

[May God bless them from on high.]”<sup>7</sup> The entry was written by Höffler’s father-in-law, Pastor Adam Medel. He must have been somewhat confused by the events, as the notated dates were contradictory: January 27, 1691, fell on Saturday, not Tuesday. The Feast of St. Paul’s Conversion was celebrated on January 25, which in 1691 was on Thursday. Perhaps Pastor Medel associated the feast day with a Sunday, and therefore mixed up the days in the ledger. Exactly nine months after their wedding night, on October 28, 1691, Anna Magdalena and Conrad Höffler baptized Sybilla Magdalena, and chose as one of the child’s three godparents her grandfather, Pastor Adam Medel, an unusual selection at that time.

Joy and sorrow arrived together in the Höffler family: on September 22, 1693, Anna Magdalena Höffler delivered twins; the first-born child was baptized Sophia Christina two days later. Information about the twin sister or brother is found in the Weissenfels obituaries for September 1693: “Stillborn infant child of Mr. Conrad Höfler [*sic*], the Duke of Saxony’s chamber musician, brought to the cemetery by the midwife Susana and laid to rest without ceremonies.” The last child of the couple, Margaretha Elisabeth, was born on October 14, 1695.

Altogether we find Höffler mentioned six times as godfather in Weissenfels between 1681 and 1692; for instance, on October 3, 1691, he stood for Johannes, the son of Johann Beer. Parents usually asked their nearest relatives and prominent citizens as godparents for their children. In Weissenfels, Höffler lived a considerable distance from his own family, and the fact that he was often asked to serve as godfather demonstrates the high esteem in which he was held by his colleagues.

As stated in Johann Beer’s account, the “Cammer Musicus und Violdigambist” Conrad Höffler died on August 19, 1696 in Weissenfels, and according to his obituary he was buried on the evening of August 22. His widow survived him by nearly fifteen years; her funeral was held on the night of April 26, 1711.<sup>8</sup> One month after Höffler’s death, Johann Beer was named guardian of

---

<sup>7</sup> The biographical article on Höffler by Karl Heinz Pauls in earlier editions of *Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart* contains incorrect information on this point.

<sup>8</sup> The death notice gives Magdalena Catharina as first names; probably the marriage and death notices give incomplete names of Höffler’s second wife.

his “two surviving sons from the first marriage” by the principality’s government. (Probably this referred to the children Johann Christian and Johann Christoph, born October 3, 1686 and October 1, 1688 respectively.) Beer was obligated as godfather only to Johann Conradt, the eldest of the three surviving children of the first marriage; his assumption of the additional responsibilities may well be considered an act of friendship to the deceased Höffler.

With his *Primitiae Chelicae*, published in 1695 most likely at his own expense, Conrad Höffler established a monument to himself. The complete title of the print reads as follows: “*PRIMITIAE CHELICAE*, or Musical Firstlings comprising 12 Suites for solo Viola da gamba in different modes together with their Basslines, arranged according to the newest style in Instrumental music and humbly dedicated and composed in honor of the illustrious Duke and Lord Johann Adolph, Duke of Saxony [...] his most gracious



Title page of Conrad Höffler's *Primitiae Chelicae*

With thanks to Ms. Doreen Busch for pointing out the entries in the Weissenfels church registries.

Prince and Lord, by His Highness's Chamber Musician Conrad Höffler, Nuremberg. In the year 1695."<sup>9</sup>

In his dedication to Duke Johann Adolph I, Höffler emphasizes that the printed harmonies are a reflection of the music that he had performed for the Duke's pleasure. During the fifteen years following the establishment of the court in Weissenfels, Höffler had been occupied in satisfying the Duke's musical tastes, and the music that has been handed down to us is the sole testimony to Höffler's expert gamba playing. Höffler was well aware of the significance of his engraving and skillfully chose his words, transforming their submissive character into an allegorical image: "Some may offer you gold, silver, or other precious materials. I can only give copper, nonetheless, whenever such as your Serene Majesty, whose most lenient rays of mercy are like the Sun, finds it worthy in your fair sight, there is no doubt that otherwise ordinary bronze will be changed into gold." Furthermore, we can take from the dedicatory text that Höffler had the encouragement and support of "several famous masters" for the publication. What could be more likely than for Höffler to have had Johann Philipp Krieger and Johann Beer in mind? Krieger, who like Höffler was born in Nuremberg, had printed and published his works throughout the 1680s and 90s with Wolfgang Moritz Endter, a successful Nuremberg book printer, editor, and publisher. Endter could well have been involved in the printing of the *Primitiæ Chelicæ*. The support of Johann Beer is evident; his Latin quatrain praising Höffler is on the title page engraved by Christian Romstet, with Höffler's portrait.

