Casper Schaffner and Musical Commonplacing

On a page from a commonplace handwriting book compiled around the turn of the 19th century, Casper Schaffner III (1767-1825) presented a self-portrait (Figure 1). The phrase “Command of Hand” stands boldly in the middle of the page. It is surrounded on four sides with other words, each penned in a different style: business, music, wine, and love. The central text on the page reflects Schaffner’s primary occupation—like his father, Schaffner was a town scriviner in Lancaster, Pennsylvania. But as his revealing creation illustrates, he did not define himself merely by his profession. Schaffner, who boldly expresses his passion for music, wine and love, saw his life as anything but one-dimensional.

Because he was male, public records document many of his civic and business engagements. For example, tax records list him variously as a shopkeeper, account clerk, scrivener, and conveyancer (one who prepared deeds, leases and other documents to change the ownership of property from one party to another). Apparently interested in the development of his city, he surveyed the Pennsylvania Turnpike, helped manage a lottery to defray street repair expenses in 1813, and was an early stockholder in the Columbia Bridge Company, which completed a bridge over the Susquehanna River in 1814 costing an astonishing $231,771.

---

1 I can locate two models for different parts of Schaffner’s creation. “Command of Hand” is modeled on the same text on page 16 of George Bickham’s *The Universal Penman*. The bird is modeled on page 42 of the same text. George Bickham, *The Universal Penman* (London, 1742). Reprinted by Dover in 1968.
2 Tax records list Schaffner in various occupations as follows: freeman from 1788 to 1791, shopkeeper from 1792 to 1793, scriviner from 1800 to 1801, (in 1802 his occupation is blank) and conveyancer from 1807 to 1812. Records are missing for years not listed. Lancaster Borough Tax records (microfilm), Lancaster County Historical Society. Lancaster, PA.
Schaffner’s name appears on dozens of wills throughout his lifetime, which illustrates one of his duties as a scrivener. At this point in time, wills were typically written while a person was on his or her death bed, and thus Schaffner was in a sense a harbinger of death.

Despite significant documentation of his public duties, Schaffner’s private life is veiled. However, several commonplace books hint at a rich home life as well. Two of these are music manuscripts, totaling over 600 pages, and indicate that he was an accomplished keyboard player. The lack of documentation of his musical life is especially interesting in light of a profound level of musical knowledge and wide range of musical taste. It is known only that he volunteered for a brief period of time as organist at the First Reformed Church in Lancaster, a position he took in 1795 and likely stepped down from soon after 1799.\(^4\) His music manuscripts, far more than a collection of popular music at this time, demonstrate a complexity of American “amateur” musical culture that far exceeds current expectations. They also demonstrate a complexity of printed musical culture that expands our knowledge of how print was used and how it circulated.

In addition to his music manuscripts, a commonplace handwriting book survives and studied alongside the musical commonplace books provides a new perspective on the act of commonplacing itself and, perhaps ironically, further insight how printed material was used at this time. By examining the physical structure of the books, studying the sources from which Schaffner borrowed, and examining how he organized and altered the material to suit his purposes, we gain a deeper understanding print culture and its relationship to manuscripts at this time.

Handwriting Book

The unique binding and construction of Schaffner’s book tells us a good deal about his working process and devotion. Typically, a compiler writes on the paper that is physically sewn into the binding (writing two pages on a folio for bifolio construction and four for quarto, etc.). Schaffner, however, constructs his book in a different and unusual manner. Schaffner writes on one side of a single folio. The pages on which he writes are not physically in the binding; rather, thicker paper is bound and sticks out from the binding in stubs. Schaffner glues his folios onto this thicker paper. It appears that Schaffner possibly did not originally intend to bind his creations. Perhaps each of these pages began their lives with a different purpose. Were they tools for teaching or practicing? Or perhaps they were created in joy, without an end in sight.

A consideration of the watermarks reveals still more about his unusual method of construction. They show that Schaffner copied his book over an extended period of time. The papers of the 38 page book were produced by a multitude of makers; the earliest watermark on record comes from 1794 while the latest comes from 1801, although it appears some of the paper is older and some newer than this. Additionally, one of the pages was copied at least as late as 1809. Perhaps this is but a prized selection of many he designed over his lifetime.

The organization of the book also tells us about Schaffner’s familial relationships, particularly that with his father, whom he lived next door to for all of his adult life. The depth of their relationship and their shared beliefs are revealed on the pages of the handwriting book in which the two collaborated. An example of this is a drawing of the outside of a beehive surrounded by bees drawn by his father (Figure 2). Around the hive, the son wrote, “The means industry—the result plenty.” One page of the manuscript created in October of 1806 illustrates a devotional practice typical of the time: writing prayers in as miniscule a hand as possible. While
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this practice was typically done in individual acts of devotion, in this manuscript, father and son collaborate, each writing prayers on the same page (Figure 3). Two of the five prayers are contained in circles, also a common practice, and all are written in German script.

