for instance the entry of the copyist’s transcription of a D major sinfonia might only be merged when it has positively been identified as an exact copy of the autograph D major sinfonia. Also a different version is listed separately, though with a reference to the original first version of the work.

Important sources that might document works by Scheibe are publishers’ catalogues or even auction catalogues. In 1759 the bookseller, Nicolas Selhof, published a comprehensive catalogue of music for sale including items such as Corelli’s trio-sonatas and works by Telemann and Vivaldi. One of the items in the catalogue is a ‘concerto for flute, two violins, viola and bass’ by Scheibe, regrettably with no further indication of movements or tonality that might reveal its precise identity.\(^{57}\) It appears to have been a manuscript and not a printed edition as it is placed under the heading ‘musique en manuscrit’. The sinfonia will be included in the database with a reference to the Selhof catalogue though it might be the same as one of the sinfonias which are shelved in The Royal Library. Taking a closer look at the famous Breitkopf catalogue of 1761–66, one immediately notices that the firm had a fairly large stock of Scheibe manuscripts in addition to Leopold Mozart, Hasse, Haydn, and the Bach sons, among others (it should be emphasised that none of the Scheibeana in this catalogue agree with the specifications of the concert listed in the Selhof catalogue). The Breitkopf catalogue is more informative as it provides each entry with an incipit making it possible to compare with the surviving works. The Breitkopf firm acquired the

music from the estate of Carl Gerlach who died in 1761.\textsuperscript{58} As the organist and music director of Leipzig’s Neue Kirche, Gerlach had gathered a large collection of music over the years collaborating with Scheibe among others, and at least performing his works while he was living in Leipzig from 1729 to 1735.\textsuperscript{59} That this is a likely scenario is supported by the fact that C.P.E. Bach borrowed some music of Graun’s from the Breitkopf firm in the 1770s which had been gathered and copied by Gerlach in Leipzig,\textsuperscript{60} hence a large part of Breitkopf’s music had been provided by Gerlach implying that the collection of Scheibeana in the catalogue stems from Gerlach. It seems plausible that Scheibe’s works listed in Breitkopf’s catalogue predate 1735 and hence are among those mentioned in his autobiography of 1740, though Scheibe does mention that he also provided Gerlach with works after he moved to Copenhagen.\textsuperscript{61} Among the works that Scheibe might have sent to Gerlach in Leipzig are four Passion Cantatas of which *Gottselige Gedanken bey dem Kreuze unsers Erlösers* was performed in Copenhagen in spring 1742.\textsuperscript{62} The works were not on the market for the general public until 1761 when Breitkopf published his catalogue.\textsuperscript{63} It might seem strange that a renowned publishing firm would issue a catalogue of manuscripts – that is, selling music manuscripts. The prospective buyer, however, browsed through the catalogue ordering the music he or she wished to acquire; the scribes at Breitkopf prepared the transcripts of the ordered works using the manuscripts as master

\textsuperscript{60} See Clark (ed. & tr.), *The Letters of C.P.E. Bach*, p. 25, letter dated 2 January 1772.
\textsuperscript{62} The work is listed in the Breitkopf catalogue of 1761; see Maul, ‘Johann Adolph Scheibes Bach-Kritik. Hintergründe und Schauplätze einer musikalischen Kontroverse’, p. 182; cf. printed libretto to *Gottselige Gedanken… Entwerfen von Gerlach; in die Music gesetzt, um am stillen Freitage 1742 aufgeführt von Jo. Ad. Scheibe* (Copenhagen, 1742).
\textsuperscript{63} It should be noted that Scheibe knew Breitkopf through Gottsched already in 1741 and could have sent manuscripts to the publishing company already then; see letter to Gottsched, 21 August 1741, in Roos (ed.), ‘Breve til Christoph Gottsched’, pp. 90–91.
copies. When finished they were sent to buyers all over Europe.\textsuperscript{64} This procedure was more common than many today probably realise. In the eighteenth century it was still cheaper to buy a manuscript copy than a printed edition and, in addition, performance material could also easily be obtained in this way. Most importantly, publishers would avoid having to maintain bulky stocks of materials in their warehouses. A large part of The Royal Library’s music collection consists of such contemporary transcripts, and the concerto for flute in the Selhof catalogue might have been such a copy rather than a now lost single original work.\textsuperscript{65}

One evident example of this use of manuscripts is Scheibe’s three sonatas for harpsichord and flute or violin that were published by Haffner in Nuremberg of which all impressions of the edition seem to have

\textsuperscript{64} See Barry S. Brook’s introduction to the facs. edn. of the Breitkopf catalogue, \textit{The Breitkopf Thematic Catalogue} (New York, c1966).

