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VITA
ABSTRACT

Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy’s Paulus, Op. 36 (1836) is one of the most important nineteenth-century contributions to the oratorio genre. Current scholarly understanding of the oratorio’s creation rests on three dissertations: Stuart Douglass Seaton identified, transcribed, and discussed some of the sketches for Paulus; Siegwart Reichwald examined the extant autographs for Paulus; and Jeffrey S. Sposato thoroughly documented the collaborative compilation of the libretto. None of these studies, however, provides a thorough examination of all the sketches for Paulus.

This study constitutes the first complete transcription of the sketches for Paulus, basing its methodology on the transcription practices of Joseph Kerman and Fabrizio Della Seta. Critical notes are provided alongside the transcriptions, and analyses based on comparisons of the sketches to the autograph and printed versions of the score are attempted. The results reveal new insights concerning the composition of Paulus, ranging from compositional details to structural planning and chronology of the sources. When compared to the various versions of the oratorio, for instance, the longer sketches demonstrate Mendelssohn’s concern for rhythmic continuity and harmonic planning. The sketches furthermore help clarify the complex chronology of the autograph scores. In addition to these findings, this study identifies two previously unidentified sketches pertaining to an aria from Paulus.
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

In addition to being one of the composer’s masterworks, Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy’s Paulus, Op. 36 is also one of the most important nineteenth-century contributions to the oratorio genre; composed between 1832 and 1837, it was premiered on 22 May 1836 at the Lower Rhine Music Festival in Düsseldorf.¹ Current scholarly understanding of the oratorio’s creation rests primarily on three dissertations: Douglass Seaton’s “A Study of a Collection of Mendelssohn’s Sketches and Other Autograph Material: Deutsche Staatsbibliothek Berlin Mus. Ms. Autogr. Mendelssohn 19,” Jeffrey Sposato’s “The Price of Assimilation: The Oratorios of Felix Mendelssohn and the Nineteenth-Century Anti-Semitic Tradition,” and Siegwart Reichwald’s “The Musical Genesis of Felix Mendelssohn’s Paulus.”² Seaton identifies and discusses many of the sketches for Paulus, Sposato thoroughly documents the collaborative compilation of its libretto, and Reichwald compares Mendelssohn’s autographs to the first published editions by Nikolaus Simrock.

Seaton’s 1977 dissertation examines one volume of sketches and other working materials Mendelssohn compiled and had bound together around 1845;³ “Mus. ms. autogr. Mendelssohn 19” (hereafter MN19),⁴ housed at the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek Berlin (scans of the 118-page

---

⁴ This form of abbreviation follows that used by Reichwald. Seaton refers to the same collection as “DSB19.”
collection are available for public access through the Staatsbibliothek’s Web site).\(^5\) Seaton’s dissertation provides a thorough physical description of MN19, attempts to identify all of the collection’s sketches and drafts, categorizes the various types of sketches and drafts, and provides sketch studies of three pieces found in the collection (the 42\(^{nd}\) Psalm, Op. 42; the Symphony No. 2 [Lobegesang], Op. 52; and the Symphony No. 3 [Scottish], Op. 56). Seaton identifies sixteen sketches in MN19 that are known to belong to various movements from \textit{Paulus}.\(^6\)

Like MN19, the two principal autograph scores, “Mus. ms. autogr. Mendelssohn 53” (MN53) and “Mus. ms. autogr. Mendelssohn 54” (MN54), once belonged to the collection in the Berlin Staatsbibliothek but were moved to Krakow’s Jagiellonian Library in 1945.\(^7\) MN53 contains the autograph score of the oratorio’s Part 1, whereas MN54 contains the autograph score of Part 2; both manuscripts contain a mixture of numbers with and without corrections.\(^8\) The Jagiellonian Library also houses an autograph of the piano-vocal score, “Mus. ms. autogr. Mendelssohn 55” (MN55), the Staatsbibliothek also the autographs of some discarded movements; various other archives house alternate autograph fragments of individual movements.\(^9\)

Research concerning the sketches in MN19 is sparse and inconclusive. As we have stated above, Seaton identifies sixteen sketches as belonging to \textit{Paulus}, but even though he transcribes and discusses some of them, a complete examination of the sketches’ significance lies beyond the scope of his dissertation. Seaton’s transcriptions, furthermore, contain some inaccuracies.

\(^5\) These scans can be viewed at the following Web site: \url{http://digital.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/dms/werkansicht/?PPN=PPN667644865}.


\(^7\) Wehner, \textit{Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy}, 18.

\(^8\) Ibid.

\(^9\) Ibid.
Reichwald’s attempts to trace Mendelssohn’s compositional process focus primarily on a comparison of the autograph full scores of MN53 and MN54 to the autograph piano-vocal score of MN55 rather than the sketches of MN19. To be sure, Reichwald does address the sketches, but his examinations are often cursory and purely descriptive. For instance, his discussion of the 129-measure continuity draft for “Mache dich auf,” the central chorus of Part 1, is relegated to a brief, three-sentence paragraph. ¹⁰ Reichwald neither discusses any musical details of the sketch nor does he draw any conclusions concerning its significance. Like Seaton, Reichwald provides occasional transcriptions of some sketches, but his transcriptions lack detail; they do not, for example, indicate canceled notes in the manuscript or identify details added by the editor. In some cases, Reichwald fails to even acknowledge the existence of a sketch at all.

Finally, Reichwald states that “MN19 does not contain enough material of Paulus to make specific statements about Mendelssohn’s working habits while working on the oratorio.”¹¹ The case, however, is not yet closed. The descriptive nature of Reichwald’s dissertation, the instances where Reichwald disregards certain sketches, and the inaccuracies and lack of detail in his and Seaton’s transcriptions leave room for further scholarly study. To date, no other scholars have fully examined MN19’s sketches for Paulus.

This thesis will retrace Reichwald’s steps, reexamining the sketches and uncovering any details Reichwald missed or omitted. We will follow the example of scholars such as Lewis Lockwood, William Kinderman, Philip Gossett, Douglass Seaton, and Fabrizio Della Seta, who have worked with nineteenth-century sketch materials. First, we will provide a complete

---

¹⁰ “MN19 contains a continuity draft of the chorus. While the main motivic material is already found in this draft, this source gives only an outline of this long and complex movement. The sections are shorter and unfocused, simply capturing the basic idea and direction of this movement.” Reichwald, The Musical Genesis of Felix Mendelssohn’s Paulus, 94.

¹¹ Reichwald, The Musical Genesis of Felix Mendelssohn’s Paulus, 204.
transcription of the *Paulus* sketches contained in MN19. Fabrizio Della Seta’s transcription of Giuseppe Verdi’s sketches for *La traviata* will serve as a model. We aim to create a transcription that achieves a high level of detail, indicating where notes and rests have been cancelled; identifying where new staves or systems begin; preserving details such as stem direction, accidentals, rests, etc. precisely as they appear in the original; and reproducing any text that appears with the sketch.

After presenting the transcriptions, we will compare the details of the sketches to the autographs and first printed versions of the score to determine what conclusions, if any, can be drawn about Mendelssohn’s working habits. Furthermore, we will highlight and answer other questions the sketches raise. For example, we hope to determine whether the sketches reveal anything about the chronology of the autographs or whether they tell us anything about the way in which Mendelssohn began planning the composition of *Paulus*.

Chapter 2 of this thesis sets the stage by synthesizing scholarship on sketch studies with an emphasis on the history of the field and typology of sketches. Chapter 3 provides a specific overview of the sources and editions of *Paulus*. Chapter 4 defines the methodology adopted in this study and introduces, discusses, and interprets the sketches for *Paulus*. And chapter 5, by way of a conclusion, reevaluates Reichwald’s assertion that the sketches contained in MN19 tell us little, if anything, about Mendelssohn’s compositional process. The principal goal, however, is the interpretation of the sketches or, at least, the facilitation of such an interpretation in the future.
CHAPTER 2: AN OVERVIEW OF SKETCH STUDIES: HISTORY AND TYPOLOGY

A Brief Survey of the History Sketch Studies

Sketch Studies: Origins through the 1950s

The musicological practice of sketch studies extends back to Gustav Nottebohm, the Beethoven scholar who laid the groundwork for the discipline. Born in Lüdenscheid in 1817, Nottebohm studied in Berlin and Leipzig before settling in Vienna in 1846, where he resided until his death in 1882. Throughout his life, he formed relationships with many important German musicians including Felix Mendelssohn, Robert Schumann, Johannes Brahms, and Joseph Joachim, and his writings would eventually have a dramatic impact on the field of Beethoven studies.¹²

Nottebohm was active at a time when German scholars laid the foundation for serious musicological study. He was involved in a wide array of activities such as editing the thematic catalogues of Beethoven’s and Schubert’s works and publishing articles on a variety of topics concerning music of the Baroque and Classical periods.¹³ His studies of Beethoven’s sketches soon came to be viewed as his most significant scholarly contributions: Ein Skizzenbuch von Beethoven: Beschrieben und in Auszügen dargestellt (1865), a series of essays from the Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung published under the title Beethoveniana: Aufsätze und Mittheilungen (1872), Ein Skizzenbuch aus dem Jahr 1803 (1880), and Zweite Beethoveniana: Nachgelassene Aufsätze von Gustav Nottebohm (published posthumously in 1887).¹⁴

¹⁴ Ibid., 141–42.
Nottebohm and his contemporaries were the first scholars to establish a chronology of Beethoven’s works by examining documentary evidence rather than relying on personal recollections of the composer.\footnote{Johnson, “Nottebohm, Gustav.”} As early as the late eighteenth century, musicians began to be fascinated by Beethoven’s sketches and to seek them out as collectables. Nottebohm examined as many of them as he could find and used them not only to establish a chronology of Beethoven’s works but also to compile a list of Beethoven’s unfinished projects.\footnote{Johnson, “Beethoven Scholars and Beethoven’s Sketches,” in 19th-Century Music 2, no. 1 (July 1978): 4.} Compared to his contemporaries—notably the American musicologist Alexander Wheelock Thayer—Nottebohm studied a greater number of sketches and applied a more scholarly method: he would describe a sketchbook, preserving the order in which the sketches appeared in the original document; include transcriptions of any significant examples; discuss what the sketches revealed about a piece’s conception or realization; and finally draw conclusions about the chronology of Beethoven’s works. As a result, Nottebohm’s findings were far more conclusive than those of his contemporaries.\footnote{Johnson, “Nottebohm, Gustav.”}

His transcriptions are a different matter, however: “he silently emended [the sketches], brought [them] into more or less conventional notation, abbreviated [them] at will, and rearranged [them] in an order designed to elucidate the compositional process.”\footnote{Joseph Kerman, introduction to Ludwig van Beethoven, Autograph Miscellany from circa 1786 to 1799: British Museum Additional Manuscript 29801, ff. 39–162 (The Kafka Sketchbook), ed. Joseph Kerman (London: The British Museum, 1970), xi.} Regardless of the inaccuracy of his transcriptions, Nottebohm’s studies were so extensive, so conclusive, and so seemingly definitive that in the ensuing decades, scholars accepted his methods, transcriptions, and conclusions without question. Some consulted Nottebohm’s transcriptions as though they were primary sources, never bothering to seek out the actual manuscripts. This was
certainly the case with Paul Mies, a German musicologist who studied musical style and compositional process, when, in 1925, he published his *Die Bedeutung der Skizzen Beethovens zur Erkenntnis seines Stiles*. In the study’s introduction, Mies writes: “the main material [of the study] is taken from the four works published by Nottebohm. I have also, of course, drawn on other sources, such as Schenker’s editions, Thayer’s biography, &c.”

Heinrich Schenker also relied heavily on Nottebohm’s transcriptions.

In Nottebohm’s wake, interest in Beethoven sketches grew quickly. In addition to the studies by Mies and Schenker mentioned above, the early 1900s saw the publication of articles that built upon Nottebohm’s findings, such as Georg Schünemann’s article in *Die Musik*, which applied Nottebohm’s methods to some previously unexamined sketches. The first published sketch facsimiles appeared in 1913 when Wilhelm Engelmann released an edition of sketches of the *Diabelli* Variations and the Ninth Symphony. Then, in 1927, came a facsimile of the sketches for two string quartets that included a commentary by Mikhail Vladimirovich Ivanov-Boretzky. In the same year, Karl Lothar Mikulicz published a complete transcription of a 91-leaf Beethoven sketchbook dating from 1800–1801.

Other scholars of the time attempted to apply the findings of sketch studies to support their analytical theories. The most notable was Schenker, who drew on the sketches to identify the essential thematic material, which in turn he used to demonstrate a work’s thematic unity. In

---

his analysis of Haydn’s “Die Vorstellung des Chaos” from *Die Schöpfung*, for instance, Schenker used a particular sketch to identify the principal motive (specifically, a three-note ascending scalar motive), which he then located in the composition’s background and foreground.\(^{25}\)

This series of sketch studies was brought to a halt by the Second World War and resumed only slowly during the ensuing decades. In the 1950s, scholars associated with the Beethovenhaus and the Beethoven-Archiv tried to revive interest by launching a complete transcription of all the Beethoven’s sketches. The project was supposed to follow the “diplomatic” method of transcription, presenting an exact replica of the autograph and without including editorial annotations. The first three volumes appeared in 1952, 1957, and 1961, respectively.\(^{26}\) Then in 1972, Sieghard Brandenburg was named general editor of the series. Influenced by a younger generation of American and English musicologists, Brandenburg moved away from diplomatic transcriptions and began to pair edited transcriptions with facsimiles of the autographs.\(^{27}\)

**New Directions, New Discussions**

Sketch studies flourished in the 1960s and 1970s when young scholars—Allen Forte, Lewis Lockwood, Alan Tyson, Joseph Kerman, and Douglas Johnson to name but a few—rediscovered the field. They began to expand the study of Beethoven’s sketches by examining the physical aspects of the sketchbooks and investigating their original structure. The examination of details such as watermarks, paper type, stitching, water damage, ink blots, tears in the paper, and other characteristics became more important. Through the study of these


\(^{26}\) Johnson, “Beethoven Scholars and Beethoven’s Sketches,” 10.

\(^{27}\) Ibid., 11.
physical aspects, the scholars mentioned above brought about two important advances in the study of Beethoven’s sketches: they were able to identify distinct sources that once had belonged together and reconstruct some of those that had been damaged.\textsuperscript{28}

The same scholars raised important questions about the aims and methods of sketch studies. One of the most debated topics was the relevance of sketches to analysis, an area of particular interest to Schenkerians. The issue is complex and harks back to Nottebohm, who felt that Beethoven’s sketches, though they clarify facts concerning the composer’s biography, revealed little about the steps of the compositional process:

If we understand [a piece of music] as an organic formation, we must assume that it arose organically and that it developed outwards into a unified whole. It is of course true that the sketchbooks, in which the firm, immutable material of the final composition appears, as it were, in flux, disclose something of the process of origin, discovery, formation etc. But we must understand quite clearly that there is much they do not reveal, and that we learn least of all from them about what we call “organic.”\textsuperscript{29}

Nottebohm’s goal was to use the sketches to establish facts about Beethoven’s biography, not to analyze Beethoven’s compositional process.\textsuperscript{30} Nearly a century after Nottebohm, Douglas Johnson, surveying several scholarly analyses and even referring back to Nottebohm’s advocacy of biography, argued against the use of sketches to aid theoretical analyses of a work:

The great growth of analytical technique in our own century … has led to a far more sophisticated discussion of internal relationships than was hitherto possible, and as our questions have become more sophisticated, so too must our resources…. It would be foolish to reject help from any quarter. So, then, we take another look at the sketches.