Other collaborations take a political slant. The handwriting book reveals both father and son as revolutionaries and ardent supporters of the new government. Around an elaborate drawing of a stern George Washington in a wig by his father, the son copies a text from Thomas Jefferson’s 1781 work *Notes on Virginia*.

“In war we have produced a Washington, whose memory will be adored while liberty shall have votaries, whose name shall triumph over time, and will in future ages assume its just station among the most celebrated worthies of the world, when that wretched philosophy shall be forgotten which would have arranged him among the degeneracies of nature.”

The two also create a page for Thomas Jefferson, likely in honor of his retirement in 1809. A portrait of the President is surround by an ornate declaration, “Jefferson, the friend of the people” and framed with, “The retirement of a Patriot Sage from Power renders his Glory immortal” (Figure 4). On the page that follows is a tribute to James Madison sans portrait: his name and “President of the United States, March 4, 1809,” the day he took office.

A zealous Jeffersonian, Schaffner creates yet another page in his honor. This time, the youngest Casper wrote a song for him and evidently performed somewhere. The music is a sprightly eight-bar air in G major tucked away at the bottom, while the eleven stanzas of text fill the page. He hopes Jefferson will “remain the People’s pride,” guided by his mind and truth. This is not Schaffner’s only musical composition that is commemorated in this volume, for he includes another text for which he composed and performed a song on March 4, 1801.

---

Schaffner also creates a page featuring excerpts from two of Thomas Paine’s works: his famous 1776 pamphlet *Common Sense* and his 1791 work *The Rights of Man*. Interestingly, Schaffner’s tribute was made after Jefferson took office—sometime in 1801 or after, as that is the date of watermark. Schaffner copies the first three of the seventeen “Rights of Man.” At the bottom of the page, Schaffner writes the quotation from James Thomas’ poem “Liberty” that opens *Common Sense*: “Man knows no master save creating heaven, or those whom choice and common good ordain.”

Like many other Americans burning with revolutionary spirit, father and son were quite disgusted when the great Napoleon became yet another dictator. Rather than lash out, father and son condemn the French ruler in a subtle yet poignantly profound manner. Father’s contribution is a striking portrait of Napoleon, around which the son writes text (Figure 5). A highly decorated Bonaparte tops the page, under which the younger Schaffner writes, “Sic transit Gloria mundi!” which he translates as “Thus passes away the glory of the world.” The Schaffner’s are marking the death of Bonaparte, for Napoleon Bonaparte has become Napoleon I.

The Schaffners’ views about Napoleon’s politics are made still more explicit when the son copies an excerpt from “Ode, to France” by Edward Rushton, published on August 24, 1802 in London’s the *Morning Chronicle*.

“He who o’erwhelms his country’s foe,
yet lays his country’s freedom low,
Must fear, tho’ girl with guards & state,
From each bold arm the stroke of fate.
And thou, usurping warrior, thou
To whom the weak and timid bow,
Thou splendid curse, whose actions prove,
That states may be undone by love,
Thou foe to man, uphold by martial breath,
Thy march is on a mine, thy every dream is death.”

At the bottom of the page, Schaffner has added a flourish in the form of a fish, similar to many found in George Bickham’s popular handwriting book *The Universal Penman*. 
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Schaffner’s creative juxtapositions and novel assembly of disparate elements recur throughout the manuscript. A knight on a horse slaying a dragon fancifully battles in the center of another page. Schaffner meticulously recreated the image from Henry Dean’s *Analytical Guide* (Figures 6 and 7). \(^6\) Whereas Dean uses the page to demonstrate the Set Chancery Alphabet, Schaffner selects quotations and does not even write them in Dean’s script. Two quotations are included in George Shelley’s *Sentences and maxims divine, moral, and historical, in prose and verse*, a popular work that was reprinted several times during the earlier part of the 18\(^{th}\) century.\(^7\)

In other instances, Schaffner chooses excerpts to copy that exemplify his philosophy of life, cleverly altering the images or ideas presented in his models. For example, from a 1748 book published in London *The Art of Writing*, Schaffner copies, “Contentment, is the most precious Jewel of human Life, and the way to Attain it, is the surmounting Difficulties, by curbing vicious Inclination, fierce unruly Passions, in bearing injuries with patience, and overcoming Temptations” (Figure 8)\(^8\) He surrounds this insightful snippet with images taken from various pages of Henry Dean’s book, which Schaffner molds into his own new design. The eagle on a globe at the bottom of the page is a less ornate version of an eagle Dean used in the middle of a page displaying the Italian alphabet (Figure 9). In the flourish above the eagle’s

---

\(^6\) The watermark on this page dates from 1801.

