

## *Updates for The Keyboard Music of J. S. Bach*

### **Chapter 4**

(p. 48). There is no “gavotte en rondeau” by d’Anglebert as imagined here, although he did include a *chaconne en rondeau* in his *Pièces de clavecin* (Paris, 1689). A dance from Lully’s opera *Phaéton* apparently is preserved under the title *Gavotte en rondeau* in at least one manuscript copy, and Bach assuredly invented neither the title nor the genre on his own, but a single model for the movement in BWV 822 cannot be found.

### **Chapter 6**

(p. 82, also in subsequent chapters and the index). The “Legrenzi” subject of BWV 574 is by Bononcini (see Zitellini 2013).

(p. 87). Mahan Esfahani kindly points out that it was Russia, not the Turks, who defeated Charles XII at Poltava, and the Swedish king was subsequently the guest of the Ottoman sultan (not prisoner, at least officially).

### **Chapter 7**

(p. 97). Wolff (2020) refers consistently to “six toccatas” as forming a set, as if Bach at some point organized BWV 910–15 into a collection, like the later half-dozens of English and French suites. There is, however, no evidence for this, apart from the mention of six (rather than seven) toccatas in the list of works included in Bach’s Obituary (written by C. P. E. Bach and Agricola). It has always been assumed that the G-major toccata (BWV 916) was excluded from the group because of its exceptional three-movement form and its title in one lost copy (see below). Yet the early manuscript transmission of the pieces does not suggest any special status for BWV 916, and Tatlow (2015), in her search for “lost compositional blueprints,” concludes that it is “impossible to reconstruct Bach’s perfect plan, if he had ever made one,” for what she calls the “Six Toccatas (BWV 911–916)”; the latter is presumably an error for BWV 910–15.

(p. 98). Newly discovered manuscript copies of BWV 913 and 914 by a pupil of Bach show that these works had already reached their familiar forms within a year or so of the composer’s appointment at Weimar (see Blanken 2013, 89–93); hence the early version of the D-minor toccata is likely to have been composed before 1708, as has been generally supposed—but it is good to have documentary support for this.

(p. 113). Add to sources for BWV 916: P 803/17, a copy from around 1750 or later, signed by one “J. Willweber,” who was apparently a pupil of Bach student’s J. L. Krebs. As such he may have been aware of a later tradition of performance perhaps going back to J. S. Bach, which in this case evidently included a heavy layer of added ornamentation (independent of the embellishment found in Preller’s copy of the slow movement, given in an appendix in the NBA), recalling rather Christoph Bach’s tendency to add ornament signs, which is indeed evident in his copy of this piece, though these are provided far less generously than in p 803, whose copyist must have played even the first movement quite slowly if he (or she) indeed played all the indicated little trills and mordents. Although P 803 was the main source for the BG, the latter omitted most of the ornaments, and this source was ignored in NBA V/9.1, which therefore repeats an obvious error in m. 77, where the last note should clearly be a’ (as in BG 36), not g’. To be sure, the BG makes seemingly arbitrary selections from the many

ornaments in this source (and in at least one other), printing only a few of these (in parentheses). Unclear as well as the source of the division of the opening passage (and its recurrences) between the two hands, indicated in the BG but not in any source seen here by changes in stem direction and breaks in the beaming. As is often the case, however, the BG's interpretation (which may have been suggested by the detailed fingering which is also present in P 803) makes good musical and technical sense and might represent a Leipzig tradition preserved by its editor Naumann, a pupil of the Thomascantor Moritz Hauptmann.

## Chapter 8

(p. 118). Górný (2019) shows that Bach, in addition to exchanging music with other courts, could have obtained music printed in the Netherlands (and elsewhere) through a dealer in Halle. The latter acted as sales agent for the Amsterdam publisher Roger—not that anyone previously might have supposed that Bach acquired music “*mainly* through Prince Johann Ernst and his travels to the Netherlands” (Górný 2019, 367, my emphasis).