Christian Romstet (Romsted, Rumstet, 1640–1721) was an important illustrator and engraver in Leipzig, and both burghers and members of the nobility ordered copperplate portraits from him. He prepared two sketched portraits of Heinrich Schütz, the second of which was done when Schütz was court Kapellmeister in

---

<sup>9</sup> *PRIMITIÆ CHELICÆ, Oder / Musicalische Erstlinge / In 12. durch unterschiedliche Tone eingetheilte Sviten Viola diGamba Solo samt / ihrer Basi, nach der ietzt florirenden Instrumental-Arth eingerichtet / Und /Dem Durchlauchtigsten Fürsten und Herrn / Herrn Johann Adolphen / Hertzogen zu Sachsen [...] seinem gnädigsten Fürsten und Herrn / zu unterthänigsten Ehren dediciret und componiret / Von Hochbesagter Seiner Durchl. Cammer-Musico / Conrad Höfflern / Noribergensi. Anno M DC XCV.*



Portrait of Conrad Höffler, from his *Primitiae Chelicae*

Dresden; it was printed for his funeral, together with the memorial sermon. Romstet also made portraits of Johannes Olearius, the senior chaplain of Duke August of Saxe-Weissenfels in Halle, in residence at the Weissenfels court from 1680 until his death in 1684; and the Lutheran theologian August(us) Pfeiffer, who was highly esteemed by Johann Sebastian Bach. Höffler therefore chose a well-known and admired artist for his portrait, someone whose work would honor and lend importance to the sitter. The beautiful engraving, lavishly designed with numerous musical instruments (more decorative than representative), shows us Höffler's thin face in his forty-eighth year.<sup>10</sup>

On the bottom edge of the page is an added inscription of ownership by a certain Joannes Christophorus Schrapsius, repeated in a similar form on the title page of the text. Schrap came from Zwickau and presumably attended the local Latin school there.

<sup>10</sup> Robert Eitner and Curt Sachs misinterpreted the inscription "Æ T[at]is 48." in the accompanying script, which resulted in the attribution of a wrong date of birth.

Later, in the nearby city of Glauchau, he established a *Winkelschule*, an alternative private school; after this was prohibited, he became a Baccalaureus (third-level teacher) at the regular Glauchau city school and held that position until his death in 1768. As the date of acquisition, “Sept 27 [1754],” indicates, the Höffler print came into the possession of the Zwickau council-school library (*Ratsschulbibliothek Zwickau/Sachsen*) during the rectorship of Christian Clodius (rector 1740–1778), presumably as a donation, although it was possibly a purchase, which would explain Clodius’s penciled entry “?gl” (later erased).<sup>11</sup> There is no way of determining why Schraps, who was probably born about the time of Höffler’s death, owned a copy of the gamba suites or if he was himself able to perform the music. At the very least, the excellent condition of the print would suggest that it was seldom used and that Schraps was the sole owner. By the time it entered the council-school library, Höffler’s music had gone out of fashion.

Returning to Johann(es) Beer and his preface beneath the Höffler portrait, his pertinent remarks read as follows:

“Höffler, whose exterior appearance you now see, is appealing because of his spiritual liveliness, but even more so because of the artistry of his hand. He has changed the rules, just as he has captivated the ears with his lyre, for (to my amazement) he has been able to form his own style.”

At first sight, this text is puzzling. The key to understanding it lies in the musical-aesthetic attitudes of Beer and Höffler. Johann Beer (Behr, Bär, Bähr, Ursus, 1655–1700) came from Sankt Georgen im Attergau and entered the court ensemble in Halle as an alto just a few weeks after Höffler. In 1680, he was one of the ensemble members who moved to the new Residence in Weissenfels. On the Saturday before Easter, 1685, according to his own account, he took over the position of “concertmaster” of the ducal ensemble, for which he negotiated “an extraordinary appointment,” an exclusive contract. On December 6, 1697 he additionally took on the duties of ducal librarian. His life ended tragically: during a bird-shooting expedition “the shotgun of Captain Barthen unexpectedly discharged,” blowing off oboist David Heinrich

---

<sup>11</sup> For this information I thank Gregor Hermann of the Council-School Library in Zwickau, Saxony.