\(^7\) Shelley’s reads, “Marcellus, when he had taken Syracuse, wept over that once Flourishing City, and particularly lamented the Death of Archimedes; esteeming one learned and wise Man, equal to the Power of a whole Commonwealth.” George Shelley, *Sentences and maxims divine, moral, and historical, in prose and verse* (London: 1752): 69. Schaffner’s reads, “Marcellus, when he had taken Syracuse, particularly lamented o’er the deaths of Archimedes, esteeming one learned and wise man, equal to the power of a whole Commonwealth.” For the second quotation, Shelley’s reads, “He who would be ranked above the Vulgar, must raise his Thoughts and Actions above them. For it is in Life as in a Play, wherein it is not so much regarded who is Prince and Beggar, as who acts the Prince and Beggar best.” Ibid., 43. Schaffner’s reads: “He who’d be ranked above the Vulgar, must raise his Actions above ‘em, for ‘tis in Life as in a Play, wherein it is not so much regarded who is Prince or Beggar, as who acts those Parts the best.”

\(^8\) *The art of writing, illustrated with copper-plates: to which is added a collection of letters, and directions for addressing persons of distinction either in writing or discourse.* (London: printed for J. Newbery, 1748): 57-58.
head where Dean wrote “Dean’s,” Schaffner has written “scripsit,” which reads with the texts to the left and right: “scripsit Casper Schaffner, Junior, Lancaster.” Above the quotation, Schaffner has borrowed from a page in the back of Dean’s book (Figure 10). The cherub above a pen tops an exercise showing sentences beginning with every letter. Schaffner has replaced “Modern Round Hand Copies” in the center of the pen with “Specimen of Penmanship.” Where Dean had written “Dean’s,” Schaffner leaves blank, omitting the flourishes as well as the text, altering the actual design rather than just moving around parts.

Not a haphazard imitator of other’s work, Schaffner took time and care in selecting quotations from others and planning what designs from Henry Dean and George Bickham to copy and combine. Schaffner was self-consciously thoughtful, commenting on design itself within his book. Between a bird and a trumpet-playing angel modeled on two different images by Henry Dean, Schaffner copies an 18th-century maxim included in many collections of sentences.

“Be not over precipitate in your Designs, great Designs require great Considerations; & also, they must have their time of maturing, otherwise they will certainly prove abortive. The Fox reproached the Lioness for her Sterility and Slowness in Breeding; She answer’d, it is true I breed slowly, but then Remember that what I bring forth is a Lion.”

Schaffner is thinking about how designs are effectively crafted, so much so that he even writes about it amongst his creations that he so carefully considered.

Schaffner writes about other elements of great design elsewhere in this book. In the center of a page, Schaffner uses the body of a swan copied from Henry Dean to frame a maxim about design. “He who would be a Master, must draw to the Life, as well as copy from

---

9 “Be not over precipitate in your designs; great designs require great considerations, and they must have their time of maturing, otherwise they will prove abortive. The fox reproached the lioness for her sterility and slowness in breeding; she answered, it is true I breed slowly, but what I bring forth is a lion.” Joseph Longman, Sentences, divine, moral, and historical; in prose and verse; with copies for the alphabet (Weymouth: E. Easton, 1786): 34. Variations on this are included in numerous other sources. The watermark for this page is from 1801.
Above this, in a series of flourishes, Schaffner copies another epigram about the qualities of a master. “As he that is Master of a good Invention, shows he hath a lively fancy, so he that makes a good Collection, hath Judgment.”

He includes a fish, also copied from Dean, at the bottom of the page.

More than a compiler, Schaffner is a creator and an author in his own right. He writes, “The Entertainment arising from the Fine Arts is often the effect of a fanciful and judicious arrangement,” illustrating the value he placed on careful and thoughtful arrangement. On another page with many embellishments, he writes “Variety Pleaseth.” While the words are often not his own and the individual parts have models, the whole is Schaffner’s design, and he selected each part from a variety of sources. His commonplacing technique carries over to his music manuscripts. Indeed, his treatment of text and musical text are parallel, and our understanding of the handwriting book enhances the depth of our understanding of the music manuscripts.

**Music Manuscripts**

Schaffner’s music manuscripts are both quite large but are different sizes and orientation. The first manuscript is more oblong, while the second more vertical; the latter contains more pages and is thicker. In the first volume, Schaffner made every effort to squeeze in as much music as possible, while in the second, longer manuscript, he left blank pages and indeed never finished paginating the last section of music he copied (the pagination stops at page 229). As a

---

10 A variation of this is included in George Shelley’s 1752 book. “He who would be a Master, must draw to the Life, as well as copy from Originals, and join Theory and Practice together.” Shelley, 46.

11 A version of this is included in an earlier edition of Shelley’s work. “As he that is Master of a good Invention, shews himself to have a lively Fancy; so he that can make a good Collection, discovers a sound Judgment.” George Shelley, Sentences and maxims divine, moral, and historical, in prose and verse. Design’d for the conduct and instruction of human life (London: Sam Keble et. al, 1712): 5.
whole, like the handwriting book, the collection was assembled over an extended period of time, from the 1790s to at least as late as 1807. Schaffner had the books bound himself. In fact, he began the first volume and decided to bind it somewhere in the middle of the copying process, whereas the second volume was bound likely before Schaffner had even begun. This might have led him to prepare a second book that was—as it turns out—longer than necessary. The second book ends with 20 blank pages.

