

*Some Remarks*  
*on the*  
*Formation*  
*of the Classical*  
*Style:*

*Instrumental Music*  
*by Amandus Ivanschiz<sup>1</sup>*

**MACIEJ JOCHYMCZYK**

The Jagiellonian University, Cracow

*INTRODUCTION*

The instrumental works by Amandus Ivanschiz attracted the interest of musicians and musicologists as early as the 1930s<sup>2</sup>. Even though several papers and one longer (unpublished) dissertation have so far been dedicated to them<sup>3</sup>, and many of the compositions appeared in print, our knowledge about this part of the composer's output is still fragmentary and superficial. The main reason for this situation is the lack of extensive source studies. Many of the printed works are random examples, not really representative of their author's technique and style, submitted to arrangements (in a varying degree), some even wrongly ascribed to Ivanschiz.

As in this case the biography is vital to a proper evaluation of the composer's oeuvre, let us list the key facts of his life. Born just before Christmas 1727 in the Austrian town of Wiener Neustadt (the exact date is unknown), he was baptised on 24<sup>th</sup> December and christened Matthias Leopold. His father came from the village of Baumgarten (presently in the Austrian Burgenland) inhabited by the Croatian minority. It was in Wiener Neustadt that on 25<sup>th</sup> December 1743 the young Matthias Leopold entered the Order of Saint Paul the First Hermit (the Paulines), taking the name of Amandus, and where he was ordained a priest on 15<sup>th</sup> November 1750. The composer spent the years 1751–1754 in Rome as assistant (*socius*) to Procurator General of the Order to the Holy See. Undoubtedly during his stay in the Eternal City, Ivanschiz had the opportunity to become acquainted with the music performed in Italy at that time and learn the most recent trends directly at

their source. From 1755 onward, we have documents of Amandus' residence in the Mariatrost Monastery near Graz and his musical activity in that place. This is also where he died in 1758, aged barely 31<sup>4</sup>.

Until recently, mainly on the basis of source dating, the end of the composer's activity was situated in the 1760s, 70s, or even the 1790s<sup>5</sup>. Even those scholars who accepted these late dates still saw Ivanschiz as one of the precursors of the new style, especially with respect to the symphony – a view that is also reflected in the entry for *Symphony* in *The New Grove Dictionary*<sup>6</sup>. The surprisingly early date of his death places his sizeable output, clearly belonging to the early Classical style, in a new light, transforming our knowledge about stylistic changes between the two eras so significantly that many encyclopaedic entries on the music of that time may need to be thoroughly rewritten.

Leaving out the works of doubtful or erroneous attribution, Ivanschiz's surviving instrumental oeuvre consists of 20 symphonies and 13 chamber trios preserved in ca 90 copies<sup>7</sup> on the territory of Austria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia, as well as in single manuscripts held in Belgium, Slovenia and Sweden. For the sake of comparison, his vocal-instrumental output comprises ca 50 works (exclusively of religious character) preserved in more than 200 sources, and so it is clearly more extensive and better disseminated<sup>8</sup>.

**1** The author of this article conducted studies on Father Amandus Ivanschiz's life and work, originally in the context of his doctoral dissertation dedicated to that composer's religious music (cf. footnote 4), and currently within a research project which aims at producing a monograph as well as a full thematic catalogue of Ivanschiz's works. The project is financed from the National Science Center's funds awarded on the basis of the decision number DEC-2011/03/N/HS2/00853.

**2** The earliest publications on this subject include: Vladimír Helfert, 'Průkopnický význam české hudby v 18. Století', in: *Co daly naše země Evropě a lidstvu*, Praha 1939, pp. 216–221; Theodora Straková, 'O neznámém skladateli předklasického údobí (P. Amandus Ivanschiz a jeho vztah k otázce vývoje sonátové formy na naší půdě)', *Časopis Moravského muzea v Brně* XXXIV (1949), pp. 218–231.

