Supplement to David Schulenberg, **Bach** *(Master Musicians series)*

This file consists of blocks of text that supplement the printed book. Each block opens with a heading that identifies where in the book it is to be inserted. Musical examples for the supplement can be accessed by clicking on the links.

This supplement comprises about 167,000 words (304 pages), exclusive of front and end matter—rather more than the printed book. Page numbers are not shown within this file but can be displayed by most pdf readers. Individual sections (listed below) can be found by using a reader's "search" function. Suggested citation for this work:

Schulenberg, David. Bach: Online Supplement. <//https://schulenbergmusic.org/bach/>. Accessed [date].

All material is copyrighted!

Copyright © 2022 by David Schulenberg. All rights reserved

Contents

For Chapter 1
The Holy Roman Empire
Life in Thuringia and Saxony
Courts and family life

Chapter 2
Names within the Bach family
Bach at Lüneburg

Chapter 3
The Quodlibet
Pachelbel and Froberger as antecedents of Bach
First compositions?

Chapter 4
Bach and the Bach family at Arnstadt
The incident with Geyersbach
Life at Mühlhausen and the return to Weimar

Chapter 5
The praeludium BWV 569
Bach's early keyboard chorales
Early fugues and other keyboard works
The D-minor "toccata and fugue," the Capriccio BWV 992, and the Praeludium in E, BWV 566
The Passacaglia BWV 582

BWV 150, 4, and 71
BWV 106 and 131

Chapter 6
Bach's Weimar
Other colleagues at Weimar
The Halle episode
Telemann, Bach's promotion, and church music at Weimar
Difficulties at Weimar
What happened at Dresden?
Bach in prison

Chapter 7
Bach's Weimar works, continued
The toccatas
Concertos and concerto (ritornello) form
Praeludia (preludes and fugues)
BWV 542, 903, and other works
The *Orgelbüchlein*, the "18," and other keyboard chorales
A Kyrie, a cantata, and other Weimar vocal works
More Weimar vocal works

Chapter 8
The Leipzig organ test
Anhalt and Cöthen
Leopold and Heinichen
Life and music at Cöthen
Trips around Anhalt
Return to Hamburg
Anna Magdalena Wilcke
Family and life at Cöthen
The Leipzig audition and appointment

Chapter 9
Bach's musical activity at Cöthen
Bach's collections
Inventions and sinfonias
The Well-Tempered Clavier
The English and French Suites
Music for solo violin, cello, and flute, plus a few other chamber works
The organ sonatas
The sonatas with obbligato keyboard
The Brandenburg Concertos
Other concertos
The "orchestral" suites

Chapter 10
Leipzig
Bach’s Leipzig librettists
Other musicians at Leipzig
Financial aspects of Bach’s position
Life and teaching at Leipzig
The Collegium Musicum

Chapter 11
Bach’s librettos and his “music-writing procedures,” especially in the Leipzig cantatas
The Leipzig church cantatas
The secular cantatas
The motets

Chapter 12
Bach’s situation at the time of the letter to Erdmann, and afterward
The *Missa*
The “Calov Bible”
Bernhard Bach
Controversies and “insults” (tables)
The “Battle of the Prefects”
Background on Scheibe
The Scheibe controversy and the Collegium
Bach’s 1741 trip to Berlin
Harrer

Chapter 13
“Instructive” ensemble compositions from the Bach circle
Bach’s late works and collections
Clavierübung, part 1
Clavierübung, part 2
Clavierübung, part 3
Clavierübung [part 4]
The Canonic Variations
The Schübler chorales
The Musical Offering (table)
The Musical Offering
The Musical Offering: Sonata and canons
The Art of Fugue
Lieder: chorales and songs
The background to Bach’s passions
The Saint John Passion
The Saint Matthew Passion
The Saint Mark Passion
Bach’s oratorios
Bach’s use of music with Latin texts

Bach’s Magnificat
Bach’s “short” masses and the supposed problem of parody
The B-Minor Mass

Chapter 14
The division of Bach’s music
Family and pupils
Posthumous reception of Bach’s music

Appendix C: Personalia
[expanded version of the print version]

Bibliography
[expanded version of the print version]

Chapter 1

The Holy Roman Empire (p. 5, following the end of the first complete paragraph, "who enjoyed legally defined privileges and powers.")

Even their subjects enjoyed certain limited rights. Bach could pursue his livelihood, move from one town to another, and when necessary take his concerns to court, trusting in a rule of law and way of life that were relatively constant from one local political entity to another. Of course there was no freedom of speech or religion. One did not criticize the local ruling authority, and Jews and other religious minorities were legally banned from Saxony and probably other localities where Bach worked. Yet although cities and other entities lost certain traditional freedoms during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the cult of absolutism founded above all in France could hardly hold full sway in a polity where the rulers of often tiny localities needed to cooperate with neighbors and subjects while operating on limited budgets. Hardly a democracy or even a model of the rule of law, the Empire nevertheless demonstrated that a fragmented political system could be as viable as a centralized autocracy, maintaining peace and a tolerable standard of living for, probably, the majority of the people while allowing the upper classes to prosper and to serve as patrons of the arts and culture.

Within the Empire a count of Hohenlohe in southern Germany could, thanks to a successful marriage policy, inherit Gleichen far to the north. The latter included the town of Ohrdruf, where Bach lived for three years. Gleichen was completely surrounded by the duchy of Saxe-Gotha, yet its ruling counts could rely on general tranquility and the acceptance of imperial or Roman law to allow communication with and control of their little enclave. The emperor and his law courts continued to mediate the disputes that naturally arose due to the complex fracturing of the realm. Rulers cooperated in maintaining roads, postal and currency systems, and other essentials of everyday life, to a sufficient degree that Bach could travel in relative safety across the numerous political borders of central and northern Germany. He could expect, moreover, to communicate with patrons, visit relatives, and seek jobs in places that were under the rule of various local dominions, including the remaining free cities. Although always working for and subject to the laws of a local dynast or municipality, Bach remained a member of a larger polity which, although far from being a modern nation-state, had a recognized cultural and ethnic identity: German-speaking Europe; more specifically, Lutheran Germany.

To be sure, the Empire included Roman Catholic as well as Reformed (Calvinist) realms. The hereditary rulers of Thuringia, Saxony, and most of northern Germany were historically Lutheran, as were their subjects. There were exceptions, but the interdenominational warfare of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries was largely a thing of the past. The emperor himself was Catholic, yet this did not stop the Lutheran free cities of Lübeck and Mühlhausen from celebrating imperial coronations during Bach's time in those places. Bach himself would hold the title of court composer to a Catholic sovereign (the duke-elector of Saxony) during his last decade and a half. For after the Thirty Years' War the emperor had been forced to recognize the right of local rulers to choose the denominations of their domains. Political and demographic realities led certain localities, notably the cities of Augsburg and Erfurt, to tolerate both Catholic and Lutheran worship. When the Lutheran elector of Saxony switched to Catholicism in 1697,

his personal conversion could not be forced upon his subjects. Indeed, he remained the titular head of the Protestant division of the imperial legislature (*Reichstag*).

Still, religious enthusiasm could lead rulers, including those of Thuringia, to impose strict theocratic regulations. Within any given domain, church appointments and practices were overseen by the state, sometimes with the active participation of the ruler himself, who might make attendance at worship a legal requirement and impose his own ideas about the conduct of the liturgy throughout his realm. As repulsive as this may be today, it was joined in some realms with a less objectionable concern for education. Schooling beyond the elementary level remained out of reach for most, yet at least basic literacy was the norm in the towns where Bach worked. A boy who possessed intellectual potential and a drive to excel might find scholarship support at least through the equivalent of high school. Endowed by pious wealthy donors, this support was often in exchange for service in church as a chorister. University study remained available only to the few who could afford it and was reserved primarily for future pastors and lawyers. But during Bach's lifetime some university training was coming to be expected of other professionals as well, including the cantors who in most Lutheran towns were schoolteachers as well as musicians.

The same rulers and upper bourgeoisie who endowed scholarships for future pastors and church musicians—and who funded the building and maintenance of churches, including their organs—also cultivated the arts. The latter, although often still tied to religious purposes, were now increasingly valued in their own right. During the seventeenth century the pious dukes of Thuringia were among the founders of the "Fruit-Bearing Society" (*Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft*), a literary association inspired by Italian "academies." Although short-lived, this was a forerunner of such eighteenth-century foundations as the Prussian Academy of Sciences and Mizler's "Corresponding Society of Musical Sciences" (to which Bach later belonged). In short, the cultural world into which Bach was born revealed both conservative and progressive currents. It was hardly the feudalistic, still medieval society depicted in some twentieth-century writings.

Yet despite the veneer of rationalism, this was still in many ways a brutal pre-modern society. Support for the poor was limited to private charity, even if rulers and the wealthy were among the donors (as memorialized in Handel's Funeral Anthem for Queen Caroline and urged in his Foundling Hospital Anthem). Crime, including infractions against religion and the ruling class, was punished severely, and public executions were the norm. At Leipzig, Bach, as cantor, was responsible for leading a choir of boys in the hymns and procession that preceded a hanging, sacralizing the ritualized killing of a transgressor. Parallels between this ritual and the passion story, as recounted in Bach's two great works, would have made the latter seem very real to listeners.[1]

Life in Thuringia and Saxony (p. 6, following the end of the first complete paragraph, "extracted from the local environment.")

---

[1] As Williams (2016, 315) observes. Afterwards the corpse might be displayed at a gate in the city wall as a warning to would-be criminal visitors.

The political subdivision of the Empire meant that what had once been a well-defined hierarchy, from king to duke to prince down to free imperial knight and ordinary subject, had become confused. The duke of Saxe-Eisenach wielded a fraction of the power of the ruling margrave of Brandenburg, who theoretically was of lower rank. Yet titles were jealously guarded and scrupulously listed among the credentials of everyone from emperor down to private citizen. Bach continued to hold honorary court positions after his arrival at Leipzig, thus maintaining precedence and prestige ahead of his colleagues there who held solely municipal appointments. In written documents—personal letters as well as dedications for published books and scores—it was essential to list correctly all the titles of the addressee. Doing so might require several lines even for a minor dignitary, whole pages for major rulers. Today such a concern seems silly and undemocratic, but it was an essential part of the culture, a way of insuring orderly social relations and reinforcing each person's precise social status. The latter was unchangeable, save through the granting of a title or privilege by a higher authority. In this sense Bach's world did retain an element of its medieval past; understanding this is essential to understanding his career as well as the texts, sacred as well as secular, that he set to music—for it was God who occupied the highest level of this complex hierarchy.

The most powerful of the Empire's hundreds of local rulers, including the duke-electors of Saxony and the margraves (also electors) of Brandenburg, could and did flout their imperial obligations, pursuing their own geopolitical aims and waging warfare even against the emperor himself. By the end of Bach's life, the elector of Brandenburg, now also king "in" Prussia—a separate region outside the Empire—was completely independent, pursuing policies that set him at odds with Austria and Saxony. Smaller realms on his borders, such as the principality of Anhalt-Cöthen and some of the small Saxon duchies, had to choose sides between Prussia and the emperor. Yet all these realms remained, in theory, under imperial law, and this was part of a way of life that did not end until the dissolution of the Empire after the victories of Napoleon in the early nineteenth century.

Bach, even as he held various municipal and court appointments, could fulfill private commissions and give performances across northern Germany. He also could be reasonably confident that he would inherit property due to him from family members residing elsewhere in the Empire. Among his few surviving letters is a request to the Erfurt city council to assure a favorable division of a relative's estate.[2] Other correspondents included an imperial diplomat and a high municipal official.[3] Such were the educated, influential acquaintances on whom Bach could call for help in negotiating a path through life for himself and his children. Although Bach never attended university, throughout his adult life he was a respected, materially successful member of the urban middle class, ultimately holding several prestigious positions simultaneously (royal court composer, city music director, and cantor). For much of his life he

---

[2] BD 1:28 (no. 8), trans. in NBR, 94–95 (no. 89); the most complete explanation of the complicated affair remains that of Spitta (1889, 1:760–63).

[3] These were his former childhood friend Georg Erdmann, imperial Russian "agent," later councilor and "resident" at Dresden (see BD 1:67–68 [no. 23], trans. in NBR, 151 [no. 152]); and Johann Friedrich Klemm, city councilor and later burgomaster of Sangerhausen (BD 1:91–95 and 107–9 [nos 37–38 and 42], trans. in NBR, 186–88 and 200–201 [nos. 188–89 and 203]).

also conducted a small household music business, giving lessons and selling copies of his own compositions and eventually also trading in books, instruments, and music by others. Not all of this would have been possible had he been born a generation or two earlier, when the Empire was recovering from a long civil war. Bach nevertheless saw to it that his three oldest sons attended university; conditions were changing, affecting the lives of musicians and music itself. Bach understood this as well as anyone.

Courts and family life (p. 8, following the end of the printed chapter, "within early modern German society.")

Dresden and Berlin, the two royal capitals that Bach knew, were major cities, as was Leipzig, where he spent his last twenty-six years. Mühlhausen, his home for about a year, was also a significant town and a free imperial city, not subject to any aristocratic ruler except, in theory, the far-off emperor. Significantly smaller was his birthplace Eisenach, as well as Arnstadt, Weimar, and Cöthen, yet each of these was a so-called residence, the seat of a count, prince, or duke, and therefore more prestigious in the eyes of the time. Whereas a modern musician dreams of performing (or recording) for a large public, Bach's contemporaries placed greater value on work in the private chamber or chapel of a ruler—unless abusive conditions or financial exigency at a court made a position in a major city more attractive.

Thanks to the fame of Sebastian Bach—and to municipal marketing—we tend to think of Eisenach and Leipzig as "Bach" cities. But family members had been employed at Eisenach for only twenty years when Bach was born there, and no one of his name seems to have worked at Leipzig prior to Sebastian. The real Bach city—the center at least for Sebastian's branch of the family—was Erfurt, a university town but not a residence. As a Lutheran musician, Sebastian might have seen something providential in his father's call to Eisenach, which was more accurately a "Luther" city. Erfurt, on the other hand, was under the rule of the Catholic archbishop of Mainz, far to the west. Lutheran worship was tolerated there, and Johann Pachelbel taught Sebastian's brother Christoph and other members of the family there—but Sebastian was never professionally engaged there, except to inspect an organ in 1716.

Of the small Thuringian centers in which Bach did spend a significant amount of time, the most important was Weimar—not that it was of great political or economic importance. Weimar during Bach's time there was not a major polity, and both it and nearby Weissenfels were mismanaged by rulers whom Bach knew. Their patronage of him and his music came at the expense of their subjects, and the classical encomiums addressed to them in works like the Hunt Cantata (see chap. 7) were essentially political propaganda. To be sure, by referring to a ruler as the "Pan" of his domain, a poet, together with his musical collaborators, might hope to move a prince toward actually becoming the godlike provider he purported to be. Duke Christian of Weissenfels supported learning and public works within his territories, but he apparently cared most of all for the unsporting form of hunting practiced by the nobility at the time. This typically involved herding animals into enclosures and then essentially slaughtering them. Christian would see his duchy taken into receivership by Electoral Saxony, even while Bach served as his titular Capellmeister. Saxony too was poorly ruled, however, as its duke-electors pursued their royal ambitions in Poland. The long reign of Friedrich August II (King Augustus III), from whom Bach sought an appointment with the gift of his *Missa* in 1733, was a disaster for Poland. Of

Bach's aristocratic employers, only Prince Leopold of Cöthen may have been a competent ruler, although before inheriting his domain he spent lavishly on travel and music.

Anyone working for a court naturally had to abide by regulations and customs that governed everything from dress to how one spoke to others, depending on their rank—although this applied to social life in general. One court's good fortune could be the ruin of another, and of its employees. When Friedrich Wilhelm I, the "Soldier King," succeeded to the crown of Prussia in 1713, he dismissed most of the court musicians. Some found service with Leopold at Cöthen, where Bach would join them. Yet life in a remote country residence must have been far less gratifying than in a royal capital, opportunities for supplemental work few and far between. During his service at Cöthen Bach, at least, got to travel. Musicians sometimes worked as diplomats, even spies, and although there is no evidence that Bach ever served in either of those capacities, he might, as a court official, have been expected to report any notable observations made during visits to other courts and towns.

Living in an age when a plutocratic oligarchy is again encroaching on much of the world, we may be better prepared than recent past generations to understand Bach's relationships to his employers. He might well have identified his interests with those of petty despots who were, in his eyes and theirs, images of the God whom they believed they all served. Whether Bach ever understood noble patronage in terms other than the personal is doubtful. Already among the highest-paid employees at the little Cöthen court, he nevertheless complained when the ruling prince married and subsequently reduced his extravagant expenditures for music; Bach accused the ruler's new wife of being a philistine ("amusa"; see chap. 8). So much would have been understandable at a time when employment, even government service, was regarded entirely from the point of view of personal relationships, and occupations were seen as callings, not jobs. Bach and his family stood proudly beneath their music-loving rulers, who were appointed by God, governing and making their own appointments as the latter's representative on earth. Today we easily see through the puffery of the poems that Bach set to music to honor the elites of both courts and cities. But there is no reason to think that Bach understood such texts as anything but sincere and true, especially as some of them were written by Lutheran clergymen.

The men of the Bach family included church organists, cantors, and court and city musicians. Very few of the women served in official positions, although Bach's second wife and her sisters were court singers.[4] Each position included roles somewhat distinct from what the term implies today. A cantor, for example, was primarily a teacher, often responsible for instruction in Latin and elementary theology as well as music. A city "piper" *(Stadtpfeifer)* such as Bach's father Ambrosius was an accomplished musician, prepared to perform on string as well as wind instruments. Such a musician received his title from a town council only after an audition or other demonstration of proficiency.[5] As son of a "piper," the young Bach might initially have

[4] Women seem occasionally to have served as professional instrumentalists, possibly even as church musicians in Bach's Germany, but there is no clear evidence that any members of the Bach family did so, apart from Anna Magdalena (see, however, Yearsley 2013).

[5] At Leipzig Bach was among those who heard auditions of potential *Stadtpfeifer* (see, e.g., his evaluation of one Pfaffe dated July 24, 1745, in BD 1:146–47 [no. 79], trans. in NBR, 220 [no. 234]). The precise terminology and relative status of positions varied from city to city.

expected to follow the same career, learning to play various instruments first as an apprentice, then as a journeyman.

Ambrosius may not have been a virtuoso soloist, but he clearly understood how to make the most of both his own talents and the family and social connections available to him. As chief town musician (*Hausmann*) at Eisenach from 1671, he enjoyed certain privileges, such as the right of first refusal for all private musical engagements. He and other members of the family nevertheless found it necessary to defend such rights continually, through petitions and legal proceedings against unofficial "beer fiddlers."[6] At Eisenach he directed the town band, twice a day leading performances from the city hall.[7] This was a vestige of the pipers' military function as town guards. Ambrosius also performed regularly at the ducal court and the city church of St. George.

The hierarchic organization of society extended from court and government into the family household. Ambrosius was master of several apprentices who lived with the family, as well as probably one journeyman (*Geselle*) who managed on his own. The household also included several members of the extended Bach family, at one point incorporating Sebastian's orphaned cousins Johann Jacob and Johann Nicolaus. Their fathers died in the plague that struck Erfurt in 1682—a reminder that disease remained a serious threat during this era, alongside war and famine.[8] For ten years afterwards, there were thus two boys named Johann Jacob in the household: this cousin and Sebastian's older brother, born that year. Whether there were also servants is not recorded, but if Bach's parents employed someone to carry out basic household chores, this would have allowed the older males to devote attention to their professions, the females to teaching the youngest children and managing the household.

Life in such a household must have followed routines and rules very different from those of a modern family. We might expect complications, both practical and emotional, to have arisen as people came and departed, whether through birth, apprenticeship, employment elsewhere, or death. Yet we know very little about life in such a household—only enough to cast doubt on any projections onto it based on twentieth-century Freudian psychology. It is easy to suppose that siblings competed with one another; evidence for this might be seen in the unusual attention paid by Bach's first biographers to the so-called Moonlight incident (see chap. 2). The tale raises the possibility of latent hostility between Bach and his older brother. Tensions between Sebastian's offspring might have been expressed in the irascibility and reputed alcoholism of the oldest son, Friedemann; the gambling of his brother Bernhard; or the more benign habit of collecting music

---

[6] Ambrosius complained twice about the loss of income due to such competition, in unsuccessful petitions to the Eisenach town council for permission to take a better-paying post at Erfurt in 1684 (see Rollberg 1927, 144–46). These *Bierfiedler* were not necessarily unskilled, but they were mocked by city musicians (*Kunstgeiger*) and pipers defending their privileges; see Rose (2011), esp. chap. 3.

[7] "aufm Ratshaus" according to his contract, in Rollberg (1927, 135).

[8] The plague of 1682 also killed the wife and son of Pachelbel. He would have known the boys' fathers Johann Nicolaus and Johann Christian Bach (Ambrosius's first cousins).

and artwork that Sebastian evidently passed on to Emanuel and Johann Christian. We also have reports of animosity later in life between the sons Friedemann and Emanuel, and the latter is said not to have spoken of Christian after the latter's departure for Italy (or perhaps his conversion to Catholicism).[9] But there is no way to be sure of any of this, and speculation can add little to our understanding of how family members became capable and sometimes brilliant composers, performers, and teachers, for generation after generation.

Sebastian is supposed to have attributed his accomplishment to hard work together with "tolerable natural gift and ability."[10] Such an absurd understatement might reflect a family culture that devalued individual achievements, even feelings, in favor of collective striving and looking out for one's "neighbor," as contemporary adages and employment contracts put it.[11] Taking their cue from the wealthy and the aristocracy, members of a middle-class clan such as the Bachs probably understood their primary responsibility, after religion and the local ruler, as being to their relatives, aiming to extend the power, wealth, and reputation of the family. Private feelings were not a part of this; even marriages, like those of rulers, were undertaken as part of one's family obligations. Although marriages may no longer all have been arranged in the strict sense of the word, the selection of a marriage partner was sharply constrained by law and custom. The most eligible choices were often from a handful of families practicing the same profession in the same town or district. Birth, death, and other life events were observed frequently and at close range, often at home—but "home" could change at any time due to natural disasters, war, the death of a parent, even the extinction of a ruling dynasty and subsequent incorporation of its territory into another state. On the other hand, the loss of a parent or the shuttering of a court could mean an opportunity for new learning and forming new relationships, after joining another household.

Courts were, in principle, merely the households of rulers. In the small states in which Bach spent the first two thirds of his life, the court, including the entire apparatus of government, remained a tangible household unit. Every member, from servant to ruler, visibly carried out his or her distinctive duties within town and castle, sometimes even workshipping in the same building. Each person had a specified place and role, and orders of precedence were clear, but everyone stood in a personal relationship to the ruler. When, as at Eisenach or Weimar, the ruler took a special interest in music, no talented member of a local family could have escaped his attention. For music was a domain in which a monarch could demonstrate his magnificence as

---

[9] As with tales of Friedemann's drunkenness, it is unclear how true was Kirnberger's report to Forkel that Emanuel would have nothing to do with his older brother ("will auch von ihm nichts weissen," letter of 1779, given by Bitter 1868, 2:323).

[10] As in Wolff (2000, 10), citing Birnbaum, who, however, puts words into Bach's mouth in the course of defending the difficulty of the latter's music: "His [Bach's] reasoning can only be as follows: that which I have achieved by industry and practice, anyone else with tolerable natural gift and ability can also achieve" (BD 2:303 [no. 409], trans. from NBR, 346 [no. 344]).

[11] Bach's Obituary even justified his decision to undergo eye surgery at the end of his life "partly out of a desire to be of further service to God and his neighbor [*Nächste*]" (BD 3:85 [no. 666], trans. in NBR, 303 [no. 306]).

well as his munificence toward both subjects and fellow rulers. Weddings and christenings even of servants might be patronized by the local lord, those of the ruling family being celebrated by the entire court as state occasions. On the other hand, a death within the ruling family would be mourned throughout its domain. During the mourning period, the ruler's subjects might be forbidden to employ music for weddings and like occasions, usually for a period of six months. This was a serious problem for a town musician such as Ambrosius Bach, who thereby lost the so-called accidental income that he was normally authorized to receive by providing music for private events. There were also regulations governing the number of musicians and types of music that could be furnished for the various classes. Wealthy or "distinguished" citizens were allowed to give more lavish celebrations; musicians of the status of the Bachs naturally preferred to work for people of this sort. "Accidental" income from the weddings and funerals of the well-to-do was essential for maintaining their standard of living, and in a good year it probably amounted to more than was earned from any regular court or city position.

The extended Bach family was comparable to other musical families of the period, including the Bendas, Grauns, Hasses, and of course the Mozarts. The Bach family, however, was unique in its size and its consistency in producing capable musicians for at least seven generations. That family members were well aware of their uniqueness is evident from Sebastian's drawing up (or at least updating) the list of family members known as the Bach Genealogy. He also helped preserve a collection of music called the Old Bach Archive. Regular gatherings of the entire clan,[12] as well as attendance at marriage ceremonies and other life events within the family, would have reinforced members' sense of their special character while providing opportunities for renewing acquaintances, exchanging news, and carrying out business (such as arranging for apprenticeships). Sebastian's grandson Wilhelm Friedrich Ernst, who died in 1845, was the last living composer from his branch of the family, which stemmed from the town of Wechmar. Others also named Bach, including a line of court composers and painters at Meiningen and the Berlin organist August Wilhelm Bach (1796–1869), probably considered themselves related, but if so they were remote from Sebastian. Within the family as a whole, the more prominent or successful households must have shared traditions and cultural patterns, perhaps also genetic traits, that favored not only creativity but a capacity for hard work. Of course, similar characteristics have been posited for German middle-class Protestant families generally, sometimes accompanied by invidious assumptions bordering on racism. Other possible factors include physical vigor, notably the capacity of the women to withstand the birth of numerous children, as well as uncommon size; Sebastian, like his father, was taller than average. Against these positive traits, however, must be balanced the possibility of hereditary mental handicaps.[13]

It has been suggested that the name *Bach*, which means "stream" or "brook" in modern German, might actually have reflected the profession of the ancestral Veit (Vitus) Bach as a baker. This,

---

[12] Reported by Forkel (1801, 18; trans. in NBR, 424), presumably on the basis of reports from Friedemann or Emanuel Bach.