(p. 119). Tatlow (2015, 254–66) argues, based on her theory of “proportional parallelism” involving the counting of measures within a multi-movement work or a set of pieces, that the twelve transcriptions copied by Johann Bernhard Bach in the manuscript P 280 constitute an integral collection assembled by Sebastian himself. She claims further that certain alterations in the number of measures within several of the transcriptions could reflect Bach's own revisions to achieve the type of numerical proportions between pieces at which he aimed in other collections. If true, this would give potential new meaning to Forkel's famous comment that by studying Vivaldi's works Bach learned “order, connection, and proportion” (*Ordnung, Zusammenhang und Verhältniß*; Forkel 1802, 24, cited by Tatlow 2015, 256).

In the Vivaldi concerto arrangement BWV 973, I have concluded after long practice that the fingering shown in example 8.1 is impractical, at least on the instruments on which I have tried to use it, and that it is effective after all to play instead on divided keyboards in mm. 56b–61a of the third movement. This can be prepared by using divided keyboards earlier in all three movements, the right hand playing on the lower (forte) manual, the left on the upper (piano) one, as follows: in first movement, mm. 22–35a, 46–69, 76b–89, and 117–24a; throughout the second movement; and in third movement, mm. 8b–12a, 21 (note 2)–27, and 49b–55a.

Sardelli (2005, 75–7) argues plausibly that the model of BWV 979 is an early work of Vivaldi, not Torelli, and the original concerto is now listed as R. 813. Because the argument rests almost entirely on style analysis, the re-attribution to Vivaldi cannot be considered entirely conclusive, but the case *against* Torelli's authorship does seem strong.

The Telemann concerto arranged as BWV 985 is TWV 51:g1, not g21 (p. 463n. 43, also index, p. 534).

## Chapter 9

On the fragmentary fugue BWV 906/2, I wrote (p. 155) that the subject cannot be combined contrapuntally “with the new themes introduced at m. 34.” This must be qualified to read “with *both* new themes,” for Moroney (1992, 114–15) demonstrated that the theme introduced at that point in the *lower* part (left hand) can indeed be combined with the original subject. Indeed, I independently discovered that very combination of themes at m. 150 in my completion of the fragment. I chose not to repeat the combination, as Moroney does (demonstrating that “this contrapuntal possibility exists and provides a very satisfactory basis for an ending”).

## Chapter 10

The discussion of formal proportions within the designs of individual inventions (pp. 190–91) needs to be revised in the face of Tatlow’s argument that Bach planned his finished collections of pieces to demonstrate certain “proportional parallelisms.” The inventions and sinfonias constitute one such collection (see esp. Tatlow 2015, 164–72). Therefore the proportions between sections of individual pieces must have been subject to revision depending on Bach’s scheme for the collection as a whole. In other words, the changes that Bach made in the inventions in E minor and A minor, expanding the final section of each, might not have been motivated in the first instance by considerations of tonal design (as argued on p. 191), although the result in each case was a more mature or compelling example of just such a form.

## Chapter 11

An eighteenth-century term for the “metrical playfulness” of the prelude in A seems to have been *imbroglio*, although the sources cited by Petersen (2016) all postdate Bach and give much simpler illustrations than the one shown in example 11.12 (cf. the discussion of the courante in the Fifth Partita on p. 336). In fact, many instances shown by eighteenth-century theorists, and by Petersen in four Bach arias, are little more than traditional hemiolas or suspensions. The term, which the theorist Riepel equated with Italian *confusione* and German *Verwirrung* (Petersen 2016, 138), does not quite convey Bach’s more purposeful technique, which approaches true polymeter in the examples cited in the present book from Bach’s keyboard works.

## Chapter 13

The title *English Suites* does occur in at least two “early sources” (contrary to what is stated on p. 280), if one includes the copy by Bach’s student J. N. Bammler in D B N.Mus. ms. 365, dating from the late 1740s—although the entry “Fait pour les Anglois” on the title page was a subsequent addition, squeezed in above J. C. Bach’s possessor’s mark. Another relatively early source, D B AmB 50, could date from as early as the 1760s.

## Chapter 14

In table 14.1 (p. 311), the last entry should read “P 418, corr. text” not “P 418, orig. text.”