The results thus far are disappointing. Is there a single important analytical insight derived from the sketches which has become common knowledge among musicians? None that I’m aware of….\textsuperscript{31}

\textsuperscript{28} Ibid., 12.
\textsuperscript{30} Johnson succinctly summarizes Nottebohm’s stance on the sketches: “The sketches belong exclusively in the realm of biography and are irrelevant to analysis.” Johnson, “Beethoven Scholars and Beethoven’s Sketches,” 5.
\textsuperscript{31} Ibid., 13.
After critiquing several scholarly analyses (including one of his own), Johnson ultimately rejected any sort of analysis, theoretical or otherwise:

[The sketches’] biographical interest, though broad, seems to me insufficient to warrant the scope of the recent literature, much of which is frankly analytical. For whom are the editions and analyses intended? All this activity will have been a vacuous exercise indeed if the product turns out to be a luxury, created for its own sake by the Beethovenhaus and American doctoral programs and applauded reflexively with bicentennial and sesquicentennial enthusiasm.32

Joseph Kerman responded by pointing to the limited scope of Johnson’s critique: “As for ‘analysis,’ which Johnson felt could not be aided by sketch studies, he made it clear he was conceiving that term quite narrowly. The models he referred to were Schenkerian.”33 Later, Kerman added: “As historians we believe that finding the right analysis for a piece or a repertory is itself a subject for historical investigation. We should not leave any obvious stones unturned in this investigation, any more than we do in any other line of musicological inquiry.”34

Another important discussion concerned the necessity of truly diplomatic transcriptions. Since this issue is addressed in detail later in chapter 4, it will suffice here to say that scholars came to favor a method of transcription that paired facsimiles of the original documents with carefully edited transcriptions. Kerman’s Autograph Miscellany from circa 1786 to 1799 (1970), a transcription of the so-called “Kafka” sketchbook, exemplifies the new practice and has become a model of sketch transcription. Following a suggestion proposed decades earlier by Mikulicz, Kerman organized the sketches by work to facilitate the charting of a single piece’s genesis.35

32 Ibid., 16. Although Johnson’s statements have grave implications for the fundamental validity of the field, he concedes that “skepticism about the role of analysis in the study of the sketches need not be considered subversive to the discipline as a whole.” Ibid., 17.
34 Ibid., 179.
35 Johnson, “Beethoven Scholars and Beethoven’s Sketches,” 8.
While Beethoven scholars became increasingly involved in complex discussions about the aims and methods of sketch studies, others began to study the sketches of composers other than Beethoven. By 1982, Kerman was able to compile a substantial list of composers whose sketches had drawn scholarly attention:

Research that has come to my attention through articles, dissertations, and papers read at AMS meetings involves at least twenty composers and considerably more scholars—Bach, Mozart, Haydn, Rossini, Schubert, Schumann, Berlioz, Mendelssohn, Chopin, Liszt, Wagner (an especially important body of work), Verdi (despite the fact that his drafts are still kept under lock and key), Strauss, Debussy, Mahler, Stravinsky, Schoenberg, Berg, Webern, and Tippett. And more Beethoven. Then there was Jessie Ann Owens’s paper about Cipriano de Rore….36

Sketch studies maintained their prominence throughout the 1980s and 1990s. Scholars continued to draw fascinating new information from Beethoven’s sketchbooks even though they had been mined almost ceaselessly since the time of Nottebohm. In an article of 1991, for instance, William Drabkin examined the Beethoven sketchbooks in a way that allowed him to draw conclusions about Beethoven’s understanding of sonata form. Drabkin determined that Beethoven conceived sonata form in two parts: the “prima parte” or “erster Theil” referring to everything before the repeat sign (the exposition), and the “seconda parte” or “zweiter Theil” referring to everything after the repeat sign (the development, recapitulation, and coda when it is present). He furthermore showed that Beethoven used various abbreviations in his sketches to represent what some might call a “second subject,” more specifically, the thematic material that first appears in a secondary key of the exposition. Beethoven’s sketches refer variably to this event as “m.g.” (possibly “Mittel-Gedanke”), “Mi.S.,” or “M.S.” (possibly “Mittel-Satz”).37

Other significant publications of the 1980s and 1990s include Douglas Johnson, Alan Tyson, and

36 Kerman, “Sketch Studies,” 176.

During the 1990s, scholars began to study sketches of twentieth-century compositions, and in the new millennium they were able to reveal an array of working methods and materials as innovative and surprising as the music itself. Joseph Auner, for example, discovered that Arnold Schoenberg used distinct types of sketches for his twelve-tone compositions, including charts, slide rulers, and rotating wheels that helped him keep track of tone rows.\(^{38}\) In another study, Jeannie Guerrero discovered that some of Luigi Nono’s sketch collections contain counterpoint exercises from Paul Hindemith’s *Kompositionslehre*; Nono subsequently hid his familiarity with Hindemith’s composition manual from his progressive Darmstadt contemporaries.\(^{39}\) In a particularly innovative article, Kevin Dahan used John Chowning’s sketches and original programming code for *Stria* to study the sound spectra and organizational principles of the piece. This article marked a significant step in reconstructing *Stria* since, until just a few years ago, its only sources consisted of two distinct recordings and Chowning’s original code, which was written in an old programming language. Although Dahan’s article does not discuss the sketches for *Stria* in any detail, it represents an important step in the field of sketch studies: it is one of the first publications to analyze the sketches for a piece of computer music.\(^{40}\)

---


Types of Sketches

Sketches may reflect a variety of distinct moments or problems in the composition of a musical work. Yet, the term “sketch” has been equally applied to discarded folios, jottings of text and melodic ideas, graphical indications of the way in which a piece should unfold, and extended drafts of an entire work. In order to better understand these documents and their relationship to the compositional processes, several scholars have offered typologies of the sketches.

Not all types of sketches described below are applicable to every composer. Composers have distinct working methods, which may change from genre to genre or from one period in a composer’s career to another and thus result in a seemingly inconsistent corpus of sketches. Nonetheless, an overview of different types of sketches can help create a general understanding of the tools available to composers. The categories listed below are based on those presented in Barry Cooper’s *Beethoven and the Creative Process*; although Cooper’s work deals exclusively with Beethoven, it applies to other composers as well, including Mendelssohn.

The preliminary sketch (variably called concept sketch or thematic sketch) is the most basic sketch; it simply records an idea that may be used in a piece. This type of sketch tends to be relatively short, but the type of material included may vary. Possible examples include a

---

41 The idea of sketches existing to solve “compositional problems” is attributable to Stuart Douglass Seaton, “A Study of a Collection of Mendelssohn’s Sketches and Other Autograph Material,” 47.
42 Rossini is known to have sketched melodies by first writing a few notes, then drawing a line to indicate the general shape of the remainder of the melody. See Philip Gossett, “Compositional Methods,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Rossini*, ed. Emanuele Senici (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 74.
43 For “preliminary sketch,” see Fabrizio Della Seta, introduction to Giuseppe Verdi, *La traviata: Schizzi e abbozzi autografi*, ed. Fabrizio Della Seta (Parma: Istituto nazionale di studi verdiani, 2000), 43–5. For “concept sketch,” see Barry Cooper, *Beethoven and the Creative Process* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 104. For “thematic sketch,” see Seaton, “A Study of a Collection of Mendelssohn’s Sketches and Other Autograph Material,” 47. This thesis will use the term “preliminary sketch” as it is the term that has been most recently used (by Della Seta). Furthermore, “preliminary sketch” is more intuitive than “concept sketch” and not as narrow as “thematic sketch.”
sketch consisting of a motivic idea only a few notes in length or a sketch consisting of a melodic strain several measures long that includes harmonic cues. In any case, the composers simply wrote down ideas they wished to remember.\textsuperscript{44}

Whereas preliminary sketches consist of relatively short ideas, synopsis sketches provide an outline of large sections of music. Other names for this type of sketch include “work plan,” “movement plan,” “telescoped draft,” and “tonal overview.” Composers use synopsis sketches to plan large sections of music such as whole movements of a symphony or entire acts of an opera. The sketch helps the composer chart key areas and indicate the location where certain thematic material will be used. Although often verbal in nature, synopsis sketches sometimes also include notation of thematic material. Transitional material, however, is usually absent.

Figure 2.1 depicts a synopsis sketch for the first act of Verdi’s \textit{La traviata}. Spanning the entire recto of the folio, the sketch consists of thematic material (in this case the \textit{brindisi}) and verbal notes about the plot and several musical numbers (in this case the location where the act takes place, an instruction for Margherita—then the name of the character who would become Violetta—to repeat the brindisi after a short \textit{ripieno}, and, at the bottom, a plot summary of the tenor’s encounter with Margherita at the party).\textsuperscript{45}

The continuity draft also outlines large sections of music, usually on one to three staves.\textsuperscript{46} The content is largely thematic, but other features, such as harmony, contrapuntal figures, etc., may also be present. Continuity drafts help composers work out the actual unfolding of a section

\textsuperscript{44} Cooper, \textit{Beethoven and the Creative Process}, 104.
\textsuperscript{45} Cooper, \textit{Beethoven and the Creative Process}, 107.
\textsuperscript{46} Some scholars differentiate between the terms “sketch” and “draft,” traditionally setting the dividing line based on the perceived completeness of the manuscript. Most attempts to define the difference between the two terms have resulted in somewhat loose parameters that cannot be consistently upheld, but in a few specific cases, the differentiation is important. Wagner scholars, for instance, have long used the distinction to identify specific phases in Wagner’s creation of both his librettos and his compositions (see John Deathridge, “The Nomenclature of Wagner’s Sketches,” \textit{Proceedings of the Royal Music Association} 101 [1974]: 75).
Figure 2.1. Synopsis sketch for Act I of Verdi’s *La traviata* (Villa Verdi, S. Agata) of music by charting thematic material, shaping transitions, and giving a sense of the proportions of the various musical sections (and thus of the number of folios that would be needed).
Continuity drafts ultimately serve as the basis for the autograph score. When Verdi, for instance, had finished the continuity draft of an opera, he basically considered the compositional process to be complete; he would then create a skeleton score (the autograph score lacking most instrumental parts other than the bass line), from which a copyist could extract the vocal parts to be used in rehearsal.\footnote{Philip Gossett, \textit{Divas and Scholars: Performing Italian Opera} (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006), 497–98.}

Figure 2.2 shows a continuity draft for Schubert’s “Die Taubenpost” from \textit{Schwanengesang}, D. 957. The sketch encompasses the entire song (although Figure 2.2 depicts only the first page of the continuity draft) and consists of a melodic line with text underlay and an incomplete bass line. It is possible that Schubert did not complete the bass line because the unfolding of the melodic line superseded the harmonic progressions in importance. Notice that Schubert notated both the vocal line and the piano interludes on the same staff (as seen, for instance, at the end of the third system and the beginning of the fourth). This type of sketch allows the composer to lay out the entire composition with all the essential material in place.

Cooper devotes significant attention to a type of sketch called the score sketch, which consists of a passage of music on a number of staves greater than one to three:

In [score sketches] Beethoven was trying to combine some sense of horizontal continuity with the problem of sketching vertical harmony and texture. No longer would a single melodic line suffice to represent the flow of the music, and several parallel lines became necessary, although often not all the voices were filled in.\footnote{Cooper, \textit{Beethoven and the Creative Process}, 107.}

Cooper also addresses the visual similarity between score sketches and discarded sections of autograph scores. Although Cooper implies that score sketches constitute a category of their
Figure 2.2. Continuity draft of Schubert’s “Die Taubenpost” (Pierpont Morgan Library, Cary 63)
own, his discussion suggests that their real significance lies in their notation on more staves than
one to three and that they thus are a variant of other types of sketches (specifically, preliminary
sketches and continuity drafts). In other words, score sketches show us that composers can
sketch a musical idea on any number of staves.49

Cooper also draws attention to a type of sketch Nottebohm called the “brouillon.”
Nebulous in definition, the brouillon is “something between a sketch and a final score.”50
Although more developed than a continuity draft or a score sketch, a brouillon lacks the detail

49 Ibid., 107–8.
50 Ibid., 108.
found in an autograph score. Cooper explains that “the distinctions between score sketch and brouillon and between brouillon and Urschrift [the first draft of an autograph score] are often very fine, and the term ‘brouillon’ is therefore not much used in recent sketch literature.”

Oddities sometimes arise. Occasionally, a strange, unidentified type of sketch appears prominently in a sketchbook. Depending on the study, scholars may find it useful to identify a subcategory to facilitate discussion of the specific collection. Cooper, for example, identified a number of sketch-like passages in Beethoven’s sketchbooks as piano exercises. Douglass Seaton discovered a series of what he calls chorale sketches in the collection of Mendelssohn sketches discussed in this study. Neither of these categories is broad or ubiquitous enough to have played a significant role in the field of sketch studies. Nevertheless, the creation of subcategories can aid scholars in understanding the sketches of a single collection or of a specific composer.

At the risk of being contradictory, we must stress one final point: while typologies of sketches do help us understand, as stated above, the tools available to composers, attempts of categorizing individual sketches can sometimes result in misleading conclusions. In chapter 4 of this thesis, for instance, we categorize Mendelssohn’s sketch for the chorus “Herr, der du bist der Gott” (No. 1) as a preliminary sketch. Since the sketch is rather long (thirty-six measures, to be exact), its categorization as “preliminary” would appear to be inconsistent (“incomplete continuity draft” or “extended preliminary sketch” might be more appropriate). But modifying the names of the categories in this way seems to weaken the purpose of defining them in the first place. In the case of “Herr, der du bist der Gott,” moreover, the sketch seems to be less of an
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51 Ibid., 108.
52 Ibid., 110.
attempt at a large-scale draft and more of an instance where Mendelssohn simply wished to record an idea, albeit a lengthy one. Regardless of the nomenclature applied to the sketch, situations like these remind us that, in practice, we should always keep an open mind when attempting to interpret individual sketches.
CHAPTER 3: THE SOURCES AND EDITIONS OF PAULUS

Autographs and Manuscripts

Those who have studied the genesis of Mendelssohn’s *Paulus* have had at their disposal a relatively large number of autograph sources ranging from sketches to full scores. The culminating document, an autograph fair copy, however, does not seem to exist. A full investigation of the compositional process must thus rely on a comparison of the extant autographs to each other and the autograph sources to the first published editions of the score. Douglass Seaton and Siegwart Reichwald have studied these documents thoroughly and documented both their musical and physical aspects. Still, there is room for further contributions, ranging from a full transcription of the sketches to the interpretation of their role in the creative process and the reassessment of chronological issues of the later sources.

MN19

As we have mentioned in chapter 1, Mendelssohn in 1845 collected many of his autograph materials and had them bound into a set of volumes. Among these volumes is “Mus. ms. autogr. Mendelssohn 19” (MN19), now housed at the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek Berlin. Although Jeffrey Sposato concisely refers to the collection as “a sketchbook,” Douglass Seaton states that “it can best be classified as an ‘autograph miscellany,’ for it is a collection of several types of autograph material …, [including] short sketches, longer drafts, and a few pages which were apparently discarded from fair copies of completed works….” Seaton presents an

---

exhaustive inventory of the document, matching many of the MN19 sketches and drafts to published works by Mendelssohn. He also provides a physical description of the document, mentioning, among other details, its green covers and noting that the works represented in MN19 generally appear in the order in which Mendelssohn composed them. A librarian numbered the recto side of each leaf with odd numbers; the resulting numbering of MN19 thus indicates pages not folios.