[13] Both a sister of Bach's father (name unknown; see Spitta 1873, 172) and Sebastian's son Gottfried Heinrich are said to have been "feeble-minded."

however, seems doubtful,[14] and the Genealogy's assertion that Veit fled "Hungary" for reasons of religion requires interpretation. Veit, Sebastian's great-great-grandfather, reportedly came to Germany in the mid-sixteenth century from Bratislava. Now capital of Slovakia, this was historically the city (then known as Pressburg) in which the Habsburgs were crowned kings of Hungary.[15] That Veit and his family indeed suffered religious persecution is plausible; ongoing warfare between the Habsburgs and the Ottoman Turks (allied with France) could also have been a factor. In any case the family evidently professed a special commitment to Lutheranism which it traced back to Veit.

Life for the members of this family remained in many ways utterly alien to what we know today. Things that we take for granted as services rendered by professionals or the state—schooling, medical care, the handling of the dead—were domestic responsibilities, at least to a further point than nowadays. This would not necessarily have affected Bach as a musician, especially if these responsibilities were assumed largely by the women of the household. But closer to Bach's own work, conveniences that we take for granted were unknown. Paper could be purchased, but it was very expensive, and paper with preprinted staff lines was generally unavailable. To write music, Bach had to rule the pages himself (or else use organ tablature, a sort of letter code for notes). Pencils were not yet in widespread use for writing; ink might still have been mixed at home by hand, pens certainly cut from bird feathers, as were the plectra that plucked the strings of a harpsichord. How well Bach and other members of the family understood instrument making is uncertain, but they certainly had to be prepared to undertake repairs on their own, using raw materials and without the benefit of power tools. Electric lighting too was unknown, of course, and as candles were not cheap, labor normally took place in daylight. In the short days of winter, however, artificial illumination must have been essential, if not always effective. Unheated churches would have been cold places for worship and music making, and the bellows of organs, like those of a fireplace, had to be pumped manually. All these things took time away from creative pursuits, including practice and rehearsal, which for all but the most elite musicians was probably a luxury.

There were compensations. Having to prepare musical scores from scratch meant that one learned every stage in the planning and preparation of a work. By assisting as calcants—pumping the bellows—boys gained intimate acquaintance with how an organ worked, perhaps also of how their master practiced, although practice and rehearsal in the modern sense were necessarily rare. The rarity of rehearsal led musicians to cultivate skills of improvisation and spontaneity that are now more common in jazz than among "classical" performers.

Bach and his two successive wives had more than the average number of children, but neither the number nor the early deaths of half of them were extraordinary. Princess Magdalena Augusta of Anhalt-Zerbst, wife of Duke Friedrich II of Saxe-Gotha, bore nineteen children. Nine lived to

---

[14] Geck (2000, 35) suggests an origin in the Middle High German verb *bachen*. The name, however, is supposed originally to have been pronounced with a long A and was sometimes even spelled *Baach* (Wolff, "Bach: Family History"), whereas the verb apparently had a short A.

[15] Johann Mathias Korabinsky, *Beschreibung der königl. ungarischen Haupt-, Frey- und Krönungsstadt Preßburg* (Preßburg, 1784), 110–12.

maturity (one was mother of Britain's George III), suggesting that the survival rate was not notably different for members of the upper class. Bach's first wife was older than he by five months, but his second wife was sixteen and a half years his junior. Her first child, born before her own twenty-second birthday, lived less than three years; seven of her thirteen children died before reaching the age of five, three of them as infants. Regina Johanna was baptized in October 1728 just twenty days after the burial of her three-year-old brother Christian Gottlieb; how would their parents have experienced this? how would their older siblings, now ranging in age from four to twenty? These events took place during a season that saw only a few new compositions, but a month later Bach's former patron Leopold of Cöthen died. During the next six months, Bach not only repeated his Saint Matthew Passion but prepared funeral music based on it for Leopold. He also produced a cantata for the visiting Duke Christian of Weissenfels that must have been sung by Anna Magdalena, his former employee. Christian would grant Bach an honorary title that February; a month later Wilhelm Friedemann began his studies at the Leipzig University, as Sebastian assumed directorship of the Collegium Musicum. It may be that family events had no bearing on Bach's professional life or the trajectory of his career, that members of such a family took births and deaths in stride and did not make the emotional investment in an infant that we take for granted. On the other hand, who could say that the frequent experience of birth and death at close hand had no effect on the music that Bach wrote?

Chapter 2

Names within the Bach family (p. 11, at the first paragraph break, "the high distinction of a royal appointment (in 1713)."

The confusing duplication of names for the men of the family reflected a long-standing German tradition. The name Johann, first borne by Sebastian's great-uncle, was shared by no fewer than eight members of the next generation and eighteen of Sebastian's, becoming almost a title, a mark of shared family identity. The tradition of recurring names went back at least to the Ptolemies of ancient Egypt and was particularly common among the nobility. In Prussia, rulers alternated for two centuries between Frederick (Friedrich in German) and Frederick William (Friedrich Wilhelm). Every male in the ruling family of the county of Reuss has been named Heinrich since the thirteenth century. Within the immediate family, Bach shared his first name Johann with his father, four brothers, uncle and great-uncle, and six of his own children.[16] Understandably, the men were typically known by the last of their given names, at least outside the household—hence "Sebastian Bach," son of Ambrosius and father of Friedemann, Emanuel, Bernhard, Friedrich, and Christian. Besides Johann, a few other names also recur frequently, especially Christoph. But it is striking that both Ambrosius and four of his six sons, including Sebastian and the short-lived Johann Rudolf and Johannes Jonas, bore names that are unique within the Wechmar branch of the family.

Given names were often those of godparents, a relationship then much more meaningful than today.[17] Between families of equal social status, standing as a godparent signified friendship and mutual obligation. When a local aristocrat served as godparent for a subject or servant, as was common, it indicated high regard as well as protection or patronage. Sebastian was named for Sebastian Nagel, a Gotha *Stadtpfeifer*. His presence in Eisenach in March 1685, whether coincidental or not, reflected the frequency with which musicians traveled within the region on both family and musical business, using such occasions to strengthen bonds of friendship and cooperation.

Bach at Lüneburg (p. 14, at the end of the page, following "his generation in northern Germany")

Lüneburg was a domain of the dukes of Brunswick and Lunenburg (Braunschweig-Lüneburg in German). Like many rulers, they had multiple palaces across their territories. Their principal residence was in Celle, fifty miles to the southwest, and the ruling Georg Wilhelm could therefore be described as "duke of Celle."[18] Bach might have journeyed there during breaks from his studies at St. Michael's School, hearing the duke's ensemble, which included many French musicians. But a closer venue for listening to the ducal *Capelle* might have been the ruler's

---

[16] These figures include Bach's brother Johannes Jonas and his daughter Regina Johanna.

[17] See Exner (2016).

[18] As in the Obituary, BD 3:82 (no. 666), NBR, 300 (no. 306).

palace at Ebstorf, some sixteen miles away, which the duke visited regularly.[19] Georg Wilhelm was one of many German rulers of the time who emulated King Louis XIV of France, forming court bands modeled after that of Paris. Printed full scores of operas and ballets by Lully, Louis's chief composer, were widely distributed, but understanding how to play them in proper style would have required hearing performances by French or French-trained musicians. This Bach evidently did for the first time while at Lüneburg.

The principal source of information for this period of Bach's life is a few lines in his Obituary, published in 1754. The chief author, Emanuel Bach, makes a point of his father's learning the French style; he also reports that during these years Sebastian made repeated trips to the great port city of Hamburg. Doing so would have provided opportunities to learn the other prevalent national style of the period, that of Italy, through attendance at the Hamburg opera. The latter would be Handel's destination in the same city in 1703, and it is hard to believe that Sebastian would not have taken advantage of his visits there to attend performances by the only public institution of this type in northern Europe. The Obituary, however, mentions only that Bach traveled to Hamburg to hear the organist and composer Johann Adamszoon Reinken.[20]

Lüneburg and Hamburg are separated by more than thirty miles, not a trivial distance in view of early eighteenth-century travel conditions. Lübeck, where the more brilliant Buxtehude lived and worked, was another forty miles distant. At Hamburg, however, Bach might have stayed with his slightly older cousin Johann Ernst Bach, then a student there. It was while returning on foot from one of these Hamburg excursions that Sebastian supposedly received anonymous assistance in the form of two coins hidden in the heads of a pair of herrings, tossed from the window of an inn. The money not only allowed him to eat but to finance another trip. It may be that Bach was recognized by someone who did not wish his charity to be known. The Obituary offers this odd tale as another instance of Bach's providential success.[21]

Unfortunately the Obituary says nothing about Bach's actual work or studies in Lüneburg. Instead it relates what evidently seemed an amusing tale about his voice changing shortly after his arrival, so that he sang "in octaves" for eight days. Scholars have had to surmise that Bach subsequently sang bass, or accompanied performances at the harpsichord or organ, or studied music in the school's library.[22] More certain is that he had access to Georg Böhm's music

[19] As argued by Traute Marshall (2016).

[20] Williams (2016, 37–38) suggests that this reticence about hearing opera reflects an "agenda" on the part of the Obituary's authors to downplay Bach's interest in Italian theatrical music, emphasizing instead his attachment to German church music.

[21] Wolff (2000, 63) suggests that it was one of the aristocratic students at the Ritter-Akademie in Lüneburg. We can imagine this fellow, similarly traveling from Hamburg, passing Bach (on foot) in his coach. But the story comes from Marpurg (BD 3:423–24 [no. 914], trans. in NBR, 409 [no. 397], who might have gotten it from his unreliable friend Friedemann Bach; hence its veracity must be doubted.

[22] Küster (1996, chap. 4), citing financial records, concludes that Bach could have been paid only to continue singing as a bass.

collection, for what appears to be the earliest music manuscript in Bach’s hand contains a copy “made in Böhm’s house” of a famous organ piece by Reinken. The composition is a tour de force of northern German fantasizing on a chorale melody.[23]

[23] The quoted phrase (*â Dom. Georg: Böhme descriptum ao. 1700 Lunaburgi*) is from Bach’s copy of Reinken’s chorale fantasia on “Am Wasserflüssen Babylons.” The identification of the copy (by Wollny and Maul, 2008) put to rest doubt as to whether Bach had studied with Böhm; these were occasioned by Emanuel Bach’s crossing out the words “his teacher Böhm” *(seinem . . . Lehrmeister Böhmen*) in a letter to Forkel of Jan. 13, 1775 (BD 3:288 [no. 803; the cancelled words are given on p. 290]; NBR, 398, no. 395). Beißwenger (2017, 248–49) expresses skepticism about the identification of the copyists of the manuscript but not about Bach’s responsibility for the colophon quoted here.

Chapter 3

The Quodlibet (p. 26, following the reference to BWV 524 in the first paragraph, "Bach's fragmentary manuscript copy of 1707 or 1708")

The anonymous text seems to refer to Bach's sister Maria Salome. But a mention of two solar eclipses "in this year" does not necessarily place the work in 1707, the date assigned to it by Schneider and subsequent biographers. Europe during the first decade of the eighteenth century experienced more solar eclipses than usual, but no single calendar year saw more than one solar eclipse, complete or partial, in Germany. A total eclipse visible in Dresden on May 12, 1706 would have been nearly total in Thuringia; three partial or annular eclipses followed on Sept. 14, 1708, March 11, 1709, and Feb. 28, 1710. "This year" does not necessarily indicate a precise calendar year and might have referred to any of these events. None of the later eclipses reached 50% totality, however, the 1709 eclipse barely achieving 20% totality in Dresden (less in Thuringia to the west). Four of the eclipses listed in NBA I/41, KB, 52, were not visible in Europe at all, and that of Sept. 14, 1708, like the other partial eclipses of 1708–10, might not have been noticed in Germany unless astronomers pointed it out.[24]

Pachelbel and Froberger as antecedents of Bach (p. 26, following the first complete paragraph, ""Ambrosius's manuscript copy")

Johann Pachelbel, born in 1653, was the most creative and most highly regarded composer in the region while Sebastian was growing up, overshadowing any member of the Bach family. Besides serving as godfather to Sebastian's short-lived sister Johanna Juditha (1680–86), Pachelbel taught his teenaged brother Christoph during Sebastian's infancy. Today famous for a somewhat atypical canonic piece for three violins and continuo, Pachelbel was best known in his day for his keyboard compositions. These include toccatas and *praeludia*, both types often incorporating fugues. The first duty listed in Pachelbel's contract as organist at Erfurt, however, was to introduce and accompany the singing of chorales (hymns) during worship, a task that he was to undertake with "understanding, learning, and knowledge."[25] This implies something beyond simple harmonization or improvisation. If it reflected expectations across the region generally, it would explain the large number of organ chorales that survive not only by Pachelbel but by the older Christoph Bach, his brother Johann Michael Bach, and ultimately Sebastian. Surely the latter studied chorale settings by all three older composers while at Ohrdruf, including those published by Pachelbel "for preluding" in 1693.[26] The many pieces of this type vary greatly in scope, style, and technique. Typically, however, they demonstrate the composer's ability to write

---

[24] These eclipse data are from the website of Her Majesty's Nautical Almanac Office <http://astro.ukho.gov.uk/eclipse/>, accessed December 12, 2018.

[25] "Verstande, Wissenschaft und Gewissen . . . vorhero *thematice praeambulando* zu tractieren sich befleissigen wird, durchgehends mitspielen," contract dated June 19, 1678, given by Hugo Botstiber in the introduction to his edition of Pachelbel's Magnificat Fugues, *Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Österreich* 8/2 (1901): viii.

[26] *Acht Choräle zum praeaumbulieren* (Nuremberg, 1693).

learned counterpoint based on the chorale melodies, sometimes expressive or virtuoso figuration as well.

In addition to writing his own exemplary compositions, Pachelbel was a transmitter of Froberger's music, thereby linking Bach to a tradition that extended back to the late Italian Renaissance. Born in Stuttgart, Johann Jacob Froberger (1616–67) studied in Rome with Frescobaldi, who was in turn a pupil of Luzzaschi at Ferrara.[27] Froberger was an imperial organist at Vienna before he returned to his native region; he also traveled to Paris, London, Dresden, and Madrid. Pachelbel might have acquired copies of Froberger's music during his service at Vienna (1673–77) or Stuttgart (1690–92). His years in Stuttgart came after Christoph had studied with him, but Pachelbel then returned to Thuringia, remaining at Gotha until 1695.[28]

Like Pachelbel, Froberger composed toccatas, but he also wrote many suites as well as ricercars and other strict contrapuntal pieces. His music remained famous enough well after his death to be published in printed editions into the early eighteenth century. His toccatas and his suites, which drew respectively on the Italian and French idioms of the day, are admired today for their improvisatory brilliance and their expressive features, respectively. But it appears to have been the contrapuntal pieces that were most prized by Pachelbel and his pupils. It was probably for these that Froberger was later said to have been, with Pachelbel, among the older composers whom Sebastian admired.[29] A selection of these contrapuntal pieces, together with some by Frescobaldi, circulated among Bach's pupils, presumably copied from music that had been in Bach's possession.[30] Two of the Froberger pieces appear also in a manuscript copied by Johann Valentin Eckelt, another pupil of Pachelbel. The same manuscript contains three further pieces by Froberger, two of them in Pachelbel's own hand.[31]

This music, dating back to the early seventeenth century, was passed down from teacher to student for some two hundred years in the form of manuscript copies. Some of these manuscripts, including Eckelt's, used the form of notation known as German organ tablature, in

---

[27] Bach's Italian cantata *Non sa che sia dolore* BWV 209 opens with lines by Guarini; these also appear in one of Luzzaschi's madrigals for the so-called Three Ladies of Ferrara.

[28] Thuringia and Stuttgart are separated by about 200 miles, but dynastic connections between the two led to the marriage in 1688 of Duke Johann Georg II of Eisenach to a Stuttgart princess, Sophie Charlotte. Her aunt Sibylla was Froberger's final patron, for whom he wrote some of his last works, but if Sophie Charlotte brought any music to Eisenach it has vanished.

[29] As C. P. E. Bach wrote to Forkel in 1775 (BD 3:288 [no. 803], trans. in NBR, 398 [no. 395]).

[30] The works in question are those known to Froberger scholars as R14, Cp10, F7, Cz4, F3, Cz3, F2, F4, Cp13, Cp9, R13, and Cp18 (Cp = Capriccio, Cz = Canzona, F = Fantasia, R = Ricercar); further discussion in Ishii (2013).

[31] Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellonska, Mus. ms. 40035; inventory in Bellotti (2001, 24–44). Eckelt copied Froberger's Cp18 and F7; Pachelbel copied Cz6 and R7. Further on Pachelbel as a teacher in Welter (2008).

which letters and symbols replaced staff lines and notes (see fig. 3.1). More compact and therefore more economical than score notation, tablature was the preferred way to write music among German keyboard players until about 1700. Bach used tablature only occasionally as an adult, chiefly to sketch brief passages in the margins of regular scores. But as a child he may have used it regularly, and his first compositions might have been written in this manner. If so, this would explain their disappearance, as tablature manuscripts tended to be discarded during the eighteenth century, when their contents were either abandoned or transcribed into score notation. Countless keyboard pieces by Pachelbel and other German composers of the previous century were probably lost as a result. Those that survive were often altered in the transcription process, which also could introduce mistakes.

It could have been a tablature manuscript that was the subject of the "Moonlight" anecdote (related in chap. 2).[32] As the music in the book included keyboard pieces by Froberger, Pachelbel, and Kerll—Pachelbel's senior colleague during his Vienna years—it was probably acquired during Christoph's studies with Pachelbel. It likely included the same types of contrapuntal pieces by Froberger that Sebastian's pupils later transmitted—fantasias, ricercars, and capriccios, not the more expressive and showy suites and toccatas. Hence Sebastian's chief interest in the book may have lain in the mysteries of counterpoint that it revealed—something to which Bach might have been devoting more time than his older brother thought good for him. Vienna would continue to be a source of learned counterpoint for Sebastian; he later owned a copy of the counterpoint textbook *Gradus ad Parnassum* by Fux, who was imperial Capellmeister there from 1715 onward.

Froberger's music also included programmatic pieces, some with autobiographical subjects that were described in accompanying verbal explanations (*Beschreibungen*). The older Christoph Bach's wedding composition was also accompanied by a "Beschreibung"; this explained the programmatic significance of some of the instrumental passages. Thus a "walking" bass line climbing a scale in quarter notes represents "a lover making his way on his own."[33] Comparable musical imagery, together with verbal descriptions, appears in Kuhnau's so-called Biblical Sonatas, published in 1700. Both works could have served as models for Sebastian's sole programmatic piece, the Capriccio BWV 992.[34] The underlying concept is already manifest in Froberger's music, and although Bach may have remembered chiefly Froberger's contrapuntal pieces, he might also have known such music as the "Meditation on my future death." A movement from one of ten suites published at Amsterdam in 1698, this contains some

---

[32] This might explain why the manuscript does not survive. According to the Obituary (BD 3:82 [no. 666], trans. in NBR, 299 [no. 306]), Bach received it after his brother's death, although the latter occurred in 1721, not 1703, as the authors believed.

[33] "Ein Verliebter schleichet seines Weges, ganz vor sich allein." This is the first of the musical images described in annotations to the continuo part.

[34] The Andreas Bach Book opens with Christoph's copies of five of the six sonatas from Kuhnau's *Musicalische Vorstellung einiger biblischer Historien* (Leipzig, 1700). The dedication of the latter is dated Aug. 31, 1700, a few months after Sebastian left Ohrdruf.

remarkable chromatic modulations which Bach would surely have noticed, even if he was unaware of their programmatic significance.[35]

It is, however, all too easy to draw hypothetical connections between older pieces that happen to survive and those by Bach that bear some similarity to them. He must have heard countless other compositions that have left no traces, not to mention improvisations that were never written down. The fact that Emanuel Bach failed to mention certain composers—especially non-Germans—as influences on his father does not mean that the latter did not know their music. Besides, a genius does not need to admire a composition or copy out its score to absorb lessons from it. A single idea, overheard while another played or improvised, could prove illuminating, even if an ordinary listener would not have found it distinctive.

First compositions? (p. 31, following the end of the printed chapter, "where it was now being cultivated")

Most biographers have assumed that Bach began composing by his Lüneburg period, that is, before the age of eighteen, and various works have been put forth as survivors from that time. But there is no documentary evidence from those years in the form of autograph manuscripts or even reliably attributed manuscript copies of compositions by Bach. His own copies of a few keyboard pieces by others show that he had access to paper and ink—something that cannot be taken for granted, given their expense. But whether he could have afforded to cover valuable paper with drafts of his own music is less certain, even if he was habitually improvising chorale settings and other pieces. Even finding time to practice might have been difficult and would have required access to an instrument—more likely a small fretted clavichord than a larger and more valuable harpsichord.[36] Organ playing would have been a much-desired but probably rare treat, for church instruments were accessible only with special permission, and they required an assistant to pump the bellows.[37] We can imagine Bach arranging with Böhm for occasional access to a church organ, perhaps alternating with another student between playing at the bench and working the bellows. But few of the compositions supposed to be by the young Bach require pedals, and most could have been managed on any keyboard instrument.

---

[35] The programmatic title is absent from the published version, which was reprinted ca. 1710 (facsimile ed. Robert Hill in *17th Century Keyboard Music: Sources Central to the Keyboard Art of the Baroque*, vol. 4, New York: Garland, 1988). The "Meditation" is followed by an old-fashioned fugal gigue in duple meter that uses dotted rather than skipping rhythms; Bach would write similar gigues as the concluding movements of his First French Suite and Sixth Partita.

[36] A *fretted* clavichord is one on which a single string serves for as many as four different notes, the metal tangents at the ends of adjacent keys striking the same string at different points. This limits the types of chords and chromatic melodic lines that can be played.

[37] Bach's appointment letter as organist at Arnstadt forbade him to grant access to the organ to anyone else "without foreknowledge of the superintendents" (*ohne vorbewurst des Herrn superintendenten*, BD 2:11 [no. 8], trans. in NBR, 41 [no. 16]). Such clauses were standard, although how rigorously they were enforced is unknown.

No surviving pieces reliably attributed to Bach are likely to date from his Ohrdruf or Lüneburg period. He was a capable singer at this time and probably a more than capable keyboard player. But that he was a prodigy like Mozart or Mendelssohn, writing significant and original compositions by his early teens, is less certain. In view of the Obituary's focus on his training as an organist, his first creative efforts are likely to have been improvisations at the keyboard. We might glean something of what these were like from surviving pieces from roughly the same time and place, whether or not these are accurately attributed to him. Among these are numerous preludes and variations on chorale melodies, including pieces attributed to "Bach." These could have been composed by members not only of Sebastian's family but of Pachelbel's, whose family name could be abbreviated by the same four letters (B and P were often exchanged, reflecting regional pronunciation).

Such pieces probably resembled what was heard on a daily basis in church. There an organist might have been expected not only to add improvisatory flourishes to the melody of a chorale, but also to lengthen or abbreviate written pieces as required, when playing during a service. Hence a piece by one composer might be revised or extended by another. Bach himself may have expanded Pachelbel's fughetta on the opening line of "Christe, der du bist Tag und Licht" into a full-fledged chorale motet.[38] Other chorale pieces may have similar histories, although some of those preserved under Bach's name are so unremarkable or so full of mistakes that, if indeed his, they tell us only that as a boy he still had much to learn.[39]

Among the more promising pieces of this type are several keyboard chorales attributed to "Seb. Bach" in a manuscript now at Yale. These take various forms. One resembles the later settings known as the "Arnstadt" chorales, in which each phrase of a four-part chorale harmonization is followed by a little cadenza, such as organists traditionally improvised (see ex. S3.1b below). Three others, called "aria" or "arioso," recall a modest type of seventeenth-century work in which instruments accompany a solo voice singing the chorale, adding a brief introduction and interludes. Although nothing in these pieces is really striking, the craftsmanship is secure, suggesting that the composer received rigorous training in four-part harmony, one of the essential skills for any organist at this time.
The late date of the manuscript (ca. 1800) means that the music in it can hardly be placed securely in Bach's student years.[40]If the little chorale settings are indeed his, then a few idiosyncracies common to later pieces had an early origin: an echoing descending figure (b′–e′)

---

[38] The resulting composition, listed as BWV 1096, is one of the "Neumeister" chorales. That collection attributes it to J. S. Bach, but the first twenty-five measures occur alone elsewhere and might be by Pachelbel or Johann Michael Bach. A chorale motet in this sense is a type of contrapuntal organ piece, modeled on old-fashioned vocal quartets such as Bach might have sung at Lüneburg

[39] Among these are most of the chorale compositions listed as BWV 741–65, edited alongside further doubtful works in NBA IV/10.

[40] The date is from the foreword to the edition by Wollny and Zehnder (1998). The pieces remain without BWV numbers.

that might be interpreted as an expressive sigh (ex.S3.1a);[41] modestly chromatic harmony, offset by passagework reminiscent of chorale fantasias by northern composers such as Reinken (ex. S3.1b).

Some more ambitious pieces might have had their origin during this period as well. Four or five sets of variations on chorale melodies—today called chorale partitas—suggest inspiration from similar works by Pachelbel or Böhm. The three best-known of these sets could have reached their final form only somewhat later.[42] But an early version of one of these, comprising five settings of the melody "Christe, der du bist der helle Tag," is preserved alongside the chorale compositions mentioned above.[43]These variations look more mature than the pieces in the manuscript. Indeed, the first variation, although likely modeled on a type of chorale setting also composed by Böhm, resembles Bach's writing for solo voice and continuo in works like the so-called *Actus tragicus* (BWV 106; see chap. 5). The disciplined motivic work of variation 2 also seems advanced for a boy in his early teens (ex. S3.2).

Variations are likely to have been a favorite form for Bach's early work, both improvised and written down. A better idea of what Bach's very first chorale variations were like, however, can probably be gained from two other sets (BWV 770 and 771), even if not every movement in these is correctly attributed to him. A set of variations on a secular melody (a sarabande) might also be an early work of J. S. Bach (BWV 990). It is, however, similar enough to two compositions attributed to Johann Christoph Bach that it could also have been composed by the latter orbit—although *which* Christoph Bach remains unclear.[44]

A few preludes and fugues and related pieces that are certainly early compositions by Sebastian are simple enough that these, too, might have been drafted before the composer's Arnstadt years. Among these are two *manualiter* fugues in A and the organ praeludium BWV 549a, with its very rudimentary pedal writing.[45] One imagines that Bach was required to demonstrate ability as an

---

[41] This piece opens with a melody that is practically identical to that of the early vocal work BWV 131.

[42] These are BWV 766, 767, and 768. The term *partita* more properly refers to an individual variation; the similar term *partie* described a suite.

[43] Example S-3.2 shows the title and musical text as given in the Yale manuscript, not the more familiar later version (BWV 766).