## Chapter 15

Joshua Rifkin has shown that the scherzo of the Third Partita was suggested not by Bonporti’s violin pieces—though the latter may well have been where Bach first saw such a title—but by keyboard pieces that Conrad Friedrich Hurlebusch played during a visit to Leipzig. Rifkin (2007, 31–43) convincingly places the latter in 1726, the year before Bach published the partita, with its added scherzo movement. This point arises in the course of an argument for dating the B-minor orchestral suite BWV 1067, or at least its final movement, the Battinerie, to this same period. Rifkin shows that the parallels between the latter movement and the scherzo include their 2/4 meter, triadic opening motive, and staccato bass that outlines a rising triad in the opening measures. The two are also in the same key, A minor, if one accepts Rifkin’s strong argument that the suite was originally a whole step lower. To be sure, Hurlebusch’s scherzos do not seem to open in the middle of the measure, as Bach does, and Rifkin’s “scamper[ing]” flute in the Battinerie (Rifkin 2007, 73) may be a mis-

characterization if one accepts Williams's argument that 2/4 does not, for Bach, imply an especially quick tempo. That argument is in fact strengthened by the *Vivace* marking of the one Hurlebusch scherzo that Rifkin gives as an example; *vivace* is used for minuets but not for very quick pieces in the early eighteenth century.

In the *gigue* of the Sixth Partita, only a few of the smallest note values are clearly products of revision—that is, added noteheads and beams for inserted passing tones—in the autograph (P 225). This is contrary to what might be implied by note 51 on p. 482.

## Chapter 17

Tomita (1999 and 2007) identified an early version of variation 5 from the Goldberg Variations, although the variants in this version are quite minor. Tomita also discussed sets of canons by Fux and Zelenka over a cantus firmus (in *DI*, Mus. ms. 1-B-98, pp. 326–31) that could have provided models for the structure of the Goldberg Variations as a whole. Yet although Bach might have gotten the idea of an “interval canon” from Fux (via Zelenka?), the cantus firmus used by the latter is a hexachord, that is, a melodic idea (scale) with weak harmonic implications (in the absence of motion by root, especially at cadences). Bach, on the other hand, gave his canons a harmonic basis by constructing them over a modern bass line, moreover one that articulates a rounded binary form.

## Chapter 18

Two typographical errors:

on page 390, line 15, for the he read he

on page 394, lines 9–10 from bottom, for some respects in read in some respects

In table 18.2 on page 401, the numbering of movements in P 200 is wrong for the mirror fugues; *Contrapunctus inversus a 4* should be 13, a 3 13 (corresponding with table 18.1).

Gregory Butler, repudiating his earlier findings (1983a), has subsequently argued that it is a “myth” that Bach intended the *Art of Fugue* to include the incomplete *Fuga a 3 soggetti* or that the latter was meant to incorporate the subject of the *Art of Fugue* as its fourth theme (or third countersubject; see Butler 2008, 116–7). In fact, the argument that the piece was to have appeared on six pages of the original publication—the basis of the reconstruction in both editions of the present book—was always provisional, due to the uncertain reading of what Butler originally took to be altered page numbers in the print. But there can be no question that the incomplete fugue is a late Bach fragment standing in need of explanation (if not completion); nor can there be any uncertainty that the subject of the *Art of Fugue* does combine contrapuntally with the three subjects of the fragment, as Nottebohm and countless authors since have recognized. Butler finds Nottebohm's “syncopation of the principal subject . . . forced and unnatural” (Butler 2008, 112n. 24), but this is to disregard the solution shown in example 18.9. Butler's ingenious suggestion that Bach might have intended the work as a contribution for Menzel's Corresponding Society is necessarily speculative. By the same token, it remains speculation that a single quadruple mirror fugue in four parts, never composed, might have filled out the “other basic plan” (*andere Grund Plan*) mentioned in a mysterious addition by Agricola to the autograph fragment.

Running counter to Butler's argument is the revised, later, dating for the incomplete fugue (and for the final work on the B-Minor Mass) offered by Milka (2010). Milka has elaborated his own argument for the inclusion of the fugue within the larger work in a study of the *Art of Fugue*, suggesting that Bach

intended it as his final offering to Mizler's Corresponding Society in 1749 (Milka 2017, 228). But whether continuing speculation about the precise chronology and constitution of the *Art of Fugue* amounts to a "new interpretation" of the latter may, like questions concerning the early version of Contrapunctus 10a and the duo version of Contrapunctus 13, be a matter of definition. It is clear enough that, as with the *Musical Offering*, the Goldberg Variations, and other works, Bach continued to elaborate and add to the *Art of Fugue* after its initial plan had been completed. Exactly which items belong to the *Art of Fugue* and in what order is a meaningful question only if one assumes that there must be some definitive sequence. But, as with the canons composed on the royal fugue subject or over the Goldberg bass line, the relationship of certain movements to the main or original portion of the collection need not be fixed, even if a publisher or performer must present them in some specific order.