Although Seaton’s interpretation of the structure of MN19 suggests that all the materials belonging to Paulus appear on pp. 1–14 of MN19, Reichwald states that “only pages 1 and 4–14 contain material from Paulus.” The assessment of this source can be further refined. Seaton identified sixteen distinct sketches and drafts for Paulus, including those for discarded movements (on pp. 1, 4–7, 10–11, and 14). Although it is clear that some sketches on the first fourteen pages pertain to works other than Paulus, the majority of the sketches remains unidentified. It is likely, however, that some of the unidentified sketches and drafts also pertain to Paulus. Evidence presented in chapter 4, for instance, suggests that some preliminary sketches on p. 7, which have to date remained unidentified, actually served as the basis for the accompaniment of the aria “Vertilge sie, Herr Zebooth” (No. 11).

**MN53 and MN54**

Like MN19, both “Mus. ms. autogr. Mendelssohn 53” (MN53) and “Mus. ms. autogr. Mendelssohn 54” (MN54) have green covers. These documents, once housed at the Deutsche
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60 Ibid., 4–15.
61 Ibid., 17.
62 Ibid., 20.
63 Ibid., 17.
65 These sketches have not been transcribed for this thesis.
Staatsbibliothek Berlin, were moved to the Jagiellonian Library in Krakow in 1945.\textsuperscript{68} MN53 contains an autograph full score of Part 1 of \textit{Paulus}, MN54 an autograph full score of Part 2.\textsuperscript{69}

Reichwald notes that “these scores do not represent just one stage of the compositional process; rather, Mendelssohn drew from several earlier autographs to arrive at these versions.”\textsuperscript{70} In other words, even though MN53 and MN54 comprise a complete score of \textit{Paulus}, Reichwald considers the two documents to be compiled of a mix of fascicles, some newly composed, others transferred from earlier drafts of movements. He continues that “the structure of MN53 is more complex than that of MN54. Paper changes are more frequent and there are more paste-overs and crossed-out pages.”\textsuperscript{71} Finally, he adds that “MN54 is a much cleaner and less revised manuscript than MN53.”\textsuperscript{72}

Although both scores are dated close to the premiere of \textit{Paulus} (22 May 1836),\textsuperscript{73} Sposito notes that the textbook printed for the premiere as well as its draft “… occasionally contain texts which differ from these manuscripts [MN53 and MN54]. Given that these alternate texts in the textbook often agree with the final published score, they are undoubtedly of later composition and reflect a different, lost [autograph] score of the true first version of the work.”\textsuperscript{74} Sposito’s conclusion clarifies that even at the time of their completion, MN53 and MN54 represented a version of \textit{Paulus} that was still in flux; however close they may have been to the version performed at the premiere, the autographs do not reflect Mendelssohn’s final conception of \textit{Paulus}.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{68} Wehner, \textit{Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy}, 18.
\item \textsuperscript{69} Reichwald, \textit{The Musical Genesis of Felix Mendelssohn’s Paulus}, 20.
\item \textsuperscript{70} Ibid., 20–1.
\item \textsuperscript{71} Ibid., 21.
\item \textsuperscript{72} Ibid., 22.
\item \textsuperscript{73} Ibid., 20. MN53 is dated 8 April 1836, MN54 18 April 1836.
\item \textsuperscript{74} Sposito, “The Price of Assimilation,” 1:233.
\end{itemize}
The Jagiellonian Library also houses an autograph version of a piano-vocal score of *Paulus*: “Mus. ms. autogr. Mendelssohn 55” (MN55). Since MN55 has brown covers rather than green ones, Reichwald suggests that MN55 may have been bound at a different time than have MN53 and MN54. Unlike MN53 and MN54, MN55 contains both parts of the oratorio.

The revisions found in MN55, as well as the document’s relationship to MN53 and MN54, are complex. Reichwald states that “as is the case with the full score of *Paulus* contained in MN53 and MN54, MN55 is also a compilation made up of earlier drafts together with new material….“ He furthermore notes that in MN55 “the second part [of the oratorio] … shows heavier revision than the first part.” Sposato neatly summarizes the complexity of MN55:

While most of the score mirrors the first version full-score manuscript [comprised of MN53 and MN54] …, it also contains versions of numbers which clearly predate and postdate it. In the former category are the dozens of corrections contained in the piano-vocal score, most of which are reflected in [MN53 and MN54]. The piano-vocal score also includes cross-outs of some arias (even some of those which would eventually appear in the first version full score) and pencil notations indicating where additional arias would eventually be placed. In addition, the score contains several aborted attempts at pieces, including an alternative version of “Vertilge sie,” a second *Stollen* in the “Wachet auf” chorale …, and a Part II opening chorus based on [the] text …“Die Nacht ist vergangen…."

Segments of the piano-vocal score which postdate [MN53 and MN54] include Recitative 24 [“Und Ananias ging hin”], which describes Paul’s baptism and preaching of Christ, and Recitative 32, “Paulus aber und Barnabas sprachen frei und öffentlich,” both of which match the final published score.
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75 Wehner, *Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy*, 18.
77 Ibid.
78 Ibid.
79 Ibid.
Other Autograph and Manuscript Sources

“Mus. ms. autogr. Mendelssohn 28” (MN28), housed at the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek Berlin,\(^{81}\) contains several movements that were rejected from *Paulus* as well as autograph material from other works by Mendelssohn.\(^{82}\) Scans of MN28 are, unfortunately, not available through the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek’s Web site and thus have not been consulted.

Reichwald discusses three other autograph sources for *Paulus*, each consisting of only a single leaf. The first, held at the Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal de Musique in Brussels, belonged to an early full-score setting of the chorus “Steiniget ihn” (No. 7);\(^{83}\) the second, held at the Hessische Landes- und Hochschulbibliothek Darmstadt, to a vocal-score setting of the discarded aria “Doch der Herr er leitet der Irrenden recht”; and the third, held at the Stanford University Library, to the duet “So sind wir nun Botschafter” (No. 24).\(^{84}\) These leaves have not been consulted, since no sketch is known to exist for any of these movements.

Three other manuscript sources are extant. One, housed at the New York Public Library, is a non-autograph copy of a piano-vocal score that is close but not identical to MN55. It bears an inscription by Julius Rietz that suggests that it represents the version performed at the premiere. Another copy, “Mus. ms. autogr. Mendelssohn 20,” is housed at the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek Berlin and contains, in Marie Mendelssohn’s hand, a piano-vocal score of the aria “Doch der Herr er leitet die Irrenden recht.” Finally, the Bodleian Library houses a copy of the discarded aria “Der du die Menschen läßt sterben.” The latter two manuscripts, once

\(^{81}\) Wehner, *Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy*, 18.
\(^{83}\) Reichwald mislabels this movement as No. 9.
\(^{84}\) Ibid., 25–6.
collected by the singer Franz Hauser, were published posthumously under the title *Zwei geistliche Lieder*, Op. 112.\(^8^5\)

**Full and Partial Editions of Paulus**

Early editions of *Paulus* include Nikolaus Simrock’s 1836 advance printing of the oratorio’s choral parts for the premiere. Later that year, Simrock published a piano-vocal score, and the following year a full score. The year 1837 also saw the publication, by J. Alfred Novello, of the version with English text, titled *St. Paul* (both in full score and piano-vocal score). In 1842, M. Schlesinger and Richault, followed with distinct French editions of the piano-vocal score, titled *La conversion de St. Paul*, and in 1844, Martelli added an Italian edition of the piano-vocal score, titled *S. Paolo*.\(^8^6\)

Novello & Co. continued to issue reprints of the piano-vocal score throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Because the firm issued so many editions and because most of these do not contain information regarding the date of publication, it is difficult to determine exactly how many were released. A WorldCat search for the keywords “Mendelssohn,” “St. Paul,” and “Novello” suggests that, between 1837 and the early 1900s, Novello may have issued as many as fifteen editions of *St. Paul*, if not more.

The earliest critical edition of *Paulus* appeared in Julius Rietz’s complete edition of Mendelssohn’s works, published between 1874 and 1877.\(^8^7\) Between 1960 and 1977, the Internationale Felix-Mendelssohn-Gesellschaft released its own complete edition of Mendelssohn’s works,\(^8^8\) with plate numbers identical to those of Rietz’s edition. Edwin F.
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\(^8^5\) Ibid., 26–7.
\(^8^6\) Wehner, *Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy*, 19.
Kalmus & Co. also released an edition of *Paulus* (1970);\(^9\) although it does not include plate numbers, a comparison of the publication to the two aforementioned editions reveals that the plates are identical.

Recent editions of *Paulus* include a 1997 critical edition in full score edited by R. Larry Todd and published by the Carus-Verlag.\(^9\) In addition, the Bärenreiter-Verlag published Urtext editions of the full score and piano-vocal score, both edited by John Michael Cooper in 2007 and 2008, respectively.\(^9\) A new Leipzig complete edition of Mendelssohn’s works, edited by Ralph Wehner and the Sächsische Akademie der Wissenschaften, has been in progress since 1997.\(^9\)

For reasons both practical and economical, this study’s comparison of the autograph sources of *Paulus* to its final version generally relies on the 2008 Bärenreiter Urtext edition of the piano-vocal score and, when necessary, the study score of Larry Todd’s 1997 critical edition published by the Carus-Verlag.\(^9\)

One significant difference between early and modern editions of *Paulus* concerns the numbering of the movements. Early editions of *Paulus* begin the numbering after the overture;\(^9\) the opening chorus “Herr, der du bist der Gott” was thus No. 1. Recent editions, such as those by Larry Todd and Michael Cooper, begin the numbering with the overture. These solutions have thus led to a discrepancy between the numbering of the critical and Urtext editions on the one hand and the numbering used in academic writing (which follows the early editions), on the

\(^{92}\) Leipziger Ausgabe der Werke von Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy, ed. Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel, in progress).
\(^{94}\) Specifically, the 1837 publications by Simrock and Novello as well as that by Rietz (1877).
other. In studies concerning the genesis of *Paulus*, the matter is further complicated by the numbering of MN53, MN54, and MN55 (the autograph sources henceforth collectively called “the scores”), which follow an entirely different numbering due to major revisions made to the oratorio after its premiere and in preparation for its publication. This study adopts the numbering which appears in the early editions for two reasons: it is used by Seaton, Reichwald, and Sposato and seems to reflect Mendelssohn’s intentions.
CHAPTER 4: THE PAULUS SKETCHES: METHODOLOGY, TRANSCRIPTION, AND ANALYSIS

Transcribing Sketches: Methodology

Sketches are private documents, not intended to be read by anyone but the composer and certainly not intended to be published. Scholars nonetheless have tried to read them, make sense of them, and even reproduce them in an intelligible and informative way, carefully preserving such details as notational errors and cancellations. Discussing the differences between the preparation of an edition of sketches and a critical edition of a work, Fabrizio Della Seta addresses the importance of such details:

[A critical edition] aims at restoring a text that represents as far as possible the composer’s intentions, going beyond the mere material data supplied even by the autograph. At the same time it intends to offer the performer a text of practical use. Therefore errors that have been verified are corrected, ambiguities clarified and gaps filled in; and, in the face of variants, the editor has a duty to choose the one which in his opinion represents the author’s final idea (at least at a given moment), mentioning the alternative readings in the apparatus criticus. On the other hand, the edition of the sketches sets out to provide documents that help reconstruct the intellectual process whereby the [work] reached completion. In this process errors, gaps and variants are no longer seen as superseded moments but as meaningful clues as to the composer’s vacillations, decisions and second thoughts. The edition must therefore offer the reader a complete picture of all the information contained in the manuscript material, giving the different readings the same importance irrespective of the order in which they were composed.95

The crucial question is, of course, how much detail to include.

In the 1950s, the aims and rhetoric specific to sketch transcription revolved around a central idea: the “diplomatic” transcription. Dagmar Weise’s edition of the sketchbook for Beethoven’s Sixth Symphony exemplified the “diplomatic” transcription in its attempt to create an exact reproduction of the autograph, preserving all aspects of the sketches—mistakes,

95 Della Seta, introduction to Verdi, La traviata: Schizzi e abbozzi autografi, 65.
measurements, and all—and avoiding any editorial intervention. In a review of Weise’s work, Lewis Lockwood rejected the idea of a truly diplomatic transcription on the grounds that “the two necessary phases—decipherment and interpretation—are not fully separable….” A few years later, Philip Gossett echoed Lockwood’s concern, championing carefully edited transcriptions (when paired with facsimiles): “With documents as complex as Beethoven’s sketches, a transcription which does not strive to be an interpretation courts incoherence. We too easily prefer the safety of quasi-scientific ‘diplomacy’ to solutions in which our intellect must also participate.” Discussing the “basic conditions” of sketch transcription, Regina Busch added:

Every reproduction, every duplication, every manuscript copy of any source is a transcription…. A transcription does not present the original document and cannot be understood as identical to it. The facsimile of a manuscript, the print of a fair copy, and the reproduction of a printed text in any medium are all adaptations, regardless of the degree to which they “faithfully reproduce” the source.

If, as Lockwood suggests, decipherment and interpretation are inseparable, a transcription will always bear the interpretive thumbprint of its transcriber. Still, a careful balance between the diplomatic and the interpretive aspects of transcription is necessary.

Many practical problems complicate the transcription and edition of sketches. A few general practices can be used to solve most problems. Standard editorial marks can be included to represent details that the editor has added or altered. Brackets, question marks, and the word
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97 Lewis Lockwood, review of *Ludwig van Beethoven*, 136.

98 Philip Gossett, “Beethoven’s Sixth Symphony: Sketches for the First Movement,” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 27, no. 2 (Summer 1974): 249. While Kerman’s edition of the Kafka sketchbook was the first major edition of a sketchbook to provide both facsimiles and edited transcriptions, Nathan Fishman had, in fact, already attempted an edition of the Wielhorsky sketchbook in 1962; it followed a similar model.

“[sic]” will draw attention to many issues. Broken lines can also be used in some cases, for instance when adding a tie or a flag to a note. When editors consciously interfere, they always draw attention to the interference in the critical commentary so as to maintain the integrity of the transcription.

One of the primary problems facing editors is penmanship. Questions of legibility arise even when dealing with composers whose writing is clear. Often, the editor’s sense of what is musically correct will serve as a guide. For example, if the position of a single note head within a scalar passage is unclear, the editor can usually determine the intended note based on its melodic context. If editors cannot, however, safely draw a sound conclusion, they should present their best guess in the transcription, drawing attention to the uncertainty by placing a question mark or an alternative reading above the note and logging an explanation in the critical commentary. Issues of paleography may further complicate the reading of a sketch. Even in cases where the composer writes with a legible hand, editors may be faced with outdated styles such as the German Kurrentschrift.

Composers often abbreviate or omit musical details that are immediately comprehensible to them. They might omit, for example, the clef, key signature, or time signature. As a general rule, editors place any determinable clefs, key signatures, and time signatures in brackets at the beginning of a transcription. Identifying the time signature of a sketch rarely presents a problem, since the meter is easily discernible when it is consistent.

Identifying the key of a sketch of tonal music can be problematic when no key signature is present. Still, the editor’s sense of style can allow him or her to draw conclusions. Familiar melodic constructs (period structures, sentence structures, etc.) can provide strong indications of the tonal center of a sketch. Likewise, its beginning and ending pitches will often suggest the
tonic, depending on the completeness of the melody. Harmony or counterpoint, too, can suggest a key. In many cases, the comparison of a sketch to a later version (including the final one) of the piece is the best way of determining the sketch’s key signature.