\textsuperscript{65} Thus many of the manuscripts in ‘Gieddes Samling’, for example, are most likely the result of this common practice.
been lost. The printed edition was employed as a master copy, for at least two manuscripts copies of the work have survived (see Figs. 2–3). The copyist has even been so precise as to reproduce the title page including the name and place of the printer (see Fig. 3).

Another example, including works by various composers such as C.P.E. Bach and Leopold Mozart, is the *Oeuvres mêlées*. The collection consists of harpsichord sonatas and was published in 1755–65 also by Haffner; a manuscript copy of Scheibe’s two sonatas in this collection is preserved in Sweden. In order to establish a usable list of works, these

---

66 Item not in *Répertoire International des Sources Musicales (RISM)*, but listed in Lothar Hoffmann-Erbrecht, ‘Der Nürnberger Musikverleger Johann Ulrich Haffner’, *Acta musicologica*, 26 (1954), p. 122; date unknown, but according to Hoffmann-Erbrecht’s list the item must have been published sometime between 1758 and 1761. According to a letter Scheibe wrote to Telemann (8 February 1757), however, Haffner planned to publish the ‘6 Sonaten für Concertirende Clavier und mit einer Geige oder Flöte... in Verlag nehmen’ during the forthcoming summer, that is summer 1757; see Grosse (ed.), *Georg Philipp Telemann*, p. 334.


so-called ghosts of the same piece, as it were, should be sifted from the list in order to represent more correctly the number of works which Scheibe composed. However, though the contemporary transcriptions are copies of the same work they are nevertheless highly interesting when studied in a social and cultural context, since they tell us about Scheibe’s popularity as a composer, the dissemination of his music and how widespread it was to use printed editions as master copies for producing cheaper autograph transcripts.

Surprisingly, also the Bach pupil, Johann Philip Kirnberger, mentions works by Scheibe. In his famous treatise, *Die Kunst des reinen Satzes in der Musik* of 1779, Kirnberger reveals that he owned ‘verschiedene Partituren von des in Koppenhagen gewesenen Capellmeisters Scheibe seiner eigenen Handschrift’ – presumably sacred music since Kirnberger on the following page mentions that the composition includes a Kyrie.\(^{69}\) He analyses one of the works for orchestra, vocal soloists and two choirs using it as an example of compositional techniques based on a three-part framework. Kirnberger does not approve of the techniques employed by ‘Modecomponisten’ and those composers who ought to know better (Scheibe, for example). Kirnberger studies the work in terms of orchestration and the doubling of parts, ending his thorough analysis with the brief remark that the timpani are placed badly on many harmonies. He concludes, however, that the scoring for two choirs which are united at the end of the piece provides the most beautiful variation (‘abwechslung’) to the work.\(^{70}\) Unfortunately, Kirnberger chose to illustrate his detailed discussion on the three-part framework technique with a piece by Gottfried Heinrich Stölzel; neither does he mention how he got hold of the music, but it is possible that he obtained the scores from Scheibe’s heirs in 1776. Unfortunately, the autograph manuscripts that Kirnberger possessed do not seem to have survived. Though Kirnberger may not have had the highest admiration for Scheibe as a composer, he chose nevertheless to include some of Scheibe’s works in his collection of music, studied them and employed at least one in his treatise on composition.

Other sources that may reveal unknown musical works of Scheibe’s are newspapers and journals. The *Fortgesetzte Nachrichten*, for example, contains reviews of scholarly works as well as other publications which were of interest to the intellectual elite of the day. This periodical also

---

includes reviews of music publications and short biographies of important authors and scholars. Under the heading ‘News’ in the issue from 1759, a little known section deals with Scheibe: first a short biography, the information of which agrees with Scheibe’s autobiography in Mattheson’s *Grundlage*, then the article points out that since 1749 Scheibe has been living in ‘Sonderburg’, opened a music school teaching the young and working with the translation of Danish authors; and the following two pages list his various writings starting with the *Critische*
Musikus mentioning the critique of the ‘world famous Bach’. The list also includes the printed edition of Oeuvres mêlées; it does not include, however, other musical works except those to which Scheibe himself wrote the texts and which were published separately as booklets.

This is not the only article in the periodical dealing with Scheibe: the previous year, a three-page long review of one of his theoretical studies, Abhandlung vom Ursprunge und Alter der Musik (Altona & Flensburg, 1754), appeared as well as briefer reviews of the texts to some of his musical compositions such as Der Tempel des Ruhmes (1752), Thränen der Sünder (1754) and Der wundervolle Tod des Welterlösers (1754).