**3** Danilo Pokorn, *Amandus Ivančič in njegovo posvetno skladateljsko delo*, doctoral dissertation, University of Ljubljana 1977.

**4** For the details of the composer's biography and his religious works, see: Maciej Jochymczyk, *Twórczość religijna o. Amandus Ivanschiza OSPPE [The Religious Music of Father Amandus Ivanschiz OSPPE]*, doctoral dissertation, The Jagiellonian University, Institute of Musicology, Cracow 2012.

**5** Cf. e.g. Lovro Županović, *Stoljeća hrvatske glazbe*, Zagreb 1980, and the English edition: Id., *Centuries of Croatian Music*, op. cit., pp. 141–152.

**6** Jan Larue, Eugene K. Wolf, *Symphony, §1: 18th century*, in: *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, ed. Stanley Sadie, vol. 24, New York–London 2001.

**7** Since neither the study of 18<sup>th</sup>-century music sources nor of Ivanschiz's instrumental works has been completed yet, these numbers should not be considered as final.

**8** This is a notable fact, as seven of the trios and one symphony by Father Amandus are listed in the Breitkopf catalogue (of 1767) and two of these trios also appear in the Ringmacher catalogue (of 1773), which means that the works were relatively easily available in manuscript copies prepared on commission. Cf.: *Supplemento II. dei Catalogi delle Sinfonie, Partite, Ouverture, Soli, Duetti, Trii, Quattri e Concerti per il Violino, Flauto Traverso, Cembalo ed altri Stromenti. Che si trovano in manoscritto nella Officina Musica di Breitkopf in Lipsia 1767*, p. 23 (under the name "Ivanschiz"), p. 9 (under the name

Contemporary music publications do not reflect these proportions. The first printed edition of Ivanschiz's vocal-instrumental music only appeared in 2013<sup>9</sup>, whereas his instrumental works had become the object of publishers' interest much earlier. Already in the 1970s, twelve of the symphonies attributed to this composer were printed in the series *Spomenici hrvatske glazbene prošlosti* (ed. Lovro Županović)<sup>10</sup>, and in the 1980s two other symphonies, edited by Danilo Pokorn, were included in the 14<sup>th</sup> volume of the monumental series *The Symphony 1720–1840*<sup>11</sup>. As these publications were largely based on unique or not very reliable sources, the editions contain two erroneously attributed works, while in several other cases the minuet was left out of classically constructed four-movement symphonies. The chamber string trios, which were published in the 1980s in two editions by Danilo Pokorn<sup>12</sup> and one by Paul M. Douglas<sup>13</sup>, were even less fortunate: as many as 6 out of 9 of the printed compositions (the contents of two volumes<sup>14</sup>) were based on the sources from the collection of the Margraves of Baden held in the Badische Landesbibliothek in Karlsruhe (D-KA). This was a particularly ill-advised choice, as in the Baden manuscripts Ivanschiz's works had been submitted to significant modifications. First of all, in most of them the violin part was entrusted to the transverse flute and adapted to suit the scale and possibilities of that instrument<sup>15</sup>. Some of

the compositions were transposed to other keys. Moreover the manuscripts from D-KA contain two works wrongly attributed to Ivanschiz, most likely composed by Franz Aspelmayr<sup>16</sup>. The 20<sup>th</sup>-century editors also introduced some changes in the instrumentation. Even though the preserved sources clearly indicate that the lowest voice in the trios was usually performed by the cello (see below) and it was not figured in any of the manuscripts, all the three editions added a fully realised part of basso continuo (referred to by Danilo Pokorn simply as "cembalo"), without clearly indicating that it comes from the editor. In this way, Ivanschiz's pioneering role in the formation of the classical string trio, the elimination of the continuo in chamber music and the use of a four-movement symphonic cycle – was effectively concealed by the editors.