Identifying the clef can be tricky as well. When the sketch appears on a grand staff, the top staff will usually require a treble clef, the bottom usually a bass clef. But composers do not necessarily sketch on grand staves and, worse, may mentally change clefs in the middle of a passage of music. Furthermore, eighteenth- and nineteenth-century composers regularly used clefs that are less common today—specifically, movable C-clefs. Cooper alludes to this problem for the editor:

Usually the clef of a single-stave draft can be deduced by reference to the final version of the work but sometimes the sketch is too short, unclear, or unfamiliar for this to be done. The problem is compounded in material such as the sketches for the duet ‘So ruhe dann’ in Christus am Ölberge, which use not just treble and bass but soprano and tenor clefs too, without usually indicating which is intended.  

Occasionally, the clef will be indeterminable. In this case, the editor should present the various possible readings and discuss the ambiguity in the critical commentary.

The process of transcribing the actual content of a sketch challenges editors to make decisions that are to some degree subjective. They need to decide which details should be strictly preserved and which details should be corrected or standardized for facilitated reading. If every detail is strictly preserved, editors risk creating a diplomatic transcription that may ultimately be more trouble than the finished product is worth. If, however, they do not take pains to preserve the original document’s details, they risk misrepresenting the steps of the compositional process. Busch discusses some of the details that can be freely modified in transcription:

As long as the essential aspects for the signification of a given document have been preserved, other inconsequential elements can be ignored: the length of note stems, the exact way in which round or square note heads are written, the thickness of beams, etc.
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Sometimes even the placing of signs before, after, above or below notes (braces, arpeggio indications, accents) and the relative size of signs can be seen as irrelevant. The idiosyncrasies and personal variants of handwriting are also normally not transcribed. The fact that a crotchet rest, a clef or an accidental was written and where it appears in the document are far more significant than how they are written.\(^\text{101}\)

In his transcription of Beethoven’s “Kafka” sketchbook, Kerman freely changed note spacing and stem direction and omitted the staves of a sketch that were left entirely blank.\(^\text{102}\) He did, however, preserve cancellations, of which he described two types: the first includes notational errors the composer fixed, the second modifications of a phrase or passage as part of the compositional process. Whether the cancellation affected a single note or entire measures, Kerman presented the original version in smaller print with a cancellation mark.\(^\text{103}\)

In transcribing Verdi’s *Traviata* sketches, Della Seta added flags and dots to notes and filled in rests but only “…when confirmed absolutely by the musical sense, the context and the version to be found in the definitive score.”\(^\text{104}\) In cases where the note values do not add up to the number of required beats in a measure, Della Seta drew attention to the measure by using “*[sic]*.”\(^\text{105}\) He also preserved obvious notational errors caused by misplaced note heads or superfluous ledger lines, again drawing attention to them with “*[sic]*.”\(^\text{106}\) Finally, in cases where Verdi had obviously omitted an accidental, Della Seta added the accidental to the transcription in brackets.\(^\text{107}\)

The method of transcription used in this study adheres closely to Della Seta’s. Every attempt has been made to preserve the details of Mendelssohn’s original manuscript in a transcription that is both clear and accurate. The present transcription relegates canceled notes or
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\(^{101}\) Busch, “Transcribing Sketches,” 87.
\(^{102}\) Kerman, introduction to Beethoven, *Autograph Miscellany from circa 1786 to 1799*, ix.
\(^{103}\) Ibid., x.
\(^{104}\) Ibid., x.
\(^{105}\) Della Seta, introduction to Verdi, *La traviata: Schizzi e abbozzi autografi*, 68.
\(^{106}\) Ibid., 69.
\(^{107}\) Ibid.
rests to an ossia staff. Ossia staves always appear above the staff to which they pertain. In cases where multiple canceled notes occur simultaneously, Della Seta placed each canceled note on its own, short ossia staff, but the present transcription prefers to place canceled notes on a single, continuous ossia staff when they belong to the same layer of revision. When multiple layers are present in the manuscript, each layer appears on its own ossia staff with later ones appearing closer to the latest one on the main staff (see Figure 4.1). Cancelled lyrics also appear on ossia staves. Ossia staves do not include clefs, key signatures, or time signatures, as they are meant to be interpreted as extensions of the main staff. Our method also attempts to differentiate whenever possible the composer’s mistakes from the composer’s revisions of a passage by adding “[sic]” above misplaced note heads, excessive rhythmic values, and other similar notational errors. In such cases, explanations are always provided in the critical commentary.

As a general rule, the present transcription places brackets around any symbol that does not appear in the manuscript but has been added for clarity (e.g., rests and accidentals). These additions only appear in the transcription when the composer’s intent is absolutely clear. Bracketed rests have often been added to facilitate the reading of measures that contain multiple

Figure 4.1. Ossia staves representing various layers of revision
voices on a single staff. Clefs, key signatures, and time signatures are transcribed in brackets when no indication is present in the manuscript.

At times, the editor has altered the rhythm of a passage. One common alteration is the addition of a stem to a note head (in which case the stem is rendered as a broken line), a dot to a note head, or a flag to a stem. In his transcription of the Traviata sketches, Della Seta simply bracketed the former sign and reproduced the latter in dotted script;¹⁰⁸ in our case, limitations of the notation software prohibit this solution. In the present edition, when the editor has added a dot or flag, the original note value of the manuscript appears in smaller typeface above or below the note that has been modified (see Figure 4.2). A discussion is then provided in the critical commentary.

![Manuscript version containing notational errors](image1)

![Corrected version as it appears in transcription](image2)

Figure 4.2. Correction of rhythmic errors

Bar lines are carefully preserved in the transcription and appear exactly as they do in the manuscript. The editor has taken great care to preserve the ending bar lines, when present, of each sketch. In the Paulus sketches, Mendelssohn ends some sketches with a double bar line. These are not interpreted as final bar lines in the transcription since Mendelssohn typically indicates the end of a piece or movement with a double bar line followed by a symbol

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 68–69.
resembling a backwards letter “S.” In the former case, the transcription reproduces an ordinary double bar line, in the latter a final bar line. When the bar line is missing at the end of a sketch in the manuscript, no ending bar line appears in the transcription. Dotted bar lines are also used in the rare instances of a missing bar line within a sketch.

Measure numbers have been added to the transcriptions without further note. Empty measures in the manuscript remain empty in the transcription. Empty staves in the transcription continue up to the line break, after which they are omitted.

In some studies, scholars view the direction of note stems in sketches as relatively inconsequential. But because Mendelssohn sketched Paulus’s four-part choir music on a grand staff, the stem direction is critical in interpreting the voice leading. For this reason, the present transcription preserves the stem directions of notes as they appear in the manuscript. There are, however, some rare instances when the editor has changed the stem direction to facilitate the reading of a passage. In such instances, the manuscript itself is often problematic in that the composer allowed multiple notational symbols to collide with one another. Whenever a stem direction has been changed, attention is drawn to it with an asterisk and a discussion in the critical commentary.

In the present transcription, numbers in rounded boxes identify the location of each measure in the manuscript. In Figure 4.3, m. 1 appears in the manuscript on the eleventh staff of the fourth page. Page numbers are not repeated for subsequent staves; thus, the manuscript location of m. 3 of Figure 4.3 would be the twelfth staff of the fourth page. Occasionally, composers extend the notation of a sketch beyond the drawn staves of a manuscript into the margin. In such cases, “marg.” is added to the staff location (see the m. 7 of Figure 4.3).109 In
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109 Della Seta uses this solution in his Traviata transcriptions but labels the pertinent mm. “bis.” See, for example, Verdi, La traviata: Schizzi e abbozzi autografi, 130 and facsimiles, fascicle X, 4.
cases where multiple sketches appear on a single staff, the number includes a lower case letter to further clarify the location within the staff. Measures 9–14 of Figure 4.3 represent part of a sketch that begins on the second staff of the manuscript’s page. The sketch is then interrupted by an intervening one on the same staff; the intervening sketch would begin at “2b” but does not appear in the transcription, as it is not part of the relevant sketch. The latter then continues at “2c.”

Figure 4.3. Explanation of manuscript location identifiers

Lyrics have been transcribed in a format that adheres to standard practice of syllabification. At times, the music and text of a vocal part in the manuscript do not line up properly. For example, vocal parts occasionally contain notes that do not have a syllable of text associated with them. These instances are transcribed exactly as they appear in the manuscript; no attempt has been made to standardize the text underlay. The beaming of vocal lines has occasionally been altered to adhere to standard typesetting conventions, which require that the

110 Labeling the page and staff locations in the manuscript in this way is particularly helpful with the *Paulus* sketches as it matches Douglass Seaton’s table of contents for MN19.
notes in a vocal line only be beamed when they share a single syllable of text. In such cases, a bracket appears above the notes to reflect the original beaming as it appears in the manuscript.

In addition to lyrics, the sketches for *Paulus* contain annotations Mendelssohn added to clarify such ideas as the voicing of a passage of music, alternations between instruments and voices, or the beginning of a new section of music. Many of the sketches contain what Seaton calls “textual incipits,” which Mendelssohn used to indicate the text of a passage without actually setting the lyrics to music. 111 No attempt has been made to syllabify these notes in the transcription or to change their format in any way.

Whenever the editor has included an element in the transcription that is based strongly on conjecture, a bracketed question mark appears above the staff and the solution is discussed in the critical commentary. In other cases, an asterisk appears in the transcription in places where the editor wishes to draw the reader’s attention to a problem discussed in the critical commentary.

**The Sketches for *Paulus*: Transcription and Analysis**

**No. 1. Chor: Herr, der du bist der Gott**

A detailed preliminary sketch for *Paulus*’s opening chorus “Herr, der du bist der Gott” (see Figures 4.4 and 4.5) occupies the middle half of p. 1 of MN19. It is preceded by an unidentified sketch in A major and followed by a few brief preliminary sketches for other pieces.

Although the sketch differs greatly from the later versions melodically and harmonically, the sections of the sketch clearly served as a basis for the final version: mm. 1–10 of the sketch relates to mm. 9–17 of the final version, mm. 17–24 of the sketch to mm. 25–33 of the final version (both examples are contrapuntal and share similar rhythms), and mm. 28–36 of the

111 Seaton, “A Study of a Collection of Mendelssohn’s Sketches and Other Autograph Material,” 70.
sketch to the section in the final version beginning with m. 46. The following paragraphs lay out and interpret some of the revisions section by section.

In the final version, the choral parts begin with an emphatic threefold declamation of the word “Herr.” Mendelssohn set the text to a succession of three chords: A major, A dominant seventh, and D major in second inversion. The same three chords appear in the sketch as well as in MN53 and MN55. The cancelled c’’-sharp in m. 3 of the sketch already hints at the modifications in voice leading Mendelssohn would make in MN53 and MN55 (reflected also in the final version). The final version ultimately adheres closely to the voice leading found in the sketch; the only difference is the tenor’s c’-sharp in m. 3 of the sketch, which Mendelssohn changed to an e’ in m. 11 of the final version.

---

Figure 4.5. Transcription of the preliminary sketch for No. 1
With m. 6 of the sketch, the music begins to deviate from that of the scores. In the latter, Mendelssohn cut the three beats of rest that appear in m. 6 of the sketch, producing a phrase that flows more seamlessly from the opening “Herr” to the statement of “der du bist der Gott.” In m. 14 of MN53, Mendelssohn had initially written out the same soprano melody that appears in m. 17 of MN19 but made revisions to the pitches of the soprano part and, consequently, to the alto and tenor parts (see Figure 4.6).\footnote{Ibid., 56.} In mm. 14–17 of MN53, Mendelssohn also reworked the
harmonies in mm. 7–10 of MN19. MN19 presents a straightforward harmonic structure that ends on a half cadence on E major (m. 10); MN53 uses similar harmonies in a condensed form, this time placing them over a pedal and ending the phrase on an authentic cadence (m. 17, not pictured here). All of these revisions made in MN53 were preserved in both MN55 and the final version.

Although mm. 11–16 of MN19 deviate musically from the scores, a comparison of the rhythm of the sketch to the lyrics of the final version suggests that these measures comprise a setting of the text “der Himmel und Erde und das Meer gemacht hat.” Bearing this in mind, the sketch seems to represent a homophonic setting of the text characterized by half-note declamations of the words “Himmel” and “Erde” with rests awkwardly separating each element (“Himmel,” “Erde,” “Meer”). Mendelssohn set the text differently in the scores, preserving the homophonic texture but repeating text to avoid its interruption by rests (see mm. 18–25 of the final version).
Once again, by comparing the rhythm of the sketch to the lyrics of the final version, we can infer that mm. 17–24 of MN19 represent an imitative setting of the text “Herr der du bist der Gott,” which features alternation between the bass and the upper parts. A corresponding passage, identical in length, appears in mm. 26–33 of the final version. The sketch and the final version share similar rhythmic features such as the five-note rhythmic motive on “der du bist der Gott,” which is identical in both versions. Additionally, the final version’s long notes on “Herr,” which are tied across the bar line (beginning in m. 25), seem to have been derived from the tenor, alto, and bass parts of the sketch (mm. 17, 19, and 21, respectively). The melodic content of the two versions, however, is distinct. The imitation in the final version is less formulaic than that of the sketch, with points of entry moving freely between the voices, sometimes slightly altering the melody. The passage is identical in all scores.

Measures 25–27 of the sketch contain three long chords that close the first formal section. The three chords are reminiscent of the opening on “Herr” and nicely round out the chorus’s first section. In the scores, Mendelssohn extended the homophonic passage; in the final version it occupies a span of twelve measures, beginning in m. 34. Although the longer versions of this passage lend the end of the first section a greater sense of finality, Mendelssohn had to sacrifice the reiteration of the opening chords.

A rhythmic examination of the sketch’s remaining nine measures suggests that they are based on the text “Die Heiden lehnen sich auf.” The final version’s corresponding setting begins in m. 46. Although the sketch’s melodic content differs from the scores, Mendelssohn did preserve the same rhythmic figures. He also maintained the section’s imitative texture and its modulation to F-sharp minor.
Critical notes:

1 Upper staff: A smudge appears in the key signature (on the d'' line). Although the presence of an extra sharp on that line would identify the key of the sketch as E major, Mendelssohn most likely made a simple error in writing the key signature, then blotted it out.

9 Upper staff: The note head of the alto part’s first e’ looks like an elision with a smaller note head on f’-sharp. Perhaps Mendelssohn began writing f’-sharp and, in the same pen stroke, realized that he needed an e’ to complete the A major chord.

9 Upper staff: The second alto e’ lies low on the staff line—so low, in fact, that it looks like a d’. Because the canceled f’-sharp (presumably also intended to be e’) immediately above the note leaves little space for the e’, and because e’ makes better harmonic sense, it seems clear that e’, not f’-sharp or d’, was Mendelssohn’s intended note.

9 Lower staff: The canceled notes on the fourth beat are completely covered by the strikethrough. They have been transcribed as a dyad consisting of a and f-sharp based solely on the marking’s position on the staff.

10 Mendelssohn originally seems to have repeated in mm. 9–10 the rhythm of mm. 7–8 (with a rest on the fourth beat). He then realized that he needed an upbeat to 11 and squeezed in a dyad on each system. The bass note was originally a whole note. Mendelssohn failed to erase the original rests and the augmenting dots.

23 Upper staff: Although the stem on the dotted half note e’ is clearly separated from the e’'-sharp in the manuscript, transcribing it as such only serves to further complicate an already cluttered spot. The two notes have thus been transcribed with a single stem.
24 Upper staff: The dotted half note $a'$ has been transcribed as sharing a stem with the $b'$ for the same reason given in note 23. The dot on the $b'$ can be seen inside of the note head of $a'$. The $a'$ itself seems to be missing a dot which has been added in the transcription.

24 Upper staff: The $d'$-sharp at the beginning of the measure was originally a half note, which Mendelssohn filled in and to which he added a dot, changing the rhythmic value to that of a dotted quarter note.