[44] The pieces in question are an "Aria Eberliniana pro dormiente Camillo variata â Joh. Christoph Bach. org.," dated March 1690, and a sarabande with fifteen variations in A minor. Melamed (1999) argued that Johann Christoph Bach of Ohrdruf is a possible composer of these pieces, but this is questioned by Dirksen (2010), who has edited these as works of the Eisenach organist.

[45] All three are preserved in later copies by Christoph Bach of Ohrdruf: BWV 549a and 896 in the Möller Manuscript, BWV 949a in the Andreas Bach Book. The latter also contains two further works that Sebastian might have composed during this early period, the little fantasia BWV 570 and the larger BWV 563 (a sort of prelude and fugue). Both are playable on manuals only despite their appearance on three staves in many editions.

improviser of preludes and fugues in his first organ auditions. Yet it is possible that he did not discover his aptitude for disciplined fugue *writing* before the Arnstadt years, until then concentrating on the less rigorous genre of the keyboard chorale. Certainly it was the latter for which he had a more immediate need as a fledgling church organist, the profession which he was now ready to enter.

Chapter 4

Bach and the Bach family at Arnstadt (p. 34, following the first paragraph break, "at odds with his superiors")

Arnstadt was a small town by modern standards.[46] It was nevertheless the oldest recorded settlement in eastern Germany, and in Bach's time the household of the ruling count comprised 120 persons, including court painters, builders, and jewelers.[47] Members of the Bach family were employed as court musicians from the mid-1660s onward, and although Sebastian held no formal title as such, it would be strange if the ruling count did not see him as one of them. If Sebastian indeed enjoyed favored status from the ruler, this would explain his apparent flouting of the expectations of his formal supervisors within the church hierarchy. In looking out for himself, Bach followed a local family tradition of sorts. In 1677 his uncle Johann Christoph (1645–93) and five other male relatives were involved in a legal battle with the Arnstadt musician Heinrich Gräser. The latter complained that "'where the Bachs live, there is nothing but dispute and quarreling . . .,' that they studied with their parents instead of with other masters, as was proper, and were even rumored to forge apprenticeship certificates."[48] Whatever the truth of these claims, the Bach clan evidently came together to defend themselves against suspicions and resentment that they aroused among competing musicians. When Sebastian confronted the Arnstadt authorities, or later his superior in the Thomasschule at Leipzig, he might have seen himself as acting not only as an individual but as representative of his family, if not his profession.

Among the positive features of Bach's time at Arnstadt was the forging of links with local ministers, who in the quasi-theocracy of the Empire enjoyed considerable prestige and power. At Arnstadt he seems to have been close to both the superintendent of churches, Johann Gottfried Olearius, and his son, the deacon Johann Christoph. Both had professional competence in music as well as an interest in hymns, and during Bach's time in Arnstadt the younger Olearius was writing a commentary on the chorales as they were sung over the course of the church year.[49] It should not have escaped the youthful Bach that a series of chorale settings was a musical equivalent of such a commentary. Bach would eventually produce at least three systematically organized sets of chorale compositions: the *Orgelbüchlein* (Little Organ Book) of the Weimar years, the cycle of chorale cantatas composed at Leipzig ten years later, and the group of at least fifteen larger chorale settings for organ begun at Weimar and revised at Leipzig. Preceding all of these, however, could have been at least the intention to assemble a cycle of chorale settings at Arnstadt. Some such compositions survive in single manuscript copies and in the so-called Neumeister collection. Given Bach's rapidly evolving sophistication in both composition and

---

[46] Arnstadt had 3800 inhabitants according to Schiffner (1985, 7), though he does not state his sources.

[47] Schiffner (1988); it is unclear whether all 120 were full-time employees.

[48] Kevorkian (forthcoming, chap. 2), citing Arnstadt archival documents.

[49] *Evangelischer Lieder-Schatz* (Jena, 1705–7), cited by Leaver (2012, 25–26).

organ playing, any such project would have made Bach, despite his limited schooling, a worthy collaborator with an older scholar and pastor. Both were contributing to the liturgy, the one through a learned and persuasive sermon, the other with equally learned and moving music.

Bach was preceded at Arnstadt by many family members, including his father Ambrosius and uncle Johann Christoph.[50] He would be succeeded at the New Church by the latter's son Johann Ernst. Where Sebastian lived at Arnstadt is not known, but he might have stayed with relatives, perhaps even the burgomaster Martin Feldhaus. Feldhaus was brother-in-law of Sebastian's cousins (once removed) Johann Günther and Johann Michael. He was, moreover, godfather of the latter's daughter Maria Barbara, who was to become Bach's first wife.[51] Although therefore a "Bach" town, Arnstadt might have seemed a narrow and provincial place to one who had been born in a larger ducal city and already seen Hamburg. At Arnstadt Bach nevertheless enjoyed a well-paid position at a fine new organ, with relatively light official duties. Here he had ample opportunity for sustained development of both his compositional skills and his technical capabilities at the organ (especially pedal playing)—things crucial for a young musician, now available to him at precisely the right moment in his career. Not least important would have been the establishment of "music-writing" habits that would remain with him throughout his life, made possible by a salary that could have allowed him to purchase adequate supplies of paper and ink.[52] As important as improvisation and memory doubtless remained for Bach's daily work, even he could not have conceived and perfected the types of music he would now compose without seeing it in written form—more likely in score than in tablature.

Bach's appointment letter or contract at Arnstadt, like others of its kind, is to a modern reader suprisingly vague about his actual duties, while laying down stringent moral and personal requirements.[53] Bach is to be sober, well-dispositioned, and loyal to his superiors and to God. Although the document says nothing about responsibilities at court, it is the count who is named first and to whom Bach must be "true, faithful, and obedient"—not an insignificant point, in view of Bach's eventual differences with his immediate superiors. His position was less a job or employment in the modern sense than a "calling" (the literal meaning of *Beruf)*; in a pre-capitalist society, work was understood within the context of traditional corporate or guild- and family-based labor.[54] Bach was to be a "servant and organist who loves honor" (*ehrliebenden Diener und Organist*), subject to both the count and the consistory, that is, the local church administration. The latter was appointed by the local ruler, who in turn was chosen by God.

---

[50] Both served as town musicians; the "profound" Johann Christoph also was born there and served briefly as court organist.

[51] According to Wolff (2000, 89), Maria Barbara was now living with the Feldhaus family.

[52] "Music-writing process" is the phrase Marshall (1972, 1:43) uses for the physical preparation of scores, including actual composition.

[53] Not so much a contract as a letter of appointment: in BD 2:11–12 (no. 8), trans. in NBR, 41 (no. 16).

[54] On "status" versus "contract" employment, see, e.g., Countouris (2016, esp. 16–25).

The incident with Geyersbach (p. 35, following the paragraph break, “the consistory might have been unable to do more”)

A closer look at the accusations reveals something of Bach’s character as well as the realities of working in a confining if not stultifying environment—not the last time this would occur in Bach’s career. Bach, apparently returning late one summer night from an event at court, was confronted by the somewhat older student, who accused Bach of insulting him—or rather of insulting his bassoon, to which Bach had applied a potentially obscene epithet.[55] A “bassoon” (*Fagott*) played at this date by a student in a provincial German town was probably an old-fashioned dulcian, not the newer French *basson*. The latter, like other woodwinds, had been redesigned for Lully in France and was gradually infiltrating German court music establishments. Bach must have known examples from the Celle court band—hence his disdain for Geyersbach’s obsolete instrument? The solo parts in the early Cantatas 131 and 150 already call for the newer type.

The two soon were tussling, and Bach at some point drew his sword (*Degen*), although he did not use it.[56] Bach claimed that he had feared for his own safety, which seems reasonable inasmuch as it was he who took the incident to a higher level by complaining to the consistory. He may also, however, have chafed under an expectation to direct unmusical students, some of them older than he was. This would explain the consistory’s subsequent complaint that Bach had failed to perform not only chorales but “figural” music with the students, that is, relatively complex compositions for voices with instruments.[57] When the Geyersbach matter first came before the consistory, in August 1705, Bach had expressed willingness to perform with the students if the consistory would appoint a *director musices* (director of music), that is, someone to train the students in more advanced types of music.[58] He repeated this demand the following February, surely knowing that the person he now addressed—the elder Olearius, superintendent of churches—had held the directorship of music at Halle.[59] Arnstadt, however, was a smaller town, and Bach, who had previously been informed that “one must live with things that are imperfect,” was now given eight days to “explain himself.”[60] Whether or how he did so is

[55] *Zippel fagotist*, translated by Marshall (2000, 501) as “prick of a bassoon player” but perhaps merely a derogatory derivative of *discipulus* (“student,” Williams 2016, 63).

[56] According to the testimony of his future sister-in-law Barbara Catharina Bach (BD 2:17 [no. 14], trans. in NBR, 45 [no. 19d]). The sword was an item of court dress, hence the presumption that he was coming from an event at court (as in Wolff 2000, 87).

[57] “so wohl Figural alß Choral,” BD 2:20 (no. 16), trans. in NBR, 46 (no. 20). This was one of a series of accusations made on Feb. 21, 1706, after his return from Lübeck.

[58] BD 2:17 (no. 14); NBR, 45 (no. 19d).

[59] *Directorium musices* (Serauky 1935–43, 2/1:293–95).

[60] “Mann lebe mit imperfectis” (BD 2:17 [no. 14]; NBR, 45 [no. 19d]); “er sich zu erclähren . . .” (BD 2:20 [no. 16], NBR, 46 [no. 20]).

unknown, but the threat was repeated in November, when Bach was also accused of bringing a woman into the organ or choir loft.[61]

One can imagine exasperation on both sides, Bach the over-confident idealist being put in his place by a weary but not entirely unsympathetic council. Bach evidently possessed a sharp tongue and a sharp temper, especially when defending what he believed to be his prerogatives—one of which was the right *not* to be forced to perform with untrained lesser musicians. At least initially, the Geyersbach incident did not lead to any change his behavior, for within two or three months he left for Lübeck "to listen in on" Buxtehude, as the Obituary put it.[62] Granted four weeks' leave, on his return Bach was accused of staying away "about four times as long."[63] If he indeed traveled on foot, as claimed, the journey alone (230 miles each way) would have taken most of the time off that he was granted. Bach must have been absent for more than three months, including the busy Christmas and New Year's season, for which he had, however, engaged a substitute to play the organ in his place.[64] Despite the reprimand that this earned him, he must have determined that it would be acceptable to do so again less than a year later. On Advent Sunday (an important day in the church year) he was some fourteen miles away in the little town of Langewiesen, inspecting a new organ there.[65]

Life at Mühlhausen and the return to Weimar (p. 42, following the end of the printed chapter, "chamber musician to the ruling Duke Wilhelm Ernst, was irresistible")

In coming to Mühlhausen from Arnstadt, Bach left a family stronghold, albeit one that was relatively provincial and perhaps unappreciating and uncongenial, as his difficulties with the authorities suggest. Mühlhausen was larger and, as a free imperial city, not under the rule of an autocrat who could insert himself into any aspect of local life—including the appointment of church musicians and the choice of music for services. Mühlhausen had, moreover, a tradition of learned and capable music-making under Bach's predecessors Johann Rudolf Ahle and his son Johann Georg, successive organists at St. Blasius. Both were authors as well as musicians, Rudolf having written manuals on singing and composition, Georg novels and poetry—he was named imperial poet laureate in 1680—as well as theoretical writings about musical rhetoric. In addition, like St. Michael's Church at Lüneburg, St. Blasius had a major choral library with a comparable repertory of seventeenth-century music. This included works of Schütz, to which

---

[61] BD 2:21 (no. 17); NBR, 47 (no. 21).

[62] "Buxtehuden, zu behorchen" (BD 3:82 [no. 666], trans. in NBR, 300).

[63] Consistory minutes for Feb. 21, 1706 (BD 2:19 [no. 16]; NBR, 46 [no. 20]).

[64] As Bach mentioned in his reply ("deme, welchen er hiezu bestellet," BD 2:19 [no. 16]; NBR, 46 [no. 20]).

[65] Made by Johann Albrecht of Coburg; Bach was joined in testing it on Nov. 28, 1706, by Johann Kister, organist at nearby Gehren (BD 2:22 [no. 18]).

Bach now assuredly had access.[66] Mühlhausen was also a minor publishing center, seeing issues not only of writings and music by the two Ahles but also Bach's first printed composition, the music for the council election of 1708. This was a bigger musical work than any previously published at Mühlhausen—another sign that Bach now received greater support than before. Compositions for the same occasion by Bach's predecessor Johann Rudolf Ahle had also been published, but those were tiny compared to Bach's sumptuous composition.[67]

If the senior Olearius was in a sense Bach's patron at Arnstadt, the same may have been true of Georg Christian Eilmar at Mühlhausen. Pastor at St. Mary's, the senior church of the city, Eilmar was the instigator of at least one major composition that Bach wrote there. He would also serve as godfather to Sebastian's and Maria Barbara's first child Catharina Dorothea. Eilmar has been seen as leader of an orthodox religious faction in the city, at a time when the population was divided by controversy over Pietism, a reformist, anti-establishment movement within Lutheranism. Eilmar's opponent in this debate, Johann Adolph Frohne, was in fact no Pietist, and scholars may have exaggerated the intensity of their differences.[68] Nevertheless, Frohne, who was pastor at Bach's church of St. Blasius, does appear to have shared with many Pietists a distaste for elaborate church music. This could have influenced Bach's decision to leave after just one year on the job. In a society whose members strongly identified with particular religious beliefs and practices, church music aroused fiercely held opinions among Pietists as well as orthodox Lutherans. The enmity between the two groups probably reflected social and political tensions, for elaborate music and expensive church organs tended to be favored by wealthier, better educated citizens, and these tended to look down on Pietists. Pietism, however, also inspired a newly personal, intense type of religious literature, and this had a parallel within orthodox Lutheranism that was reflected in the poetry that Bach set to music. The elaborate sacred music of the type in which Bach participated was nevertheless primarily for the elite, and in 1707 Frohne called for "moderation" in church music.[69] This was probably coded language against the sophisticated (and expensive) music that Bach and Eilmar favored, and Bach's cantata BWV 131, composed "at the wish" (*begehren*) of Eilmar, could have been a response to it. Eilmar's church was the one attended by members of the town council, and in working for Eilmar Bach appears, as he did throughout his career, to have sided with the ruling class and with strict Lutheran orthodoxy.

---

[66] As pointed out by Melamed (2002, 213). Unfortunately, far less is known about its holdings than those of St. Michael's.

[67] Ahle's works are lost, but some of the costs related to music by both composers are recorded (see BD 2:29–30 and 38 [nos. 30, 31, and 43] and NBR, 52–54 [no. 28]).

[68] The idea that Frohne led a Pietist faction can be traced to Spitta (1873–1880, 1:358–64). This has been refuted, but Eilmar was actively anti-pietist, author of the tract *Die Pietisterey als das gröste Hindernis wahrer Gottseeligkeit* (Wittenberg, 1705), cited by Koch (2009, 81n. 27).

[69] In a new edition of his textbook *Theologia definitiva*, which was probably used in the Mühlhausen schools (Koch 2009, 87–88).

It is striking that Eilmar, not the pastor of Bach's own church, should have commissioned at least this one work from him. As at Arnstadt, Bach had no formal obligation to provide "concerted" music at St. Blasius. There, however, he may have been actively discouraged from cultivating the type of music that most interested him; Eilmar gave him some scope for doing so. Certainly the text of BWV 131 reflected Eilmar's pastoral interest in "repentance theology" (*Bußtheologie*), for it is the composer's only work based almost entirely on a single psalm: the penitential Psalm 130, which is joined in two movements with sixteenth-century chorale stanzas on the same theme.[70]

We have no other information as to what might have led to Bach's return to Weimar, which he had accomplished by mid-July 1708.[71] His continuing relationship with Mühlhausen after his departure contrasts, however, with the situation at Arnstadt, a "Bach" town with which he seems to have had nothing further to do. That he maintained links to Mühlhausen is a bit surprising, as his letter of resignation to the parish council complains vaguely of "hindrance" and "vexation" while working there.[72] One reason for falling out of touch with Arnstadt could have been political: Count Anton Günther was involved in a protracted dispute with the ruling Duke of Weimar, who eventually seized the town.[73] This would have been reason enough for Bach to avoid contact with a city that remained home to several close relatives. On the other hand, he provided music for the next two Mühlhausen council elections, in 1709 and 1710, probably inspecting Wender's newly renovated organ at St. Blasius on those occasions as well.[74] Many years later the "great disappointment" caused by Bach's departure was still remembered.[75] He

---

[70] Thus Koch (2009, 88–90). Melamed (2002, 214) suggests that BWV 131, like BWV 71, was influenced by Schütz's setting of Psalm 25, which Bach could have found in the St. Blasius choral library.

[71] Bach's gift of 10 florins as a new arrival at Weimar is recorded in a document of July 14, 1708 (BD 2:35 [item 38]; NBR, 60 [no. 36]).

[72] *Wiedrigkeit* and *Verdriessligkeit* (BD 1:19 and 29 [no. 1]; NBR, 57 [no. 32]).

[73] In 1711 Duke Wilhelm Ernst sent 1500 soldiers to occupy Arnstadt, two years after the count had accepted an imperial appointment to the *Reichsfürstenrat;* in theory this had eliminated the legal authority of the Saxon dukes over the counts of Schwarzburg-Sondershausen. The dispute sparked an outpouring of detailed legal tracts, and these include accounts of forced "contributions" (effectively ransom) that must have left Arnstadt destitute (see Apfelstedt 1856, 96–97).

[74] In granting his dismissal, the council resolved to ask Bach to continue to "help bring to completion the project that had been undertaken," that is, the rebuilding of the organ (BD 1:21 [commentary to no. 1]; trans. in NBR, 58 [no. 33]). Records survive of payments for subsequent council election music (BD 2:38 [no. 43]; NBR, 52–54 [no. 28]), but the music itself is lost.

[75] *Verdruß*, according to a fictional dialog about organists and musical education published at Erfurt in 1742 by the Saxon organist Johann Christian Voigt (BD 2:405 [no. 514]; NBR, 334 [no. 337]).

was immediately replaced by his (and Maria Barbara's) cousin Johann Friedrich Bach, who was, however, hired at Ahle's much lower salary.[76] Sebastian's son Bernhard would fill the same position during 1735–37.

The meaning of the oft-quoted phrases from Bach's resignation letter might have been clearer to the parish council than to us. The context suggests that, as at Arnstadt, he regretted the absence of a music director to train the available singers and instrumentalists. The latter probably could not handle the "most choice church pieces" which Bach says he had been collecting; as a result, the quality of the "harmony" at St. Blasius was no better than in "almost all the parishes around." Whether he left these compositions at Mühlhausen or carried them with him as his own possessions he does not say. Evidently, however, he was already collecting sacred vocal compositions as well as keyboard pieces.

Those who knew Bach at the time might have recognized in some of his complaints a dig at the pastor of St. Blasius. If so, this would not be the last time that a superior frustrated Bach's musical ambitions. Perhaps, too, some in Mühlhausen remembered the quick loss of interest in the position by another organist—Bach's cousin Walther, who had withdrawn his application in 1707 after finding the town "hateful."[77] Walther did not say what made the city or the position so uninviting, but Bach surely knew, for he and Walther were relatives and must have talked.[78]

---

[76] BD 2:33 (no. 37); NBR, 58 (no. 33).

[77] *Verhasst*, in a long autobiographical letter to a friend (Oct. 3, 1729, to Heinrich Bokemeyer, in Walther 1987, 70 [no. 9]). In a more guarded letter of Dec. 28, 1739 to Mattheson, Walther refers only to vague "notables [*Bekannten*]" who saw his appointment as "not beneficial [*dienlich*]" (Walther 1987, 220 [no. 37]).

[78] First cousins once removed, they shared a common ancestor, Bach's maternal grandfather Valentin Lämmerhirt. Walther also had studied at Erfurt with Johann Aegidius Bach, cousin of Sebastian's father; they presumably shared a common pedagogical background.

Chapter 5

The praeludium BWV 569 (p. 57, following the last paragraph on the page, “clearly for the latter types of instrument”)

One little-known piece can illustrate the types of challenges that Bach was setting for himself as he took up his position at Arnstadt. The Praeludium in A minor BWV 569 may at first seem “monotonous” due to its persistent use of a single motive through nearly all of its hundred fifty measures. But its “flawless” part-writing makes it “something of a *tour de force*,”[79]as it leads the player through a series of sequences that provide practice with patterns involving both hands and feet in free invertible counterpoint (ex. S5.1). The tonal design—the sequence of keys to which the piece modulates—is somewhat rambling, but it *does* modulate, unlike many preludes and other pieces by earlier composers. Several modulations reveal Bach’s early fascination with moving between remotely related keys, which he does with complete confidence (E minor to F major in mm. 48–60, F-sharp minor to C major in mm. 117–22). There is also a slow but inexorable build-up of momentum over the course of the piece as a whole. This culminates in a grand coda that introduces arpeggios in sixteenths.

In its extant version BWV 569 probably stems from Weimar, where Walther made a copy.[80] But the piece exemplifies how Bach learned to integrate the conceptual arts of counterpoint and motivic development with the practical skill of pedal playing. In later works he carried the project further. For instance, the fugue of BWV 550, a praeludium probably composed during the early Weimar years, seems calculated to drive an aspring organist crazy by requiring persistent contrary motion between feet and hands. This occurs in a maddening passage that one must play repeatedly, as it involves the main fugue subject and its recurring counterpoints. To be able to conceive such a work—let alone play it—required preliminary exercises such s those furnished by BWV 569.

Other early pieces suggest the struggles that Bach encountered in trying to write inventive four-part harmony and counterpoint idiomatic to a keyboard instrument. For instance, leaping motives, catchy or entertaining on their own (ex. S5.2a), become awkward to play when embedded within a contrapuntal texture, crossing other parts and jumping between hands (ex. S5.2b). The challenge that Bach accepted and overcame in such compositions was to write counterpoint as learned and skillful as the quasi-vocal polyphony found in compositions by Froberger and members of the Pachelbel circle, while employing an up-to-date virtuoso keyboard idiom. Already in BWV 569, the idea of invertible counterpoint is joined to that of making the feet equal to the hands, so that any line assigned to one of the top parts can be exchanged with the bass. The physical player at the instrument becomes an embodiment of the abstract art of counterpoint.

Bach’s early keyboard chorales (p. 60, following the paragraph break, “chorale melodies first essayed in his youth”)

---

[79] Williams (2003, 164), quoting earlier evaluations by Spitta and Werner Breig.

[80] In Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. Bach P 801.

One type that does *not* recur among later settings is represented by the so-called "Arnstadt chorales." These are five or six mostly *manualiter* pieces in which a plain four-part harmonization of the tune is interrupted by a written-out cadenza at the end of each phrase (ex. S5.3).[81] As we have them, these are probably from Weimar, but so-called sketches copied by one of Bach's pupils might be traces of earlier versions. These settings are clearly written-out models for a traditional variety of improvisation.[82] As notable as the "cadenzas" in these settings is the chromatic, counter-intuitive harmonization of the melodies. Unfortunately, whether Bach really played chorales like this at Arnstadt, and whether doing so was what got him in trouble there, is impossible to know.

Another group is comprised of the pieces in the Neumeister collection together with a few others. When it was identified in 1985, the Neumeister manuscript, named for its late-eighteenth-century owner and likely copyist, generated controversy over the trustworthiness of its attributions. These, however, have been accepted by most scholars.[83] The thirty-eight little chorale compositions assigned to "J. S. Bach" fall among a greater number of similar pieces by other composers, chiefly "J. M. Bach," that is, Johann Michael Bach, and "J. C. Bach," presumably his brother Christoph (the Eisenach organist). Seven of the pieces that have been assigned to Sebastian were previously known; several left anonymous in the manuscript could also be Bach's. How the collection came to Neumeister and who was responsible for assembling and ordering the pieces in it is unknown. Yet the works attributed to Sebastian make sense as falling between the rudimentary pieces considered in chapter 3 and the mature compositions that he would produce at Weimar.

A few of the Neumeister pieces anticipate varieties of chorale prelude found in the *Orgelbüchlein*—for instance, canonic settings like BWV 724 ("Ach, Gott und Herr"), or the two settings that make up BWV 1108 ("Als Jesus Christus in der Nacht"). In the latter, the melody in the soprano is accompanied by the densely imitative interplay of two livelier motives in the lower parts (ex. S5.4). At first glance neither of these pieces looks very remarkable, and the use of a single motive throughout each half of BWV 1108 runs the risk of seeming pedantic. This is,

---

[81] This group includes BWV 715, 722, 726, 729, 732, and 738. The last of these is more elaborate than the others and incorporates melodic figuration also used in the prelude of the First English Suite, probably a Weimar work.

[82] Charles Burney (1775, 279–80) described what seems to be a sadly degenerate survival of this tradition as practiced by an organist at Bremen in the 1770s. The "sketches" (BWV 722a, 729a, 732a, and 738a), preserved in copies by J. T. Krebs, might actually represent a sort of analytical reduction.

[83] Johann Gottfried Neumeister appears to have been unrelated to the famous theologian and librettist of the same last name (see chap. 6). Dürr (1986) expressed doubts about the reliability of all the attributions, and Williams (2016, 43) remained guarded in his last evaluation of the pieces. A preliminary edition by Wolff (1985) has been superseded by the revised one in NBA, vol. IV/9.

however, the same type of limitation that Bach imposed on himself in many later pieces, reflecting a tradition that goes back to early seventeenth-century organ settings.

BWV 724 would have been notable around 1705 for its key of B minor, rare in early keyboard music (Pachelbel used it in a fugue whose tablature Bach copied out at Lüneburg). The opening section, which requires pedals for at least a few low bass notes, recalls an old type of toccata whose purpose was to explore strange dissonances and chromatic voice leading (ex. S5.5a). But the heart of the piece is the second and final section. Here the chorale melody is presented canonically in long notes by soprano and bass as the other two parts develop livelier motives, also imitatively.[84] The canon is not entirely strict, the fourth and fifth phrases being treated freely. But this does not detract from the impression of a rigorously conceived plan in which imitation is a means to an end, not a pedantic end in itself (ex. S5.5b). Notable too is the assured voice leading, which, as in the "Arnstadt" chorales, does not rule out harsh passing dissonances and unusual leaps. Both features could be considered expressive, not inappropriate in the setting of a Lenten chorale associated with the passion.