As we begin to navigate our way through this collection, we must remember that we are not an audience observing a performance but rather like eavesdroppers, observers of a man’s private craft. A collection of this type was made in fact for the eyes of the collector. It is all too easy to see ineptitude in Schaffner’s tendency to omit the names of composers (a common feature in American manuscripts at this time) or scatter them throughout the manuscript. But since Schaffner was preparing the books for his own use, he either had no need to identify the composer or in other instances simply did not care. On the other hand, he was meticulous about copying the notes themselves, with a kind of precision that seems to contradict the fact that he would often omit or even alter the title of pieces, which poses many difficulties for the scholar.

But titles and opus numbers appear to hold little importance for Schaffner; our modern obsession with citation and attribution was far from his conscious mind. Schaffner presents music and musical ideas as he knew them, understood them, or wanted them to be.

Schaffner’s inconsistencies, as frustrating as they might be, provide a great deal of insight both into his mind and also into the practices of copyists throughout centuries. A few of the most curious features of the manuscript are the changes in Schaffner’s hand. While in the first manuscript, it is consistent throughout, in the second, the script changes several times, as it was copied in short chunks over an extended period. Both the pace of copying music shifts and the
text changes dramatically throughout the second manuscript, such that it appears at first glance perhaps to have been copied by more than one person.

Yet what is truly remarkable about Schaffner’’s manuscripts are not only his methods of compiling them but also the contents themselves. The collection takes us far beyond conventional scholarly notions of American music during this period. Further, it raises questions about how music circulated not only in America but in Europe as well. It suggests, for example, that music traveled not only further than we might expect, but remained in circulation for longer periods of time, reminding us how little information is conveyed by a publication date. Or to put it another way, can we really know from a publication date how long and under what circumstances the music was actually played? Moreover, Schaffner chose to make copies of music that perhaps circulated in manuscripts only or in printed editions for which there are no extant copies.

Because we can locate many of the printed editions from which Schaffner copied, we get a sense of his approach to a given piece of sheet music in a way that pushes us far beyond the contents of contemporary treatises. We can savor how malleable a musical text might be; it was altered, arranged, truncated and reorganized in the hands of the musician. Schaffner serves us, over 200 years later, by documenting his practice, which indeed was not an anomaly but rather an established practice, part of musical culture in which Schaffner participated. Print, it seems, was clay rather than stone. Music was grounds for experimentation—it was played and also played with; thus the performer had the last say in how it would sonically enter the world. His or her changes to a musical text were made from a place of integrity, from of place of

---

understanding about how a given piece of music worked. The performer was not a vehicle for
the composer but rather a creator in his own right, with his own rights.

Schaffner’s collection was also copied rather methodically over an extended period that
perhaps coincidently was also a pivotal moment in the history of the American music industry.
It thus provides us with snapshots of the way these changes affected the music people played.
His collection shows the shift of a musical culture fueled by imported music to one fed by
American imprints. As we will see, this shift was gradual, and it affected both the editions of
music people used and the actual music that they played. And as people tend to play what they
like, so the changing industry affected musical taste.

Though he may provide us with much insight into American musical culture, we must not
forget that Schaffner was an individual. His collection also provides us the rare opportunity to
witness the changing tastes of a single consumer and player of music across this extended time.
Although he naturally was affected by the world, he himself also changed during this period. For
instance, we see that he organized his musical differently, and was slightly less meticulous
preferring longer pieces as he got older, perhaps as a result of greater patience, focus, or
expertise.

The content of his manuscripts is predominantly (all except one page) for solo keyboard,
though some of the pieces did not originate for this instrumentation. The vast majority of the
music is secular. While clearly Schaffner performed alone on the keyboard often, this collection
does not tell us what other music he might have owned or kept in a different manuscript, nor
does it tell us who he might have played with. It is possible that Schaffner made keyboard
arrangements of chamber works that he regularly played with musicians, thus providing himself
with an opportunity to play them in solitude. Perhaps he owned a vast library of printed music,
or perhaps he had only these manuscripts. Maybe he fell somewhere in the middle. What the manuscripts do not illustrate is a dislike or lack of experience with the music that is not included but rather a fondness for what is.

In what follows, I give an overview of what I consider to be the highpoints of the collection. I pay particular attention to issues concerning content, musical approach and the act of commonplacing itself. My three main concerns are each like prisms, shedding light on issues about Schaffner himself—from his personality to his approach to musical text—and more broadly about music in America—from the ways it was performed to the ways it circulated. For reasons noted above, it is indeed impossible to identify all of the pieces in the collection, and further, the absence of modern editions of almost all of the music in the manuscripts complicates the puzzle. This being said, while it is impossible to know everything Schaffner copied, we have a good idea of what is in the collection.