26 The “[sic]” alerts to the dotted quarter rests, which are an eighth too long.

34 Lower staff: Mendelssohn failed to cross out the dotted eighth-note $g$-sharp on the second beat between the note heads of the $a$ and $f$-sharp. It is nonetheless clear that Mendelssohn intended the $b$ and $g$-sharp to be canceled in favor of the $a$ and $f$-sharp.

36 Upper staff: Mendelssohn failed to cross out the sixteenth-note $f'$-sharp. The dotted eighth note immediately preceding it, however, is crossed out, making it clear that Mendelssohn preferred $e'''$-sharp in the alto part.

No. 2. Choral: Allein Gott in der Höh sei Ehr

Of the five chorales in Paulus, “Allein Gott in der Höh sei Ehr” (see Figures 4.7 and 4.8) is the only one to appear in both MN19 and the final score. Like many traditional Lutheran chorales, it is in bar form (AAB). In the sketch, Mendelssohn did not write out the repetition of the A section, presumably because he intended to repeat it exactly. The music of Paulus rarely
repeats the same music in exactly the same way, however, often changing the harmonic or contrapuntal accompaniment with the repetition of a melody.

The opening chorale in early drafts of the libretto is “Ach bleib mit deiner Gnade,” but the scores all use “Allein Gott in der Hôh sei Ehr.” MN53 places the chorale between two recitatives that follow the chorus “Herr, der du bist der Gott.” For the final version, however, Mendelssohn placed “Allein Gott in der Hôh sei Ehr” immediately after “Herr der du bist der Gott” and combined the two recitatives into a single movement.114

The main purpose of this sketch seems to have been to work out issues of voice leading. Mendelssohn completed the harmony for the first two phrases of the chorale in a conventional homophonic SATB setting. Seaton notes that Mendelssohn seems to have first written out the melody (since the inner voices remained incomplete), then wrote the bass line (since the stem directions change), and finally filled out the inner voices.115 Mendelssohn attempted to extend the passing eighth-note figure of the melodic upbeat to the lower parts, sometimes successfully,

---

sometimes not. The voice leading is essentially correct, but it is sometimes awkward as in the harmonically incomplete chords at the end of m. 1 and the beginning of m. 4. The versions of the chorale in the scores all preserve the eighth-note figurations in the inner or bass parts while maintaining smooth harmonic progressions.

Critical notes:

1. Lower staff: In the sketch, the stem on the e in the bass part extends slightly beyond the eighth note beam. Cases like this pose a problem for the transcription of this particular sketch since stems that extend beyond a beam might suggest that the following note was added as an afterthought. It is equally possible, however, that the stem only appears elongated because Mendelssohn was writing quickly and was not concerned with neatness. Because of this ambiguity, no attempt has been made to transcribe the protruding stems.

2. Upper staff: The eighth note f'-sharp in the alto part initially had a flag, not a beam, to indicate its duration. It is unclear whether this was a simple notational error or whether Mendelssohn originally intended the note to be followed by a note of a different duration.

10. The “[sic]” accounts for the number of beats in the final measure. Since the sketch begins on an upbeat, the last measure would conventionally contain only three beats. Mendelssohn, however, wrote four.

**No. 9. Recitativo: Und die Zeugen legten ab ihre Kleider**

Page 11 of MN19 contains preliminary sketches for several passages of recitativo. Material from one appears heavily revised in the final version of No. 9, “Und die Zeugen legten ab ihre Kleider” (see Figures 4.9 and 4.10).
In his dissertation, Seaton discusses the sketch for No. 9, commenting on the absence of text in the sketch and demonstrating the way in which the rhythm often does not fit the syllable count.\textsuperscript{116} The dissociation of rhythm and syllable count is characteristic of all the \textit{Paulus} sketches for recitatives. Seaton concludes that Mendelssohn’s primary concern when writing sketches for recitatives was to compose a fluid melodic line; the details of actually setting the text were secondary.\textsuperscript{117} Compared to the other \textit{Paulus} sketches for recitatives, however, the sketch for No. 9 contains more revisions and harmonic indications. It thus seems that, at some point, filling out the harmonies became an equally important concern.

\textsuperscript{116} Seaton, “A Study of a Collection of Mendelssohn’s Sketches and Other Autograph Material,” 86.
\textsuperscript{117} Ibid.,” 86–88.
Seaton provides a transcription of this sketch but identifies a key signature of four flats, in agreement with the final version.\footnote{Ibid., 85.} He may not have consulted MN53 or MN55 (see Figures 4.11 and 4.12), both of which place the recitative “Es beschickten aber Stephanum,” a distinct

![Figure 4.11. MN53, “Es beschickten aber Stephanum”](image)

\footnote{Ibid., 85.}
number derived from the sketch but eventually part of the final version’s No. 9, in a key signature of one flat (cadencing in B-flat major). While reading the sketch in a key signature of four flats is not especially problematic, some issues do arise, such as the accented interval of a diminished twelfth on the third beat of m. 2 and the chromatic voice exchange caused by e’-flat and the e-natural in m. 4, more strongly suggesting a key signature of one flat.

In completing the final version of *Paulus*, Mendelssohn made major structural revisions to Part 1 of the oratorio that account for the recitative’s change of key. Both MN53 and MN55 place the soprano aria “Der du die Menschen,” eventually cut, after the chorale “Dir, Herr, dir will ich mich ergeben” (No. 8 in the final version). In MN53 and MN55, both the aria and the ensuing recitative (“Es beschickten aber Stephanum”) are in F major, but after discarding the aria, Mendelssohn was forced to revise the recitative so that the music would transition from F minor (the key of the chorale) to B-flat major (the key of the chorus, No. 10). In addition to the musical changes, Mendelssohn also reworked the libretto, revising part of the text of another recitative from MN53 and MN55, “Und die Zeugen hatten abgelegt,” and adding it to the

---

beginning of “Es beschickten aber Stephanum.”\textsuperscript{121} The result was a recitative movement in a completely different key and of twice the length of the original version. During the process of revising, the material at the beginning of the sketch became obsolete, but Mendelssohn retained the second half in all scores.\textsuperscript{122}

The revisions of the sketch for No. 9 are especially difficult to interpret. Beginning with m. 3, Mendelssohn made modifications to the melody and added notes to fill out the harmony. The resulting proliferation of musical symbols clutters the staff so much that Mendelssohn, in fact, resorted to simply writing dots instead of actual notes to represent the inner voices.

The revisions suggest the existence of two different layers in the second half of m. 3 (see Figure 4.13). Mendelssohn initially wrote a melodic line that consisted of an eighth-note $g'$ followed by a quarter note and an eighth-note $b'$-flat. He then crossed out the notes and wrote a new melody consisting of an eighth-note $e'$ followed by three eighth-notes $g'$. The new melody makes the ascent of the melodic line more dramatic, whereas the prominence of the $b'$-flat in the rejected layer causes the melody to become stagnant. In addition, the revised melody matches the

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{revision_layers.png}
\caption{Revision layers in the MN19 sketch for No. 9, m. 3}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{121} For a full discussion, see Reichwald’s discussion of the recitatives. Reichwald, \textit{The Musical Genesis of Felix Mendelssohn’s Paulus}, 78.
\textsuperscript{122} Seaton, “A Study of a Collection of Mendelssohn’s Sketches and Other Autograph Material,” 85.
syllable count of the text “und hielten eine” exactly. As mentioned earlier, Mendelssohn, in sketching recitatives, was not generally interested in writing music that would match perfectly the syllable count of the text, but this clearly seems to have become a concern in the latter half of this sketch. Mendelssohn furthermore began adding the inner voices at the same spot and preserved the new harmonies in MN53 and MN55. The second half of the sketch for No. 9, thus, evidently served a greater purpose than to simply lay out a fluid melodic line.

Critical notes:

3 It is possible that the $b'$-flat in the original soprano line may be a dotted quarter note and that the dot is obstructed by the diagonal strikethrough on the note. The subsequent eighth notes seem to belong to the same layer, however, and therefore imply that the note value of the $b'$-flat is that of a quarter note.

3 The stem and flag of the $e'$ that appears on the fourth beat of the transcription do not appear in the manuscript.

4 The $d'$-flats that appear in the manuscript as free-floating dots are interpreted in the transcription as the lower pitches of dyads sharing a stem with the notes above.

5 The sketch contains an odd-looking symbol that appears on the first beat in the $f'$ space. The shape, though very small, resembles a half note. Since a half note $f'$ makes good musical sense, it has been transcribed as such.

5 The note in the $f'$ space on the third beat at first glance seems to be a dotted half note. Note, however, that Mendelssohn’s white notes often are thicker on the top right portion of the note. Mendelssohn seems to have written white notes in two pen strokes, first writing a figure resembling the letter “C,” then closing the note with a second pen stroke. The “dot” on the half note $f'$ is likely the second pen stroke of the half note.
No. 11. Aria: Vertilge sie, Herr Zebaoth (aria fragment)

This fragment of Saulus’s *Rachearie* (see Figures 4.14 and 4.15) appears on p. 5, which also contains at least three other sketches as well as marginal jottings, arithmetic equations, two faint drawings (one of a leaf and branch, the other of a townscape), and several inkblots. The fragment, scored for bass and orchestra, appears on eight-stave systems, but only the bottom two staves contain any music. Mendelssohn later used the remaining empty staves to fill in sketches for other pieces.

Although there is no way of knowing for sure which instruments are represented in the sketch, some inferences can be made. The absence of key signatures on the second and fourth staves suggests that the staves were intended for transposing instruments. Curiously, there seems to be a staff missing (for either first or second violins). If the alto clef on the sixth staff identifies the violas, the fourth and fifth staves should identify the first and second violins. But the fourth staff contains a treble clef without a key signature. Since that staff likely represents a transposing instrument, it does not seem to represent the first violins. One possible explanation is that Mendelssohn intended for certain staves to represent multiple instruments, a practice to which he occasionally resorted in MN53.

The fragment for No. 11 differs greatly from the version of the aria in the scores. Although both the fragment and the final version are written for bass and both are in cut time, the key and the melodic content are drastically different. The sketch is in the key of G minor while

---

123 As we mentioned in Chapter 2, the words “sketch” and “fragment” have at times been used interchangeably. This study uses the word “fragment” for this sketch (as well as the sketch for No. 30) to differentiate the nature of this sketch from others. It is not a preliminary sketch, and it is not a continuity draft. It is something different. Here, Mendelssohn set out to complete an entire draft of the movement. In this case, he never finished it; in the case of No. 30, he did. In either scenario, only part of the draft survives, and for that reason, this study refers to the drafts as “fragments.” Referring to the discarded draft of No. 11 as a “fragment” further helps differentiate the discussion of this sketch from that of the continuity draft for the same movement.

Figure 4.14. MN19, p. 5, staves 1–16
the final version is in B minor. In addition, there is no connection whatsoever between the melodic and harmonic content of the sketch and that of the final version.

The text of the sketch differs from that of the final version as well and reads as follows:

“… mache sie wie Stoppeln vor dem Winde, wie ein Feuer den Wald verbrennt, wie eine
Flamme die Berge anzündet.”125 There are obvious connections between this text, derived from Psalm 83 of the Luther Bible, and the text of the first line of the final version (“Vertilge sie, Herr Zebaoth, wie Stoppeln vor dem Feuer!”126). Reichwald identified the text of the fragment as part of an early version of the libretto and thus determined that the fragment must have been an early attempt at setting the aria.127

Critical notes:

1. The transcription includes only the seventh and eighth staves, since these are the only ones that contain music belonging to the fragment. The original clefs and key signatures of the eight staves are as follows:

   1. Treble clef, two flats
   2. Treble clef, no key signature
   3. Bass clef, two flats
   4. Treble clef, no key signature
   5. Treble clef, two flats
   6. Alto clef, two flats
   7. Bass clef, two flats
   8. Bass clef, two flats

1. The decision to transcribe the sketch in cut time is based on the beaming of the eighth notes on the bottom staff, which suggests that the measures are divided into two beats rather than four. Mendelssohn did, however, often beam eighth notes in groups of four in common time (see, for example, Nos. 1, 21, and 41). Some ambiguity remains.

2–3. The text beginning at the fourth beat of the second measure originally read “mache sie wie.” Mendelssohn, however, crossed this text out and replaced it with a single word: “wie.” He initially needed flags on the first two eighth notes of m. 3 since each carried its own syllable, but

125 “Make them like stubble before the wind, like a fire that burns the woods, like a flame that sets fire to the mountains.”
126 “Destroy them, Lord Sabaoth, like stubble before the fire.”
after substituting a single syllable, he drew a beam connecting the two notes. The beam appears in the transcription without any representation of the flags.

9 Upper staff: A pronounced dot appears immediately after the quarter-note \( c' \). The dot is somewhat ambiguous: slightly too large for a dot on the preceding quarter note and slightly too small for a new note head. Its placement, immediately to the right of the quarter note and slightly below the note head, is consistent with the way in which Mendelssohn dotted notes, but a dotted quarter note does not fit the meter. One possibility is that Mendelssohn originally wrote a dotted quarter note, then decided he needed only a quarter note and forgot to cross out the dot.

Alternatively, it could simply be a splash of ink. Regardless of its meaning, the symbol does not appear in the transcription since it does not make any musical sense.

**No. 11. Aria: Vertilge sie, Herr Zebaoth (preliminary sketches)**

Page 7 of MN19 contains a several sketches. Seaton’s inventory labels all but three of these as unidentified (the three identified ones belonging to *Paulus*).\(^{128}\) It is clear, however, that the hitherto unidentified sketches on staves 6b–c and 7b also belong to *Paulus*, specifically the accompaniment of the aria “Vertilge sie, Herr Zebaoth” (see Figures 4.16 and 4.17).

---

\(^{128}\) Specifically, the sketches for Nos. 27 and 41 appear on the page along with a sketch for a rejected movement that is not discussed in this thesis.
Even though he does not seem to have recognized the sketch’s connection to *Paulus,* Seaton provides a transcription and briefly discusses some details. He specifically mentions the dynamic indication of \( p \), noting that “…the sketch as a whole appears to be particularly rough and incomplete, yet the dynamic marking is boldly included even in such an apparently undeveloped context.”\(^{129}\)

Since Seaton was unaware of the sketch’s connection to “Vertilge sie” and since some of the note heads are very small, his transcription, albeit accurate overall, does contain some problems. He believes, for instance, that the music on the staves 6b–c and 7b makes up a single sketch; this study, however, interprets them as two distinct if related sketches \((a \text{ and } b)\), separated by a significant amount of space and with the melodic material in m. 1 of sketch \(a\) recurring transposed in m. 3 of sketch \(b\). (The beginning of sketch \(b\) likely represents the end of a

---

\(^{129}\) Seaton, “A Study of a Collection of Mendelssohn’s Sketches and Other Autograph Material,” 68.
transitional passage, but no corresponding passage exists in any of the scores.) Seaton also missed some details such as the sixteenth-note c” on the fourth beat of sketch a, m. 1 and the free-standing sharp at the end of sketch a; he, furthermore, mistook the eighth-note a’ on the fourth beat of sketch b, m. 2 for g’.

Sketch a shares with the parallel passage of the scores both the overall melodic contour and harmonic structure (see MN55 in Figure 4.18 and MN53 [in piano reduction] in Figure 4.19). But Mendelssohn lengthened the melodic pattern from two eighth notes (interlocking falling thirds) to four, the key from A minor to B minor, and the meter from common time to cut time while changing the sketches’ sixteenth notes to the scores’ eighth notes.