Most of the Neumeister pieces are of types peculiar to the collection. Although similar in dimensions to the works by other composers within the same manuscript, they exceed them in their exuberant imagination and their diversity. If Sebastian knew these compositions by his older relatives, he was deliberately outdoing them. The most ambitious among the pieces attributed to him, such as BWV 1090, 1092, 1099, and 1102, comprise several contrasting sections. These draw ideas from various sources, including dances, overtures, and arias with ritornellos. Thus BWV 1099 ("Aus tiefer Noth") opens like the "Arnstadt" chorales with a simple setting of the opening line in block chords. It then continues, first, with a canonic passage, then with a little fugue in jig rhythm, before ending with an expressive adagio (ex. S5.6). BWV 1093 ("Herzliebster Jesu") consists of a single section, but it builds gradually from a quiet chromatic opening in quarters and eighths to flowing sixteenths at the end (ex. S5.7). One previously known piece, BWV 957 ("Machs mit mir, Gott"), was not even recognized as a chorale setting until the discovery of an additional section for it in the Neumeister collection (ex. S5.8). The latter gives the proper title and shows that the initial setion, a fughetta based on the first phrase of the chorale tune, could be followed by a four-part setting of the complete melody.

These pieces remain improvisatory in the sense that they typically proceed from one idea to another without following any regular plan. In this they reflect a early-Baroque aesthetic that still lingered in northern Europe at the time. The same is true of a few longer compositions from probably the same period, such as the fantasia on "Christ lag in Todesbanden" BWV 718. This, or the ambitious fantasia on "Wo Gott der Herr nicht bey uns hält" BWV 1128 (formerly Anh. 71), looks like Bach's successful effort to surpass Reinken in developing a chorale melody through counterpoint, melodic embellishment, and free development of motives in successive sections of a single extended piece. Particularly notable is the fluency with which the hands, playing on different manuals, cross one another while executing contrapuntal lines that cover the entire four-octave keyboard (ex. S5.9). Evidently this skill, which Bach would put to use in the

---

[84] The second section was known from other sources before the discovery of the Neumeister manuscript—hence the lower BWV number and the inclusion of this canonic section in older editions.

organ sonatas and Goldberg Variations, was already part of his youthful repertory of virtuoso techniques. Other settings in the same vein include the chorale fantasia BWV 720 and the longer variations included in the chorale "partitas" BWV 767 and 768.

Useful for demonstrating an organist's capabilities as well as those of the instrument itself, such compositions nevertheless lacked discipline. Musical forms coming into fashion by the end of the seventeenth century limited the degree of improvisatory freedom permissable within a single movement, forcing composers to use greater ingenuity and craft. Loosely structured fantasias and variation sets no longer satisfied an aesthetic that demanded greater integration; this could be one reason why Bach in later years avoided variation forms as well as free fantasias, at least in his written compositions. That the youthful Bach was already capable of writing a more focused type of piece is suggested by a number of early chorale fugues. A double fugue on "Allein Gott" BWV 716 develops ideas from the first two phrases of the chorale melody separately, then combines them at the end (ex. S5.10). The melody, used for Luther's German version of the Gloria, was one that Bach would set often. The eighty-nine measures of this piece make it comparable in dimensions to some of the "free" fugues probably written around the same time. Bach would conclude many further chorale settings with a polyphonic combination of phrases from a single melody.[85]

Early fugues and other keyboard works (p. 62, following the first paragraph break, "a more unified or integrated design")

Revisions similar to those undergone by the "Albinoni" fugue probably also took place in the sonata BWV 965, Bach's keyboard arrangement of movements from Reinken's *Hortus musicus*, a set of six chamber sonatas published in 1687. Although one might imagine that Bach first encountered Reinken's original during his student days at Lüneburg, BWV 965 can have reached its final form only much later.[86] It includes embellished keyboard transcriptions of the opening section and the first three dance movements, replacing Reinken's somewhat stodgy part writing with livelier figuration. Together with Bach's embellished transcriptions of concertos by Vivaldi and others (see chap. 7), this is a valuable document for how Bach might have improvised extempore keyboard versions of many other compositions, German as well as Italian, during this period.

BWV 965 also includes a fugue as well as a final dance movement (a gigue) in fugal form. Both are new compositions, retaining only Reinken's basic melodic ideas. In their original forms, both are so-called permutation fugues, consisting essentially of a single passage of invertible counterpoint whose separate melodic lines are cycled systematically through all parts. Bach employed the same principle in some of his early vocal fugues (see ex. S5.20 below), but he evidently considered it inappropriate for keyboard music.

---

[85] As in the chorale fughetta BWV 701 and the last of the Chorale Variations BWV 769 (as printed).

[86] Arrangements of other selections from Reinken's *Hortus musicus* apparently did not undergo revision: the two movements of the sonata BWV 966 and the fugue BWV 954. Further on the revisions of BWV 965 in Schulenberg (2006, 89–92).

Further early pieces derived from works by others include an organ fugue whose subject—actually subject and countersubject—is by Corelli, and a double fugue based on a theme said to be Legrenzi's but more likely by Bononcini.[87]The dimensions of these pieces are greater than those of all but Bach's largest early chorale fantasias, but unlike the latter they are unified by reliance on a single recurring subject. They also vastly exceed the dimensions of the movements from which Bach borrowed their subjects, demonstrating how much more he could extract from their ideas than the original composers did. Whereas Corelli ended his fugue shortly after a single stretto entry, Bach creates a contrapuntal climax with a close four-part stretto (ex. S5.11). The "Corelli" fugue does at times fall into the sequential chains of suspensions for which the Italian composer was famous. But three episodes introduce scurrying figuration that is closer to instrumental writing in Bach's own early vocal works (ex. S5.12). We now describe the Italian pieces from which Bach took these subjects as belonging to the Baroque, yet their aesthetic is more rationalistic, even classical, by comparison to that of earlier seventeenth-century music. The "Corelli" fugue shares the latter quality even while retaining elements of the older approach. The latter remains predominant in the "Legrenzi" fugue, which ends with the type of thematically unrelated virtuoso coda typical of the Buxtehude style.[88] This does not prove that one composition is later than the other, but it does suggest that Bach only gradually came to accept the new aesthetic.

The D-minor "toccata and fugue," the Capriccio BWV 992, and the Praeludium in E, BWV 566 (p. 63, following the second complete paragraph, "the contrapuntal character of the genre")

The score of BWV 565 can be traced back to the circle of Bach's friend Kellner—but not to Bach himself. It is true that BWV 565 might be among the early compositions that Forkel disparaged as the work of a "clavier hussar," likely a posthumous echo of the composer's own opinion late in life of his "defective first attempts at composition."[89] Even so, there is nothing in Bach's authoritatively attributed pieces comparable to the crude anachronisms of BWV 565, such as the writing in parallel octaves and sixths in the opening section. Although highly dramatic, these suggest that the music is by Kellner himself or another member of his generation.

---

[87] The fugue BWV 579 is based on the second movement of Corelli's trio sonata op. 3, no. 4, first published in 1689. Another fuge, BWV 574, bears the title *Thema Legrenzianum elaboratum pro Joan Seb. Bach cum subjecto* (theme by Legrenzi elaborated by J. S. Bach with a countersubject) in the manuscript copy by Sebastian's brother Christoph. But Zitellini (2013) demonstrated that the same theme appears in a piece from Giovanni Maria Bononcini's op. 6 (1672), although a portion of the same theme also occurs in the Corelli movement (first violin, mm. 6b–7, repeated in mm. 31–32).

[88] Another fugue in the same key (C minor) with a similar ending, BWV 575, seems roughly similar in style. Odd details force one to wonder about its authorship, although these might be due to poor transmission or to Bach's failure to give it a final polishing.

[89] Forkel (1802, 23; trans. in NBR, 441). A hussar was a type of cavalry soldier, envisioned here as running aimlessly up and down the keyboard.

The distinctive expressive language of the *Capriccio sopra la lontananza de il fratro dilettissimo* includes a repeated "sigh" figure (ex. S5.13a; cf. ex. S5.23 below) as well as the fugue's repeated modulation in what we call the subdominant direction. The latter was probably not understood at the time as "downward" movement (*catabasis*).[90] But the idea of migrating to increasingly rare minor keys signifies a "foretaste of the various calamities" that might take place during foreign travel. This leads to the "general lament" of the following section: a chaconne in F minor, with a chromatic bass line reminiscent of operatic laments.[91] This section imitates vocal music quite literally by giving the keyboard player a figured bass that must be realized improvisatorily—not the only instance of this in Bach's early works (ex. S5.13c).[92]The capriccio nevertheless closes with a jolly fugue whose countersubject is based on the posthorn motive already heard in the little "air of the postillion" (cf. ex. S5.2 above). Both movements quote the brass instrument that announced the arrival of a mail carriage—a sound that might have been especially welcome to a young traveler.

The Praeludium in E shares its basic design with Buxtehude's G-minor praeludium (BuxWV 150), found in the Andreas Bach Book and perhaps brought back from Lübeck for study by both Sebastian and his brother. The so-called repercussive subject is another archaic element, echoing choral fugues in which repeated notes would have been sung to different syllables. Also old-fashioned is the rambling first preludial section, which, after free solos for hands and then pedals, wanders as far as G-sharp minor before settling into "obstinate" repetitions of a single motive, another Buxtehudian gesture (ex. S5.15).[93]

The Passacaglia BWV 582 (p. 64, following the first paragraph break, "a climax in the fugue's concluding phrases")

Buxtehude's Passacaglia BuxWV 161, copied into the Andreas Bach Book by Christoph Bach, must have been an inspiration for Bach's Passacaglia, preserved in the same manuscript. Bach surely knew that passacaglias and chaconnes were both originally dances; the Möller and

---

[90] *Catabasis*—from a Greek word literally meaning "descent" (opposite of the title of Xenophon's famous historical memoir, *Anabasis*)—is one of a number of music-rhetorical figures whose meaning has been extended by modern writers, not always in ways not documented in eighteenth-century sources. Walther (1732, 148) illustrates the term by showing a subject that descends by chromatic half steps.

[91] See, e.g., Rosand (1979). Williams (1997, 65) suggests that in Cavalli's operas the use of the device is "deliberately simple," "stripped . . . of its complexity"; whether Bach's lament is to be taken with equal seriousness is uncertain.

[92] Figured bass notation occurs also in the "aria" of the partita BWV 833 and in the sonata BWV 967. One wonders whether it also was not originally present in the recitative passage of the Chromatic Fantasia (BWV 903/1); Emanuel Bach used it in a recitative movement from his First Prussian Sonata (W. 48/1).

[93] The same device occurs in the final variation (before the fugue) in the Passacaglia BWV 582 and in the chaconne chorus from BWV 150 (mvt. 7, mm. 73–80).

Andreas Bach manuscripts include several chaconnes as movements in French-style dance suites. But German organ chaconnes, like the one by Pachelbel and the two by Buxtehude copied into these manuscripts, are largely devoid of dance character, consisting of abstract variations over a bass line. This is true of Bach's Passacaglia as well.

Like the Buxtehude work, Bach's Passacaglia begins on an upbeat, and the unusual syncopated motive of Bach's first variation is a variation of Buxtehude's (ex. S5.16). More substantially, Buxtehude's work follows a grand formal scheme: its twenty-eight variations are built over seven statements of the bass line in the tonic D minor, then seven statements in F major and seven more in A minor, before concluding with a final seven in the tonic. Bach makes no attempt to emulate that geometric plan, following instead a distinct but equally far-reaching design that makes the passacaglia proper the prelude for an enormous fugue. The latter approaches the first section in length (124 vs. 168 measures) and in the number of entries of the theme (12 vs. 20).

In the fugue, the regular combination of the subject with two countersubjects (ex. S5.17) gives this section of the piece a permutational character, although not so doggedly as in some of Bach's vocal compositions. The overwhelming impact that the piece makes in a good performance is due in part to the stunning virtuosity that it requires. Equally crucial, however, is the deliberate expansion and contraction of the texture. Both large sections ("prelude" and fugue) begin with a gradual build-up that is relieved by *manualiter* passages in the middle (mm. 89–96, 198–220) before each concludes climactically.

A passacaglia is particularly good for providing practice in the execution or working out of patterns. Nearly every new statement of the ostinato is accompanied by a new motive in the other parts; the motive is then developed imitatively, in sequence, and so forth. Yet the modern terms *motive* and *development* do not quite indicate the extraordinary intensity with which Bach invents and deploys "note-patterns" in this and other works from the Arnstadt or Mühlhausen years onward.[94] Sometimes the patterns are traditional, like the zigzag figure used in the second countersubject of the Passacaglia (see ex. S5.17 above), so well suited to the alternating-feet technique of an organist on the pedals. Other patterns are new, some of them probably intended to exercise the fingers in particular ways (as in the Inventions, drafted some ten years later). These patterns are not limited to individual melodic figures. They also include the successive transpositions of a motive by a recurring interval to compose out a sequence, as well as the shuffling of melodic lines between different parts through invertible counterpoint (as in a permutation fugue).

Regular patterning went against the grain of earlier Baroque style, which favored *varietas*. The sequences and other patterns that now attracted Bach and his contemporaries were not new, nor was Bach by any means the only composer of his generation to be fascinated by them. Italian composers were equally interested in what were sometimes called *perfidia*—extended sequences of similar-sounding figuration.[95] Two so-called cadenzas (more correctly *capricci*) that Vivaldi wrote for his violin concerto R. 208 are notable examples. Bach transcribed them essentially

---

[94] The phrase is Williams's (2003, 185, and in many other places).

[95] On *perfidia* see Giegling (1974) and Hofmann (1998).

verbatim in his organ version BWV 594, presumably around 1713. Earlier composers such as Buxtehude avoided such things, probably because they would have been deemed signs of unoriginality, failures of the imagination. Already in Bach's early keyboard pieces, however, one finds a balancing of *varietas* and *ratio* (reason) through the use of regular patterns. These coexist, not always easily, with unpredictable harmony, modulation, and voice leading, as well as with diverse types of melodic embellishment.

Among the new, rationalistic, elements of composition that Bach now adopted was the idea that a composition as a whole might be shaped by a simple modulating scheme. Already glimpsed in Buxtehude's Passacaglia, this idea is realized more flexibly and dramatically in the fugal section of Bach's Passacaglia. There, instead of deploying the ostinato in different keys according to a simple geometric plan, Bach introduces the subject in new tonalities that are prepared through modulating bridges or episodes. The succession of tonalities is no longer a mechanical alternation between tonic and dominant, as in a strict permutation fugue. Nor is it an improvisatory series of modulations that grow increasingly remote, as in some early works such as the fugue of BWV 992. These make their furthest modulation from the home key just before concluding. Now, however, Bach's increasingly lengthy pieces follow a tonal design that forms a single long arch, placing the more remote modulations more in the center, or balanced on either side of it.

Thus in the fugue of the Passacaglia, the opening expository passage leads from C minor to the relative major E-flat (mm. 169–97). Ensuing episodes lead to entries of the subject in B-flat and *its* relative, G minor (mm. 209–221). After a return to the tonic C minor (m. 234), there is a final excursion to the subdominant F minor (m. 256) shortly before the end. The music travels to each foreign key only once (apart from momentary tonicizations), and it avoids modulating too remotely within the main body of the fugue. The one really startling progression—the stunning pause on the Neapolitan (D-flat) at m. 285—is reserved for the coda, where it is not, however, part of a lasting modulation but merely a local inflection of the C-minor scale. This is a powerfully dramatic moment, but it is only the temporary interruption of an inexorable process. The underlying flexible but rational approach to design would govern most of Bach's subsequent compositions.

BWV 150, 4, and 71 (p. 71, following the first paragraph break, "unless BWV 143 is one of them")

Perhaps BWV 150 as well as BWV 4 was written for Bach's postulated Eastertide audition. Its text is appropriate for Jubilate Sunday, three weeks later, and it refers to the Mühlhausen burgomaster Meckbach.[96] The two pieces are as different as could have been imagined at that date, but that could be one reason why Bach would have thought it appropriate to submit both as demonstrations of his prowess as a composer. On the other hand, it needs to be remembered that

---

[96] As revealed by Schulze (2010, 70–71, also 2011, 255), who showed that the first letters in the lines of movements 1, 5, and 7 form the acrostic "Doctor Conrad Meckbach" (after emending the unreliable source). Rathey (2016b, 452) points out that the liturgical assignment of BWV 150 to Jubilate is only a suggestion (by Martin Petzoldt).

nothing actually connects either composition to Easter 1707, and even Bach's authorship of BWV 150 has been questioned.[97]

This is not the case with BWV 4, whose sinfonia paraphrases the first two phrases of the chorale melody, like some of the early organ preludes. The vocal movements juxtapose settings of various types, ranging from simple to complex and scored for various combinations of the nine vocal and instrumental parts. The work as a whole is often compared with a similarly conceived Easter composition by Pachelbel based on the same chorale.[98]Both, for example, place the melody (cantus firmus) in long notes in the soprano of the first vocal movement. The latter concludes, in both settings, with a lively syncopated version of the final phrase of the chorale melody (ex. S5.18). Yet Bach develops the syncopated idea at length in a separate quick (*alla breve*) section, distributing the phrase contrapuntally between all four voices (not merely the three lower ones). At the end he adds ecstatic octaves in the violins as climactic counterpoint (ex. S5.19).

Whereas BWV 4 is archaic by design, its libretto limited to a traditional hymn, BWV 150 combines biblical with madrigalian poetry, and its music includes two chaconnes as well as a short aria with ritornellos. Even the initial sinfonia is more up-to-date, echoing the texture and some of the style of a Corellian trio sonata. At the same time, the composer demonstrates his awareness of the type of strict counterpoint taught by Reinken by including a little permutation fugue within the penultimate movement. The passage begins with statements of the subject and three countersubjects (ex. S5.20); the four voices then repeat the pattern with each entry in the tonic replaced by one in the dominant, and vice versa.[99]The work's high point, however, is probably the central choral movement, setting another verse from Psalm 25. This opens with a rising scale fragment for the words *Leite mich* (Lead me), which passes imitatively from bass through tenor and alto to the highest voice (ex. S5.21). The invention of a distinctive musical image—the rising line is "led" from one voice to the next higher one—is characteristic of the young Bach's intensely rhetorical approach to vocal composition. The musical rhetoric, however, is local; as in earlier German polyphony, the music moves on to the next line of text, never returning to or further developing the striking compositional idea.

---

[97] Only BWV 4 survives in a source connected with Bach: his performing parts for a revised version heard at Leipzig in 1724 (see NBA I/9, KB, 13–14). On the attribution of BWV 150, see Glöckner (1988), who later edited it as Bach's (NBA I/41, 2000). Errors of part writing that have raised doubts about Bach's authorship of BWV 150 may be copyist mistakes in the sole independent source, a manuscript that was scored from parts.

[98] Bach added wind parts—cornetto and three trombones—to double the voices in three movements for the revival of 1725. The concluding "simple" four-part harmonization of the chorale melody may also have originated at Leipzig, perhaps replacing a more elaborate chorale motet such as constitutes the final movement of Pachelbel's setting.

[99] The two violins also participate in the permutational design. Further permutation fugues occur in BWV 71 (mvts. 3 and 7) and as late as the Weimar works BWV 21 and 182.

BWV 71 requires no fewer than nineteen parts, for four voices and fifteen instruments (not counting doublings). The instruments include cello and solo (obbligato) organ, both rare at this date in any music, let alone that for a provincial German city. It is possible that nothing comparable had been heard in Mühlhausen since Schütz performed his double-chorus *Da pacem, Domine* (SWV 465) there in 1627.[100] Even if Bach knew the latter composition, a more immediate inspiration was probably the double-choral music by Buxtehude which he had heard at Lübeck a little more than two years earlier. The compositions performed at that time to mark the imperial succession employed two "musical choirs" as well as trumpets and trombones.[101] The complete loss—with one possible exception—of Buxtehude's music for the Vespers concerts makes it impossible to judge what Bach might have taken away from the latter. But his composition for the Mühlhausen council election of 1708 could have deliberately echoed Buxtehude's homage for the new emperor Joseph, mentioned in the text of the Mühlhausen work.

Bach's autograph score for BWV 71 is a masterpiece of musical calligraphy. The four vocal parts are accompanied by four instrumental groups, each comprising several higher parts together with a bass line: three trumpets with timpani; two recorders with cello; two oboes with bassoon; and strings, all joined by organ continuo.[102] His original manuscript performing parts, which also survive, show that the vocal choir of four soloists was joined by a second choir of four reinforcing (*ripieno*) singers.[103] Bach would employ similar principles in the scoring of subsequent large-scale works, deploying both voices and instruments in self-contained "choirs," although the precise make-up of the latter would vary. In particular, the cello soon became a regular member of the string choir, and only exceptionally were *ripieno* voices added to the four principal singers (*Concertisten*).

If Bach was emulating or even competing with Buxtehude in the luxuriant scoring of BWV 71, he was also trying to outdo the older composer in his attention to the text. The latter is "painted" in ways that are more vivid or literal than those seen in Buxtehude's extant music. Particularly imaginative is the setting of a verse from Psalm 74, where solo bassoon and cello provide

---

[100] For the Electoral Diet of 1627, one of several futile meetings of the electors of the Empire held in an effort to end the Thirty Years' War—hence the text of Schütz's work. Whether Bach knew the latter is unknown, but he probably could have consulted Schütz's polychoral *Psalmen Davids* (1619) in the choral library of St. Blasius (see Melamed 2002, 212–13).

[101] According to a contemporary account, cited by Snyder (2007, 67). The brass instruments were muted in the work that memorialized the late emperor Leopold I.

[102] Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. Bach P 45/1 (visible on bach-digital.de). The bass for the string group, which Bach calls *violono*, was perhaps a large viola da gamba playing at notated pitch.

[103] Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, D B Mus. ms. Bach St 371. The survival of these parts together with the score implies that Bach took care to preserve his laboriously prepared materials for this work, even though he does not seem ever to have performed it again.

obbligato bass lines for alternating pairs of oboes and recorders (ex. S5.22).[104]A surprisingly delicate moment within this grand ceremonial work, it represents the cowering turtledoves of the poem. The expressive slurred half steps of the upper parts and repeated falling leaps in the bassoon are "fingerprints" of the youthful composer, recurring in BWV 131 and 106. More indicative of later things, however, is the simultaneous combination of a chorale stanza (text and melody) with a bible verse in the first solo movement (ex. S5.23).

The same impulse to mix genres or styles is evident in the grand concluding chorus. This employs no fewer than six distinct combinations of tempo, meter, and texture (including fugue) to set the respective lines of its aria-style text. Although less moving than the penitential works BWV 131 and 106, nothing could have more convincingly demonstrated the brilliance of the composer, who had yet to see his twenty-third birthday. The presence of an obbligato (solo) organ part in BWV 71 is a particularly tantalizing feature of this work. Although limited to short phrases in just two movements, such use of the organ is rare or unknown in seventeenth-century German church music, despite the ubiquitous presence of the instrument as part of the basso continuo. At the time BWV 71 was performed at the main city church of St. Mary's, Bach might have already drafted his recommendations for further work on Wender's instrument at St. Blasius. He submitted this less than three weeks later. One wonders, then, whether the performance of BWV 71 for the council election service could have served as a sort of advertisement for Wender—and whether an organ fantasia such as BWV 720 or BWV 1128 might have been heard on the same occasion.[105]

BWV 106 and 131 (p. 72, following the end of the printed chapter, "the final invocation of Jesus' name")

The recorders in BWV 106, like other woodwinds in Bach's works, were evidently of the types developed by instrument makers for the French court during the later seventeenth century. These instruments sounded at a lower pitch than had been customary for the strings, brass, and organ in German ensembles. The resulting "chamber pitch" (*Kammerton*), about a whole step below organ or "choir" pitch (*Chorton*), became the norm at fashionable German courts during the first half of the eighteenth century. At Leipzig, Kuhnau, adopted chamber pitch as the standard pitch for church music—meaning that the organ became a transposing instrument. Bach maintained that practice after succeeding Kuhnau, and everywhere he, like his contemporaries, had to take different local versions of *Kammerton* and *Chorton* into account whenever writing for woodwinds or carrying pieces from one city to another—or even from church to court in the

[104] It seems unlikely that the very high "violoncello" part was meant for the familiar bass instrument with bottom string C, played in upright position. It might have been for a smaller tenor instrument played *da spalla*, resembling a large violin or viola.

[105] These pieces require alternating manuals and a pedal compass consistent with the Wender organs at both St. Mary's (as noted by Marshall and Marshall 2016, 44) and at St. Blasius (as rebuilt according to Bach's specifications). Some details of the melodic writing in BWV 1128, such as the frequent embellishment in triplets, are common to the obbligato organ writing in BWV 71 (cf. ex. 5.23).

same city. The first modern editions of BWV 106 failed to do so properly, printing it in E-flat rather than F—which made the recorder parts unplayable.[106]

The work's original notation provides a hint that Bach wrote BWV 106 before moving to Weimar. There the winds were pitched in an even lower version of chamber pitch (*tief Kammerton*). But the work could have been composed there for performance elsewhere, and its profoundly imaginative conception suggests that it is a somewhat more mature composition than those written at Mühlhausen (or earlier).

Was it Bach or his librettists who came up with the idea of combining a hymn with a madrigalian or biblical text within a single movement? Despite his lack of university training, Bach might already have been prepared to reshape any libretto handed to him through the addition of chorales. If so, this would have juxtaposed texts of different types, in ways unanticipated by the author. Handel, who had a similar education, was proud in later years to "have read my Bible." He was confident in his treatment of texts by more learned writers—who could make fools of themselves by disparaging his treatment of their work.[107]

Perhaps in view of its subject matter, BWV 106 avoids the types of aria (or quasi-aria) already present in BWV 71. That Bach elsewhere was prepared to write such music, even in the absence of a madrigalian text, is clear from both BWV 131 and the little BWV 196, another early work of uncertain date and occasion.[108] The central movement of BWV 196, setting a psalm verse, takes the form of a da capo (ABA) aria. It even employs what would soon be Bach's favored device of *Einbau*, the voice combining contrapuntally with the violin part from the instrumental introduction or ritornello. Whatever the exact date of this work (or of BWV 106), within a few years of leaving Mühlhausen Bach would wholeheartedly take up the new Italianate approach to composition, in both sacred and secular vocal music.

BWV 131 was conceived as a continuous setting of its psalm text, but in two solo movements Bach adds stanzas from a chorale. The result is equivalent to what would be called a chorale aria in a later work. Technically, however, neither movement is an aria, as the main text of each is a psalm verse. The first of these movements has, in addition to the solo voices, an additional soloist in the form of a solo oboe—likely the first of many expressive obbligato parts that Bach would write for this instrument in his vocal music (ex. S5.25).

