

## “Et in unum Dominum”

Eric Basta Oct. 12, 2010:

Re: Concordance, Chronology & Sources Charts of the *Mass in B-Minor*, BWV 232

Question: Could you comment on the source of BWV 232 II/3 (“Et in unum”) - I can find little information on BWV 213/11 "2 later versions."

The entry referred to is:

II. *Symbolum Nicenum*, BWV 232<sup>II</sup> Mvt. 15 (NBA<sup>rev</sup> 1/12; NBA 3) *Et in unum* 1733 Parody known “Ich bin deine, du bist meine”, BWV 213/11 (2 later versions 1748-49).

The path of this parody is quite convoluted so that a misconception could easily arise that the music for the *Aria Duetto* (A,T) from BWV 213/11 “Ich bin deine, du bist meine” [September 5, 1733] which was parodied as the *Aria Duetto* (S,B) from BWV 248/29 “Herr dein Mitleid, dein Erbarmen” [December 27, 1734] is the same music that is contained in the movement “Et in unum” from the *B-Minor Mass* BWV 232<sup>II</sup>. This is, however, not the case; hence, a more detailed explanation is necessary.

As Bach was composing consecutively all the movements of BWV 213 “Laßt uns sorgen, laßt uns wachen” [his autograph score *P 125* is still extant] in the days preceding September 5, 1733, he ended page 14<sup>v</sup> with the customary notation of the title of the subsequent movement to follow on the next page. This marking reads: *Sequitur* [abbreviated] *Aria Duetto* | *a due Viole*. At the top edge of page 15<sup>r</sup> he writes: *Aria Duetto. due Viole. certati. e Alto, Tenore con Cont.* Then he begins to sketch out the theme of the movement on the uppermost staff on this page as follows:



He then proceeds to cross out this entire first line (or the topmost staff on the page) and begin composing on the lines directly below this thematic ‘sketch’ the music which replaces this first, failed incipit. This is the duet movement which is performed on September 5, 1733 and which is then parodied as a movement that is performed as part of the Christmas Oratorio on December 17, 1734, over a year later.

It is the theme that was cancelled out and abandoned, the same theme that appears as the completely orchestrated “Et in unum” movement of the *Frühfassung* as well as the final version from the late 1740s. Thus we have a very strange parody of a secular cantata movement where only the abandoned jotting down of this incipit is the link between BWV 213 and BWV 232.

Much more complicated are the suggestions which have been offered in an attempt to connect this incipit with other possible scenarios for the evidence presented above:

George B. Stauffer, *The Mass in B Minor*, Schirmer Books, 1997, pp. 114-115:

There is little doubt that the “Et in unum Dominum” is a parody. The clean look of the text in the *P 180* manuscript and the abundance of performance indications point in that direction. So, too, does the appearance of the first four measures of the “Et in unum Dominum” violin 1 line\*, written in C major, in the autograph score of Cantata 213. Bach apparently considered using the music, which must have existed in another source, for movement 13[sic] of Cantata 213, the duet “ich bin deine.” But writing out the incipit, he crossed it out and abandoned the idea in favor of a new composition. Efforts by Klaus Häfner to pinpoint the model of “Et in unum Dominum” are not convincing, and it is likely that we will never know the precise context in which the music was first conceived. Nevertheless, one suspects that the unusual descending portamento figures in mm. 21-22 and m. 66 once highlighted an appropriate phrase in a now-lost text, just as the falling figures in mm. 58-59 once highlighted “descendit de coelis.” Sometimes glimpses of Bach’s creative process can be as unsettling as they are insightful.

\* The violin line is not a sketch but a fair copy, as Marshall points out in “The Mass in B Minor: The Autograph Scores and the Compositional Process” in *The Music of Johann Sebastian Bach: The Sources, the Style, the Significance* (New York, Schirmer Books) 1989, p. 183. [‘Fair copy’ implies that Bach was copying from an already existing source.]

John Butt, *Bach: Mass in B Minor*, Cambridge University Press, 1991, pp. 52-53:

Scholars are in no doubt that Bach took this duet from a pre-existent composition, since not only is the present manuscript cleanly notated but the opening line appears in a cancelled sketch of a canonic duet in the autograph from the secular cantata BWV 213 (1733). However, this was almost certainly not the first time that Bach used this music. His notation for the duet ‘ich bin deine, du bist meine’ (‘I am yours, you are mine’) contains the top line only; according to Robert Marshall, Bach would probably have notated the second line simultaneously with the first when composing canons, to facilitate the imitation....

Bach eventually decided on a different setting for the text concerned in BWV 213, but his consideration of the music which eventually became the ‘Et in unum’ is instructive....A certain amount of controversy

has surrounded Bach's reworking of the 'Et in unum', which originally included the text of the 'Et incarnatus' (no. 4) that now follows....Smend substantiates his preference for the earlier version by citing the spurious evidence of a later score which he considered to have been completed during Bach's lifetime. However, nothing suggests that Bach reverted to the earlier version of 'Et in unum'. Indeed another theologian, Walter Blankenburg, considers that the first version is overburdened with text and that several sections in the second version show a text setting preferable to that of the first....[Here is a reference to various versions of this movement with opposing positions taken by two prominent Bach scholars during the 1950s and 1960s.]