Figure 4.18. MN55, “Vertilge sie, Herr Zebaoth,” opening measures

The sketches are preliminary in the truest sense of the word: Mendelssohn simply recorded ideas he wished to remember. When he wrote them down, he may not have even had a sense of the way in which they would be used in Paulus. The connection between the sketches and the scores of the aria is nonetheless clear.
Critical notes:

Sketch a

1. Upper staff: The stem connected to the $e''$ and $c''$ of the chord beginning on the third beat seems to be slightly detached from the stem connected to the $e'$ below. The transcription interprets the chord as having a single stem.

Sketch b

1. The note head of the quarter note $a'$ lies closer to the $b'$ line. The surrounding harmonic context, however, requires that the pitch be $a'$.

2. The note head at the beginning of the third beat seems to contain several symbols that are blotted together. A shape resembling a two connected curves appears in the $e''$ space. Another symbol, resembling a note head, appears in the $c''$ space. A vertical line extends up from the latter shape’s right side. Seaton interpreted the cluster as a dyad comprised of $e''$ and $c''$.\(^{130}\) The present transcription presumes that a note head on $e''$ must be present since that note properly resolves the preceding $d''$-sharp. The potential $c''$ has not been transcribed.

---

\(^{130}\) Seaton, “A Study of a Collection of Mendelssohn’s Sketches and Other Autograph Material,” 69.
No. 11. Aria: Vertilge sie, Herr Zebaoth (continuity draft)

Page 11 of MN19 contains a continuity draft for a recitative and a portion of Saulus’s *Rachearie* (see Figures 4.20 and 4.21). The latter differs significantly from the aria fragment on p. 5, staves 1–16 and the preliminary sketches on p. 7, staves 6b–c and 7b. To begin with, the continuity draft is longer than the aria fragment and shows a more thoroughly developed conception of the movement. In addition, both the key and the melody of the sketch now conform to the versions of the aria in the scores.

Figure 4.20. MN19, p. 11, staves 1–7

The sketch begins with an outline of a recitative. In the final version, the aria is preceded by the recitative “Saulus aber zerstörte die Gemeinde,” whereas in MN53 and MN55, it is
Figure 4.21. Transcription of the continuity draft for No. 11
preceded by the recitative “Und die Zeugen hatten abgelegt” (see Figures 4.22 and 4.23).\textsuperscript{131} Reichwald describes the sketch as follows: “Framing the aria are two recitatives … unrelated to later versions.”\textsuperscript{132} The recitative that precedes the aria, however, is similar to “Und die Zeugen hatten abgelegt” of MN53 and MN55; the recitative that follows the aria is the sketch for No. 9 discussed above. In other words, both recitatives are related to later versions in the scores.

The sketch poses two fundamental questions: one concerns the text on which the sketch is based, the other the relationship of the sketch to MN55 and MN53. As we shall see, the latter question helps determine not only the chronology of the scores but also the vocal register of the sketch’s recitative.

The recitative seems to be based on the same text as the recitatives of MN53 and MN55 (“Und die Zeugen hatten abgelegt ihre Kleider zu den Füssen eines Jünglings, der hiess Saulus, der hatte Wohlgefallen an seinem Tode und sprach”),\textsuperscript{133} but Mendelssohn, as was his habit, did not at this stage take into full account the syllabification. The aria is based on text derived from two sources, Psalm 83 and Jeremiah 8:12. In m. 12 of the continuity draft (pertaining to the aria),

\textsuperscript{131} Reichwald, \textit{The Musical Genesis of Felix Mendelssohn’s Paulus}, 80.
\textsuperscript{132} Ibid., 87.
\textsuperscript{133} “And the witnesses laid their clothes at the feet of a young man named Saul, who took delight in his death and spoke….”
Mendelssohn scrawled beneath the staff “Also müssen sie fallen Herr,” a text that seems to be derived from Martin Luther’s translation of Jeremiah 8:12 (bracketed words denote modernized spelling): “[Darum] werden sie mit [Schanden] bestehen, daß sie solche [Greuel] treiben. Wiewohl sie wollen [ungeschändet] sein und wollen sich nicht [schämen]. [Darum]
müssen sie fallen über einen [Haufen und] wenn ich sie heimsuchen werde, sollen sie fallen, spricht der HERR.”


---

134 “So they live in dishonor, for they committed such atrocity, though they will not feel disgraced and will not be ashamed of themselves. Therefore, they must fall [together] in a heap, and when I punish them, they will fall, says the Lord.” Jeremiah 8:12 (Luther Bibel) via “Lutherbibel 1545 Original-Text,” http://enominepatris.com/biblia/biblia2/index.htm (accessed September 30, 2016).

Julius Fürst’s first libretto draft (ca. January 1833), one of the earliest sources of the Paulus libretto, also references Psalm 83 when, after Stephanus’s stoning, Saulus and a crowd of people cry out: “Also müssen umkommen, Herr alle deine Feinde!” Mendelssohn used Fürst’s text in several subsequent versions of the libretto, but the text “Also müssen sie fallen, Herr” is, unique to MN19.

With regard to the chronology of MN55 and MN53, revisions reflected in both scores are irrelevant but nevertheless of musical interest. In the recitative, for instance, the rhythm and contour of the sketch’s first phrase recurs, at least loosely, in MN53 and MN55’s “Und die Zeugen hatten abgelegt.” The harmonic context, however, differs; the sketch begins in D major, whereas MN53 and MN55 begin in B major. In the aria “Vertilge sie,” m. 21 of the sketch originally began with a canceled quarter rest followed by a dotted half note, which suggests that Mendelssohn intended to repeat the syncopated rhythm of the opening theme (m. 7).

Beginning with m. 20 of the sketch, the relationship to the scores begins to clarify the chronology. Here, the vocal line shares similarities especially with MN55 (see Figure 4.24). In mm. 25–28 of the sketch, Mendelssohn originally ended the passage on a half cadence but then revised it to end with an authentic cadence. In mm. 17–18 of MN55, Mendelssohn restored the half cadence and preserved it in mm. 17–18 of MN53 (see Figure 4.25) as well as in the final

135 “Make their faces full of shame so that they must ask for your name. They must be ashamed and afraid ever more and more and be disgraced and perish. Thus, they will come to know that you alone, with your name, call yourself Lord, the Most High in all the world.” Psalm 83:17–19 via ibid.
Figure 4.24. MN55, “Vertilge sie,” mm. 13–43 (measure numbers added)
version. The melody of mm. 29–32 of the sketch appears in the scores unaltered (mm. 19–22 of MN55, MN53, and the final version), except for the dotted rhythm in the second half of m. 29, which in the scores consists of two quarter notes (as it does two measures later in the sketch). More important, Mendelssohn transferred mm. 33–37 of the sketch to mm. 23–27 of MN55 but changed them for MN53 (mm. 23–26) and again for the final version (mm. 23–26). Finally, comparing the rhythm of the sketch to the lyrics of the final version, we can deduce that mm. 37–
44 of the sketch represent a setting of the text “der Höchste in aller Welt.” With its upward leap of an octave, it paints the word “Höchste,” a feature preserved in MN55 at 26–27. MN53 reduces the leap to a sixth, in agreement with the final version. After this point, MN53 and the final version deviate from the sketch and MN55.

At the outset of his dissertation, Reichwald states plainly one of his general assumptions concerning Mendelssohn’s compositional process: “… Mendelssohn completed movements first in full score …,”138 the implication being that Mendelssohn generally completed the autographs of Paulus in full score (MN53, MN54, and MN28) before he completed the vocal score (MN55). Reichwald does, however, acknowledge that the true chronology of the autograph sources is complex in that “… the revisions of MN53 and MN54 interlock with those of MN55. Essentially every movement has to be viewed separately.”139 Reichwald suggests, for instance, that in the case of No. 11, Mendelssohn seems to have written MN55 before MN53.140 Two factors strongly support Reichwald’s hypothesis: (1) MN55 conforms closely to the sketch, and (2) Mendelssohn transferred many of the revisions in MN55 to MN53. In light of such evidence, it is tempting to accept the conclusion that Mendelssohn completed the autographs of this number in a completely linear order: MN19, MN55, and finally MN53.

The choice of vocal register for the recitative complicates the matter, however. In MN53, Mendelssohn initially indicated “Sopr. Solo” but then substituted “Ten. Solo,” whereas in MN55 he indicated “Tenore solo” from the start. In the final version, the solo is given to the tenor. These assignments might suggest that part of MN53 was completed before MN55. It is likely,
however, that, in MN53, Mendelssohn initially assigned the part to soprano in error, since the clef is the intended tenor clef and not a soprano clef. And if the sketch had been intended for soprano, then that intention might have led Mendelssohn to mechanically assign the part to soprano in MN53, even if he had previously assigned it to the tenor in MN55. The sketch, unfortunately, does not provide a clear answer due to the missing clef.

Critical notes:

1. Although this recitative contains many measures with excessive or deficient rhythmic values, it has been transcribed in common time.

1. It is unclear which voice part is represented in the recitative. For the sake of simplicity, this transcription uses a treble clef, but Mendelssohn may have intended a tenorizing treble clef if he had intended the recitative to be sung by a tenor.

2. The natural sign has been added to the third note since it seems clear that Mendelssohn intended to tonicize G at the beginning of the third measure.

2. The “[sic]” accounts for the beat that is excessive to the meter.

3. Although the spacing of the half notes in the lower part does not align with the upper part, the passage makes sense rhythmically and harmonically. No attempt has been made to reflect the original spacing in the transcription.

4. A dashed stem has been added to the c'-sharp to make it fit the meter.

5. A faint mark appears to the left of the stem on the c'-sharp immediately above the beam. Although the mark possibly indicates a sixteenth note, the preceding eighth does not have a dot. Thus, the transcription presents two eighth notes.
11 The spacing of the notes in the manuscript is distorted. The transcription interprets the $f'$-sharp and the $b$ at the beginning of the measure as simultaneously sounding notes. In order to avoid a collision between the two notes, the kneed beam has been replaced by a regular one.

18 Some of the notes in the margin do not appear on a staff. The editor has transcribed them based on the relative vertical spacing and the musical sense.

21 The spacing of signs in this measure suggests that the original rhythm was identical to that of m. 7. Mendelssohn added the dot to the $d'$ after crossing out the rest. The original spacing is not reproduced in the transcription.

59 The sharp in this measure suggests that Mendelssohn intended the measure to be read in treble clef. Reading the measure in bass clef renders a D augmented chord in first inversion, a harmony Mendelssohn surely did not intend.

61 Although the pitch of the whole note in this measure is somewhat unclear, the tie at the beginning of the following measure confirms that the pitch is $b$.

**No. 12. Recitativo: Und zog mit einer Schar**

Although the MN19 sketch for a recitative movement titled “Saulus aber peinigte sie oft” (see Figures 4.26 and 4.27) differs greatly from the scores, parts of the sketch were eventually used, in greatly revised form, in MN53 and MN55 for the recitative “Und Saulus zerstörte die Gemeinde,” introducing the alto aria “Doch der Herr, er leitet die irrenden recht.” As mentioned in chapter 3, this aria was eventually removed from *Paulus* and published by Simrock as *Zwei geistliche Lieder*, Op. 112. Of the recitative, only the latter half, beginning with the textual phrase “Und zog mit einer Schar gen Damaskus,” ultimately survived in the first printed

---

Figure 4.26. MN19, p. 14, staves 4–6

Figure 4.27. Transcription of the sketch for “Saulus aber peinigte sie oft,” eventually reworked as No. 12.

edition—in an entirely new musical context—in the recitative introducing the alto arioso “Doch der Herr vergisst der Seinen nicht” (No. 12).
The compositional sequence from sketch to final recitative has been misunderstood. Remnants of the sketch survive in the recitative “Und Saulus zerstörte die Gemeinde” of both MN53 and MN55, in the former scored for alto and introducing the alto arioso “Doch der Herr vergisst der Seinen nicht,” in the latter scored for soprano and introducing an aria, neither named nor actually included (presumably “Doch der Herr, er leitet die irrenden recht” and scored for alto). Reichwald, presuming that the MN53 version predates the MN55 version, states that the version of “… ‘Und Saulus zerstörte die Gemeinde’ [in MN53] is rewritten in MN55 to make a change from alto to soprano possible. This change can be explained by the ensuing arioso,\textsuperscript{142} which was written for alto voice; to avoid back-to-back recitative and aria movements for the same soloist, Mendelssohn rewrote the recitative for soprano voice.”\textsuperscript{143}

It appears, however, that Reichwald misunderstood the chronology of the versions in MN53 and MN55. A comparison with the sketch suggests that Mendelssohn composed the version in MN55 (Figure 4.28) before that of MN53 (Figure 4.29). Although much of the sketch differs from the scores, the passage beginning at the end of m. 3, above which Mendelssohn wrote the text “und zog mit einer Schar gen Damaskus und hatte,” is melodically similar to the setting of the same text in mm. 5 and 6 of MN55; the parallel passage of MN53 is much closer to the final version. In light of this evidence, it is clear that Mendelssohn changed the soloist from soprano (in MN55) to alto (in MN53) and not the other way around. We can thus dispel Reichwald’s concern that Mendelssohn’s reassignment of soloists is inconsistent with No. 9 (where he reassigned the recitative from tenor to soprano, thus causing both the recitative and the

\textsuperscript{142} It is somewhat unclear to which movement Reichwald is referring; his use of the term “arioso” seems to refer to “Doch der Herr vergisst der Seinen nicht,” but as stated, that movement does not appear in MN55. Regardless of whether Reichwald is referring to “Doch der Herr vergisst der Seinen nicht” or “Doch der Herr, er leitet die Irrenden recht,” Mendelssohn must have conceived the missing movement following “Und Saulus zerstörte die Gemeinde” in MN55 for alto solo.

\textsuperscript{143} Reichwald, \textit{The Musical Genesis of Felix Mendelssohn’s} Paulus, 79.
Figure 4.28. MN 55, “Und Saulus zerstörte die Gemeinde”

aria to be sung by the soprano);\textsuperscript{144} with both “Und Saulus zerstörte die Gemeinde” and “Es beschickten aber Stephanum,” Mendelssohn purposely allowed the same soloist to sing consecutive recitative and aria movements.

The sketch itself raises a multitude of rhythmic and metrical problems. The opening phrase fits the rhythm of “Saulus aber peinigte sie oft,” added above the staff, only loosely and includes an excessive note ($f'$) at the end; the subsequent phrases do not fit the rhythm of “und erfolgte sie bis in die Fremde” at all. Similar problems characterize the remaining portion of the

\textsuperscript{144} In No. 9 (the version of MN53) Mendelssohn changed the soloist for the recitative “Es beschickten aber Stephanum” from tenor to soprano (see Figure 4.11 above), a change that caused both the recitative and the preceding aria to be sung by the soprano soloist. Reichwald (ibid., 80–81) concludes that the reassignment of soloists that Mendelssohn made to “Und Saulus zerstörte die Gemeinde” “… makes his earlier change in the manuscript, which actually assigns two consecutive movements to the same soloist, seem inconsistent.”
Figure 4.29. MN 53, “Und Saulus zerstörte die Gemeinde,” alto solo and orchestral bass part sketch, suggesting that Mendelssohn first composed the melodic line and only afterward added the text above the staff,\textsuperscript{145} or that he once again notated only cues to an eventual rhythmic solution, without regard to writing complete measures.

Seaton transcribed the sketch in G major, the key of the final version of the recitative. The presence of certain accidentals in the sketch, however, more strongly suggest the key of G minor. The natural sign on the central line of the staff in m. 1, the accidentals on the $f'$-sharps in mm. 5 and 8, and the $e'$-naturals in mm. 4 and 9 are already indicative of G minor, but the $a'$-flats in mm. 2 and 10 are even more telling. Reading the sketch in G major causes the $a'$-flat in m. 2 to form an interval of a diminished third with the preceding $f'$-sharp, and the same pitch in m. 10 forms an interval of an augmented second with the preceding $b'$-natural. Reading the sketch in G minor resolves these issues.