### *CHAMBER MUSIC*<sup>17</sup>

Ivanschiz's thematic catalogue, which was part of Danilo Pokorn's dissertation, lists four categories of chamber music: sonatas, trios, divertimentos and simfonias<sup>18</sup>. This division, based on the titles in the manuscripts, was confirmed in Pokorn's and Douglas's printed editions<sup>19</sup>, which suggests that these are seen as four separate, clearly distinguishable music genres. A comprehensive analysis of the preserved music sources, as well as a comparison of the compositions themselves, however, lead to different conclusions. All of Ivanschiz's chamber music of safe attribution demonstrates clear similarities, especially with respect to the scoring and musical form. They are all (with one exception – that of the *Trio in F T.F.1*<sup>20</sup>)

of "Seiffert"); Christian Ulrich Ringmacher, *Catalogo de' soli, duetti, trii, quintetti, partite, de' concerti e delle sinfonie per il cembalo, violino, flauto traverso ed altri stromenti che si trovano in manoscritto nella officina musica di Christiano Ulrico Ringmacher librario in Berlino, 1773*, p. 96.

**9** Maciej Jochymczyk (ed.), *Amandus Ivanschiz, Missa in C*, «Musica Claromontana», vol. 10, Cracow 2013.

**10** Lovro Županović (ed.), «Spomenici hrvatske glazbene prošlosti», vol. 2: *Iz renesanse u barok (J. Skjavetić, T. Cecchini, A. Grgičević, I. Šibenčanin, A. Ivančić)*, Zagreb 1971; vol. 6: *Amando Ivančić, Simfonije I–V*, Zagreb 1975; vol. 7: *Amando Ivančić, Simfonije VI–XI*, Zagreb, 1976.

**11** Danilo Pokorn (ed.), *Amandus Ivančić, Two Symphonies: Them. Index F1, D9 [...]*, «The Symphony 1720–1840», series B, vol. 14, New York–London 1985.

**12** Danilo Pokorn (ed.), «Monumenta artis musicae Sloveniae», vol. 1: *Amandus Ivančić, [5] Sonata a tre*, Ljubljana 1983; vol. 3: *Amandus Ivančić, [3] Simfonije za dve violini in bas*, Ljubljana 1984.

**13** Paul M. Douglas (ed.), *Amandus Ivanschiz, Six Sonatas a Tre for Flute, Viola, and Basso Continuo*, vol. 1: nos. 1–3, London 1982.

**14** Paul M. Douglas (ed.), op. cit. and Pokorn Danilo (ed.), *Amandus Ivančić, [5] Sonate a tre*, op. cit. NB. Two of the pieces appear in both publications.

**15** Sometimes the changes consisted merely in transposing the sounds below *d*<sup>1</sup> an octave higher. In other cases, more serious

interference took place, e.g. figurations difficult to perform on the flute were transposed to the viola part.

**16** Shelf no. Mus. Hs. 225 and 229.

**17** For the purposes of this article, we accept the distinction between chamber and orchestral works within Ivanschiz's instrumental oeuvre. One must be aware, though, that this distinction concerns not just the choice of scoring, but first and foremost the style and technique. In the mid-18<sup>th</sup> century the criterion of performance forces was very far from precise. Symphonies could at times be played by soloists (and a typical ensemble was rarely larger than 2–3 instruments per part), whereas chamber music would occasionally be performed with multiple instruments interpreting each part (cf. e.g. the printed edition of Johann Stamitz's *Six Sonates à Trois parties concertantes qui sont faites pour exécuter ou à trois, ou avec toute l'Orchestre* of 1755).