**Process and the Status of a Musical Work**

Schaffner’s collection brings a new dimension to the much-discussed concept of “work,” especially during this period.\(^\text{13}\) Manuscripts of this type exist somewhere on Michael Talbot’s spectrum between musical text and musical performance.\(^\text{14}\) While they are copies of music, they document musical alterations done in performance that go far beyond the ornaments, articulation, flourishes, and cadenzas that are usually considered when thinking of a performer’s alterations to the musical text itself. Further, the way in which Schaffner identifies music is constantly in flux.

---

\(^\text{13}\) The status of work was first bought under the microscope by Lydia Goehr and subsequently been addressed by many a scholar. Lydia Goehr, *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works: An Essay in the Philosophy of Music* (Oxford: Clarendron Press, 1992).
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Sometimes works are identified by composer, sometimes by genre, and sometimes both or neither, complicating even Talbot’s sophisticated views on what constituted a “work” in the 18th century. Schaffner may never have used the term “work;” nonetheless his treatment of musical compositions challenge conventional understandings of the work concept. Over the course of the manuscript, it expands from an individual movement to an entire piece or a group of movements or pieces. In the early years of compiling the manuscript, Schaffner’s focus on single movements seems to be a manifestation of his interest in variety. For example in the first volume, he copied but a single movement from one sonata from what Schaffner calls “Vento’s Sixth Book” (The Allegro from opus 6 no. 3 by Mattia Vento). Typical of the trajectory of the first volume, he includes one Sonatina by Georg Andreas Sorge (The first Sonatina from Sechs Sonatinen vors Clavier nach Italianischen Gusto), one lied by Heinrich Laag (“Ja, Tad des Hern” Dreyzehntes Lied from Funfzig Lieder) and one movement from arrangement of a Hasse Concerto from opus three from a circa 1743 John Walsh edition of arrangements.

Such small selections from entire books of printed works might make one wonder if Schaffner was copying from another collection rather than the printed editions themselves, which typically include many works by a single composer. This, however, seems unlikely considering the way in which Schaffner revisits some of the music later in the manuscript. Sometimes he modifies pieces he had copied earlier in the collection, adding movements to a work from which he originally choose a smaller selection. For example, on pages 47 to 51 of the first volume, Schaffner copies the first and second movements from the third sonata in Wagenseil’s opus two.

15 Talbot dates the shift from genre-centered identification to composer-centered identification to around 1800. While before 1800 sorting by genre was most common, “in Western art music composers themselves, and probably many performers and some patrons along with them, have always ‘sorted’ music first by composer. But that is really no more significant than to observe that violin-makers take a keen interest in what their colleagues do: understandably, they have a professional bias.” Ibid, 173. However, Schaffner’s shifting modes of identification even go beyond this model, and it is unclear why his preference changes in many cases.
On page 236 of the same volume, he copies the third movement from the same work, and notes at the bottom of page 51 “play Allegro page 236 after this” (Figure 12). On page 236 however, he does not indicate this; rather, he entitles the piece “Allegro by Wagenseil.”

Schaffner also adds to the selections he made from some sonatas by Johann August Just. On page 54 of the second volume, Schaffner copies “Sonata 4th by J.A. Just,” from opus 6. He notes at the end of the movement, “The Andante in the first Book page 252 is to be played after this Allegro & then the Grazioso in the Book Page 45. after the Andante which is the whole of the Sonata” (Figure 13) Thus, to play the entire sonata, Schaffner would not only have to change books for the middle movement but also flip forward in the second volume for the last movement! From the same opus, he copies the first movement, Allegro Assai, on page 252 of the first volume and the second movement, Arioso, on page 58 of the second volume, which he notes in volume two. He also copies three of the four movements from the first sonata without giving indication of this in the manuscripts. The first movement precedes the fourth movement on pages 248 and 249 of the first volume. Schaffner copies the second movement on page 57 of the second volume.

This way of managing the manuscripts falls in line with Schaffner’s shifting preference throughout the course of the manuscripts for an entire work or group of works rather than single movements. The opening of the second volume of the manuscript, for instance, provides a poignant illustration of the way in which Schaffner’s taste is changing. It begins with twelve blank pages, which are followed by complete versions of Sonatinas four through six from Joseph Dale’s opus three. As he often does, he omits the flute or violin obligato part, which was sometimes in the practice in performances at this time. What of the twelve blank pages? Schaffner likely intended to revisit them and write the first three sonatinas, completing his copy
of Dale’s opus three. Until this point, it has been unusual for him to copy an entire volume by a single composer. However, it seems likely that Schaffner realized his copy of Dale’s work was already complete, for he had previously copied the first three sonatinas in the first manuscript, albeit the movements are not together. Pages 273 through 277 contain the entire first and second sonatinas as well as the first movement of the third sonatina. Although he doesn’t indicate the origin of the pieces, he squeezes the last movement of the third sonatina onto the last page of the first volume. Thus, in a way the second volume of the manuscript actually picks up where the first volume left off, perhaps to Schaffner’s surprise.