Critical notes:

1. Due to the lack of a clear meter, the transcription does not provide a time signature.

1. The transcription aligns the text with the start of each new musical phrase. This conforms to the manuscript where Mendelssohn roughly aligned the text with each musical phrase.

1. The presence of the two natural symbols clarify the harmony of the first measure as G major.

4. A bold vertical line appears just to the left of the $e'$. It was presumably intended to indicate that the whole-note $e'$-natural of the original layer should be moved to the left and, as a half note, coincide with the eighth-note $c''$.

6/7. The bar line at the end of the measure intersects the eighth note $d''$. The transcription places the $d''$ on the downbeat of the next measure (as opposed to the upbeat), where it would align with the stressed fourth syllable “Weib-[er]” in the text written above the staff. Placing the accented syllable on the upbeat to the seventh measure would garble the text.

9. Although the symbol above the $e'$ is somewhat problematic, it seems that Mendelssohn originally wrote an eighth note $a'$ over which he wrote an eighth rest. The transcription interprets the $a'$ as a cancelled note, placing it on the ossia staff.

No. 14. Chor: Mache dich auf, werde Licht

The sketch for the chorus “Mache dich auf, werde Licht” (see Figures 4.30, 4.31, and 4.32) is the longest of all the Paulus sketches. In 129 measures of continuity draft, it outlines all but one formal section of the chorus. Although Mendelssohn did make many changes in completing the final version of the chorus, he preserved the sketch’s thematic material and broad-scale formal structure through the final version.
Figure 4.32. Transcription of the continuity draft for No. 14
(Figure 4.32 continued)
(Figure 4.32 continued)
The sketch appears on pp. 5 and 6 of MN19. It begins in the bottom right corner of p. 6 and continues backwards onto p. 5. In other words, because of the way in which the pages were bound in MN19, the sketch for No. 14 appears upside down and backwards on the empty staves left over from the aria fragment for No. 11 (which also appears on p. 5). In fact, the two sketches at times share the same bar lines, confirming that the fragment for No. 11 was composed before the sketch for No. 14, since Mendelssohn wrote the material for the sketch on the unused staves of the aria fragment.

Mendelssohn wrote the first two pages of the MN53 version on a different type of paper than he did the rest of the movement. Reichwald believes that the paper of the first pages represents an earlier stage in the composition of Paulus; thus, the first two pages predate the rest of the movement. Based on this conclusion, Reichwald states that “… there was at least one earlier complete draft of the movement, of which we have only the first two pages.” He suggests that the first two pages, written on the last leaf of a fascicle, are the only pages in MN53 that remain from the earlier draft and that Mendelssohn’s most extensive revisions would have existed in that earlier draft. Whatever revisions Mendelssohn may have made, the versions of the chorus in MN53 and MN55 conform closely to the final version. Because these autograph versions are so similar to the final version, the discussion below compares the sketch to the final version unless otherwise indicated.

Even though this sketch is the longest surviving one for Paulus, Reichwald states that it “gives only an outline for this long and complex movement. The sections are shorter and

\[146\] Reichwald, The Musical Genesis of Felix Mendelssohn’s Paulus, 87.
\[147\] For a discussion of Mendelssohn’s use of preexisting bar lines in MN19, see Seaton, “A Study of a Collection of Mendelssohn’s Sketches and Other Autograph Material,” 25.
\[149\] Ibid., 94–95.
unfocused, simply capturing the basic idea and direction of this movement.”\textsuperscript{150} A careful study of this sketch suggests, however, that it presents all of the main motivic material, outlines the development of most of the movement, and already includes many interesting details of the final version.

In its final version, the chorus consists of five parts: an instrumental introduction, an A section on the text “Mache dich auf, werde Licht,” a fugal B section on the text “Denn siehe, Finsternis bedeckt das Erdreich,” a very brief homophonic C section on “Aber über dir gehet auf der Herr,” and finally a long coda that features a return to the music of the A section. The sketch features material belonging to each section except for the final one. Table 4.1 shows the chorus’s formal structure and provides the measure numbers of the sections in both the sketch and in the final version.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>A (Coda)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sketch</td>
<td>mm. 1–25</td>
<td>mm. 26–67</td>
<td>mm. 68–114</td>
<td>mm. 115–129</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final version</td>
<td>mm. 1–30</td>
<td>mm. 31–76</td>
<td>mm. 77–161</td>
<td>mm. 162–181</td>
<td>mm. 182–227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The introductory section of the sketch shares many details with the scores, among them the ostinato quarter-note $d$s, the dotted figures (see mm. 1–2 of the sketch), the white note suspensions (beginning in m. 3), and the long ascending scale in the bass (beginning in m. 13). Mendelssohn did, however, expand the section by adding more suspensions. He also revised the passage appearing in mm. 21–24 of the sketch; the version of the scores, while still four measures in length, feature double-dotted quarter notes rather than the single-dotted eighth notes of the sketch (see mm. 26–29 of the final version).

\textsuperscript{150} Ibid., 94.
The A section generally conforms closely to the final version, but Mendelssohn increased the overall length by four measures as a result of more gradually building up the harmonic tension:

- The tonic on the downbeat in m. 33 (final version) simplifies the lower mediant in m. 28 (sketch).

- Measures 40–43 of the sketch are modified in 45–47 of the final version to effect a modulation (see subsequent point).

- The setting of “denn dein Licht kommt” (mm. 48–52 of the final version) is melodically similar to mm. 43–47 of the sketch, but Mendelssohn transposed it down a perfect fourth in the final version (the result of the modulation mentioned above).

- The canceled notes in m. 50 of the sketch suggests that Mendelssohn initially thought of repeating the text “und die Herrlichkeit des Herrn” but then canceled the dotted-quarter-note $f''$-sharp and eighth-note $e''$ and substituted a half-note $f''$-sharp, in agreement with the rhythm of the text “gehet auf über dir.” Instead of repeating “und die Herrlichkeit des Herrn” three times consecutively, the revision suggest the sequence “und die Herrlichkeit des Herrn gehet auf über dir, und die Herrlichkeit des Herrn [gehet auf über dir].”

- Mendelssohn harmonically enriched mm. 55–59 of the sketch in mm. 60–64 of the final version. This harmonic change, in connection with the ones mentioned above and below, suggests that Mendelssohn was withholding some harmonic interest at the beginning to build it up later.

- Mendelssohn intensified the harmony toward the end of the A section (compare mm. 65–70 of the final version with mm. 60–65 of the sketch), further building tension.
resolve it, he prolonged the dominant at m. 66 of the sketch by four measures (mm. 71–76).

Although Mendelssohn greatly expanded the chorus’s fugal B section (the section consists of forty-seven measures in the sketch and eighty-five measures in the final version), he preserved many aspects of the sketch in the final version, most notably the sequence of entries of the fugal subject (see table 4.2). Due to inconsistent stem direction, the voicing of the final entry is unclear in the sketch, but note that the pitches are preserved exactly in the final version; every entry in the sketch has a corresponding entry in the final version.

Table 4.2. Entries of the fugal subject No. 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voice part</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Beginning pitch</th>
<th>Voice part</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Beginning pitch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenor</td>
<td>m. 68</td>
<td>$f'$-sharp</td>
<td>Tenor</td>
<td>m. 77</td>
<td>$f'$-sharp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alto</td>
<td>m. 73</td>
<td>$b'$</td>
<td>Alto</td>
<td>m. 81</td>
<td>$b'$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soprano</td>
<td>m. 78</td>
<td>$f''$-sharp</td>
<td>Soprano</td>
<td>m. 85</td>
<td>$f''$-sharp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass</td>
<td>m. 82</td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>Bass</td>
<td>m. 89</td>
<td>$b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass</td>
<td>m. 89</td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>Bass</td>
<td>m. 99</td>
<td>$b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soprano</td>
<td>m. 96</td>
<td>$g''$</td>
<td>Soprano</td>
<td>m. 107</td>
<td>$g''$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenor (?)</td>
<td>m. 106</td>
<td>$c'$-sharp</td>
<td>Bass</td>
<td>m. 138</td>
<td>$c'$-sharp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenor</td>
<td>m. 110</td>
<td>$f'$-sharp</td>
<td>Alto</td>
<td>m. 142</td>
<td>$f'$-sharp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mendelssohn not only omitted in the final version the counter subject introduced in m. 73 of the sketch, he also made some modifications to the fugue subject itself (Figure 4.33 juxtaposes the fugue subject as it appears in the sketch and the final version, respectively). Mendelssohn’s reasoning for modifying the subject likely concerned prosody. Adding the text to the sketch’s version causes the unstressed syllable “[Finster]-nis” to fall on a downbeat, thus giving it a metric accent. The final version corrects the issue by placing the stressed syllable “[be]-deckt” on the downbeat instead. The revision comes at a price, however: it emphasizes “Finsternis,”
Thus robbing the latter of some of its importance. Mendelssohn, it seems, was forced to choose the lesser of two problems.

The C section underwent relatively few changes. Figure 4.34 juxtaposes the version of the sketch and a reduction of the vocal parts of the scores (the latter are identical to each other). In revising the passage, Mendelssohn made minor rhythmic adjustments to the melody, filled out the harmonies, and reworked some of the part writing.

Critical notes:

2 An illegible word is scribbled above the staff.

3 Lower staff: The various repeat symbols have been preserved in the transcription exactly in the way that Mendelssohn wrote them.

3 Upper staff: Mendelssohn changed the half-note $d$ to a whole note by crossing out the stem. It seems that mm. 3–4 were originally intended to make up a single measure (with $d – c$ as half notes).

5 Upper staff: The dashed ties have been added for the sake of consistency, since the surrounding measures contain tied whole notes.

15 The numeral 22 between the staves of the manuscript has not been transcribed.
The upper staff contains a symbol that looks like a whole note $g'$, and while that note makes harmonic sense, the symbol more likely represents something else. Note, for instance, that Mendelssohn typically notates whole notes in the middle of the measure (as with the $b'$ in the same measure), but the symbol in question appears at the beginning. Furthermore, the same symbol appears in m. 49, in which case a $g'$ would not fit the harmony. Based on its vertical staff position, the symbol could possibly represent a shorthand for a treble clef, but whereas Mendelssohn might have had some reason to reaffirm the clef in m. 16 (the first staff beginning...
in treble clef), he would have had no reason to do so in m. 49 (since there is no clef change on the previous staff). The symbol has been suppressed in the transcription.

33 Lower staff: Two pieces of evidence suggest that the five-note chord is not part of the sketch for No. 14. First, the ink is a shade lighter than in the remainder of the sketch. Second, as mentioned in the critical notes accompanying the transcription of the sketch for No. 9, Mendelssohn seems to have written white notes in two pen strokes, the first forming the shape of the letter “C,” the second closing the note head. Looking at the notes on the top two staff lines, the two pen strokes are clearly visible, but the “C” strokes are inverted. This indicates that when Mendelssohn wrote the chord, he had rotated the page 180 degrees. Thus, the chord could not have been written as part of the sketch under consideration here.

33 Lower staff: The flat and natural signs associated with the canceled half notes indicate that, unlike the whole notes discussed above, these were definitely written with the page rotated in the same direction as when the sketch was written. Still, they do not seem to constitute a part of the sketch under consideration here. To begin with, the notes only make sense when read in treble clef (the presence of the flat would create an interval of a diminished third if the notes were read in bass, soprano, alto, or tenor clefs), yet they appear on the bottom staff, which in the sketch is clearly notated in bass clef. Finally, the half-note rhythm does not fit the meter of the sketch.

38 Upper staff: The numeral 53 above the staff has not been transcribed.

40 Lower staff: Beginning in this measure, many rhythmic values have been altered in the transcription to reflect the prevalent, ostinato-like dotted figure that appears in the final version.
Lower staff: Beginning in this measure, the stem direction of many notes has been changed for the sake of clarity; preserving the stem directions of the manuscript would produce a cluttered-looking transcription.

Upper staff: The symbol on the g’ line does not appear in the transcription due to its ambiguous nature (see note 16 above).

Lower staff: The “[sic]” acknowledges that, although a dotted eighth note A is clearly written in the manuscript, B seems to make more harmonic sense.

Lower staff: In the first half of the measure, Mendelssohn originally wrote a half rest, then substituted an abbreviation for alternating eighth notes d and D, crossed them out, and substituted a sign to repeat the pattern of the previous measure.

Lower staff: On the downbeat, Mendelssohn originally wrote a note head d, then crossed it out and substituted a half-note G.

Upper staff: The stem direction of the eighth notes in the second half of the measure has been altered in the transcription to avoid a collision with the quarter-note b’.

Lower staff: The spacing of the notes implies that Mendelssohn originally wrote a half note followed by two quarter notes. He then changed the rhythm by adding a dot to the half note and adding a beam to the two quarter notes. The original rhythm is presented on the ossia staff of the transcription.

Upper staff: The central position of the dotted-half-notes e’ and g’ within the measure indicate that Mendelssohn originally wrote a whole-note dyad to which he subsequently added a stem and dots.
No. 22. Coro: Der Erdkreis ist nun des Herrn

Even though the sketch for the chorus “Der Erdkreis ist nun des Herrn” (see Figures 4.35 and 4.36) is one of the shortest, it contains much information about the movement, not least both

Figure 4.35. MN19, p. 4, staves 3b and 4b

Figure 4.36. Transcription of the sketch for No. 22

subjects of the long double fugue. Seaton (who also transcribed the sketch)\(^{151}\) suggests that Mendelssohn first composed the subject on the bottom staff and subsequently designed the subject on the upper staff to fit that of the lower one. Finally, in order to save space, Mendelssohn wrote the stretto line in parallel thirds above the subject on the bottom staff. Because the stretto line does not fit the subject on the top staff harmonically, Seaton notes that “there are actually two sketches where at first there appears to be only one.” In other words, the

\(^{151}\) Seaton, “A Study of a Collection of Mendelssohn’s Sketches and Other Autograph Material,” 83.
sketch makes sense only if one reads the lowest voice with the top staff or if one reads the bottom staff alone; with all voices combined, the sketch makes no harmonic sense.\textsuperscript{152}

Seaton’s discussion suggests that Mendelssohn wrote both voices of the stretto line simultaneously. The stems of the stretto in the manuscript, however, are sometimes broken, and the second beat of m. 4 even shows two separate stems side by side. The evidence suggests that the two stretto voices were written independently of one another. Mendelssohn perhaps wrote the upper one first, then abandoned the idea (without canceling it) when he noticed the parallel fifths, and added the lower one. It is also possible that he wrote the lower stretto first and then added the upper one because he intended to present the fugal subject in parallel thirds, which indeed he did in m. 54 of the final version.

Although Seaton observes that “the subjects [as they appear in the sketch] are not yet in their final forms…,”\textsuperscript{153} Mendelssohn made only two small changes to the sketch’s upper subject when he composed the fugue: (1) he added a tied eighth note on the downbeat of m. 4 (see m. 75 of the final version), shortening the e”-flat to an eighth, and (2) he lengthened the quarter note on the downbeat of m. 5 to a half. Mendelssohn made more significant revisions to the sketch’s lower subject. First, he changed the eighth-notes g in m. 3 of the sketch to a dotted eighth and sixteenth, then the leap down to B-flat in m. 4 of the sketch to a scalar descent (see Figure 4.37).\textsuperscript{154} The cancelled e’-flat and d’ in MN55 are evidently a holdover from m. 5 of the sketch. Mendelssohn presumably modified it in MN55 (and preserved the modification in MN54) to allow for a smoother entry of the fugal subject’s answer.