**18** Danilo Pokorn, *Amandus Ivančić in njegovo posvetno skladateljsko delo*, op. cit., pp. 134–143.

**19** Cf. footnotes no. 12 i 13.

**20** The catalogue numbers refer to the thematic catalogue

three-part compositions constructed on the following model: (1) a slow movement – (2) minuet with trio – (3) a fast movement. The texture invariably contains three voices, to be performed by solo instruments: the highest part is played by the violin (replaced by a transverse flute in D-KA), the middle part – by a violin or a viola, while the lowest part requires a low string instrument and is referred to in the sources as a *basso* or *violoncello*. The titles on the manuscript covers include: “Trio”, “A tre”, “Divertimento”, “Sonata”, less frequently “Simfonia”, and in one case – “Sonatina”. These terms are, however, applied interchangeably, without relation to the form and style of the composition. As a rule, one and the same piece is entered in manuscripts of different provenience under different titles. For instance the *Trio in C* (T.C.1) is referred to as a “Trio”<sup>21</sup>, “Divertimento”<sup>22</sup>, “Sonata”<sup>23</sup>, “Sonatina”<sup>24</sup> and “A tre”<sup>25</sup>. An analysis of the surviving body of sources leads us to the conclusion that the use of one or another title was mainly related to the local tradition concerning musical terminology. For example, the covers of the three trios kept in the archive of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde in Vienna (all copied in the same hand) contain the term “Simfonia”, whereas the symphonies from the monastery of Kremsmünster are referred to as “Divertimento”. Regardless of the titles in manuscripts, all of Ivanschiz’s chamber music falls within the genre of the string trio, extremely popular in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, though now slightly forgotten<sup>26</sup>. A striking feature of his output is that the majority of the preserved works (9 out of 13) were composed for a violin, viola and basso (cello) – the characteristic line-up of a mature classical string trio<sup>27</sup>. In this context, we should revise the hypothesis presented by the authors of the entry for *String trio* in *The New Grove Dictionary*<sup>28</sup> that

the first composer to use this kind of scoring was Joseph Haydn. Haydn’s earliest trios were probably written in the late 1750s and the early 1760s<sup>29</sup>, and so – already after the death of Ivanschiz, who belonged to the first generation of Austrian musicians working in this genre. What is more, similarly as in some of Father Amandus’ vocal-instrumental works, the viola part is treated on a par with the violin and its role is not limited to doubling the melody in thirds and sixths or complementing the harmony (cf. example 1).

The two trios by Franz Aspelmayr (1728–1786) erroneously published under Ivanschiz’s name were probably composed some years later (though before 1767, as proved by thematic catalogues from that time). They differ from the works of the Pauline composer by structure of the cycle (a slow movement – a fast movement – a minuet) and a much more active bass part, which enters into dialogue with the other instruments (cf. example 2). In the trios by Father Amandus, the bass part mainly functions as the harmonic foundation and is not usually treated melodically. That the erroneously attributed works were in fact composed later is also confirmed by the use in the fast movements of a more elaborate sonata form, which contains a relatively more advanced development<sup>30</sup>. Furthermore there are differences in the way of composing minuets, which in Aspelmayr’s works do not contain trios and preserve the distinct character of a court dance<sup>31</sup>, whereas in Ivanschiz’s music they are more akin to an Austrian *ländler*.

The two harpsichord pieces wrongly ascribed to Ivanschiz deserve a separate mention. These are *Harpeggio per il cembalo* and *Parthia per il cembalo* signed “P[ad]re Amando” (now in the music collection of the National Museum in Prague, CZ-Pnm). As Ivanschiz played the organ, and his monastic name was hardly popular in that period, his authorship of the two works was considered likely. However, the collection of the Sächsische Landesbibliothek in Dresden (D-DI) contains four harpsichord pieces (one fugue and three sonatas da

---

of Amandus Ivanschiz’s works compiled by the author of this article (in preparation for print).

**21** D-B, Shelf no.: Mus.ms. 20375; D-RH Shelf no.: Ms 437, Ms 867 (library sigla after RISM).

**22** CZ-Bu, Shelf no.: Skř 17-525.714.

**23** D-KA, Shelf no.: Mus. Hs. 230.

**24** D-KBD, Shelf no.: KBD/KES K7 Ms091.

**25** A-LA, Shelf no.: 254.

**26** The importance of this genre is confirmed e.g. by the fact that the number of string trios composed in 1750–1780 significantly exceeded that of quartets, cf. Barry S. Brook, ‘Haydn’s String Trios: a Misunderstood Genre’, *Current Musicology* no. 36 (1983), pp. 61–77.