In the second manuscript, one finds more movements from individual works, more excerpts from published works and even copies of entire published books. For example, Schaffner includes Alexander Reinagle’s entire Second Set of 24 Short and Easy Lessons, op. 2, which he entitles “Twenty four pieces Composed by A. Reinagle (page 128 through 142—figure 14). This is also a reflection of his shifting preference for American printed editions and composers living in America. It is important to remember that this is not simply a change in personal taste but rather one influenced by availability and possibly a changing national taste.

Schaffner includes but one piece by Reinagle in the first manuscript, his “Foederal [sic] march as performed in the grand Procession in Philadelphia the 4th of July,” a patriotic work published in 1788 that was performed at Philadelphia’s Grand Federal Procession, celebrating both Independence Day and the ratification of the Constitution.16 In the second volume, Schaffner

---

16During the spring and summer of 1788, many “Federal Processions” were held in seaports up the East coast, celebrating the ratification of the Constitution. Philadelphia’s “Grand Federal Procession” was scheduled to coincide with the Fourth of July and was organized by Francis Hopkinson. Much scholarly attention has been given to these celebrations in recent years. See Laura Rigal, “‘Raising the Roof’: Authors, Spectators and Artisans in the Grand Federal Procession of 1788,” Theatre Journal 48 (October 1996): 253-277; Dietmar Schloss, “The Grand Federal Procession in Philadelphia, 1788” in Celebrating Ethnicity and Nation: American Festive Culture from the Revolution to the Early Twentieth Century, ed. Geneviève Fabre, Jürgen Heideking, and Kai Dreisbach (New York: Berghahn, 2001): 44-62.
includes not only the entire volume of Reinagle’s works discussed above but also his *La Chase*, three arias, a minuet, and *The New Presidents or Jefferson’s March*.

Schaffner’s copies of works by the German-born “American” composer John Christopher Moller reflect both trends: his predilection for American composers and printed editions and his growing interest in copying longer works. Consider, for example, the copies that he makes from Moller’s opus 6, *A Sett of Progressive Lessons for the Harpsichord or Pianoforte*. While English editions of this work include ten lessons, it appears that Schaffner copied from American printer George Willig’s edition of the work, which included only six “Lessons.” The first lesson in Willig’s edition differs from European editions of the work, and Willig writes a lengthy preface, which Schaffner does not include. Additionally, Willig includes many fingerings, and while Schaffner begins his copy including these markings, he soon leaves them out; a keyboardist as skilled as Schaffner likely did not need them. Interestingly, the organization of Schaffner’s copy suggests that he did not immediately decide he wanted to copy all of Willig’s edition of Moller. On page 101, he copies all of the “Lesson 1st.” which he follows immediately by the “Minueto” second movement of the second lesson. After this, he moves away from Moller, copying the introduction from the *Picture of Paris*, as arranged by William Shield. It appears that he changes his mind about Moller, for he returns to his work, copying the first and third (last) movements of Moller’s second lesson. It seems that when Schaffner played the piece, he actually followed the order that Moller gave, for on page 101, he notes that “The above Minueto must be play’d between the 2d Lesson Gavotto of Möllers. Page 105.” Following page 105, however, Schaffner again moves away from Moller’s works, returning to them on page 110. Schaffner copies all of his “Lesson 4th” and “Lesson 5th,” which he follows by the “Lesson 3rd” on pages 113 to 114. On page 115, he copies the second and third movements of the sixth
lesson; Schaffner never copies the first movement of this work, perhaps because it is very long. Later in the book, Schaffner has firmly decided he enjoys Moller’s music; on pages 153 through 170, he copies all of Moller’s *Eight Easy Lessons for the Piano Forte or Harpsicord for Young Practicioners* opus 5 in order, calling it by a different name. He also includes a *Sinfonia* by Moller (118), which opens a piece published in 1793 in *Moller and Capron’s Monthly Numbers*, a popular subscription series.

Other American composers included within the manuscripts are worth noting. Reinagle’s teacher, Rayner Taylor, is also represented in the collection with the only keyboard duet Schaffner copies: Taylor’s arrangement of *The Presidents March*, which was printed in Philadelphia around 1795. In the last dozen pages of the manuscript another American composer (this time New York-based) appears—Adam Geib. His *The Blue Bells of Scotland with Variations* was printed in New York in 1807, and appears to be the latest printed piece included in the manuscript.