---

[106] Nevertheless the actual performing pitch of the work's first performance was probably somewhat lower than suggested by modern scores in F. This leaves the vocal parts, especially tenor and bass, higher than is usual in other works.

[107] Burrows (2012, 206 and 266) cites Burney's biographical sketch of 1785, quoting a letter by the librettist Jennens about Handel's "maggots" (musical ideas of which Jennens disapproved).

[108] Whether BWV 196 was actually written for a wedding, as has been supposed since its first publication (in BG 13, 1864), has been questioned by Küster (1996), who also argues for a somewhat later origin than is usually assumed. Wolff (2000, 91), however, suggests that Bach wrote it for his own first wedding in 1708; see also Greer (2008, 24–25), who argues that Bach would have identified personally with the "house of Aaron" mentioned in the text (from Ps. 115).

The work ends with an impressive double fugue that presents the two respective clauses of the final psalm verse in contrasting subjects (ex. S5.26). This was a rhetorical device that went back to the sixteenth-century Italian madrigal; Bach would use it countless times in later vocal works. Yet it was the "arias" that might have really made an impression on Bach's more knowledgeable listeners, especially if the addition of a chorale to the psalm verse in each movement was his own idea, introducing a layer of meaning and counterpoint not imagined by the original librettist. The chorale melody, with its relatively lengthy text, imposes its own form on the lone psalm verse sung against it, raising the "arias" to a stature that Eilmar might not have anticipated. The second one lacks an obbligato instrumental part, yet its bass line fulfills the function of an instrumental soloist, providing ritornellos at beginning and end and between entries of the voices—just as in a real Italian aria of the period. One wonders whether Bach was already eager to try his hand at the operatic vocal music which he must have heard previously at Hamburg and perhaps in the Arnstadt court theater. What is clear is that he had no hesitation about using instruments—whether organ, oboe, or violin, even trumpets and drums in BWV 71—as equal partners to the voices. Even the choruses include genuinely independent instrumental parts, a rarity in late-Baroque vocal music. The oboe adds a fifth voice to the concluding fugue, and elsewhere it joins the strings strings in the little interlocking motives that recur in BWV 106 (ex. S5.27; cf. ex. S5.28 below).

As impressive as is the contrapuntal craftsmanship, it is only a means toward deepening the emotional import of both works. This is particularly clear in the *Actus tragicus*, where the passage just illustrated is part of a gradual layering-on of contrapuntal and textual ideas after the lonely soprano solo, followed by silence, at the end of the first half. Now the alto soloist, initially singing a verse from Psalm 31 ("Into your hands I commend my spirit"), is answered by Jesus' words on the cross from Luke 23 ("Today you will be with me in Paradise"). To this Bach appends the funeral chorale "Mit Fried und Freud" (With peace and joy I journey on"),[109]and at the same time two gambas join the counterpoint. These eventually conclude the movement on their own, never letting go of the expressive little slurred motives so beloved of the young Bach (ex. S5.28). The work again concludes with a double fugue based on the last phrase of the chorale melody "In dich hab' ich gehoffnet" (I have hoped in thee). As in BWV 71, the last thing one hears in this grand edifice is the recorders playing a quiet echo of the final cadence (ex. S5.29). Was this a way for Bach to avoid leaving an impression of bombast—even of excessive pride in his own masterful accomplishment? Few later compositions have such an understated ending.

---

[109] Although marked *tutti* (all) in some editions, the chorale originally would have been sung by the same alto soloist heard at the beginning of this section. Unlike BWV 71, sung by eight voices in Bach's 1708 performance, BWV 106 was conceived for a vocal quartet, which balances the instrumental quartet of two recorders and two violas da gamba.

Chapter 6

Bach's Weimar (p. 74, following the first complete paragraph, "from the later eighteenth century onward")

Compared to the later "golden-age" Weimar, the town Bach knew was a more insular place, made peculiar not only by the presence of a double court but also by the religious enthusiasm (if not fanaticism) of the ruler Wilhelm Ernst. He frequently ordered detailed changes in the liturgy throughout his realm,[110] and he is supposed to have quizzed members of his court on what they heard during sermons in the court chapel. As gratuitously authoritative as this appears today, to Bach—who as organist would have been directly affected by changes in the services—this approach toward religion from a ruler might have seemed praiseworthy. It surely guaranteed an attentive audience for Bach's sacred vocal music. We might suspect that Wilhelm Ernst's religiosity was related in some way to the fact that his unhappy marriage to his cousin Charlotte Marie of Saxe-Jena was dissolved in 1690; there were no children, and he never remarried.

Initially at Weimar, Bach rented an apartment in the house of Adam Immanuel Weldig, a falsetto singer who was also master of the pages (*Pagenhofmeister*). As such Weldig looked after the sons of noblemen who would eventually become officers in the ducal military forces.[111] Weldig's house, on the town's market square, was just a few minutes' walk from the palace of the ruling duke, known as the Wilhelmsburg. This was largely destroyed in 1774 by a fire that took with it the court chapel. The junior duke and his household occupied a second, smaller palace, known as the Red Castle, which was connected to the Wilhelmsburg by a corridor. This as well as all entrances must have been closely guarded, especially after the senior duke's order of 1707 forbidding court musicians from performing in the Red Palace without his permission.[112] Wilhelm Ernst might have surmised correctly that his younger cousin would make a poor ruler, but the fact that the unmarried senior duke was childless meant that Ernst August was likely to succeed him eventually. When Ernst August became sole ruler in 1728, he indeed proved unpopular and incompetent.

Still, by the second decade of the century Weimar was already a regional center for music and literature, as Bach would have known from his previous time there. Before his arrival Bach must also have understood the unusual organization of Weimar, as a court with two co-reigning dukes who did not get along. It was apparently at the Red Palace that Bach had been chiefly employed during his six months at Weimar during 1703. Now he officially served both ducal households, but perhaps only in the sense that his primary responsibility was as organist in the chapel, where both dukes presumably worshipped. Every indication is that Bach maintained a special

---

[110] See, e.g., Koch (2006, 41–42).

[111] BD 2:39 (no. 45). Weldig's house was destroyed by bombing in 1944 (ibid., commentary). The duchy's military forces, although insignificant even by regional standards of the time, were sufficient to project power locally, as in the occupation of nearby Arnstadt in 1711.

[112] Wolff (2000, 119). The order was given in the same year in which Ernst August I succeeded his father Johann Ernst III as junior duke.

association with the junior court. In addition to his basic salary, Bach received payments for services rendered to the junior court, as when he repaired harpsichords in 1709 and 1710 and gave keyboard lessons in 1712 to Ernst August's page Jagemann.[113]

At the time of Bach's arrival, Ernst August's heir presumptive was his younger half-brother Johann Ernst, a capable amateur violinist and composer of concertos, some of which Bach arranged for solo keyboard instruments. Despite his promise, Johann Ernst died in 1715 before his nineteenth birthday. Although Ernst August soon married and produced sons of his own, the temporary absence of an heir to the two living Weimar dukes—the next in line was Johann Wilhelm III of Eisenach—would have reminded everyone at Weimar that the duchy could suddenly lose its independence and with it their own employment. It was, in fact, Eisenach that would eventually be absorbed into a larger state ruled from Weimar. But it was probably more than serendipity that led Telemann, who served at Eisenach from 1708 to 1712, to then leave Thuringia for the relative security of a municipal appointment at Frankfurt (Main). Bach would follow his example, perhaps coming to share Telemann's realization that life in a "republic," that is, an autonomous city, was more predictable than under the arbitrary rule of a monarch.[114]

Such thoughts never prevented either composer from accepting commissions and honorary titles from rulers. Emanuel Bach would name Ernst August as the first of three aristocratic patrons who "especially loved" his father and "rewarded him accordingly."[115] The "love" of a ruler for a servant might permit genuine fondness, but eighteenth-century aristocrats valued loyalty above all. Still, if serving Ernst August loyally meant sometimes incurring the wrath of the ruling duke, doing so could have earned Bach a special place in Ernst August's affections, as Quantz did in those of King Frederick "the Great."[116]

Other colleagues at Weimar (p. 78, at the end of the printed page, "unlikely to have been anticipated by the poet")

---

[113] "Information . . . auf dem Clavier," BD 2:41, 44 (nos. 49, 53), trans. in NBR, 60, 64 (nos. 37, 43). Presumably it was through Weldig that Bach was assigned the duty of teaching one of the pages.

[114] "Wer Zeit Lebens fest sitzen wolle, müsse sich in einer Republick niederlassen." From the third and most detailed of Telemann's autobiographies, in Mattheson (1740, 363).

[115] "ihn besonders beliebt und auch nach proportion beschenckt," letter to Forkel of Jan. 13, 1775, in BD 3:289 (no. 803), trans. in NBR, 399 (no. 395). Emanuel himself would become an honorary Capellmeister to Princess Anna Amalie of Prussia after succeeding Telemann at Hamburg, just as the latter remained Capellmeister *von Haus aus* after his departure from Eisenach.

[116] Quantz famously gave flute lessons to Crown Prince Frederick despite the disapproval of the latter's father King Friedrich Wilhelm I.

Bach's colleagues within the *Capelle* at the time of his arrival comprised five singers and four string players, plus the two Dreses.[117] As was common at small residences, several of these musicians, such as Weldig, also served in non-musical capacities. The basic ensemble alone could have barely covered a four- or five-part vocal or instrumental work—and only if none were ill or traveling—but other members of the household staff probably functioned as musicians as well. There were also military musicians, the traditional ensemble of trumpets and timpani, who formed a separate unit within the court and by this date must have been musically literate. Outside of the chapel, the court trumpeters were probably employed as much for ceremonial as for genuinely military purposes, as well as for hunting, an important aristocratic activity. As at Eisenach, it could not have been unusual to hire additional town musicians when needed for festive services or other special occasions, such as birthdays and funerals within the ruling family. Such events were typically marked by new poetry by Franck, with music presumably by Bach or one of the Dreses. From Bach, however, the only music from Weimar for such occasions is his so-called Hunt Cantata, BWV 208, an important work thought to have been originally written for a court visit to nearby Weissenfels in 1713. That event constituted another significant duty for Franck and the court musicians: support for the ruler's diplomatic efforts, in this case honoring the succession the previous year of Duke Christian to a neighboring territory.

Although it is often surmised that Bach did not get along with the Dreses, nothing is actually known about their relationship. But Bach must have been closer to his fellow musician and landlord Weldig, with whom he exchanged roles as godparent. In March 1714, after leaving Weimar for Weissenfels, Weldig stood as godfather to Emanuel Bach, and two weeks later Sebastian did the same for Weldig's son.[118] As master of the pages, Weldig held a position of considerable trust that brought him into regular contact with his social superiors. He might have provided entrée for Bach, if any were needed, into the workings of the court. In addition, Bach's friendship with Weldig was one of several important relationships established at Weimar not only with fellow court employees but with visitors such as the violinist-composer Pisendel. The latter is thought to have stopped at Weimar in 1709 while on his way to Leipzig to attend university there, after studies with Torelli in Ansbach. Pisendel, perhaps already the leading violinist in Germany, would become concertmaster of the Dresden orchestra, one of the best in Europe at the time. Bach must have been eager to exchange music and ideas with such a figure. Concrete evidence for this seems, however, to be limited to a manuscript copy made by them jointly of a concerto by an even more significant German musician: Telemann, whose likely influence over the Bach family will be considered separately.

Outside the court, Bach's most important and lasting musical connection at Weimar was with his cousin Walther, organist at the main city church since 1707. Both collected music and, perhaps

---

[117] Wolff (2000, 121) lists the musicians, based on archival research by Hans-Rudolf Jung. The older Drese had previously served as court organist at Jena (according to Walther 1732), and his son presumably was a keyboard player as well.

[118] As recorded on March 10 and 22, respectively, in documents reproduced in BD 2:54 (nos. 67–68), the first trans. in NBR, 72 (no. 55). Bach was not actually present for the event at Weissenfels, where, according to the document, he was represented by Weldig's fellow *Pagenmeister* Johann Christoph Eulenberg.

already during these years, books; in his correspondence, Walther mentions owning more than two hundred works by German organists, especially Buxtehude and Bach.[119] Walther, a capable but unimaginative composer, also collected facts, eventually gathering them in his *Musicalisches Lexicon* (Musical Dictionary), the first truly comprehensive music encyclopedia in any language.[120] This work could have been the product only of tireless research in the libraries of the Saxon dukes and extended correspondence with fellow musicians across Europe. Through Walther, Bach would have gained a deeper appreciation of the diversity of European musical styles, techniques, and accomplishments during the past few centuries. Doubtless this spurred not only his native curiosity but his sense of competition, leading him to emulate Palestrina and other past masters, some of whose works perhaps only now became accessible to him.[121]

Bach's (and Walther's) understanding of music history was not ours. Palestrina for them was not a "Renaissance" composer, and they themselves did not belong to a musical "Baroque." The older type of vocal polyphony that we call the *stile antico*—a term not used by Walther—was less a style of the past than one of several possible approaches to counterpoint still belonging to the present. Thus when Walther enumerates various styles (in his lexicon entry for *stylus*), he includes dance style, ecclesiastical (church) style, various national and regional styles—French, Italian, and more specifically Venetian, Roman, and so forth—all constituting parts of the available vocabulary of present-day musicians. His sense of which composers were notable—their music worth copying—was likewise different from ours. It depended in some part on what was available to him in printed or manuscript copies, and this in turn depended on personal contacts between musicians, as when a teacher made something available for copying by students. Monteverdi, today regarded as a central figure in music history, receives from Walther only a short paragraph that fails to mention his major works. Schütz, on the other hand, gets a long and detailed account. Bach and Walther jointly copied not only music by Palestrina, recognized since his own time as a master of vocal counterpoint, but a mass by the obscure Johann Baal.[122] They might have discerned little distinction between the latter's modernized version of the *stile antico* and what we would consider the genuine Renaissance style of Palestrina.

Although Walther apparently did not work for the court as a musician, it was he who, at that time of his appointment at the city church in 1707, also became the principal instructor for Prince

---

[119] Letter of Aug. 6, 1729, to Heinrich Bokemeyer, in Walther (1987, 62–63 [no. 8]).

[120] Walther (1732). Many of the definitions of musical terms were borrowed from earlier lexicographers, notably Sebastian Brossard, but information about contemporary musicians was gathered through Walther's voluminous correspondence. For figures of the past he cites numerous printed works as authorities, implying access to sources that was extraordinary for the time.

[121] Wollny (2015) reconstructs a substantial repertory of music that Bach may have known at Weimar, including archaic vocal polyphony as well as French-style keyboard music.

[122] Bach copied the Kyrie, Walther the remaining movements; these constitute the manuscript score Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. 30091.

Johann Ernst. The latter, then eleven years old, was evidently already seriously interested in music. Walther's attendance at the St. Thomas School in Leipzig and then at the University of Erfurt would have made him more suitable than Bach as instructor of a potential future duke. By 1708 Walther had completed a textbook for the prince, the *Praecepta der musicalischen Composition* (Precepts of Musical Composition), which survives in manuscript.[123] This included a glossary—a first sketch of Walther's musical lexicon. A number of Bach's Weimar pupils also studied with Walther, presumably gaining lessons similar to those received by the prince. One would think that Bach and Walther were therefore close, yet it is also possible that over time Bach came to resent the competition for students or patronage with his cousin. A break between them has been deduced from the relatively cursory entry for Bach in Walther's *Lexicon*, which betrays little familiarity with Bach's later life and fails to mention most of his important works.[124]

Whether Bach and his growing family remained in the same house after Weldig left Weimar and sold the building in 1713 is unknown. But with three children (two more arriving in the next two years) and a household that now included his wife, sister-in-law, and perhaps several students or apprentices, Bach would soon have needed larger quarters than when he and Maria Barbara first arrived.[125] How conducive their home was to composing and practicing is impossible to say, although an order by the ruling duke to hold rehearsals in the chapel, beginning in 1714, might have reflected lack of sufficient space in Bach's own home.[126] There could have been other reasons for the order, which was issued two weeks after Bach's promotion to concertmaster; a note indicates that rehearsals had previously taken place at the home of the Capellmeister, which was now forbidden. If, prior to his promotion, Bach had furnished the keyboard continuo in chapel performances, he would have had to rehearse with his colleagues at the home of the older Drese, perhaps not the most comfortable situation for either of them.

Given the close quarters in which even well-paid court musicians must have lived, they probably cultivated from childhood an imperviousness to distractions that would drive a modern musician crazy. Burney later reported on the cacaphony created in one of the Naples conservatories by multiple students practicing in a single room.[127] Although Bach's house might have been less noisy—Emanuel Bach described his boyhood home in Leipzig as resembling a pigeon coop[128]—

---

[123] Modern edition by Peter Benary (Walther 1955).

[124] As suggested by Spitta (1873–80, 1:388–89).

[125] Kevorkian (2017, 114) states that Bach did not have apprentices, but his household certainly included pupils and relatives who studied with and worked for him, much as formal apprentices would have done.

[126] BD 2:53 (no. 66, marginal text); trans. in NBR, 71 (no. 52).

[127] Burney (1773, 336).

[128] "sein Haus einem Taubenhause u. deßen Lebhaftigkeit vollkommen gliche," letter of Jan. 13, 1775 (BD 3:290 [no. 803]; NBR, 400 [no. 395] translates *Taubenhaus* as "beehive").

it could not have been ideal by today's standards for either composing or practicing. Quiet solitude, however, was not yet valued by the middle class, and perhaps even a composer did not regard it as desirable for writing music. Other types of work were rarely carried out alone, and although music making might have created a din of sorts, the overall level of sound in an unmechanized environment was surely much lower than in many a present-day work space.

The Halle episode (p. 83, at the end of the printed page, "the offer of a position as organist")

Halle is a major city some fifty miles to the northeast of Weimar, the birthplace of Handel. It was, in theory, the capital of the duchy of Magdeburg, but the latter was never an independent dominion. The territory was ruled from Berlin by the margrave-electors of Brandenburg, after 1700 also kings of Prussia. Hence Sebastian's visit in 1713 may have been the first by a Bach into the state where two of his sons and a grandson, as well as several pupils, would serve members of the Hohenzollern family.[129] One matter of consequence for any member of the Bach family was that the Hohenzollerns followed the Calvinist (Reformed) form of Protestantism. Unlike orthodox Lutheranism, Calvinism forebade elaborate church music, including vocal polyphony and organ playing. Friedrich Wilhelm I, who had succeeded to the crown in February 1713, was a fervent Calvinist whose austerity extended beyond church music; he began his reign by firing most of the musicians of a court that had previously been a major patron of the arts. Other family members, including the king's uncle Christian Ludwig, margrave of Brandenburg-Schwedt, and Queen Sophia Dorothea (sister of Britain's George II), retained their enthusiasm for music. But the king would support the Pietist faction at the recently established University of Halle, famously expelling the philosopher Christian Wolff in 1723. Later known as the Soldier King, he doubled the size of the Prussian army, integrated the military and financial affairs of his scattered domains, and notoriously mistreated his son, the future Frederick the Great (born in 1712). In his defense, it must be said that Friedrich Wilhelm, for all his militarism, kept the country largely at peace—and his dismissal of his father's court musicians turned out to have positive effects for Bach.

Sebastian may have understood little about the new regime when he provided "music performed for his test" at Halle in December 1713.[130] He must have been curious about the position there, for Friedrich Wilhelm Zachow, Handel's teacher and organist at St. Mary's (known as the Market Church), had died the previous year and not yet been replaced. The position was only that of a municipal, not ducal, organist. But it was in a major city at a major church where the master organ builder Christoph Contius (Cuncius) was completing a new instrument, larger if not finer than any previously entrusted to Bach. Four other organists had already auditioned for the position before Bach's visit, which was unusually long, lasting two or three weeks. It is possible that, after fulfilling the request of the Halle authorities merely to "present himself" (as he later

---

[129] Halle itself was part of a small enclave separated from the main body of Brandenburg by realms belonging to the princes of Anhalt—who were, however, subject to domination by Prussia, as the latter was far more powerful.

[130] "die zur probe auffgeführete Musique," according to an entry in the church accounts (Wollny 1994, 32; NBR, 65 [no. 46]). The phrase implies but does not conclusively establish that Bach himself led the performance.

put it in a letter to them), Bach was pressed by the Market Church pastor Heineccius into composing and performing a church piece on a text by the latter. Before leaving he was offered the position himself.[131]

Bach accepted the offer and returned to Weimar, perhaps really expecting to take the job. But we can imagine his having second thoughts during the long trip, probably two or three days, back to Weimar. In January he failed to sign a contract sent to him, explaining that he had not yet fully obtained his dismissal from the court; he would write again to request some changes in salary and responsibilities after fulfilling "certain obligations at court in connection with the Prince's birthday."[132] If Bach indeed wrote back within the week, as promised, his follow-up letter has been lost, probably together with some subsequent correspondence. As a result, we cannot know whether Bach was attempting to play the Halle authorities against his employers at Weimar. He seems to have been placed in an awkward situation by what may have been an unexpected job offer, and he might well have been unsure how to proceed. In the extant letter he admits his difficulty in reaching a "categorical decision" (*resolution*) during what must have been a busy season for a court and church musician. He does not mention that, on top of all this, he and his wife were expecting another child. But by March he was writing back to Halle to defend himself against an accusation of double dealing—and in addition to having a healthy infant son, he had been appointed to the newly created position of Concertmaster at Weimar.[133]

At Halle Bach had received generous accommodations and a substantial fee for his composition. The bill for lodging—at an inn good enough to have previously served for the king—plus food, beer, brandy, and tobacco was more than half the 12 Taler paid for "music and travel expenses."[134] Yet his initial invitation must have been, at least ostensibly, only to hear him play and to receive his thoughts about the as yet unfinished organ. Only with some such understanding could he have been permitted to leave Weimar shortly before the busy Christmas season. He is unlikely to have done anything to deceive the ruling duke, for within weeks of his

---

[131] "ich mich gemeldet," letter of March 19, 1714 (BD 1:23–24 [no. 4]; NBR, 70 [no. 50]). The length of Bach's visit is suggested by his insistence in the same letter that even two or three weeks in Halle was insufficient time to determine what his income from *accidentia* (weddings and other fees, beyond salary) would have been there. His reference to "the piece that you know about" ("das bewuste Stücke") implies performance of a cantata, not an organ piece, as also does the noun *Musique* in the church records (see previous note).

[132] Letter of Jan. 14, 1714, in BD 1:21–22 (no. 3), trans. in NBR, 69 (no. 49). Prince Johann Ernst was born on Christmas Day; whether his birthday in 1713 was observed on the holiday or some time afterward seems not to be recorded.

[133] He defends himself in the letter of March 19 (op. cit.); his promotion was recorded on March 2 (BD 2: 53 [no. 66]; NBR, 70 [no. 51]).

[134] According to Wollny (1994, 34, 35) and the previously cited church records. It was once supposed that Bach's music for Halle included Bach's Christmas piece BWV 63, but he was there only for the first two Sundays in Advent, and there is no evidence of a Halle performance of that work.

return he received not a rebuke but a promotion and a salary increase. Nor did Bach's failure to accept their offer leave the Halle authorities with any lasting enmity against him. In 1716 he returned as one of three guests, including the Leipzig cantor Kuhnau, to inspect the finished organ.[135] On that occasion, if not previously, Bach would have met the successful applicant for the organist's position, Zachow's pupil Gottfried Kirchhoff. When the latter died in 1746, he was succeeded by Bach's oldest son Wilhelm Friedemann—who, having just celebrated his third birthday at the time of his father's absence in Halle, could not have had more than a vague sense of what was going on.

The Halle contract would have required Bach to compose church music on a regular basis, and it has been supposed that this "appealed to him so greatly that he used it as a bargaining point to achieve basically the same goal in Weimar."[136] Indeed, Bach's new position at Weimar, granted at his request, included a similar responsibility. Yet he might have quickly realized that the Halle position, offered suddenly, was less attractive than it first appeared. That he was ever in a position to conduct real negotiations with Duke Wilhelm Ernst seems unlikely, given the latter's summary response to Bach's request several years later for a dismissal. But in 1714 the duke might have viewed Bach's promotion to Concertmaster as just reward for faithful service—also as a solution to an emerging personnel problem, as the court organist was beginning to overshadow his nominal superiors, Capellmeister Drese and son. That issue probably came to a head when the elder Drese died at the end of 1716, but for now Bach's trajectory at Weimar seems to have continued upward.

Telemann, Bach's promotion, and church music at Weimar (p. 84, following the paragraph break, "and likely on Sebastian as well")

A journey from Frankfurt to Weimar would have taken Telemann through Eisenach, which he continued to supply with church pieces as Capellmeister "in absentia" (*von Haus aus*) after his departure.[137] Another likely visitor from Eisenach, little more than a year later, was Bach's second cousin Johann Bernhard, who had succeeded his uncle Johann Christoph as court and city organist there in 1703. Bernhard also held the more prestigious title of ducal chamber musician, and it was presumably in that capacity that he became a significant composer of orchestral suites "in the style of Telemann."[138] He had taught Walther during the latter's childhood at Erfurt; if present for Johann Gottfried Bernhard's baptism in May 1715, he would have taken the occasion to share notes with Sebastian both figuratively and literally. Bernhard's manuscript copy of twelve concerto transcriptions by Sebastian is the principal source for those works, which are important documents for his assimilation of the Italian concerto style. Sebastian might also at

---

[135] Together with C. F. Rolle, both signed the organ report (BD 1:157–59 [no. 85]; NBR, 74–76 [no. 59]), which, despite its length, leaves much uncertain, such as the temperament; Williams (1984, 3:148) suspects Kuhnau of having written it.

[136] Wolff (2000, 155).

[137] As he explains in his autobiography, published by Mattheson (1740, 363).

[138] "nach dem Telemannischen Geschmacke," Obituary (BD 3:81 [no. 666]; NBR, 298).

this time have received scores of at least two of Bernhard's orchestral suites, which he later performed at Leipzig.[139]

Exactly what Bach's new position as Concertmaster entailed will be taken up in chapter 7. His chief official responsibility appears to have been to present a new church piece for the court chapel on every fourth Sunday. The first of these works was BWV 182, given on Palm Sunday 1714 (March 25). We know of three more (BWV 12, 172 and 21) composed over the next three months, after which the regular monthly pattern breaks down. Already for BWV 21, however, Bach probably drew on a previously drafted work, as he would do on subsequent occasions as well. Hence the new title may have reflected more an ongoing than a sudden change in Bach's work for the court, and presumably he continued to perform as before as organist and chamber musician. By the end of 1714, however, the court poet Franck, perhaps with the active encouragement of the pious ruling duke, had begun writing texts for a complete annual cycle of church pieces or cantatas. Probably printed individually for each service, the year's librettos were then published collectively by the end of 1715.[140] The full title of the publication is worth quoting: "Evangelical devotional offering inspired by the Christian and princely decree of the most serene prince and lord, Lord Wilhelm Ernst, duke of Saxony . . . performed as sacred cantatas on the Sundays and holidays of the church year in the princely Saxon court chapel of Wilhelmsburg in the year 1715."[141] This suggests that Franck's *Jahrgang*, although modeled on previously published cycles of such poetry (including one of his own), was part of the same program of pious reconstruction manifested in the renovations of the Weimar chapel and organ.