**27** The other four compositions have been preserved in versions for two violins and basso.

**28** Michael Tilmouth, Basil Smallman, *String Trio*, in: *The New*

---

*Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*: “Although the trio for two violins and cello was not wholly abandoned even during the 19<sup>th</sup> century, that for violin, viola and cello began to take precedence. Haydn seems to have been the first to use this combination, soon followed by Simon Le Duc (op.1, 1768), Boccherini (op.14, 1772) and Giardini (opp.17 and 20).”

**29** Cf. Barry S. Brook, ‘Haydn’s String Trios...’, pp. 74–75.

**30** Ivanschiz’s music illustrates an early stage of that form, almost completely without development.

**31** Aspelmayr’s father was a dance teacher, and he himself was employed, among others, as a composer of ballet music for the Viennese Kärntnertheater, so he must have been familiar with the qualities of a courtly minuet.

16  
Vn  
Vla  
Vlc

21  
Vn  
Vla  
Vlc

26  
Vn  
Vla  
Vlc

**Example 1.** A. Ivanschiz – *Trio in B* (T.B.1), Movement I: Adagio, bars 16–30\*

5  
Fl  
Vla  
B

11  
Fl  
Vla  
B

**Example 2.** F. Aspelmayr – *Trio* erroneously ascribed to Ivanschiz, Movement I: Largo, bars 5–15\*\*

\* After manuscript CZ-Pu, Shelf no.: 59 R 3548.

\*\* After manuscript D-KA, Shelf no.: Mus. Hs. 225. In the original, the piece was notated in F major and scored for two violins and basso (cello).

camera) signed “del Padre Amando Roffeld”, and one of these sonatas is identical with the “Parthia” held in Prague. Similar features of style and notation suggest that also the *Harpeggio*, bearing the same signature, is the work of a little known Czech composer, Father Amandus Roffeld (ca 1700–1780), rather than Ivanschiz.

### ORCHESTRAL WORKS

More than a half of the preserved symphonies by Ivanschiz (11 out of 20) follow the four-part model (with a minuet as the 3<sup>rd</sup> movement) which was then becoming the common convention of Classicism (the other nine demonstrate the traditional three-movement form looking back to the Italian *sinfonia*). This fact did not previously attract scholarly attention as – on the basis of source dating – it was assumed that those works were composed in 1755–1770<sup>32</sup> or even later, when cycles of that type were already used in numerous music centres. It was only the recent discovery of the composer’s date of death that entailed a significant change in the dating of his music, all of which must have been written before 1758, which means that Ivanschiz wrote four-movement symphonies in the same period as Johann Stamitz (1717–1757), who is considered a pioneer in this field<sup>33</sup>. This fact changes the well-established views on the history of the genre. According to what we know today, Ivanschiz’s symphonies are the earliest documented examples of a consistent use of the four-movement form in Austria (though previously it was used on individual occasions by other composers, the most famous example being M. G. Monn’s symphony of 1740). Consequently, the opinion that the “consistency of Stamitz’s use of four-movement form with penultimate minuet and trio has no analogue in the music of Austria or Bohemia before 1760”, expressed in the influential monograph by Eugene K. Wolf dedicated to Stamitz’s symphonies – must now be considered outdated<sup>34</sup>. Admittedly, the symphonies of the Mannheim school representative are much more numerous, but Ivanschiz’s output still proves that Austrian composers working away from the main centres associated with the formation of

the Classical style worked out similar solutions in the same period. What is more, two of the four-movement symphonies by the Pauline composer are preceded by a slow introduction, showing an earlier application of this idea than previously thought<sup>35</sup>.