**Reorganization of Musical Text**

One of the most striking features of Schaffner’s editorial procedures is the way in which he routinely imposes his own order on cycles and sets. In some instances he breaks collections into self-standing works and in others creates new cycles from works that the composer organized differently. On pages 138 to 141 of first volume of the manuscript, Schaffner copies three preludes and an “Echo en Minuet” excerpted from Johann Nikolaus Tischer’s (1707-1774) *Galanterie Partiten*, a collection of suites published in five volumes in the mid-18th century. When Schaffner copied these movements, it appears that they stood alone as separate “works.” Schaffner revisits Tischer’s works in the second volume, and by then his idea of what constitutes
a “work” has changed (Figures 15 and 16). He does not copy only a few movements that stand alone, nor does he copy entire suites from Tischer’s printed works. Rather Schaffner arranges his own suites from various movements scattered across all five of the published volumes. Thus while Schaffner is copying suites by Tischer, he is not copying Tischer’s suites as they appeared in print. In so doing, he might be seen to follow 17th-century French practice, when the individual dance movements were published so that the performer himself could determine the order of the suite. It has been assumed that this practice stopped around the turn of the 18th century, when formally structured suites were published instead of a collection of movements. However, Schaffner’s collection, copied around a hundred years after this change is thought to have taken place, suggests that the change in how music was printed perhaps did not change the way in which music was actually performed.

Schaffner uses a similar approach with Johann Abraham Peter Schulz’s Lieder im Volkston, which were printed in three volumes from 1782 to 1792.17 It is important to note that Schaffner omits the text, suggesting that he probably performed them on solo keyboard or as an accompaniment to a fellow musician. In the printed work, the songs stand alone and are not organized in specific sets; however, it seems that the order of the songs mattered greatly to Schaffner. Rather than copying the lieder in an order that reflects the printed books, he develops an elaborate organization scheme for 38 of the songs, pulling various lieder from different volumes. Indeed he goes far beyond copying his favorite lieder from each volume; the lieder are like a shuffled deck of cards. Copying in this way is much more difficult than copying in a way that reflects the printed music, which suggests that his process was purposefully rather than

17 The first two were published in Berlin and the third in Copenhagen.
random. Do the individual songs stand alone, and how do we treat this carefully orchestrated larger structure? Indeed, our concept of “work” is challenged yet again.

**Truncating Music**

Schaffner also occasionally abbreviated the works that he copied. His relationship with the music of Valentino Nicolai is most interesting, for Schaffner seems to find him long-winded. While he continually truncates his music, he sometimes changes his mind about how the pieces should be shortened. On page 289 of the first volume, Schaffner copied the Rondo Poco Presto from the first sonata of Nicolai’s opus three. Schaffner, however, shortens the lengthy movement to 40 bars, attaching the final nine bars of the piece to the first 31. This makes the lengthy 257 bar piece into a single page of music. Perhaps this was done in part because Schaffner was running out of room, but it seems more likely that he shortened the piece for musical reasons. It seems that Schaffner found Nicolai repetitive. In the second volume of the manuscript, Schaffner copies the same movement again. As is more often the case in his second book, he copies both movements of the two-movement work; however, the second movement still remains too long for Schaffner’s taste. While he includes 100 more measures of the music, he still leaves out the Mineur and Majeur sections, again reattaching the last nine bars of the piece elsewhere. While Schaffner seems to enjoy Nicolai’s works more by the time he copies the second volume, he still finds him too long. His alterations, however, fall in line with his growing appreciation for length throughout the course of the collection.
Arranging

The arrangement of music for a different instrument or instruments is also common to both volumes of the manuscript. Schaffner regularly omits the accompanying instrument part for works for solo keyboard with the accompaniment of the flute or violin, which was common. As noted above, perhaps he wanted to continue playing works he had previously played with other musicians, or perhaps he relished the music and enjoyed playing alone. Some of Schaffner’s arrangements are more elaborate than simply omitting parts. In the first volume, for example, Schaffner includes a solo keyboard arrangement of a work originally for two violins and continuo—a movement from a sonata by Giovanni Battista Lampugnani (1708-1788). The second volume contains keyboard arrangements of quintets by Friedrich Schwindl, originally for two flutes, two violins and continuo. Works like Lampugnani and Schwindl’s would be difficult if not impossible to perform on a keyboard while reading from the printed page—the parts that Schaffner is combining are in physically separate part books. Schaffner’s arrangements illustrate how malleable the musical text was; although musically simple, they show, especially in the case of the Schwindl, a drastic reduction of musical forces and an elimination of parts. While arrangements were published throughout the 18th-century, Schaffner’s collection suggests that musicians themselves were adeptly making arrangements as well. Once again, Schaffner demonstrates the fluidity of the musical text; the musician was free to adapt it according to his or her desires.

Extraordinary Works

Several works in the manuscripts stand out because they no longer exist in printed sources, if they ever existed at all. The second volume of the manuscript contains the only
known copy of John Valentine’s (1730-1791) opus one, *Fourteen Marches* (Figure 17). Published around 1769 in London, the famous Leicester musician’s work was originally in four parts; this manuscript includes keyboard arrangements that were likely done by Schaffner. It is interesting that these works survive only in keyboard arrangements made in Pennsylvania about 30 years after publication.