Footnotes:

71 Fortgesetzte Nachrichten, 6 (1759), pp. 557–560, at p. 558. The periodical was published between 1758–63.
All these works belong to the most popular and most famous of his day. As seen in the reviews many of the texts which Scheibe wrote—and to which he composed music—were published as booklets. Browsing through the catalogues of The Royal Library, it becomes apparent that Scheibe wrote a large number of works which otherwise are unknown; the only evidence left is the booklets (see fig. 6).\textsuperscript{73} So far 32 such texts to musical works, dating from 1739–78, have been uncovered.\textsuperscript{74} Furthermore, in connection with the performances of large works, newspapers not only included reviews and advertisements of the event but also published the texts to musical works of which at least four since have been lost.\textsuperscript{75}

Yet, one should not only search The Royal Library in Copenhagen for works and information on works, as quite a few of Scheibe’s compositions are preserved in Berlin or in various Swedish libraries—even works which were composed for special events in Copenhagen or commissioned by the Danish royal family or the court. As mentioned above, Kirnberger possessed some of Scheibe’s autograph scores and other works might have been presented to C.P.E. Bach. While in Hamburg, Schiørring, a harpsichord pupil of Scheibe’s and Bach’s, borrowed some of Bach’s passion music which was to be performed in Copenhagen, and it is likely that he would have brought some of Scheibe’s music with him presenting it to Bach.\textsuperscript{76} Also Friedrich Wilhelm Marpurg had an intimate knowledge of Scheibe as a composer mentioning him several times in his writings; it seems that he even made transcripts of some of Scheibe’s works for performance.\textsuperscript{77} And among the Telemann

\textsuperscript{73} There are most likely other works of this kind (that is, booklets of libretti to which Scheibe composed music) to be discovered in German libraries; thus Scheibe’s \textit{Die Frucht des Leidens Jesu} was performed on Good Friday 1739 in the Neue Kirche, Leipzig, presumably directed by Gerlach; the music has not survived. See Maul, ‘Neues zum Kontext einer musikalischen Debatte: Johann Adolph Scheibes Bach-Kritik’, \textit{Bach Magazin}, issue 17 (2011), p. 10, and Maul, ‘Johann Adolph Scheibes Bach-Kritik. Hintergründe und Schauplätze einer musikalischen Kontroverse’, pp. 153–198. See also Schouenborg, ‘Kantaten i Danmark’.

\textsuperscript{74} See Schouenborg, ‘Kantaten i Danmark’.

\textsuperscript{75} See e.g. \textit{Adresseavisen}, 16 April 1762, 27 June 1764, 1 October 1764, and 30 November 1770.

\textsuperscript{76} The work in question is presumably ‘Die letzten Leiden des Erlösers’ of which ‘Passions Cantata, del Signore C.F.E. Bach’, \textit{DK-Kk}, mu6309.1632, is a transcript copy.

\textsuperscript{77} The works which Marpurg might have copied are two Magnificats, one in D major, the other in G major; see \textit{D-B}, Mus ms. 30187, nr. 3 (score), Mus ms. 19764/8 (parts); and \textit{D-B}, Mus ms. 30187, nr. 4 (score), Mus ms. 19764/6 (parts). According to \textit{RISM} the parts are
collection of the Staatsbibliothek in Berlin which was donated by his grandson Michael, a cover that originally contained Scheibe’s lost *Am 19ten nach Dreyeinigkeit, 1737*, now includes a work of Telemann’s.\textsuperscript{78} The text to *Patrioten*, performed at the crown prince of Denmark’s birthday in 1760, was published and sold to the audience at the event; Scheibe’s autograph score, however, is today preserved in Berlin with a comment added by the famous collector of music Georg Poelchau, who knew members of the German circle in Copenhagen such as Klopstock and his wife.\textsuperscript{79} It is possible that parts of Scheibe’s estate was sold to various collectors or presented by members of the family to friends in Denmark and Germany. Thus Poelchau often wrote to the chapel master, C.E.F. Weyse, in Copenhagen enquiring whether it was still possible to get hold of more of Scheibe’s music; and, finally, in 1832 he succeeded in obtaining the cantata *Der Auferstehung und Himmelfahrt Jesu* of 1760 (text by Ramler) and explains in a letter to Weyse that ‘Von Ihren Vorgängern Scheibe habe ich endlich eine seiner grösseren Compositionen erhalten, die Ramlersche Auferstehung; die aber bis auf die Recitative, die