Tatlow (2015, 253), arguing as elsewhere that Bach completed a work such as the *Art of Fugue* by finalizing a set of "proportional parallelisms," concludes that the "simplest" plan and the one most likely to have been adopted at the end by Bach was the one that included a *Fuga a 3 soggetti* of 280 measures. That Bach, however, really intended the missing 41 measures to remain uncomposed, represented in the printed work by blank space as a "task for Heaven" (a possibility raised by Tatlow 2015, 247 and 254), seems uncharacteristic of a composer who everywhere else rose to the challenges he created for himself.

## **Appendix A**

On BWV 905, the reference to a "dropping out of the bass" in mm. 3–4 of the prelude is an error for the "dropping out of the upper parts."

## **Appendix B**

On p. 448, no. 29 in P 225 is the C-major prelude from WTC1, not WTC2.

## Bibliography

The article cited as Rifkin (n.d.) is the one now cited here as Rifkin (2007).

Blanken, Christine. 2013. "Ein wieder zugänglich gemachter Bestand alter Musikalien der Bach-Familie im Verlagsarchiv Breitkopf & Härtel." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 99: 79–128.

Butler, Gregory G. 2008. "Scribes, Engravers, and Notational Styles: The Final Disposition of Bach's *Art of Fugue*." In Butler, Stauffer, and Greer (2008, 111–23).

Butler, Gregory G., ed. 2007. *Bach Perspectives, Volume 6: J. S. Bach's Concerted Ensemble Music, The Overture*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Butler, Gregory G., George B. Stauffer, and Mary Dalton Greer, eds. 2008. *About Bach*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Górny, Tomasz. 2019. "Estienne Roger and His Agent Adam Christoph Sellius: New Light on Italian and French Music in Bach's World." *Early Music* (advance online publication).

Milka, Anatoly P. 2010. "Zur Datierung der H-Moll-Messe und der Kunst der Fuge." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 96: 53–68.

———. 2017. *Rethinking J. S. Bach's The Art of Fugue*. Translated by Marina Ritzarev and edited by Esti Sheinberg; originally 2009. "Iskusstvo Fugi" *I. S. Bacha* (St. Petersburg: Kompositor, 2009). London and New York: Routledge.

Petersen, Peter. 2016. "'Imbrogljo': Über rhythmisch-metrische Verwirrspiele in vier Arien von Johann Sebastian Bach." *Archiv für Musikwissenschaft* 73: 137–58.

Rifkin, Joshua. 2007. "The 'B-Minor Flute Suite' Deconstructed: New Light on Bach's Overture BWV 1067." In Butler (2007, 1–98).

Sardelli, Federico Maria. 2005. "Le opere giovanili di Antonio Vivaldi." In *Studi vivaldiani* 5: 45–78.

Tatlow, Ruth. 2015. *Bach's Numbers: Compositional Proportion and Significance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tomita, Yo. 1999. "Bach and His Early Drafts: Some Observations on Little-Known Early Versions of *Well-Tempered Clavier* II and the Goldberg Variations from the Manfred Gorke Collection." *BACH* 30/2: 49–71.

———. 2007. "Bach and Dresden: A New Hypothesis on the Origin of the *Goldberg Variations* (BWV 988)." In Zager (2007, 169–91).

Wolff, Christoph. 2020. *Bach's Musical Universe: The Composer and His Work*. Kindle Edition. New York: Norton.

Zager, Daniel, ed. 2007. *Music and Theology: Essays in Honor of Robin A. Leaver*. Lanham, Md.: Scarecrow Press.

Zitellini, Rodolfo. 2013. "Das 'Thema Legrenzianum' der Fuge BWV 574: Eine Fehlzuschreibung?"  
BJ 99: 243–59.

*Updated June 3, 2020*