Beginning with Bach's cantata for Dec. 30, 1714, most of his remaining compositions for the chapel were based on texts from this volume. It is unknown whether one or the other Drese wrote settings of Franck's librettos for those three or four Sundays in each month when Bach did not; if they did, none survive.[142] Another potential contributor was the city cantor Georg Theodor Reineccius, who seems to have set earlier texts by Franck, but apparently none of his music

---

[139] Sebastian's parts, prepared in 1729, survive for the suites in G major and G minor (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. mss. Bach St 319 and 320). Sebastian also owned parts for an *ouverture* in D (St 318) and, probably, for one in E minor. The latter survives in a score (P 291) likely prepared from Sebastian's parts, as were scores in the same manuscript for the three other suites (see the edition by Hans Bergmann, Stuttgart: Carus, 1988, p. 3).

[140] The dedication is dated June 4, 1715.

[141] Salomo Franck, *Evangelisches Andachts-Opffer auf des durchlauchtigsten Fürsten und Herrn Herrn Wilhelm Ernstens . . . Christ-Fürstl. Anordnung in geistlichen Cantaten welche auf die ordentliche Sonn- und Fest-Tage in der F. S. ges. Hof-Capelle zur Wilhelmsburg A. 1715 zu musiciren angezündet* (Weimar, 1715). The obsequious reference to the duke, including the two "Herrs," was standard in titles of this sort within the Empire.

[142] Walther (1732, 217) reported that the elder Drese had "prepared many church pieces" ("viele Kirchen-Stücke . . . verfertigt") as well as keyboard pieces, sonatas, "partien," and "*theatralische* Sachen."

survives either.[143] In any case, Bach, whether on his own accord, in agreement with Franck, or on the orders of the duke or the Capellmeister, was now part of a collaboration to produce a new musical repertory for the chapel. Other courts and localities were undertaking similar projects during this period. At Eisenach, Telemann had already set a complete annual cycle of librettos by Erdmann Neumeister.[144] There is evidence of a comparable project at the choir school of Grimma, near Leipzig, during the 1720s, when the cantors there assembled a new repertory of church pieces heavily weighted toward recent works of Telemann.[145] Bach would undertake the same at Leipzig itself after his arrival there in 1723, albeit by using his own music rather than borrowing that of others. The initial impetus for such projects probably came from the desire of rulers such as Wilhelm Ernst to demonstrate their piety as patrons of a new type of sacred music. Another who did so was his second cousin Ernst Ludwig I of Saxe-Meiningen, who apparently wrote his own sacred texts of the composite type championed by Neumeister. These were set to music by Johann Ludwig Bach, although probably not before the composition of similar works by Neumeister and Telemann.[146]

This systematic approach to church music probably took its cue from pastors, who might organize their sermons into annual cycles based on a given theme. During Bach's first full year at Weimar (1709) the chief court preacher Lairitz focused on "Christ as the way to heaven"; during 1714 his theme was the Last Judgement. It has been claimed that Lairitz's theme of Hell and damnation during 1715 is reflected in an emphasis on death and mortality in Franck's cycle of librettos for 1714–15.[147] The underlying parallel between the work of pastor, poet, and composer could have been taken for granted by a believing court musician who regarded himself as a worthy collaborator in the ecclesiastical project.

Difficulties at Weimar (p. 87, following the paragraph break, "as he was already doing at Eisenach")

---

[143] In 1713 Reineccius (or Reinecke), who trained the choristers heard in the Weimar chapel, was godfather to Sebastian's short-lived daughter Maria Sophia. Hofmann-Erbrecht (1950, 126) named him as a possible composer of Franck's first annual cycle of cantata texts (1694, published 1711). Born in 1660, Reineccius, if still active as a composer in 1714, is likely to have written in the older style of Krieger and others of his generation; Wollny (2015, 135–38) shows that Bach exchanged music with him.

[144] Once believed to have been completed only during 1717–18 at Frankfurt, this "Eisenach cycle" is now known to have been composed in 1710–11; see Poetzsch (2006, especially 119–28).

[145] See Landmann (1983, 15–19) and Bärwald (2014).

[146] Six earlier settings from this same annual cycle of texts survive by Georg Caspar Schürmann (three appear in Feld and Leisinger 2003). Sebastian later performed some of Johann Ludwig Bach's settings at Leipzig (see chap. 11).

[147] Koch (2006, 50–51).

The junior duke's invitation to Telemann at first seems surprising in view of his presumed preference for Bach. Nothing came of it, and exactly when or why the proposal was made is unclear, although it is most likely to have been made at a time when Bach had either ceased composing for the Weimar court or had already left for Cöthen.[148] Telemann, however, was well known at Weimar, and possibly his vocal as well as his instrumental music was being regularly heard there. It may be, too, that the ruling duke Wilhelm Ernst had decided well before the death of the Weimar Capellmeister Drese, on Dec. 1, 1716, not to replace him with Bach, even though the latter was surely the most qualified member of his *Capelle*. The duke's reasons likely included private differences with his co-reigning nephew. Wilhelm Ernst had decreed several times that the musicians, who in theory served and were paid jointly by both dukes, were not to enter the Red Palace.[149] Yet Bach appears to have continued to work for Ernst August, who gave the composer extra payments from his private funds through the third quarter of 1717.[150] Ongoing performances or instruction within the Red Palace are suggested in particular by the junior duke's acquisition of a lute-harpsichord in 1715 from Johann Nicolaus Bach of Jena; Sebastian's E-minor suite BWV 996 could have been composed for it.[151]

Although Bach, at least initially, probably shared Wilhelm Ernst's zeal for establishing a rigorous program of sacred music, the ruler might have regarded Bach as overreaching, too ambitious to be given complete control of the court music. There was, moreover, a faithful and longer-serving candidate, the younger Drese. Any music by the latter was surely modest in scope and accomplishment by comparison to that of Bach (or Telemann). Bach's contributions to the chapel music must have been appreciated, for otherwise he would not have continued writing them into 1716. But by comparison to anyone else's they were longer and more artfully crafted, comprising substantial fugues, harmonically challenging chorale settings and recitatives, and hybrid types such as the chorale aria, in which the composer might add an instrumental cantus firmus that imposed a new structure and meaning on the court poet's text.

However admirable, such compositions could try the patience of both ordinary listeners and musicians, and they took up precious rehearsal time, energy, even music paper and ink. One of these per month might have been tolerable, but it is possible to have too much of a good thing. Perhaps, too, Bach's religious zeal was excessive, competing with the ruler's in a way that was manifested inappropriately in his church music. Telemann, a pastor's son, might have understood better how to express his piety without seeming to compete with an employer or a senior colleague. Early in his career, at the court of Sorau (now Żary in Poland), Telemann had worked

---

[148] Jung (in Telemann 1972, 168–69) dates the call to Telemann to early 1718 but admits that evidence for it is limited to Telemann's own later testimony.

[149] Wolff (2000, 176), citing Glöckner (1988a, 138).

[150] BD 2:64 (no. 81).

[151] Payment for this instrument on May 6, 1715, from funds belonging to the junior court, is documented in the Weimar court records according to Jauernig (1950, 99n. 14). Johann Nicolaus Bach was Sebastian's second cousin, a son of J. C. Bach of Eisenach.

alongside the court pastor Neumeister. Afterwards he continued to set the latter's librettos at Eisenach, Frankfurt (Main), and finally Hamburg, where they again served together. Although Bach might have had a comparable relationship at Weimar with the court poet Franck, he would have no such senior colleague at Cöthen. At Leipzig he worked with poets and musicians who were mostly either students or younger freelancers, and this might have proved to be a more comfortable arrangement for him as well as his collaborators.

Whatever Bach's precise situation during his final year at Weimar, he must at some point have come to understood that he had reached a ceiling and that the pathway to further advancement would not be through the Himmelsburg, at least so long as the senior duke lived. His regular composition of church pieces seems to have ended around the time of Ernst August's marriage in early 1716. Probably Bach wrote a few more such works over the course of the year, and after the death of Drese on Dec. 1 he immediately composed music for each of the following three Sundays (Advent 2–4). These were more ambitious and in some ways more original than the church pieces he had composed in his initial efforts as concertmaster, but whether any of them were actually performed is uncertain.[152] Biographers have assumed that they were composed as part of a bid for promotion to Drese's position. They might also have been part of a plan to set a new annual cycle of Franck's poetry; the church year had begun on Advent Sunday, and the texts for these works appeared in Franck's next published volume of cantata librettos.

But Bach would take no further part in any such project. We know no compositions and little else about Bach's activities during the next two months, but on Good Friday (March 26, 1717) he was in Gotha for a performance of the traditional passion music. He could have led a work of his own composition—the postulated "Weimar" or "Gotha" passion—or a pastiche, such as the "Keiser" passion. But we have only a record of payment for printing of a libretto, which is lost.[153] As only twenty copies were produced, this might have been a private performance for the ducal household—a true audition. For Bach to be absent from Weimar on such an important day in the church year suggests that he went with the permission of Wilhelm Ernst, perhaps as a favor to the latter's distant cousin Duke Friedrich II. The Capellmeister Witt, who had been seriously ill since January if not before, died just a few days later, and Bach must have been under consideration as Witt's successor. But it was Telemann who received the first offer and the Gera Capellmeister Georg Heinrich Stölzel who eventually got the job—not the last time Bach would fail to be even a second choice.

---

[152] The works survive only in substantially revised versions from Leipzig. Three performing parts survive for the first work, BWV 70a, and a Leipzig oboe part for BWV 186 shows traces of a Weimar original (BWV 186a). Yet Bach seems not to have prepared parts for the third work, BWV 147a, although his autograph score for the Leipzig version (BWV 147) was begun on paper from Weimar used for the original version (see NBA 1/1, commentary, pp. 86, 89, 110).

[153] Glöckner (1995, 35), trans. in NBR, 78 (no. 64). The "Keiser" passion, formerly attributed to the Hamburg opera composer Reinhard Keiser, is now thought more likely to be by Friedrich Nicolaus Brauns or Keiser's father Gottfried; see the edition by Hans Bergmann (Stuttgart: Carus, 1997) and Melamed (2005, 85).

What happened at Dresden? (p. 90, following the paragraph break, "while serving as governor of Leipzig")

Accounts of what happened, which vary in small details, all go back to Bach's own retelling of the story, probably on multiple occasions. Many things remain fuzzy: apart from the date, how Bach came to be in touch with Volumier and whether a competition with Marchand was the only reason Bach was called to the rather distant Saxon capital. There Bach enjoyed the advantage of playing on his home turf, as it were, as well as the opportunity, which Marchand probably did not, of knowing his opponent's style.[154] Of course we do not know what Bach played. Something like the Chromatic Fantasia and Fugue, likely composed by this date, would have been a good choice: a virtuoso prelude followed by a free fugue on a distinctive subject probably was expected of a German organist, even when playing on harpsichord (chorales would have been inappropriate in Catholic-ruled Dresden).

Other selections that have been suggested, such as movements from the English Suites, are not implausible. On the other hand, an ensemble work like the Fifth Brandenburg Concerto is unlikely, for we have no indication that Bach was joined on this occasion by any of the Dresden musicians.[155] But if Bach had stayed in touch with Pisendel, he would have had at least an inkling that the Dresden court was in the course of shifting its musical focus from French toward Italian style, and thus (in instrumental music) from suites to concertos. The return of the crown prince from Venice in September was followed by the performance of Lotti's *Giove in Argo* the following month, but from the silence of the accounts on this matter, it would appear that Bach's visit preceded both events. Nevertheless, his demonstration of both the refined French and the more outwardly virtuoso Italian styles could have made Bach seem more impressive (and fashionable) than Marchand, who was probably more limited in the range of styles which he had mastered. It might have been understanding of this, rather than fear of being outplayed by a mere German, that provoked Marchand to make his early departure.

It may seem strange that there is no record of Bach's visit in Dresden itself, but the appearance of a provincial organist would have been a thing of passing interest by comparison with ensuing dynastic and operatic events. These culminated two years later in the performance of another Lotti opera for the crown prince's wedding, which brought many additional famous musicians to the capital (possibly including Handel). For Bach, merely seeing the city and especially the royal treatment of its musicians must have provoked admiration if not envy, even if his visit predated the expenditure of truly astronomical sums on opera and ballet in later years. Under Pisendel the Dresden orchestra would become perhaps the best in Europe; his predecessor Volumier, concertmaster until his death in 1728, is supposed to have trained the orchestra in the French

---

[154] As Wolff (2000, 182) notes, a copy of Marchand's D-minor suite, published in 1701 or 1702, appears in the Andreas Bach Book (not the Möller Manuscript). Christoph Bach had probably already made the copy by the time Sebastian played in Dresden.

[155] Dirksen (1992, 178–79) argues for an origin of the Fifth Brandenburg Concerto in relation to the Dresden trip, noting the thematic parallel between the second movement and an organ fugue by Marchand. The paralleism, which is undeniable, is intriguing, but Marchand's piece could be later than Bach's.

style, but they must have performed more than serviceably in works such as Lotti's, and hearing any of the Dresden ensembles at the time might have deepened Bach's understanding of what could be achieved by a well-rehearsed band of professional virtuosos. Any Leipzig city councilors who had heard music at Dresden orchestra might have been wishing for something like it in their own city when they hired Bach in 1723.

Bach in prison (p. 91, following the end of the printed chapter, "notice of his dishonorable discharge")

Bach was probably imprisoned in the Weimar Bastille, which survives next to the tower, the lone extant portion of the original castle. The Bastille, recently reopened as a museum, has an ornate sixteenth-century portal and, like its Parisian counterpart, would have been a relatively comfortable place of detention for upper- and middle-class infractors. Bach's incarceration by a peeved prince was probably illegal, especially as no crime was alleged and he was not a subject of Weimar. Perhaps, as in France, prisoners were held under the legal fiction that they were merely being detained while an investigation into possible criminal activity was carried out. One imagines that Bach was held under conditions similar to those applied to officials of the Red Castle, whom Wilhelm Ernst also arrested at one point in the feuding between the two ducal households. This would explain how it was possible for Bach to have composed a portion of the Well-Tempered Clavier while imprisoned—the usual interpretation of a comment by Ernst Ludwig Gerber, son of Bach's pupil Heinrich Nicolaus.[156]

By calling him the *former* Concertmaster and organist, the court record makes clear that Bach was no longer working for the Weimar dukes. He last received pay at Weimar for the quarter of the year ending in mid-September, and his salary for the final quarter was assigned to his pupil Schubart.[157] By now, Bach's appointment as Capellmeister at Cöthen must have been known, and although this could not have pleased the ruling duke, it might have discouraged the latter from too severely mistreating the servant of a fellow ruler to whom he was now related by marriage. Since, moreover, Bach had already received a payment from Cöthen, the loss of his Weimar salary and the cost to his family of maintaining him while held (which might be assumed under eighteenth-century practice) cannot have been unbearable.

It is usually supposed that Bach had angered the ruling duke by insisting on his release from service. Perhaps he had also stirred up dissension among his fellow musicians or actively

---

[156] Gerber (1790, col. 90) recorded that "according to a certain tradition, [part 1 of the Well-Tempered Clavier] was written in a place where discontent, long hours, and lack of any sort of musical instrument compelled this way of passing the time" (*dies sind . . . an einem Orte geschrieben, wo ihm Unmuth, lange Weile und Mangel an jeder Art von musikalischen Instrumenten diesen Zeitvertreib abnöthigte*), in BD 3:468 (no. 948), NBR, 372 (no. 370). Gerber's account was the first, veiled, acknowledgement in print of Bach's imprisonment, which was still unknown when Spitta wrote his biography (1873–80).

[157] BD 2:36 (commentary to no. 39). From this it would appear that Bach accepted payment from both Weimar and Cöthen at least for August and the first part of September. According to Walther (1732, 557), Schubart replaced him as organist during Advent 1717.

flaunted the rule of his superior, the vice-Capellmeister Drese junior. Bach's detention could also have been a slap at Ernst August and the latter's new brother-in-law at Cöthen, who were both deprived of Bach's services for at least a few weeks. As petty and self-serving as both Weimar dukes could be, it would not have looked good for a famous player who had earned the respect of the Saxon elector and king of Poland to be held unjustly for very long. Many years later, when Emanuel Bach had to press repeatedly for his release from the court of a much more powerful ruler—Frederick the Great, who was a stickler for loyalty—he must have remembered his father's experience, even though he did not mention it in the Obituary. Emanuel, too, had a position waiting for him, and his departure, too, was delayed, even though he had proved his loyalty by serving far longer at Berlin than his father did at Weimar. Although Emanuel had not yet reached his fourth birthday when the family left for Cöthen, he must have learnt lessons not only in patience but in the tactful treatment of superiors from his father.[158]

Whatever it was that Bach had done to get himself jailed, it could be that nothing short of a serious confrontation would have gotten him out of Weimar. Held against his will, without an instrument on which to practice or pass the time, he surely contemplated his past, his future, and how he might continue to serve "God and his neighbor," as a pious Lutheran organist promised to do. If he had come to Weimar eager to create sacred music on a regular basis in the service of a fellow believer, he was now leaving for a position in which he would write and perform nothing of the sort. Perhaps he did pass the time by working on the keyboard pieces that we know as part 1 of the *Well-Tempered Clavier*. Gerber's account of the latter's origin might have been intended only to illustrate Bach's exceptional powers of concentration—his ability to throw himself into his work regardless of his situation. But it suggests, through its reference to *Unmut* (discontent, chagrin, resentment), that Bach was depressed, and maybe not only because of his arrest.

He would leave Weimar disillusioned, having learned, perhaps, to be suspicious of the type of religious enthusiasm so ostentatiously paraded by the ruling duke. Yet out of this experience could have come a more tolerant religious attitude, evident in his willingness to work for a Calvinist and later a Catholic sovereign. His sons would execute commissions for a Jewish woman, advertise an important work as being suitable to all Christian denominations, and even convert to Catholicism, remaining in that faith after it was no longer required for purposes of employment.[159] The apparent evolution in religious attitudes, taking place over the course of two or three generations, made possible such important compositions as Sebastian's B-Minor Mass, Emanuel's Double Concerto for harpsichord and piano, and numerous Latin church works by Christian. Do we owe this music, indirectly, to the intolerance of a Weimar duke?

---

[158] On Emanuel's dismissal from Berlin in 1767, see Schulenberg (2014, 180).

[159] Emanuel and Friedemann evidently fulfilled commissions for Sara Levy; Emanuel's *Auferstehung* (Resurrection) cantata was performed by Gluck and Mozart in Catholic Vienna (see Schulenberg 2010, 10–11, and 2014, 208–9 and 303); Christian continued to worship as a Catholic after moving from Italy to England.

Chapter 7

Bach's Weimar works, continued (p. 104, following the first paragraph break, "introducing students to the analysis of fugues")

Bach himself could not have thought of these elements of style as we do. Form is rarely discussed in musical writings of the time, and harmony and voice leading were understood according to principles entirely different from those first published by Rameau during the next decade. Lacking our analytical vocabulary, Bach and his contemporaries might instead have spoken of musical "ideas" (*Gedanken*), an expression that Emanuel Bach and later writers such as Forkel often employed to mean something like what we call motives and themes. A new focus on motivic invention and development, however, was just one facet of the many-sided development that was taking place in Bach's music, and in that of his European composers generally, during the first two or three decades of the century. As late as 1802, Forkel, likely reflecting a Bach family tradition conveyed to him by Friedemann or Emanuel, viewed as crucial Sebastian's keyboard transcriptions of "all" Vivaldi's concertos. Here Bach studied "the development of ideas, the relationships between them, the variety of modulation, and many other things." Rewriting Vivaldi's violin figuration for the keyboard taught Bach to "think musically"; paradoxically, he learned to invent "ideas *[Gedanken]* . . . from his own imagination" rather than from what "his fingers might be expected to play."[160] An earlier account, probably based directly on Bach's own teaching, was largely a defense of the latter's "harmony"—meaning counterpoint, in the language of the time—against the accusation that his complicated textures were somehow less "natural" than the more straightforward writing of Telemann and other contemporaries.[161] "Nature," the great ideal of eighteenth-century aesthetics, was thought to be simple and immediately comprehensible; "unnatural" or complex music such as Bach's was viewed as inexpressive, too focused on its own technical development to communicate feeling to the listener in the supposedly direct manner of simpler music.

To criticize an innovative composer in this way has remained a common mode of attack to the present day. Bach, however, came to be misunderstood as a musical conservative, not an innovator. This was largely because of his continuing interest in counterpoint, which his contemporaries viewed as an art of the past, useful for teaching but chiefly of technical interest. But to focus too intently on his counterpoint was to overlook Bach's adoption of current musical ideas throughout his career, not least at Weimar. Particularly in the vocal works that he

---

[160] Forkel (1802, 24): "Er studirte die Führung der Gedanken, das Verhältniß derselben unter einander, die Abwechselungen der Modulation und mancherley andere Dinge mehr. Die Umänderung der für die Violine eingerichteten . . . Gedanken und Passagen, lehrte ihn auch musikalisch denken, so daß er nach vollbrachter Arbeit seine Gedanken nicht mehr von seinen Fingern zu erwarten brauchte, sondern sie schon aus eigener Fantasie nehmen konnte." The German is difficult to translate because most of the nouns, even *Modulation*, are vague, not yet the precisely defined technical terms of present-day musical analysis. The rendering in NBR, 441, is doubly misleading for a modern reader because it is based on an early nineteenth-century translation (see NBR, 418) that fails to reflect even the incipient music theory of that time.

[161] Thus Birnbaum's defense of Bach against Scheibe (see chap. 12).

composed there, he demonstrated his zeal for emotional expression as well as for conveying the substance or meaning of the poetic texts. His means for doing so included both traditional musical rhetoric (*musica poetica*) and newer devices from contemporary Italian and German vocal music. Fundamental was Bach's adoption of current types of recitatives and arias, which he had already begun to cultivate in his pre-Weimar vocal compositions. Formal design was also a part of this, even though form as an element of composition was almost entirely ignored in writings by Bach's contemporaries. Even today, its relevance to musical expression or experience is difficult to convey. Yet the pervasive adoption of ritornello form and da capo form by Bach's contemporaries—and to a more limited degree in his own music—suggests that these devices, no less than word painting and expressive harmony, represented something fundamental in how listeners at the time preferred to experience music.

The large number of musically significant compositions that Bach wrote at Weimar, every one worthy of close examination, makes it possible to focus on only a selection in what follows. Even a random choice of works demonstrates that it was here, in the years around 1714, that Bach became Bach as we know him. Even the greatest of his earlier works, such as the *Actus tragicus* and the organ Passacaglia, are distinctly older in style and more confined to local or regional sources of inspiration. One can hardly avoid being astonished by the sheer variety of forms, genres, settings, and styles in which Bach now worked with complete assuredness and mastery despite the newness of what he was doing. Apparent crudities, as in the rough counterpoint of some keyboard pieces, are deliberate products of Bach's intentionally challenging the player or listener. He does this through choices of motives or harmonic progressions (often chromatic) that force the fingers or the voice into patterns that may be unfamiliar but only seem unidiomatic or ineffective. The keyboard music still reveals occasional difficulty in confining four-part writing to what can be comfortably managed by two hands. Entirely gone, however, are the vestiges of short-sighted seventeenth-century writing, such as the barely hidden parallel fifths still present in earlier compositions.[162]

One of the accomplishments of Bach's Weimar keyboard music was the thorough assimilation of the types of "note-patterns" mentioned earlier. Another was the planning of entire movements according to a clear tonal design, that is, a rational series of modulations, with the most remote keys now reached near the center rather than toward the end. This was a regular element of the Italian music that he now emulated at Weimar; another was the reliance on certain standard forms, such as ternary form in an aria and ritornello form in a concerto movement. Although Bach now adopted these standard designs of contemporary Italian music, he never did so routinely or exclusively. His approach to large-scale form reveals the same balance between imaginative variety and regular patterning that we see in his approach to the musical surface.

The chronological window during which a composer could have learned such a balance was small. Members of earlier generations, including Buxtehude and even Böhm, might follow grand "architectural" plans, as in Buxtehude's Passacaglia. Yet they never quite grasped the principles of large-scale tonal design that emerge in Bach's Weimar works. By the time of the next generation, including Bach's older sons, Italian and German composers were tending to work within a few stereotyped formal plans. Bach was surely aware of these, even though theorists of

[162] As in BWV 566 (mm. 75–77) and BWV 954 (mm. 11–12).

the time were only beginning to develop a vocabulary for describing them. Bach may even have counseled his pupils to follow the standard types of aria and sonata forms that are ubiquitous in the music of his younger contemporaries, such as Hasse and Quantz. In his own music, however, he never follows any design slavishly, so that even a standard da-capo aria text might receive a musical setting of a very different type. The reason for his doing so sometimes becomes apparent from a reading of the text, but in other cases sheer musical invention or a refusal to follow convention could have been the motivation. Although modern writers have assigned many of Bach's works to simple formal categories, we must remind ourselves constantly that these were not givens for him. Even when presented with an aria text in a conventional strophic or ABA form, he by no means felt bound to set it to music according to that design.

A few minor elements of style that changed during Bach's Weimar years are also worth mentioning. For instance, he seems to have shifted from using sixteenth notes to eighths as the basic unit of musical pulsation. Although this might seem purely notational, the dense counterpoint of older pieces like the organ Passacaglia or the C-minor toccata is replaced by more transparent textures involving a greater variety of note values, large and small. This leaves the page looking a little less black even when there remain ornamental figures in thirty-seconds; one sees this if, for example, one compares almost any of the concerto transcriptions with an earlier example of Bach's keyboard writing (ex. S7.1). Bach's change in notation probably reflected an insight into current Italian style, an appreciation for its way of using melodic figuration to embellish fundamentally simple progressions. Although the tempo of the two passages need not be fundamentally different, in example S7.1a there is a new chord on almost every quarter-note beat, whereas in example S7.1b the harmony changes only every two or four beats (after the first measure).