\textsuperscript{152} Ibid., 82–83.
\textsuperscript{153} Ibid., 83.
\textsuperscript{154} The passage shown in Figure 4.37 is from the tenor part, which is written with a tenorizing treble clef, so the subject as it appears in Figure 4.37 is actually written an octave higher than the MN19 version.
Figure 4.37. MN55, No. 22. First entry of the primary subject (tenor part, written with a tenorized treble clef)

Critical notes:

1 Upper staff: The right end of the cancelation mark obscures the dot.

6 On the lower staff, a small dot appears above the second b-flat of the measure. While the dot could be interpreted as a note head representing a quarter note d, its nature is inconclusive. The dot is not reproduced in the transcription.

No. 27. Chor: So spricht der Herr 155

Both Seaton and Reichwald have discussed the preliminary sketch for the chorus “So spricht der Herr” (see Figures 4.38 and 4.39). After providing an accurate transcription, Seaton notes that in completing the final version, Mendelssohn changed the falling sevenths in the tenor

Figure 4.38. MN19, p. 7, staves 4–7.

155 Seaton’s inventory mistakenly assigns this sketch to No. 21.
and soprano to fifths in the alto and soprano, rejected the three-note upbeats in m. 9 and the chords in mm. 11–13, and adjusted the melody’s placement within the meter so that the half notes fall on the downbeat of each measure.\footnote{Seaton, “A Study of a Collection of Mendelssohn’s Sketches and Other Autograph Material,” 77.} Reichwald also provides a transcription of the sketch, but his contains less detail than Seaton’s.\footnote{Reichwald, The Musical Genesis of Felix Mendelssohn’s Paulus, 154.} To Seaton’s observations, Reichwald adds that Mendelssohn possibly adjusted the meter to emphasize the word “Herr” instead of “so” and suggests that Mendelssohn made the change in the course of preparing the version of MN55, since the modified bar lines appear only on the first system of that source.\footnote{Ibid., 149–52.} It is more likely, however, that Mendelssohn wanted to avoid the dissonance between the sustained $a$ and the leaping $b’$-flat. Furthermore, neither Seaton nor Reichwald acknowledge the sudden shift to B-flat major in m. 11, one of the sketch’s most surprising aspects. It is likely that the sketch ends
with m. 10 and that mm. 11–13 comprise a distinct sketch pertaining to a later section of the chorus.

Critical notes:

5 The abbreviation “Ten.” appears to the left of the quarter note $a'$. In the transcription, the abbreviation has been moved so that it appears above the note.

13 Upper staff: Although the second-highest note head is written low (as to signal $b'$-flat), the tie from the previous measure indicates that the note is actually $c''$.

**No. 30. Aria: Denn also hat uns der Herr geboten**

Like the continuity draft for No. 14, the aria fragment for “Denn also hat uns der Herr geboten” (see Figures 4.40 and 4.41) appears in MN19 upside down. The fourteen-measure fragment consists of the final page of a completed draft of an aria that was eventually discarded from *Paulus*; it occupies all but the bottom two staves (taken up by two other short sketches). The music of the fragment was recomposed completely for the final version (the fragment belongs to a bass aria in D minor and 6/8, the final version is a duet for tenor and bass in E major and cut time); the two versions share only the text. Several measures of the fragment contain cancellations and revisions, with the majority of them appearing in the instrumental parts but the most substantial one in the vocal part (mm. 3–4). None of these reveals anything of substance about the way in which Mendelssohn arrived at the final version because the final version is essentially new.

The scoring of the aria is somewhat ambiguous. The clefs used in the orchestral parts—two treble clefs, an alto clef, and a bass clef—indicate that Mendelssohn wrote out the parts for a string section. As in the aria fragment for No. 11, however, he may have intended to have
Mendelssohn apparently made the decision to set the text "Denn also hat uns der Herr" as a duet late in the compositional process. In both MN54 and MN55, he followed the acquisition of the "other instruments double the string parts. Additional information concerning the instrumentation may have appeared on any one of the fragment's previous pages, all of which are lost.

Figure 4.40. MN19, p. 10, staves 3-12 (image rotated 180 degrees)
Figure 4.41. Transcription of the fragment of No. 30
preceding recitative with only a simple verbal note: “hier folgt eine Arie,” presumably still planning on incorporating an aria while completing the autograph full and vocal scores. Even though the printed program of the premiere labels the movement “Arie,” Reichwald believes that “it is not clear what, if any, movement was performed at the premiere at that spot.”\textsuperscript{159} The duet first appeared in Simrock’s edition of the score.\textsuperscript{160} Mendelssohn likely chose to write a duet instead of an aria simply because a duet more logically follows the statement “Paulus aber und Barnabas sprachen frei und öffentlich” in the preceding recitative. The inclusion of a duet furthermore introduced more variety to the overall work.

\textsuperscript{159} Ibid., 153.
Critical notes:

2  [Vni II]: A note clearly appears on the second staff on the a leger line; he presumably anticipated it by mistake from m. 3.

2–4  [Bass]: When Mendelssohn added the text “Ich habe dich den Heiden, den” he began with the downbeat of m. 3 instead of the upbeat to m. 3, placing “Ich habe den” in m. 3 and “Heiden, den” in m. 4. He realized that something was not correct, crossed out “Heiden” at the beginning of m. 4, substituted “dich,” realized that his solution was now garbled, and put “Heiden” back in. His original intention is perfectly clear, and this edition underlays the text as originally intended.

5  [Bass]: Flags appear on the e and d. Mendelssohn likely wrote the notes individually before realizing that they shared the syllable “Licht.” He then added a downward-pointing stem to the d and joined the notes with a beam. The transcription only reflects the d with the downward stem.

10  [Vc and Cb]: A mark appears underneath the dotted quarter-note A. Although the mark resembles a leger line, it seems to have little significance to the musical context and thus is not reproduced in the transcription.

13  [Vni I, Vni II]: The pp above the staff has been moved beneath the staff, in agreement with standard typesetting practice.

13  [Vle]: A dotted quarter note and a dotted half note, both d, appear simultaneously in the middle of the measure. The placement of the notes in the middle of the measure suggests that Mendelssohn wrote a dotted half note first, then he partially filled in the note to create a dotted quarter note.
14 [Vc and Cb]: It is not clear whether the A on the downbeat was a quarter note or a dotted quarter note when Mendelssohn canceled it, as the cancellation mark covers the spot where the dot would have appeared. Even though a dot is not visible, the A has been transcribed as a dotted quarter note, the clearly intended duration.

**No. 34. Chor: Seid uns gnädig, hohe Götter**

This short preliminary sketch (see Figures 4.43 and 4.44) presents the chorus’s primary melodic material. The bass line drops out after the first measure and reappears briefly in m. 7. Reichwald and Seaton both mention this sketch but do not discuss it in detail.\(^{161}\)

![Figure 4.43. MN19, p. 4, staves 5 and 6](image)

Mendelssohn preserved the melody found in mm. 1–2 of the sketch in all the scores. He also maintained the bass line of m. 1. Beginning with the end of m. 2, however, the scores begin to deviate from sketch. The ascent to f''-sharp in mm. 6–7 of the sketch is recalled in the soprano’s ascent to the same pitch in mm. 37–38 of the final version. Since this is the only occurrence of this ascending figure in the final version, it is possible that Mendelssohn did not intend to sketch a single, continuous section of music but rather two distinct ones.

There is evidence supporting this hypothesis. Above the bar line of mm. 5/6, Mendelssohn wrote what appears to be a letter “L.” The letter seems to be an abbreviation, the

---

meaning of which, however, is not entirely clear. If the ascending phrase that follows is indeed parallel to mm. 37–38 of the final version as suggested above, the “L” could possibly stand for the word “letztes [mal]” since mm. 37–39 of the final version constitute the last statement of “Seid uns gnädig, hohe Götter” before the coda-like section that begins in m. 43.

Critical notes:

1 The text “sey[d] uns gnädig” is interpreted in as an incipit, in agreement with the placement of Mendelssohn’s other incipits. Even though, in this example, the text aligns perfectly with the notes to which it belongs, the beamed eighth notes on the upbeat to m. 1 suggest that text was indeed intended as an incipit.

4–5 Lower staff: The sixteenth notes are not reproduced in the transcription, as they do not appear to belong to the sketch. They do not align with the measures of the upper staff and conform with them neither rhythmically nor metrically. Even though sixteenth-note figurations
are prominently featured in the scores’ flute obbligato (beginning with m. 17 of the final version), neither the specific pitches nor the specific beaming appears in the scores.

7 Upper staff: The extraneous ink near the first g’ seems to be a smear rather than cancelation mark, note stem, or accidental.

7 Lower staff: The inclusion of the three bass notes in the transcription is based on their perfect alignment and harmonic compatibility with the notes on the upper staff. The transcription supplies bar lines not present in the manuscript.

8 Upper staff: The pitches as written make little sense. It is possible that Mendelssohn intended two write a top pitch of e” on the downbeat and a bottom pitch of f’-sharp on the second beat.

**No. 41. Coro: Schone doch deiner selbst**

A preliminary sketch for the chorus “Schone doch deiner selbst” (see Figures 4.45 and 4.46) appears on a cluttered page immediately beneath the sketch for No. 27. Although the sketch is relatively short, it maps out the entire movement section by section.
Seaton and Reichwald both provide transcriptions.\textsuperscript{162} Reichwald’s is incomplete, presumably because he intended it solely to show the difference—on a broad scale—between the

sketch and the scores. To begin with, he does not include details such as cancelled notes, even though they are critical for the interpretation of the sketch. Furthermore, his transcription contains some notational errors and does not include any indication of the text associated with the sketch. Seaton’s transcription is more complete, but some elements, including such verbal annotations as “etc.” or “Meine Augen” are still missing. Seaton does, however, discuss those annotations he did include in his transcription, stating that even though they provide only general indications of instrumentation and voicing, they suggest that “… Mendelssohn had clearly formed a precise aural image of the final scoring.”

All versions, including the sketch, are in A minor and scored for four-part choir, but only the scores (which, with regard to the vocal parts are very similar to each other) also include annotations regarding solo parts (see, for instance, Figures 4.47 and 4.48). Of the sketch, only the first seven measures were used in the scores, and the bass line of the first four measures is preserved exactly, even though the accompaniment otherwise varies greatly. In the upper parts, Mendelssohn introduced some minor changes, both in the process of sketching (e.g., the tenor part in m. 2) and in the process of composing it out (e.g., the rhythm of the second beat in m. 1). The most substantial change pertains to the sequence of the vocal entries (see Table 4.3) and the harmonization beginning with m. 5, where the sketch takes a surprising turn from A minor to G minor and then progresses to a C dominant seventh. The first portion of the sketch seems to end with m. 7, on a harmony continuing from the previous measure, as in the final version.

Beginning with m. 8, Mendelssohn seems to have sketched a new section of the chorus, based on text (e.g., “Meine Augen” above m. 8) not included in the scores. The text of the final

---

Figure 4.47. MN54, “Schone doch deiner selbst”
Figure 4.48. MN55, “Schone doch deiner selbst” (m. 1 is not pictured here)
Table 4.3. Succession of vocal entries in the sketch and the final version.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Phrase of lyrics</th>
<th>Voice entry in the sketch</th>
<th>Voice entry in the scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Schone doch…</td>
<td>Alto (?)</td>
<td>Soprano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Das widerfahre…</td>
<td>Tenor</td>
<td>Alto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Schone doch…</td>
<td>Alto (?)</td>
<td>Tenor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Schone doch…</td>
<td>Bass</td>
<td>Soprano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Das widerfahre…</td>
<td>Soprano</td>
<td>Bass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

version of the chorus is very short: “Schone doch deiner selbst! Das widerfahre dir nur nicht!”

But Julius Fürst’s first draft of the libretto consists of a longer version:

Jünger:
Herr, schone deiner selbst.

Andere:
Das widerfahre dir nur nicht.
Meine Augen müssen mit Thrählen fließen daß des Herrn Heerde gefangen wird.165

This text is preserved in two subsequent drafts of the libretto; the earlier one is a draft written by Mendelssohn himself, dated 6 September 1833 and containing comments by Julius Schubring (Mendelssohn’s collaborator);166 the later one, again written by Mendelssohn, dates from late October that same year.167 The material of the sketch not transferred to the scores must have been based on this early libretto text.

Critical notes:

5 Lower staff: The word “Bassi” appears to the left of the d’. It has been moved above the note.

---

164 The question marks beside the presumed alto entries allude to the ambiguity of the voicing. The phrase seems to more comfortably fit the soprano vocal range, but the downward-pointing stems in the sketch suggest that the phrase represents the alto part.
167 Ibid., 2:141.
Mendelssohn left a considerable amount of empty space at the beginning of the measure, presumably to suggest that subsequent music was intended for a later section of the chorus. The transcription accounts for the empty space.

The text beneath the “etc.” is difficult to make out. Sposato suggests “Engeln,” an unlikely solution, since the word does not appear in Fürst’s first draft of the libretto. It is more likely that the text refers to a structural aspect of the subsequent section of the text.

A diagonal squiggle appears at the beginning of the measure, presumably intended to separate distinct portions of the sketch. The squiggle is not reproduced in the sketch, but empty space appears in the transcription in order to represent the distinction between the different portions.

---

168 Ibid., 2:150.
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

Although scholars have transcribed some of the sketches for *Paulus*, this thesis constitutes the first attempt at a complete transcription: it traces canceled notes, establishes a chronology of the various layers, and clarifies problems of existing transcriptions (e.g., the key signatures of the sketches for Nos. 9 and 12). This meticulous approach has generated results beyond the sketches themselves.

1. The longer sketches have helped us to better understand structural aspects of the compositional process. When placed in the context of the scores, the sketch for No. 1, for example, shows Mendelssohn’s concern for greater rhythmic continuity, and the sketch for No. 14 reveals a concern for harmonic planning (i.e., for withholding harmonic complexity early in the movement to build up tension gradually).

2. The identification of the text on which some of the sketches were based has allowed us to identify in what number the recitative portion of the continuity draft for No. 11 was eventually used.

3. Two hitherto unidentified sketches have been identified as sketches pertaining to No. 11.

4. The sketches have helped define the chronology of the autographs MN53/54 and MN55. The continuity draft for No. 11 and the preliminary sketches for Nos. 12 and 22 reveal, for example, that the version in MN55 (piano-vocal score) was completed before the version in MN53 or MN54 (full score). In the case of No. 12, the chronology corrects that proposed by Reichwald; in the case of No. 11, it corroborates Reichwald; and in the case of 22, it is established here for the first time.

With regard to the chronology of MN53/54 and MN55, the next logical step consists of a reexamination of paper types to see whether the musical evidence generated by the study of the
sketches matches the physical evidence. Our understanding of the genesis of *Paulus* may yet be further enhanced by an examination of the sketches for discarded movements, the results of which may in turn clarify the structure, content, and chronology of the oratorio’s various stages.

Not only the relationship of the sources among each other, but also the document of MN19 by itself leaves room for future discoveries. The identification of two hitherto unidentified sketches suggests that the first fourteen pages of MN19—especially pp. 4 and 7—might include additional material belonging to *Paulus*, especially to discarded or unfinished movements.

Finally, as we have stated at the outset of this thesis, Reichwald believes that “MN19 does not contain enough material of *Paulus* to make specific statements about Mendelssohn’s working habits while working on the oratorio.”¹⁶⁹ The analyses presented here show, however, that MN19 is a better key to Mendelssohn’s compositional process than Reichwald suggests.
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