Christoph Wolff: *Johann Sebastian Bach: Messe in h-Moll*, Bärenreiter, 2009, pp. 84-85:

[Summary translation from the original]

This movement, "Et in unum", is a parody although it is not possible to produce the full original on which this parody is based. A very instructive hint can be found in the autograph score of the 'Hercules' Cantata which dates from the fall of 1733. Specifically a connection can be made with the duet "Ich bin deine, du bist meine" BWV 213/11. Preceding the F major duet movement which is found there, Bach wrote down four measures which are identical to the beginning of the "Et in unum" duet. From this we can deduce that Bach originally had wanted to use this music which he had already composed and which would eventually be used for the "Et in unum", but then set that score aside to compose a different movement which is now BWV 213/11. Whatever caused Bach to change his plans is not known, but for a while at least, he considered the music as possible, usable parody for BWV 213/11.

Werner Neumann, NBA KB I/36, Bärenreiter, 1962, p. 64-65:

[Summary translation from the original]

It remains a mystery why Bach, on the top staff of the page that begins the duet "Ich bin deine, du bist meine" BWV 213/11, wrote down the beginning of the theme for "Et in unum Dominum" that would later appear in the *Mass in B-Minor* and then crossed it out again. Since the results of recent research [at that time in 1962] point to the origin of the *Symbolum* as being late in Bach's career, it raises the possibility that this theme citation points to the existence of another, yet unknown secular cantata from which Bach had wanted to borrow the music for this movement. Of greater, immediate interest for us is whether the source was a sketch from which Bach copied the first line only to set it aside. Then, while composing the score for BWV 213, when he needed a new sheet of paper, he picked up the sheet with the one-line melody on the top and crossed it out so that he could use the paper for composing the duet BWV 213/11. Other important factors for consideration are: 1. the top-most accolade includes the discarded [clean copy] 'sketch' – this would exclude the notion that Bach simply wanted to make good use of a sheet of paper that happened to have a crossed-out, unrelated incipit on it; 2. a comparison of the ink used for the 'sketch', for the crossing out of the sketch and for the subsequent beginning of movement BWV 213/11 in its final version shows that there are no differences that are detectable. It is

difficult to explain why, if Bach had the complete original source (a movement from a cantata) before him, why he would even have to write down this single line and then discard it just as quickly, without even having come upon any of the complications he would later encounter when trying to set the new text to this music.

### The '2 later versions'

This term is used by Christoph Wolff in the book listed above.

Possible explanations:

*Frühfassung* [early] version: the discarded, abandoned, cancelled, cross-out one-line incipit dated to just prior to September 5, 1733. This clean copy incipit points to a probable secular cantata movement that had been completed and performed prior to this date. This would have been the earliest version of the music having a secular text (still not identified when and where this would have taken place).

'2 later versions':

*Frühfassung* [early] version (Smend had given the date as 1732) of the *Symbolum Nicenum* indicated as BWV 232<sup>II</sup> has been more recently dated to belong to the period 1748 to 1749 (with the exception, of course, of the "Credo" movement). Nevertheless, there is a *Frühfassung* of the "Et in unum Dominum" and a later revision of it. According to the most recent critical edition of BWV 232, the NBA<sup>rev</sup> I, p. 313, the first version of the "Et in unum Dominum" included the "Et incarnatus est" part (for a while during 1748-1749, there was no separate movement for the latter). Later, probably in 1749, Bach composed a separate movement entitled "Et incarnatus est" based upon the text he had removed from the text-laden ('too full of text') duet. Then he went back to the "Et in unum Dominum" duet movement and retexted it with the text that remained and made some changes to the vocal parts as well in order to accommodate the new text. This then is the 2<sup>nd</sup> later version that we are familiar with today.

The NBA KB II/1 (Smend, 1956) on pp. 333-334 gives the changes in the text of the two later versions as follows:

Version 1 (probably 1748)

mm. 9-28: Et in unum Dominum Jesum Christum Filium Dei unigenitum et ex Patre natum ante omnia secula,  
mm. 34-42: Deum de Deo, lumen de lumine, Deum verum de Deo vero, genitum non factum, consubstantialem Patri, per quem omnia facta sunt,  
mm. 48-62: qui propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem descendit de coelis,  
mm. 64-76: et incarnatus est de Spiritu sancto ex Maria virgine et homo factus est.

Version 2 (probably 1749) musical score written out once again with some changes to the vocal lines; at the top of the page Bach writes: *Duo Voces Articuli* (this did not appear with Version 1).

mm. 9-28: Et in unum Dominum Jesum Christum Filium Dei unigenitum  
mm. 34-42: et ex Patre natum ante omnia secula,  
mm. 48-62: Deum de Deo, lumen de lumine, Deum verum de Deo vero, genitum non factum, consubstantialem patri, per quem omnia facta sunt,  
mm. 64-76: qui propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem descendit de coelis.

Thomas Braatz