Page of music from Höffler's *Primitivæ Cheliceæ*

Gasthoff's lower lip, and striking Beer in the neck. Although the lead bullet was removed, Beer died nine days afterward. With his death, the Residence lost a multi-talented artist: musician, composer, wood-carver, poet, writer, and music theorist. His literary works, published under his own name and a variety of pseudonyms, would have filled a small library and included chivalric romances and comedies as well as autobiographical, theological, political, satirical, historical, and musical-aesthetic works.

In Chapter 11 of his book *Musical Discourses* (*Musicalische Discurse*), published posthumously in 1719, Beer formulated his musical credo: "Do the rules follow the ear, or does the ear follow the rules? This issue has long been debated by numerous critics, who have spared no pains to establish the fundamental nature of music.... If the ear or the beauty of music comes indeed from the rules, it would be as if the mother is born of the daughter: *quod est absurdum*. Furthermore, how can one formulate a rule regarding something that does not exist? Can a surveyor measure a plot of land that is not there? Were you named Hans before you were born? Therefore, my absolute *perpetuum asserere*: the rules are derived from the ear, not the ear from the rules. You may dispute it as long as you like, whether music sounds well because it follows the rules, or that the rules are made because one hears first of all

whether it sounds well or ill. Here is my assertion: music comes first, before the rules.”

And what do we read in Höffler’s “Brief Notice to the Musical Reader” (*Kurtze Erinnerung an den Musicalischen Leser*)? “I bring this, my first work, into the light of day, and at the same time open myself up to criticism. But this fear is not great enough to limit my intentions unnecessarily.... I have treated regular fugues as irregular and vice versa, irregular as regular, and have not bound myself to a rule that might go against my conscience when they leap over the walls of the musical cloister and alter the mode.” Those who have reprimanded Höffler for breaking the rules of counterpoint (as did Alfred Einstein, for example) should reconsider. Höffler and Beer were linked not only through their proximity as friends and colleagues, but also by a shared musical-aesthetic point of view. They were connected in spirit, and in his preface Beer recognized with awe how Höffler had freely treated the rules of composition in the *Primitiæ Cheliciæ* and thereby created his own inimitable style.

Höffler’s words regarding his own regular and irregular fugues require an explanation, and this we find in Friedrich Wilhelm Marpurg’s *A Treatise on the Fugue* (*Abhandlung von der Fuge*, Berlin, 1753): “A fugue, the characteristic elements of which are properly arranged according to the rules, is called a regular fugue—*fuga propria* or *regularis*. A fugue in which these elements are not so arranged but rather are arbitrarily handled is called an irregular fugue—*fuga impropria* or *irregularis*.” According to Marpurg, “in all fugues, five characteristic elements are to be distinguished”: the “leader” [opening statement] and “companion” [answer] (for *Dux* and *Comes*); the “restatement” (for “the arrangement by which the opening and the answer are heard alternately in the different voices”); the “counterpart” (for the “composition that is set against the fugue theme in the remaining voices”); and the “connecting passage” (for segments between the different executions of the fugue theme). As regards counterpoint, there can be no greater freedom in a fugue than the deference of a mathematically clear organization to the dictates of the ear. Or in the words of Beer: “The rules are derived from the ear, not the ear from the rules.”

As a precaution, in the “Brief Notice to the Musical Reader” Höffler defends himself against possible accusations of plagiarism, in his choice of melodic material as well as longer musical passages. However, he recognizes his occasional musical borrowings: “It is not forbidden for the pastor to rework another’s text.... They are also mistaken who, with all too shallow comprehension, claim that imitation is nothing more than mere copying.” To counter the risks inherent in his endeavors, Höffler explains that he has “arranged the suites according to the now-flourishing instrumental style.”

Höffler’s twelve suites contain no notated ornaments with the exception of a single trill, in significant contrast to August Kühnel’s *Sonate ô Partite ad una ô due Viole da Gamba con il Basso Continuo*, which appeared just three years later. According to Höffler’s remarks, such notation would require additional oral instructions. He nonetheless assumed that ornaments would be added, leaving them up to the sensitivity and discretion of the individual player.

In 1695, at the time of his first printing, Höffler had planned to publish another work, but there is no evidence that he was able to bring his plans to fruition before his approaching death. The *Primitiae Chelicae* exemplify Höffler’s musical prowess and place him along with August Kühnel and Johann Schenck among the leading viola da gamba players of the late seventeenth century.