There is another exceptional work in the first volume of the manuscript—“The Battle of Prague,” which Schaffner attributes to “Mr. Bach” (Figure 18). Not Franz Kotzwara’s famous “Battle of Prague” first published in 1790, this piece is in fact quite different from other battle pieces, a very popular genre at the time. Rather than generic battle descriptions, it references the actual 1757 battle between the Prussians and Austrians, detailing the actions of “Der König,” Frederick the Great, and General Schwerin, one of Frederick’s leading commanders. General Schwerin died in the Battle of Prague, and the piece celebrates the important victory during the Seven Years’ War and honors the famous general. It would not be extraordinary to write a piece in honor of the famous battle; Carl Heinrich Graun, Kapellmeister for Frederick the Great, also did so with his *Te Deum* of 1757. Thus, it is likely that the “Mr. Bach” here is none other than Carl Philip Emmanuel Bach, who was Graun’s colleague and a chamber musician at Frederick’s court at the time. Bach is not known to have written a “Battle of Prague.” However, essentially the same battle piece was published with two different titles under C.P.E. Bach’s name: “La Bataille de Rosbach” and “La Bataille de Bergen.” Containing a general portrayal of battle rather than specifics (especially in “la Bataille de Bergen, which gives but two descriptions), “La Bataille of Rosbach” was first published in 1780 in Mannheim and in 1790 in London. Confounding matters, the same work was also published under Graun’s name in London in 1790 and 1798. Based on musical features, the work has been dismissed as “Certainly not by C. P. E.
Bach,” is listed as spurious in Helm’s catalogue, and is not included in the new Bach complete works. Yet, “The Battle of Prague” is virtually the same piece. It is the only piece to use German texts in the first volume of the manuscript and appears to have been copied verbatim from another source. Schaffner either copied it out of a lost printed edition (as no printed edition of the piece is known to have existed) or a manuscript copy of the music brought to Pennsylvania by one of many German immigrants living there.

Interestingly, the only other battle piece that Schaffner copied is Kotzwara’s famous “Battle of Prague” (pg. 205-213 of volume 2), providing further evidence that the authorial attributions are not accidental; Schaffner realized both pieces existed yet were different. With the typical general battle descriptions, Kotzwara’s piece provides a unique case study exploring how battle pieces could take on patriotic overtones for the particular country where they were printed. Schaffner apparently copied from a Philadelphia edition of the work, published in America by both Carr and Willig in the second half of the 1790s, as in place of “God Save the King” known in English editions (and indeed, later American editions, such as Oliver Ditson’s published in Boston in the mid-19th century) is “Hail Great Washington,” although the tune is the same. That the English printed edition of Kotzwara’s work contains “God Save the King” shows that the piece is not actually about the Battle of Prague but about England itself.

On pages 28 and 29 of the first volume, Schaffner copies a “Lesson” likely composed by Philadelphia-based musician Stephen Forrage, whose music is not known to have been printed.

---


19 This holds true for the copy in Elizabeth Henry’s manuscript book as well, in which the Philadelphian probably copied from a local edition as well.

On pages 95 and 97 through 102 is a collection of “Polonoises” and “Polonesses” by “Neruda,” who was probably Johann Baptist Georg Neruda, the Czech composer who lived in Prague and Dresden. Most of Neruda’s music only circulated in manuscript and has been lost.

Other previously unknown pieces provide insight into American history. “Baron von Steuben’s March” honors the famous former Prussian General, who, by bringing discipline and order, helped turn the continentals into a disciplined army at Valley Forge. In contrast, General Kniphausen, for whom another march in the collection is named, led the Hessian troops, who fought against General Washington in the Battle of Trenton. This heretofore-unknown march is also in the 1793 manuscript book of Henig Schoener, a resident of nearby Reading. The piece provides a unique link between the Hessian soldiers fighting for the British and Casper Schaffner. His father, John Casper Schaffner, is believed to have been a wartime prison guard for the Hessian soldiers, who, after being captured in the Battle of Trenton, were sent to Lancaster temporarily. Many of the “Hessians” made America their home after the Revolution.

Conclusion

Schaffner’s commonplace books open doors to new ways of understanding the numerous manuscripts copied in America at this time. Further, Schaffner’s collection inspires us to look at printed musical culture through a new lens, reexamining the circulation and performance practice of music at this time. Schaffner leaves behind a large quantity of manuscript material, but he was not alone in his pursuit of music. His father and neighbor John Hoff (the three men lived in

---

a row on West King Street near Penn Square in Lancaster) all kept music manuscripts.\textsuperscript{22} The content of the friends’ manuscripts is quite disparate, pointing to an even broader musical culture than we find in Schaffner’s collection alone. America had a thriving and complex musical culture at this time; one based in the home that is best documented in manuscripts containing mostly published pieces of music.

\textsuperscript{22} Hoff additionally had at least one printed music book—volumes one and two of Schulz’s lieder, which Schaffner includes in his collection, as we have seen.