Melodic embellishment had long been a fundamental element of both improvisation and composition in the Italian style. A treatise first published a decade before Bach's birth had explained for German readers the Italianate art of transforming simple melodic steps or intervals into motives or "note-patterns."[163] Those same melodic patterns had become common elements of German music before the end of the seventeenth century. Now, however, written-out melodic embellishments by actual Italian musicians became available in Germany. Examples include the famous embellished versions of Corelli's violin sonatas, published at Amsterdam around 1712, as well as passages within concertos by Vivaldi and others.[164]Bach might have been emulating such things even before coming to Weimar, if he had already written down the sonatas BWV 965 and 966 (after Reinken) at Arnstadt or Mühlhausen. Now we see him composing original music in the same style and incorporating the latter into a contrapuntal, imitative texture, as in the opening sinfonias of several Weimar church pieces (ex. S7.2).

---

[163] Printz's (1676–77, vol. 2, chaps. 8–13) demonstration of melodic embellishment culminated in one hundred variations over a simple ground bass; the volume was reprinted in 1696 with no substantial changes in this section.

[164] As in the second movement of the violin concerto in D illustrated in example 7.1b, known as the "Grosso Mogul."

In such works Bach usually reserves sixteenths and smaller note values for soloistic passagework or written-out embellishment. There are still dense passages in which two, three, or more parts all move contrapuntally in sixteenths, but these grow increasingly uncommon. Bach does not simplify his counterpoint, but he writes clearer, more lucid textures, with greater rhythmic diversity between the parts and less pure busy work. The shift is gradual and perhaps was not made consciously. But it reflects the displacement of Buxtehude and other older German composers by Vivaldi and other Italians as principal sources of style.

In the "Little" G-minor organ fugue BWV 578, the subject opens with a tonic triad arpeggiated in quarters—already a type of motive rare in older music (ex. S7.3). The outlining of a chord in this manner would have seemed simplistic in an older style that favored nervous, ever-changing types of figuration. Now it becomes desirable as a simple "idea" or motive that is immediately audible whenever it occurs, clearly articulating each entrance of the fugue subject. Over the course of its five measures, however, the subject accelerates to sixteenths. These then predominate in a countersubject that is reminiscent of the type of figuration found in Venetian violin concertos of around 1710 (ex. S7.4). But in contrast to Bach's earlier contrapuntal writing, this figuration in sixteenths is usually present in only one voice at a time; exceptions rarely last for more than one measure. Together with the frequency of three-part as opposed to four-part writing, this makes even the busiest passages of the G-minor fugue piece more transparent texture than those of the Passacaglia and other works in the older style.

Another new feature, the principle of tonal design, is already evident in some of the pieces considered in chapter 5. The tonal design of BWV 578 is articulated with particular clarity by the outlining of the new tonic triad at the beginning of each statement of the fugue subject. In other works the same function—articulating a modulating scheme—is served by ritornellos, as in an aria or a concerto movement. Tonal design is a regular feature of the Italian compositions that Bach was now emulating. Not every movement features it, and it is not always as simple or straightforward as in this piece, with its emphatic cadences to the three most important scale degrees: dominant, relative major, and subdominant, respectively, as shown in table S7.1.[165] The table shows the division of the piece into alternating expositions and episodes; it also shows the tonality of each entry of the subject as well as formally significant cadences and parallel passages, that is, the restatement of the first episode starting in the second half of m. 45.

The related principle of recapitulation (as understood here) is clearly at work in the episodes (ex. S7.5). These passages also involve contrapuntal manipulation of the material, but only by exchange of material between the various voices, leaving the identity of the recapitulated matter—typically a sequence, as here—readily apparent. The fact that the second episode restates material from the first reinforces the symmetry already audible in the regular alternation of expository and episodic passages.

[165] The first two of these cadences divide the piece into three roughly equal segments of about 25 measures each, but the numerical proportions are too imprecise to be related to the geometric constructivism that Bach followed in other compositions.

Table S7.1. “Little” Fugue in G minor, BWV 578

<table>
<tr><td>section:</td><td></td><td>Exposition</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Episode</td><td></td><td>Exposition</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Episode</td><td>Exposition</td><td>Episode</td><td>Exposition</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>subject entries:</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>S:</td><td></td><td>g</td><td>1</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>g′</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td></td><td>c</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>A:</td><td></td><td></td><td>d</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Bb</td><td></td><td></td><td>(1)</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>T:</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>g</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>(g)</td><td>1</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>B:</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>d</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Bb</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>g</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>cadences:</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>d</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Bb</td><td></td><td>c</td><td>g</td><td>g</td></tr>
<tr><td>m. no.:</td><td>1</td><td></td><td>22</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>25</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>45b</td><td>50b</td><td>55</td><td>63</td><td>68</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>|| mm.:</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>22–23</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>

letters = keys of subject entries   prime symbol = modified statement
1 = first countersubject   (1) = altered or abbreviated statement
|| mm. = parallel passages

BWV 578 nevertheless retains a fundamental asymmetry, inasmuch as the time intervals between entries of the subject grow longer as the composition progresses. Moreover, the last two subject entries (in mm. 50 and 63) are separated by an episode longer than either of the previous episodes. This final episode, moreover, introduces a new arpeggiated motive, and this gives the episode a climactic character comparable to that of the final solo passage in a concerto allegro. Yet the fugue closes with a final statement of the subject in the pedals, not a thematically unrelated coda—as, for example, in Bach’s “Legrenzi” fugue and most of the toccatas. The way in which Bach brings the piece to a conclusion shows how far he has come here from the style of his earlier works. The presence of this piece in a manuscript copy by his brother Christoph shows that it is still relatively early. Yet by ending with a formula straight out of Vivaldi, it signals the composer’s stylistic reorientation that took place at Weimar.[166]

The toccatas (p. 106, following the paragraph break, “including the Venetian solo concerto”)

The D-major toccata comprises six sections, including two fugues. The first of these, at the center of the piece as a whole, is in the surprising key of F-sharp minor; two modulating bridges, before and after, connect this fugue with the rest of the composition. Although the toccata opens with the usual brilliant figuration (ex. S7.6a), followed by a lively allegro (ex. S7.6b), the central fugue in F-sharp minor is quietly expressive and chromatic (ex. S7.6c). But the ensuing modulating section works its way back to the tonic key in a particularly dramatic way, giving the

---

[166] BWV 578 is no. 28 in the Andreas Bach Book, the earliest source. It falls within the middle section of the manuscript, which, according to Robert Hill (1991, xxii–xxiii), was filled in some time after the surrounding portions of the manuscript. This implies a date of composition around 1710 or perhaps even a bit later.

toccata as a whole a distinctive emotional arc that concludes with a brilliantly energetic second fugue in gigue rhythm (ex. S7.6d).

The C-minor toccata, on the other hand, comprises just three sections, the last of which is an enormous fugue that makes up the great majority of the piece (about 140 out of 175 measures). Replete with many ingenious details, the fugue reveals above all the composer's aspirations toward monumentality. The more compact E-minor toccata, with its four shorter sections, is probably more engaging, and its concluding fugue shares extensive material with an anonymous Italian piece—although which came first is unknown.[167] Still, Bach probably regarded the toccata as a specifically Italian genre, modeling elements of these pieces on things he found in violin music: older compositions such as those of Giovanni Bononcini and Corelli, as well as recent works by the Venetians Vivaldi and Albinoni. Echoes of the latter include arpeggiated passagework, used to form sequences both in episodes, as in BWV 578, and in subjects, like that of the closing fugue of the toccata in E minor. Italian inspiration is often thought to be clearest in the G-major toccata, which falls into three distinct movements (fast-slow-fast), like many a Vivaldian concerto. But it does not sound like a concerto, relying (like most of the other toccatas) on ideas that for the most part still have their origin in the German organ tradition.

The one *pedaliter* toccata in this group, BWV 564 in C, is indisputably the grandest, though whether this makes it the latest is impossible to say.[168] Like the G-major toccata, it falls into three clearly articulated movements in the order fast-slow-fast, like the majority of Vivaldi's concertos. Yet the first movement is divided between the traditional improvisatory introduction and a regular allegro. The second movement, in A minor, although resembling a type of solo arioso common in Italian sonatas and concertos of the early eighteenth century, ends with a modulating transition to the concluding fugue. Hence the piece is no more in the form of a concerto than is the G-major toccata. The opening allegro, although superficially calling to mind a ritornello form, is constructed—like similar passages in the D-major and G-minor toccatas—from short-winded phrases of two or four measures that modulate and are then restated in a new key.

Much the same type of design occurs in the quick sections of the sonatas that Kuhnau had already published in 1696. Although Bach's melodic ideas are more engaging than Kuhnau's, the alternating phrases of this movement do not clearly correspond to either the solo or the "tutti" passages of a real concerto. Kuhnau's sonatas—among the first such pieces for a solo keyboard instrument—suggest that he shared Bach's fascination with manipulating patterns. But despite their continuing fascination with short-breathed phrases, Sebastian's toccatas are already composed on a broader time scheme than Kuhnau's sonatas. By the time of Bach's promotion in 1714, Kuhnau's obsessive play with tiny themes a few beats in length would have seemed

---

[167] Details in Schulenberg (2006, 109–11). If Bach was the borrower, he modified the borrowed material, including the subject, to make it his own.

[168] BWV 564 was once dated to Bach's Cöthen period, as it requires the note d‴ (twice, in mm. 35 and 80), supposedly available on the organ of St. Agnus's church there. In fact the manual compass of that instrument is uncertain (Wolff and Zepf 2012, 44), and the fugue seems to go out of its way to avoid this same note in m. 200.

pedantic and small-scale when set beside the immense designs that Bach was now filling out under the inspiration of Venetian violin music.

Concertos and concerto (ritornello) form (p. 107, following the first full paragraph, "four harpsichords and strings")

Forkel emphasized the abstract compositional values of this music, which was unfairly denigrated by twentieth-century commentators who may never have heard stylish performances of Vivaldi's original compositions. Bach, like other listeners of the time, must have been struck by Vivaldi's constantly inventive scoring, which reveals an imagination as much for sound and texture as for motivic work and counterpoint. Keyboard versions of such pieces inevitably lacked the color of the originals, and it could be that Forkel's implicit devaluation of the sensuous side of this music reflected Bach's own. Yet Forkel also seems to have missed the element of play in Vivaldi's use of "note-patterns," which Bach enhanced by adding further figuration (especially in the bass; see ex. S7.7). A hint that Bach did enjoy the pure sonorities of this music could be seen in the rare explicit registrations included in the organ arrangements BWV 593 and 596.

In addition to the five concertos from Vivaldi's opus 3, Bach is known to have made keyboard versions of four further Vivaldi concertos. There are also ten arrangements of concertos by other Italian and German composers, including Telemann and Prince Johann Ernst. The origins of three works are unidentified; one of these (BWV 976) is claimed to be Vivaldi's in its sole manuscript copy, but could this and two others (BWV 983 and 986) have been efforts by Bach himself or his pupils? The style is remote from that of Bach's surviving concertos, but those are probably later compositions, and we cannot be sure what his first efforts in this genre might have resembled. On the other hand, the poor survival rate of this music in general suggests that these could well have been based on lost concertos by Telemann or other composers.[169] In their short phrases and avoidance of extended virtuoso passagework, BWV 983 and 986, like the transcriptions of known works by Telemann and Johann Ernst, are closer to concertos by Albinoni than those of Vivaldi. The latter would soon make quick figuration for the soloist a hallmark of the concerto. But when the concerto was new, it was not necessarily seen as a vehicle for a virtuoso soloist, rather as a type of chamber music marked by variety of scoring and texture. As one for whom solo passagework was child's play, Bach might have been most intrigued by the intellectual features of this type of music, as Forkel implied.

Even if Bach wrote no concertos of his own before leaving Weimar, he certainly incorporated the defining elements of such music into other compositions written there, including keyboard chorales as well as praeludia (preludes and fugues). As far as Bach was concerned, the most important element borrowed from the Italian concerto might have been the distinctive types of "ideas" or motives that could be incorporated into the soloistic figuration or passagework of the quick movements.[170] Modern commentators, however, have tended to focus on the formal design

---

[169] Even for the opus 1 concertos by the well-known composer Benedetto Marcello, the solo violin part is lost. This leaves Bach's arrangement of one concerto (BWV 981) the only integral source for any work from this set of twelve, published at Venice in 1708.

[170] When Bach's critic Scheibe described "concerto style" (*Concertenart*), he regarded this as defined by the presence of "variegated" (*verändernd*) or "convoluted" (*kräuselnd*) passages, that

of Italian concertos, or more precisely on the typical organization of their quick movements, now described as being in "ritornello form." In fact the latter is not present even in some of the allegro movements that Bach transcribed for keyboard instruments. But ritornello form is clear enough in most of these, where we find a more or less regular alternation between recurring passages played by the full ensemble (or tutti) and solo episodes, scored most often for one violin and continuo. Most ritornellos begin with a reference to the movement's opening "idea," a theme or at least a distinctive motive or phrase played by the tutti. The episodes, on the other hand, usually involve solo figuration of some sort (as in the last two measures of ex. S7.7). Modulations can take place within either type of section, but they occur more often in the solo episodes. The "tutti" passages, by restating the main ritornello idea, articulate a tonal design that touches on a rounded series of closely related tonalities.

To what degree Bach was conscious of ritornello form, deliberately incorporating it into his instrumental music, cannot be known. The silence of writers on the subject during his lifetime leaves us uncertain whether he even would have used the word *ritornello* to describe a passage in a concerto.[171] Nevertheless, in his instrumental compositions, including works for solo keyboard, Bach did gradually adopt elements of ritornello form as described in modern textbooks. These occur not only in concertos but in preludes, fugues, and chorale settings, although it would be hazardous to use the presence of "ritornello" elements to deduce a precise chronological sequence for Bach's Weimar compositions.

Still, it can be no accident that the design of the "Little" G-minor organ fugue and comparable works comes so close to ritornello form in a quick concerto movement. The beauty of such a design lay in both its predictability and its flexibility, allowing almost unlimited expansion and elaboration. Such a form therefore satisfied early eighteenth-century demands for both rationality and variety, and it could be filled out with "ideas" that were expressive as well as exciting. Yet, contrary to what is suggested in modern textbooks, there was never a standard "ritornello form," nor does every concerto movement by Bach, or even by Vivaldi, even allude to it. For at least the first two decades of the eighteenth century, the ritornello continued to be regarded as an element of the aria, not of instrumental music. An introductory passage for the full ensemble that sounds to us like a ritornello might never return—as is the case in the splendid work by Vivaldi whose arrangement comes first in Bernhard Bach's collection (BWV 972).

Bach never standardized his use of ritornellos in the way that can be seen in music by the next generation of composers, including his older sons.[172] For this reason, a work that begins with a passage for the entire ensemble, proceeding to a solo episode, may nevertheless avoid a regular alternation of "tutti" and solo passages in subsequent sections. In pieces for solo keyboard,

---

is, solo episodes—not ritornellos, as mistakenly assumed by some modern writers (see Schulenberg 2008, 66)

[171] The term *ritornello* applied properly to an instrumental passage played between the stanzas of a strophic aria. Its extension to other types of arias was perhaps self-evident, but Scheibe in 1739 still regarded its application to instrumental music as metaphorical (see Schulenberg 2008, 60).

[172] As in the music of C. P. E. Bach; see Schulenberg (2014, 51).

apparent allusions to ritornello form may likewise break down after the opening passage or two, even if there is an initial alternation between two types of contrasting material or texture. Similar contrasts can be present in a fugue, as in the alternation between exposition and episode, but where we might hear this as an analogy to concerto form, for Bach and his contemporaries it may have been simply alternation—a dialog, or rather a duologue, between two equally engaging "ideas."

Praeludia (preludes and fugues) (p. 108, following the paragraph break, "intolerably sour triads")

The prelude of BWV 532 includes an extended passage that was clearly inspired by Corelli's trio sonatas, and its fugue subject incorporates sequential passagework that would not sound out of place in a solo passage from a Vivaldi concerto (ex. S7.8). Even something as simple as the threefold repetition of the opening motive, which would have seemed emptily banal in the old *stylus fantasticus*, now communicates something of the breadth of the new style, whose effects are achieved through in part through direct restatement of not only individual motives but entire sections. A virtuoso showpiece, the fugue thus achieves a length that seems enormous by comparison with the fugal passages of the toccatas and other more old-fashioned works. It also reveals purposeful formal planning in its clear division between expositions and episodes—which correspond roughly with the ritornellos and solo passages of a concerto movement—and in its sensible placement of the most remote minor keys in the central portion (as in BWV 912). This is true whether the most remote of these modulations, to C-sharp minor (m. 84), was a later insert or was subsequently removed to create a shorter version of the fugue.[173]

BWV 532 must be one of Bach's earliest pieces that achieves both the length and the virtuosity—compositional as well as performative—that have made his *pedaliter* praeludia among the most astonishing, iconic examples of organ music by anyone. Prior to their composition, the "prelude with fugue" was not a distinct genre, comprising a pair of movements roughly equal in length and accomplishment. Yet each of these pieces raises questions. Were the two movements indeed composed as a pair, or were they brought together later (not necessarily by Bach)? Does the form in which we have them reflect substantial revision, and if so when was it carried out? What was the purpose of these pieces: as preludes or postludes for church services (as in present-day use)? audition or recital pieces (*Proben*)? for training in counterpoint and performance? The answer to each of these questions is probably "maybe": in every case we may have pairs of movements that evolved to serve varying purposes.[174]

---

[173] The excursion to C-sharp minor is part of a long passage that is absent from the shorter version of the fugue BWV 532a, which also differs in other important ways. Williams (2003, 44), following Spitta (1873–80, 1:405), tended toward seeing BWV 532a as a later abbreviation. Schulenberg (2007) points to features suggesting that the shorter version is earlier.

[174] At least two of these works may for a while have comprised three movements, like the toccatas in C and G. Three manuscript copies of BWV 545 in C include a section that later became the slow movement of the organ sonata no. 5 in C (BWV 529). One copy of BWV 541 in G directs the player to insert the slow movement of sonata no. 4 (BWV 528).

The multisectional D-major prelude (BWV 532/1) still comprises outer improvisatory sections in old-fashioned German style, although these frame the Corellian passage that constitutes the main part of the movement. Bach repeated the same fundamental concept in several other works, notably the one called—perhaps for lack of a better name—the *Pièce d'orgue* ("Organ piece") BWV 572. The latter was never joined to a fugue, and its central section seems to have been inspired by French music—whose influence throughout Bach's career tends to be overshadowed by Italianisms in modern accounts but can hardly be discounted. Still, the majority of Bach's subsequent preludes and fugues draw above all on the Venetian concerto.

Among these are three fugues in A minor—BWV 543/2, 944/2, and 894/2—as well as the prelude of the last of these, BWV 894/1. The subjects of the three fugues are similar: long and consisting mainly, like that of BWV 532/2, of sequential figuration in steady sixteenths. The "motoric" rhythmic surface once led pieces of this sort to be played as anticipations of twentieth-century machinery. Yet before the invention of the metronome such music must have been performed with nuances of timing, "breathing" between phrases, and other refinements now again common in "historically informed" renditions.

Superficial resemblances between BWV 543 and BWV 944 have had led to their being seen as a *pedaliter/manualiter* pair, much like BWV 532 and BWV 912. But even if Bach had some such idea in mind, careful examination again reveals significant differences. Not least of these is that BWV 944 lacks a real prelude,[175] whereas BWV 543 as a whole is still recognizable as an old-fashioned praeludium, its fugue ending with a free coda that reverts to the "Germanic" style of its prelude. Several long passages in BWV 543 for manuals alone provide the type of textural contrast found in the solo episodes of a concerto movement. Other passages, including the fugue subject, incorporate figuration surely inspired by Vivaldian violin writing, which Bach would continue to use not only for pedal solos but for actual violin and cello parts. The latter include basso continuo parts in the Weimar vocal works, as well as the compositions for unaccompanied string instruments.

The most genuinely concerto-like movement of these pieces may be the prelude BWV 894/1. This so closely resembles movements in Bach's actual concertos (notably BWV 1052/1) that the suggestion has been made that it was based, like the transcriptions, on an ensemble work.[176]This is unlikely, if only because at some much later date Bach, or possibly a student, turned BWV 894/1 into the first movement of a real concerto (BWV 1044). The transformation is effective, but what is startling from the present-day point of view is that the arranger ignored what now seem the obvious points of division between the piece's "ritornellos" and "episodes." For instance, the opening section of the original prelude comes to a strong cadence in the tonic on the downbeat of m. 18 (ex. S7.9). This marks the end of a ritornello, and the more lightly scored

[175] Ten measures of chords that precede the fugue are designated "Fantasia" in the copy by Christoph Bach (one of the last entries in the Andreas Bach Book). Perhaps meant to be the basis of improvised arpeggios, this passage is absent from some later sources, suggesting that Bach (or a copyist?) dropped the introduction.

[176] By Eppstein (1970). One of the earliest sources for BWV 894, as for the concerto transcriptions, is a manuscript copy by Bernhard Bach (Leipzig, Musikbibliothek, Ms. R 9).

passage that follows is the equivalent of a solo episode. It leads to a cadence in the relative major followed by a restatement of the opening music—another ritornello—in that key.

The arranger of the concerto version assigned *all* of this to the soloist. Essentially the entire original prelude is placed in the solo harpsichord part, preceded by a new ritornello of eight measures for the added string parts. Subsequent interpolations for the tutti expanded the piece in a manner that reflects either a student's complete misunderstanding of the original version, or else the counterintuitive ingenuity that we would expect from Bach himself. Pointing to the latter is the addition of solo flute and violin parts to the solo episode. These provide counterpoint to the original harpsichord part (mm. 9–13) before receiving new solo matter of their own in a further interpolated passage (mm. 13–17). Whether or not Bach's, the virtuoso writing for the flute—far beyond anything in his Weimar and even Cöthen parts for this instrument—points to a much later date than the original.[177] The concerto version also reveals that, however obvious the ritornello form of the original might seem to us, it was not foremost in the mind of the arranger. For Bach at Weimar, the contrasts between "tutti" and "solo," whether in a real concerto or in an emulation of one for solo keyboard, might have seemed equally secondary, a mere local play of texture or sonority, not a fundamental "idea."

BWV 542, 903, and other works (p. 112, following the paragraph break, "used as a secondary fugue subject")

The remarkable chromatic modulations in these pieces are not mere caprices, introduced for their own sake; as remote as they are, they nevertheless are integrated into larger tonal designs. Just after launching into its recitative section, the Chromatic Fantasia moves jarringly from D or G minor toward B-flat minor (see ex. 7.3b). What follows is built over a bass line that descends slowly and irregularly in chromatic steps from G-flat (m. 50) through C-sharp (mm. 58–61) and A (m. 71) to D (m. 75); the chromatic descent is then repeated in quarter notes over a final tonic pedal point (mm. 75–79). The many remarkable details of this astonishing passage, which nineteenth-century commentators saw as prefiguring the music of their own century, could only have been products of many hours of testing chromatic and enharmonic modulations at the keyboard. Joined with expressive melodic figuration, this must have been the type of playing that had given Bach's Arnstadt listeners headaches but which (perhaps) was now appreciated at Weimar.

In BWV 542, the fantasia is an elaboration of the same binary form used in countless dances and other pieces of the period, although one would never guess it on first hearing. The first half begins by moving from tonic to dominant (mm. 9–13), and the second recapitulates that music a fifth lower (mm. 25–30). The underlying principle of transposed repetition was by now basic to Bach's way of composing. But into this essentially binary design he adds modulations that throw an enharmonic wrench into the gears of the tonal machine, sending it twice in unanticipated directions: first to B minor (m. 15), then to D-flat minor (m. 34). The latter is as far as one could

---

[177] Also marking BWV 1044 as much later than BWV 894 is the ascent of the harpsichord part to f‴ in mm. 5 and 38 of the slow movement. The note is otherwise unknown in keyboard music reliably attributed to Bach.

go from the tonic G minor—a tritone away—yet in just five or six more measures the music returns to the home key.

The fugues attached to the two organ toccatas (BWV 538 and 540) are of the *alla breve* type, written in large note values in imitation of sixteenth-century polyphony, which Bach and Walther were studying around this time. Stylistically, however, they have little in common with the music of Palestrina, their ostensive model—or with each other. Still, the notation signals the particular concern of both fugues with what has been called "demonstration counterpoint,"[178] that is, the systematic illustration of specific imitative devices. Writing such fugues meant avoiding the concerto style of other Weimar organ pieces, even in episodes, which are largely absent here. On the other hand, the prefatory toccatas more than make up for this in their concerto-style melodic writing.

As in other pieces, the presence of violinistic "ideas," even the alternation between passages in contrasting textures or sonorities—made explicit by Walther's organ registrations in his manuscript copy of the "Dorian" toccata—does not mean that either opening movement was designed as a ritornello form. Indeed, as in the opening movement of BWV 564 or the allegro sections of the *manualiter* toccatas, it is hard to assign the opening movement of BWV 538 to any standard textbook form, despite the presence of two recurring (recapitulated) passages and a clear tonal design. Measure 13 sounds like the end of a ritornello, followed by a solo episode—but subsequent transitions are less distinctly concerto-like. Instead of alternating between quasi-"tutti" and "solo" passages, the later sections of the piece build inexorably, gradually increasing the levels of sonority and virtuosity in a way that could not be achieved in the relatively short-winded concluding sections of earlier three-part preludes (like that of BWV 532).

The canons in the "Dorian" fugue are of two types: strettos based on the fugue subject, and canonic bridges or episodes connecting entries of the fugue subject. The strettos, heard at the beginning of all but the first of the five expositions, always involve imitation at the octave, at the distance of one measure (ex. 7.10a). The canonic bridges are also of varying types, although each incorporates a syncopated motive or suspension that is developed in sequence (ex. 7.10b).

Overlaying the "contrapuntal" design of this fugue is Bach's usual type of modulating plan or tonal design, as well as a regular alternation between passages with and without pedal, which re-enters each time with the subject in the tonic. The second of these pedal entries, preceded by a chromatic sequence and then a unique four-part *manualiter* canon, might be the climax of the piece. It occurs at m. 167, almost precisely three quarters of the way through. Yet it is the final pedal entrance at m. 204, after the second of only two non-canonic episodes, that is preceded by scales in contrary motion—a Bach fingerprint that the composer often used to set up a climatic subject entry near the end of a fugue.[179]

Hence, despite its focus on "demonstration counterpoint," Bach gave the "Dorian" fugue a dramatic or expressive structure audible even to listeners unaware of its special contrapuntal

---

[178] Williams (1980–84, 3:191–92 and 195).