In the first movements of Father Amandus’ symphonies, we find a more advanced sonata form than that used in his chamber music. The development – in agreement with theoretical recipes of the day – is brief and does not play any major role, but in the exposition we have two distinct, contrasted thematic groups, which return in the fundamental key in the reprise. Also the overall tonal concept of the symphonic cycle is different from that of Ivanschiz’s chamber music. The slow movement in the symphonies uses the key of the dominant or the subdominant, whereas in the chamber trios all the movements of the cycle maintain the same key, following the fashion of the Baroque.

The scoring of Ivanschiz’s symphonies is rather conservative. It is centred on a string ensemble *a quattro* (two violins, a viola and basso), supplemented in seven compositions by a pair of brass instruments (trumpets or horns). The bass part is – with few exceptions – non-figured, though we can glean from the preserved sources that in some places it could also be interpreted by keyboard instruments (especially the organ – in the case of church performances).

As already suggested, Ivanschiz’s musical language – both in his chamber and orchestral works – demonstrates distinct early Classical qualities. The melody has a clear periodic structure, in some cases – with symmetrical phrase length. It is also light and vivid, and makes use of triplets and appoggiaturas that are characteristic of that style. Harmonic structures are simplified. The compositions are mostly constructed on long, tonally stable planes, using harmonic progressions typical of the fully crystallised major-minor system. The harmonic rhythm is slowed down. There is also a marked predilection for the major keys with the minimum number of key signatures. The melodically active, late Baroque basso continuo part gives way to a bass understood as a harmonic fundament, frequently consisting of multiple repetitions of the same sound, which enliven the rhythmic progressions (the so-called *Trommelbass*).

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Jan Larue, Eugene K. Wolf, *Symphony, §I: 18th century*, op. cit.

<sup>33</sup> 30 out of 58 symphonies by J. Stamitz are four-movement cycles, though most likely this only became the standard form of his compositions in the late 1740s. Cf. Eugene K. Wolf, *The Symphonies of Johann Stamitz. A Study in the Formation of the Classic Style*, Utrecht–Boston etc., 1981, pp. 79, 84.

<sup>34</sup> Eugene K. Wolf, *The Symphonies of Johann Stamitz...*, op. cit., pp. 88–89.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. e.g. Jan Larue, Eugene K. Wolf, *Symphony, §I: 18th century*, op. cit.

CONCLUSION

The question of the possible influence of the Mannheim school on the formation of the Classical style in Vienna has long been the subject of debate in scholarly publications<sup>36</sup>. If we follow Webster in assuming that the school did not make a major impact, we face the need to search for a missing link or source of inspiration in the Austrian repertoires<sup>37</sup>. The case of Ivanschiz shows that the poorly researched work of early Classical composers working outside the main centres may provide answers to many key questions concerning stylistic transformations in the mid-18<sup>th</sup> century. In view of the universal problem with dating of the preserved compositions, Ivanschiz's music turns out to be especially valuable as research material, since it possesses an intransgressible *terminus ante quem* provided by the date of the composer's untimely death in 1758. It now seems obvious that, without rediscovering the work of Ivanschiz and many similar composers, our picture of the origins of musical Classicism and the musical culture in that period will remain incomplete and inaccurate.

---

**36** Cf. e.g.: James Webster, 'Towards a History of Viennese Chamber Music in the Early Classical Period', "Journal of the American Musicological Society", vol. 27, no. 2 (Summer, 1974) pp. 214, 215; Eugene K. Wolf, *The Symphonies of Johann Stamitz...*, op. cit., pp. 88–91.

**37** Far from claiming to solve this complex problem, I would only like to point out that Ivanschiz's works were known in the circles of the Esterházy musicians in Eisenstadt already at an early stage of Joseph Haydn's activity. This is confirmed e.g. by manuscripts of two four-movement symphonies by Father Amandus coming from Eisenstadt and dated to ca 1760 (H-Bn, Shelf no.: Ms. mus. IV. 597 and Ms. mus. IV. 596). The manuscripts belonged to the violinist Franz Nigst and were most likely sold to Prince Esterházy's orchestra.