in Marpurg’s hand. Marpurg, *Legende einiger Musikheiligen* (Cologne, 1786) pp. 150–151, writes on Scheibe: ‘Before being promoted to Kapellmeister at Denmark, Johann Adolph Scheibe spent some time in Thuringia, where he supplied various village cantors with Sunday church pieces consisting of a pair of recitatives and as many arias. As he always dispatched his duties with unbelievable speed, needing no more than a month to complete an entire Jahrgang, one of the village Amphions asked him how it was possible for him to compose a quantity of scores that the most industrious scribe could scarcely write out in fair copy in the same time. “It happens quite naturally,” answered Scheibe while he drew a freshly dipped pen across a piece of paper, here and there making strokes and blots. “I do the same on a piece of music paper and the substance of the composition is there, requiring only to be divided into measures.” Perhaps Scheibe was onto something, but only with regard to his own sorry work. He was no Josquin or Telemann, who thought quickly and beautifully. His strength lay in criticism, as did Agricola’s’ (quot. in Steven Zohn, ‘Images of Telemann: Narratives of Reception in the Composer’s Anecdote, 1750–1830’, *The Journal of Musicology*, 21 (2004), p. 465.

\textsuperscript{78} D-B, Mus ms. 21474/30.

mitunter vortrefflich declamirt sind, doch einer sehr magere Arbeit ist'.

The portrait of Scheibe (Fig. 1) was given by his family to Sorø Academy, and among the collection of The Royal Library one finds some items which according to the protocols of provenance were part of Scheibe’s estate such as the mentioned booklet to Patrioten (see Fig. 6).

Conclusion

Working on establishing a comprehensive list of Scheibe’s compositions is an overwhelming and complex task leading to many considerations as to what such a list ought to include of information and hence reflect. Is it a practical tool informing the scholar and interested alike in locating the surviving musical works only? Should it be a more comprehensive one including also the lost works as well as source descriptions and incipits? Or, should it not only be a practical reference tool but also include information revealing Scheibe’s involvement in the musical life and his importance to the intellectual establishment at that time? It is evident that Scheibe was acknowledged by many of his contemporaries as an influential music theorist and critic playing an active part in the musical life as well as the founding of musical societies. He had an extensive international network consisting of not only musicians and composers but also writers, poets, philologists, educators and historians. Though he might have been recognised as an able composer rather than one with a great talent, he exerted nevertheless enormous influence on the development of new musical trends, especially promoting for example German opera, the interest in children’s songs and the understanding of the distinction between recitative and declamation. At the same time, Scheibe’s many literary works (monographs and translations as well as detailed introductions to musical works) contain a wealth of information on music and society as it developed and flourished in Copenhagen during the second half of the eighteenth century. It is difficult to assess Scheibe as a composer, however, since a comprehensive work list has still not been established; indeed, such a list will also help sorting out which works may be ascribed to Scheibe with certainty and which may not. When a work list has been produced

80 DK-Kk, NKS 2836, 4o, letter to Weyse no. 215, dated 15 September 1832; other letters mentioning Scheibe are nos. 213a (1 April 1829), and 214 (27 June 1829).

81 DK-Kk, C II, 196 a (provenance: Scheibe’s estate).
it will be time for the Danish Centre for Music Publication to plan a critical edition of some of his most important and influential musical works such as the Passion oratories and cantatas.

SUMMARY

Peter Hauge: J.A. Scheibe and Copenhagen

Johann Adolph Scheibe (1708–1776), a German composer and theorist, settled in Denmark in 1740 employed as Christian VI’s new chapel master. He is, in particular, known for his periodical *Critischer Musikus* published during the years 1737–40 in which he includes a famous critique of J.S. Bach’s musical style. Though Scheibe was indeed a highly productive and popular composer in his day his works are rather unknown and the majority of them are only available in manuscript in the collections of The Royal Library, among other places.

The first part of the article deals with Scheibe’s connections with members of the circle of intellectual immigrants that settled in Copenhagen during the eighteenth century, which included J.E. Schlegel, F.G. Klopstock, H.W. Gerstenberg, J.A. Cramer and J.B. Basedow. The subjects in which they showed a great interest were for instance the relationship between text and music, but also subjects such as education, history (Scandinavian), language, religion and philology were given due attention.

The second part of the article discusses the problems involved in establishing a complete list of Scheibe’s works, in particular his compositions. For instance, should the list only include works that have survived or should it also include those which are referred to in contemporary sources such as newspapers, journals and published booklets but have since been lost? And how may such a list reflect Scheibe’s importance for the musical environment in Copenhagen during the second half of the eighteenth century?