[179] See Schulenberg (2008a).

agenda. Yet the canonic passages are remarkably dissonant, blatantly violating the usual rules of Baroque counterpoint. All are essentially elaborations of a diatonic sequence, progressions of seventh chords. The dissonances marked in example 7.10b could be explained as embellishments of the simpler voice leading shown in example 7.10c. But analysis along such lines is unknown in actual Baroque writings. Bach might have simply dismissed the irregularities as products of the "theatrical" treatment of dissonance—something that would not have been expected, however, in an ostensively strict, archaic keyboard fugue.[180]

Yet there is indeed something theatrical in this "demonstration counterpoint," which so ostentatiously exhibits both expressive dissonance and the récherché fugal devices of stretto and canon. Unlike the occasional parallel fifths and octaves tolerated elsewhere by Bach—which according to Forkel "offended every beginner in composition but afterwards soon justified themselves"[181]—these dissonances are deliberately grating, especially when heard on the *plenum* or *grand jeu* of a Baroque organ. Yet Bach evidently relished them, as we can too if we accept that this piece, like any number of post-1900 compositions, defines its own rules contextually. The dissonances are an integral part of the composition's design, and Bach does not shy away from them, especially not in the four-part canon near the end of the piece (mm. 211–17). This serves as a climax of the contrapuntal work—and of the piece's persistent cultivation of discord.

The 438 bars of the F-major toccata (BWV 540/1) are not quite as extraordinary as the number makes them seem, as they are brief measures of 3/8 time. But the toccata is still a massive piece between eight and ten minutes in length. Its antecedents include Vivaldi's D-minor "double" concerto (transcribed by Bach as BWV 596), with its opening prelude for soloists over a tonic pedal point. Other predecessors include any number of earlier organ toccatas, including the first movement of BWV 564, with its concerto-like main section preceded by the traditional improvisatory passages, including pedal solos. Bach also explored the possibility of organizing a large piece around recurring pedal points in the fugue BWV 944/2. The latter, probably somewhat earlier than the toccata of BWV 540, also incorporates an unusual modulating episode that recurs as a sort of climax, an idea that receives its apotheosis here.

Hence Bach did not dream up the F-major toccata out of thin air. Yet the meter, plan, and overall integration of the movement were unprecedented in a keyboard toccata, and the shattering conclusion surpasses even the climactic build-ups in Bach's other grand preludes and fugues. Like the Chromatic Fantasia and the first movement of the C-major toccata, it comprises two sections, but the first, preludial, section alone is enormous, comprising 176 measures. This is nevertheless only 40% of the toccata as a whole, and it is integrated with the ensuing "concerto" section, which draws on common material for one recurring passage.[182] Near the end (m. 394),

---

[180] Nothing resembling these passages from BWV 538 can be found in the many examples of irregular voice leading shown by Heinichen in part 2 of his huge 1728 treatise (chapter 1,"Von theatralischen Resolutionibus der Dissonantien," comprises pp. 585–724).

[181] Forkel (1802, 27; trans. in NBR, 444).

[182] The passage at m. 219, which recurs in different keys at mm. 271 and 333, employs the same motive as the opening of the "prelude," serving somewhat like a ritornello.

the main concerto-like section recapitulates the idea of a pedal point, although not the actual musical substance of the two pedal point passages from the "prelude." Indeed, the exact point of division between the "prelude" and "concerto" sections is not entirely clear, and within the latter there are no distinct, contrasting "ritornellos" and "episodes." There are, however, several easily recognized passages that recur, usually in the same order, so that the "concerto" can be described as comprising four roughly parallel sections. These articulate the type of tonal design familiar from other pieces. Because the opening "prelude" has already modulated to the dominant, these can begin in C (m. 176), proceeding to A minor (m. 271), G minor (m. 333), and B-flat (m. 382). Each section modulates further, the last naturally returning to the tonic.

Merely enumerating these key changes sounds dry; what makes them remarkable is how Bach accomplishes them, above all through the use of the BACH motive. Each appearance of the latter in BWV 540 is the product of an unusual sort of deceptive cadence, as in example S7.11—"one of the most startling . . . even in J. S. Bach's peerless repertory" of such passages.[183]Every recurrence of the idea seems to throw us suddenly into a remote tonal realm, although there is always a coherent connection between the jarring harmonies. Bach would have understood the latter in terms of the smooth if chromatic voice leading. Today we might analyze the "B" chord in example S7.11a as an enharmonic pivot, functioning as both V of flat II and as an altered subdominant of D minor: the same German sixth (in root position) that had fascinated Bach since the very early fantasias BWV 922 and 1121 (ex. S7.12). Far from being an isolated unicum, this vast movement ties together strands common to much of Bach's work from the earliest time onward.

After this the fugue comes as something of an afterthought—but a suitably massive one. The design, in which two subjects are introduced separately, then combined, goes back to the seventeenth century. Bach would have seen things like it in keyboard publications by Scheidt and Krieger. It occurs as well in a fugue by Peter Heidorn (probably a pupil of Reinken) that Christoph Bach copied into the Möller Manuscript.[184]Sebastian followed the same plan in the "Legrenzi" fugue as well as the A-minor fugue BWV 904/2. Neither of those, however, was in *alla breve* style, and although the second subject of BWV 904/2 is chromatic, here chromaticism is present from the opening (ex. S7.13).

Another departure from those earlier double fugues is that now the second subject is the lively, even dance-like, one. It has something in common with the bourrée of the lute suite BWV 996 (perhaps a roughly contemporary Weimar composition). In a further distinction from Bach's earlier double fugues, this one integrates the contrapuntal structure with a tonal design. The first section, introducing the chromatic subject, cadences in the dominant; the second section, with the "bourrée" subject, opens in the relative minor; and the final section, combining the two themes, of course ends in the tonic. In such a fugue there is no question of reverting to toccata style for the concluding passage. Instead the piece ends with a final combination of the two subjects, the more serious main theme appearing in the pedals. Bach would end many subsequent fugues in a

[183] Williams (2003, 76).

[184] Edited by Hill (1991, 104–111).

similar manner, drawing attention to a final contrapuntal combination; here it is a relatively understated way of ending one of Bach's literally greatest works.

The *Orgelbüchlein, the "18," and other keyboard chorales* (p. 114, following the first paragraph break, "the latest Italian concertos and trio sonatas")

That a church organist might need written chorale settings was not a given. Most of the melodies had probably been memorized from days as a choirboy, and basic keyboard training must have included learning to improvise chorale arrangements of various types and lengths. But surely the organist at a court such as Weimar's needed a collection of hymn tunes for reference; most printed hymn books gave only texts, not melodies. No straightforward book of chorale melodies owned by Bach survives, with or without simple harmonizations.[185] But the writing of hymns had been a concern of German Protestant musicians since the Reformation, when Luther himself is thought to have produced poems for thirty-six chorales. Thirty of these were to have been included in the *Orgelbüchlein*.

A new hymnbook was published at Weimar in 1713, a year that also saw a re-issue of an older volume. Yet although Bach surely had to be thoroughly conversant with the contents of both—if he had not had a hand in their production—the ordering of the hymn tunes in the *Orgelbüchlein* does not correspond precisely with that of the Weimar books.[186] This has led to speculation that the *Orgelbüchlein* might have been intended for use elsewhere, even for Bach's audition at Halle in 1713.[187] More likely, Bach intended it, as the title page implies, for teaching—not least for self-instruction, at least in its early stages, when he was probably still working out the various types of composition found in the book. Hence work on the pieces was not necessarily broken off when, or because, Bach was promoted to Concertmaster.

Other composers had written collections of keyboard chorales, but none is so focused on providing so broad a variety of forms and textures within so specific a format. Each setting is short and almost continuously in four parts, without passages in reduced texture, also without the introductions or ritornello-like passages of many larger settings. Use of the pedals, required in every piece, is cultivated with the same intensity and variety as compositional devices such as canon, yet without calling attention to itself through pedal solos or pedal passagework. Rather the pedal work is integrated into the texture as just another contrapuntal line (an idea that might have seemed revolutionary to some eighteenth-century players). These features make the *Orgelbüchein* both refined and perpetually surprising, in ways that many earlier chorale settings are not: refined in that not a single note seems inessential, nor do voices enter or drop out; surprising in the unexpected ways Bach finds to lead voices through passing dissonances and

---

[185] Leaver (2016, 31) argues that a manuscript collection of chorales now in Rochester, N.Y., "looks very much like an anthology either made by or for an organ pupil at the beginning of his studies with Bach," representing a type of collection of melodies with simple accompaniments that Bach and other organists kept.

[186] As Wolff (2000, 127) notes.

[187] Further discussion in Williams (2016, 150–55).

other details of the counterpoint. Neither here nor in the "Eighteen," however, does one find the types of surprises cultivated in the earlier pieces of the "Neumeister" manuscript, whose sometimes startling juxtapositions of style and affect are dramatic yet, by comparison to these pieces, unrefined.

As in most of Bach's collections, the pieces making up both the *Orgelbüchlein* and the "Eighteen" are more varied than a superficial examination might suggest. Nevertheless, within both sets one can identify recurring types, which can also be found in other pieces that were never incorporated into one of these "official" collections. Attempts have been made to arrange all these pieces into chronological sequences, but, as with the praeludia, such efforts are based primarily on subjective style analysis. The similar project of identifying or categorizing the types of settings in each collection likewise tends toward arbitrariness, for one of Bach's aims in both sets must have been to combine elements that had separate origins. Even the basic division between "preludes" and longer settings is blurred by at least one relatively lengthy, fantasia-like piece within the *Orgelbüchlein* (BWV 615). Yet it remains helpful to label at least some of the types of pieces within both sets, for here, as with the "prelude and fugue," Bach was creating new sub-genres while ostensibly working within established traditions.

A list of the types of keyboard chorale setting left by Bach, here and elsewhere, might look somewhat like the following:

- plain two- and four-part harmonizations
- the same with interposed flourishes or cadenzas
- four-part chorale motets (line-by-line contrapuntal settings)
- chorale fughettas (fugues whose subject is the opening phrase of a chorale)
- canons
- "monodic" settings (usually a decorated melody with simpler accompaniment)
- settings of the so-called *"Orgelbüchlein"* type
- chorale trios
- chorale fantasias, with and without ritornellos
- others: bicinia, echo fantasias, etc.

Most of these categories could be subdivided, and frequently a single piece contains features of two or more types. Most of these types also occur in works by other composers, and Bach must have conceived many chorale settings within categories established by older musicians such as Pachelbel. Doubtless he also knew more recent settings, such as the purposely simple ones published in 1709 and 1713 by the Leipzig organist Daniel Vetter, as well as efforts by Walther to compose more sophisticated types. But even the most elaborate or ambitious of these compositions pale beside Bach's.

Some of the varieties listed above, including canons and fantasias, occur among the pieces already considered in chapters 3 and 5. Efforts have been made to identify early examples or prototypes of others, including what has been called a special *"Orgelbüchlein"* variety of chorale prelude. In this type—which is rare outside this collection—Bach sets out the complete chorale tune in the upper part, without introduction or interludes and with little or no melodic embellishment. The three lower voices accompany with livelier counterpoint—usually imitative and rigorously developing one or two distinctive motives. Two pieces from the *Orgelbüchlein* were also copied into the Neumeister manuscript, and one of these is a perfect example of the

special type found in roughly half the pieces of the later collection (ex. S7.14). BWV 601, however, was a late entry in the Neumeister copy, and prototypes for the "*Orgelbüchlein*" settings cannot be easily found among the earlier pieces preserved by Neumeister and elsewhere.[188]

Bach must have invented this type of setting during the early Weimar years, as much for his own improvement as for any other use. It permitted great variety, depending on the nature of the counterpoint added to the melody, but its fundamental principle is that the hymn tune remains preeminent; such a piece really could be used as a prelude to remind the congregation of how the melody went. Often, as in BWV 601, the counterpoint appears to be abstract, devoid of "meaning" except inasmuch as it might represent the general emotional character of the chorale. In this case, the lively leaping motive present in the lower voices from the first beat onwards was appropriate for a hymn of rejoicing. One of Bach's pupils later claimed to have been taught to play hymns "according to the feeling *(Affect)* of their words."[189]Although vague as to its exact sense, the phrase probably echoes something that Bach took for granted in creating the *Orgelbüchlein*. Another manifestation of this doctrine occurs famously in the setting of "Durch Adams Fall," also of the *"Orgelbüchlein"* type. Here, instead of imitating one another, each of the lower voices develops a distinct motive, the alto moving chromatically and the bass leaping through large descending dissonant intervals. Both represent the idea (expressed in the text of the chorale) that, thanks to original sin (*Adams Fall*), "all is corrupted" (*ist ganz verderbt*) (ex. S7.15).
Almost as prominent as this type of setting, at least within the *de tempore* section of the collection, are nine canons. These maintain—in more rigorous and more accomplished ways—the fascination with strict imitation that was already evident in Bach's earliest keyboard chorales. Bach continues to allow small deviations from strict canon where necessary to allow two parts to proceed in close imitation. But now he finds ingenious ways to maintain stricter canon between two voices, often while the two others develop a characteristic motive in the manner of the *"Orgelbüchlein"*-type settings.

Thus in example S7.16 the first phrase of the melody is presented in exact canon between the outer voices, whereas the third phrase incorporates a small rhythmic adjustment in the bass (pedals). The bass in the *Orgelbüchlein* is not always played by the feet; the pedals can also have a tenor or alto line, as in BWV 618 ("O Lamm Gottes"), with its expressive "sigh" motives in the non-canonic parts (ex. S7.17a). Soprano and tenor—the latter in the pedals—are the canonic voices in the Christmas chorale BWV 608 (In dulci jubilo), famous for the rhythmic conundrum

---

[188] The other piece shared with the *Orgelbüchlein*, BWV 639, is a unique example within the latter collection of a trio for two keyboards and pedal. Wolff (1991, 9) describes these two pieces in the Neumeister collection, near the end of the manuscript, as constituting "a later appendix."

[189] Johann Gotthilf Ziegler wrote thus in his application for the job of organist at the Halle Market Church, which went to W. F. Bach (BD 2:423 [no. 423]; NBR, 336 [no. 340]). Ziegler used the word *Lieder* ("songs") for chorales, a reminder that the latter were understood as much as literature as music and were a concern of poets as well as composers.

of its triplet notation (ex. 7.17b).[190] But here the alto and bass parts are also canonic, and, given the lively character of this setting, one could hardly imagine a piece of music more different from BWV 618.

None of the eight original canonic pieces repeats the same configuration of imitative voices. In BWV 632 ("Herr Jesu Christ, dich zu uns wend"), as in BWV 629, the bass (played on the pedals) follows the soprano. BWV 632, however, is the one example in the book of rhythmically free canon, the tune in the soprano being presented mainly in quarters, the bass imitating in eighths.[191]The much stricter BWV 629 (see ex. S7.16) is one of nine settings, three of them canonic, in which Bach calls for the use of two separate manuals, as also in BWV 624 ("Hilf Gott, dass mir's gelinge," ex. S7.18). In the latter, distinct registrations for the two hands help bring out the lively left-hand line against the two-part canon played by the right hand.

The use of two manuals is essential in BWV 624, as the left hand ranges freely above and below the more sustained notes of the chorale melody. This, incidentally, makes transcription onto three staves the only practical way of presenting the music in a modern edition. The same was already true of the early chorale fantasia BWV 1128 (see ex. S5.9), whose double-manual writing was a precursor of this piece. But Bach used this type of notation only for various types of organ trios.[192] As ingenious as BWV 624 is, how it reflects the *Affect* of the underlying passion chorale is far from clear. It is not the only piece in Bach's collections of organ chorales that could be described as "rather remote, subdued, strange even."[193] Those characteristics arise in this case in part because the setting contains not a single cadence of any conventional type.

Five of the six other settings that Bach marked as being "for two keyboards and pedals" (*a 2 Clav. e Pedale*) are of a type that has been called "monodic." In these the chorale melody, played alone by the right hand, is accompanied by subsidiary parts on both a second manual and the pedals.[194]Such a setting had clear antecedents in organ chorales by Buxtehude. Often the melody is embellished with Italian-style figuration, as in the latter's setting of "Nun bitten wir den heiligen Geist" (ex. S7.19a). Bach, however, sometimes left the melody plain, as in a little

---

[190] Most likely Bach meant the notation to be interpreted literally, for otherwise he would not have written precise triplet quarters in mm. 25–26, etc. Organists tend to play the piece too fast for the cross-meters to be heard distinctly.

[191] Another soprano-bass canon occurs in BWV 620 ("Christus, der uns selig macht"). This, however, is the piece that Bach added around 1740, lightly revising a previous version (BWV 620a) that was not necessarily much earlier.

[192] In the autograph manuscript of BWV 624 (P 283), Bach notated the bass part in the form of tablature symbols beneath the lower stave (for the left hand).

[193] Williams (2003, 284).

[194] The term comes from Breig (1990, 260–61). A sixth piece for three keyboards, BWV 639 ("Ich ruf' zu dir"), might also be considered "monodic," but it is for just three voices, the left hand providing a single subsidiary part.

chorale setting not included in the *Orgelbüchlein*, the simple-looking BWV 721 ("Erbarm' dich mein," ex. 7.19b). Here the accompaniment alludes to *tremolo* strings, as also in the setting of the related chorale "Aus teifer Not" from one of Kuhnau's Biblical Sonatas (ex. S7.20). The melody remains plain in two other independent chorale settings, BWV 727 ("Herzlich tut mich verlangen") and 731 ("Liebster Jesu, wir sind hier")—not so, however, in BWV 709 ("Herr Jesu Christ, dich zu uns wend'"), which might have been a prototype for the decorated examples in the *Orgelbüchlein*. BWV 709 might, however, have been composed somewhat later than the examples in the *Orgelbüchlein*, which it exceeds slightly in its level of elaboration (ex. S7.21).[195]

As in "monodic" settings by Buxtehude, Bach's decoration of the melodies owed something to French models. But on the whole the embellishment is in the same Italian style that Bach adopted for expressive slow movements and arias in his ensemble works. Applying this style to a chorale melody would have been part of a larger project of attaching elements of current Italian style to chorales and to Lutheran sacred music generally. In principle, such Italianate embellishment could be improvised. But with Bach even improvisatory figuration gains *motivicity* as it is incorporated into an imitative texture. In the New Year's chorale BWV 614, the chromatic counterpoint of the opening passage later migrates into the top part. There it becomes part of the almost weirdly expressive embellishment of the chorale melody (ex. S7.22).

Even within the embellished Amsterdam edition of Corelli's op. 5, recapitulated passages are repeated with the same embellishments—something unlikely to have occured in a real improvisation. Bach similarly incorporates written-out embellishment into the formal scheme of BWV 730 ("Liebster Jesu, wir sind hier"). This is another monodic setting presumed to predate the *Orgelbüchlein*. It is in Bar form, reflecting the AAB form of its chorale melody, and both statements of the A section bear the same melodic embellishment. The same is true of three *manualiter* chorale settings of this type that Bach included in the later music books for Wilhelm Friedemann and Anna Magdalena.[196] Presumably these were meant for teaching Italian melodic embellishment within the context of a pious hymn. But the monodic settings within the *Orgelbüchlein* are through-composed—even BWV 622 ("O Mensch, bewein), which is in Bar form. In this respect, they maintain the pretense of improvisation, and the best known of these settings, BWV 641 (see ex. S7.21b), probably originated through the addition of embellishments to a much plainer, lost setting.

Elaborated instead as a chorale motet, the same melody became the basis of what was once regarded as Bach's last keyboard chorale, BWV 668. A late, possibly posthumous, addition to the manuscript containing the "Eighteen," BWV 668 may incorporate some late corrections or revisions by Bach. But it must otherwise be an early work, close in style to the seventeenth-century models of the genre. Most of the other pieces in the "Great Eighteen" represent the same basic principle of elaborating a chorale melody line by line, but they leave the vocal style and thus the fundamental idea of the organ "motet" far behind. Indeed, the essential compositional idea of the collection—to which BWV 668 probably does not really belong—is the integration of

---

[195] The earliest source for BWV 709 appears to be Leipzig, Musikbibliothek, Ms. III.8.10, a copy in an unidentified hand made in the 1740s, later owned by Bach's pupil Oley.

[196] BWV 691, 728, and 753 (a fragment; see Schulenberg 2006, 168–69).

the German Protestant chorale with elements from the new Italian types of instrumental music. Whether or not the first fifteen pieces form a "perfected" collection comprising exactly 1200 measures—perhaps even one tracing a "theological progression" of some sort[197]—their order follows no discernible principle of style, form, key, or chronology (either by date of composition or place in the church year). The last four pieces, including the final one copied by Bach (BWV 665), seem particularly miscellaneous, stylistically. And although Bach probably carried out at least minor revisions in all eighteen pieces, only the first three underwent substantive rewriting at Leipzig. Among these the most radical change, the addition of 58 measures to the first piece, consisted in large part of a written-out repeat.[198] Thus even in its final form the collection can be considered in essence a Weimar work.

All this suggests that within his first few years at Weimar Bach had rejected the type of chorale fantasia written by Reinken and Buxtehude for performance on large north-German instruments. In these pieces each line of the melody is worked out at length, often with virtuoso figuration on divided or echoing manuals. Such music must have seemed too discursive or rambling by comparison with the vocal compositions that were now being heard in the chapel, not to mention the instrumental ones that Telemann, if not yet Bach, was writing for the chamber. Perhaps the last of Bach's chorale fantasias of the older sort was BWV 718 ("Christ lag in Todesbanden"), an impressive *manualiter* composition perhaps originally conceived as the climax of a series of variations, such as the chorale "partita" BWV 768. Two variations in the latter nevertheless contain suggestions of ritornello form, as does the first part of BWV 718, hence pointing, perhaps, toward some of Bach's later chorale compositions.[199]

The more integrated type of chorale fantasia included in the "Eighteen" was glimpsed in another *manualiter* setting of the same Easter hymn, BWV 695, and was subsequently achieved in at least four other pieces that must have been written around the same time as the bulk of the "Eighteen": BWV 694, 734, 735a, and 736.[200] The first two of these are trios, the "free" voices providing lively introductions and interludes to the statements of the chorale phrases. The other two, both based on "Valet will ich dir geben," share the same quasi-ritornello design but otherwise are utterly distinct. As in the "Eighteen," the "ritornellos" are imitative workings-out of motives from the chorale. Thus the two pieces combine the contrapuntal element of the chorale motet with the liveliness of a quick concerto movement. Both settings might well have

---

197

As argued by Tatlow (2015, 280–82), whose bar count does not include repeated measures.

198 The early version, BWV 651a, lacks mm. 43b–86a and 89–103, but of these mm. 55–86a merely repeat mm. 12–43a, leaving only 25-1/2 measures of new material. Even some of this recapitulates previously heard music: mm. 25–27 are repeated a fourth lower at m. 48 and are also the basis of the new mm. 98–99.

199 These are variations 1 and 10 as given in modern editions, which follow late manuscript copies; a few early sources give only some of the variations, in differing orders.

200 BWV 735, printed as the main version in the old *Bachgesamtausgabe*, is now thought to be a nineteenth-century arrangement of the original BWV 735a.

been included in the "Eighteen" as *alio modo* (alternative) settings of the same melody; five other chorales included in the set receive multiple settings. The absence of these last two pieces from the collection might have been due to any number of factors: the irrelevance of their hymn text to the postulated theological program of the latter; difficulties that Bach encountered in fitting their 111 measures into a satisfactory numerical scheme; or "details in common" between BWV 665 and BWV 735 that would have made the latter superfluous, musically.[201]

Although a few of the "Eighteen" are fairly austere or archaic in style, most reflect the same impulses that gave rise to the new type of sacred cantata. This incorporated what Neumeister called *galant* writing, that is, words as well as music that would have been perceived at the time as both fashionable and expressive. One reason for incorporating the new sonata and concerto style into organ chorales might have been that Bach, until promoted to Concertmaster, had few opportunites to write this type of instrumental music for the *Capelle*. Ever since Bach's time, organists and their audiences have been accustomed to hearing chorale melodies interspersed with Vivaldian ritornellos and with embellishments in the style of Corelli's decorated sonatas, just as they are used to hearing recitatives and arias in sacred vocal music. But around 1712 it would have been a novelty to hear similar sequential passagework in a concerto and in a setting of an Advent chorale, as in BWV 660. Bach could obtain experience in the new style (and, presumably, applause) by incorporating it into both types of composition.

Certain parallels between these pieces and Bach's actual concertos raise the question of which came first. For instance, the chorale trio BWV 655 uses the same motive and much the same sequential patterns as passages in the Third Brandenburg Concerto, which is in the same key (exx. S7.23 and S7.24).[202]Surely Bach did not need to have written concertos and sonatas before incorporating their style into chorale compositions. But although the final version of the Brandenburg Concertos is from Bach's Cöthen years, individual works from that set could well have originated at Weimar. The third concerto seems particularly early, not only on account of its strings-only scoring but also because its first movement, although opening with what seems like a normal ritornello, thenceforth proceeds very differently from any "textbook" ritornello form. At the beginning of its final section, moreover, it unexpectedly turns into a sort of double fugue. This is entirely different from, and yet in a certain way similar to, the introduction of a cantus firmus in the final section of BWV 655. Both pieces contain a type of compositional surprise that might have occurred to a youthful genius during a period of intense concentration on new types of sacred and secular music (exx. S7.25 and S7.26).

The most old-fashioned of the "Eighteen" and the last of those copied by Bach is BWV 665. It is nevertheless far more up-to-date than the really austere chorale motet BWV 668. It introduces lively countermelodies and develops each of the hymn's four phrases not only through the

---

[201] Williams (2003, 479) mentions the similarity of the opening of BWV 665 to mm. 29ff. of BWV 735.

[202] The form of the motive shown in ex. S7.23a is, however, derived from a chorale melody. Also reminiscent of the Third Brandenburg is the duet no. 5 from BWV 63 ("Ruft und fleht"), in the same key and using the same three-part parallel motion in the strings, implying an origin during the same period for all three works.

traditional "pre-imitation," but with additional imitative entries after each has appeared in the pedals. BWV 665 is also one of two movements from the collection in which the sudden addition of chromatic counterpoint creates a rupture, a dramatic break in what might otherwise seem a merely dutiful setting out of the chorale melody. This occurs with the introduction of a chromatic motive as a countersubject against phrase 3 of the chorale melody, marking the exact midpoint of the piece (ex. S7.27a). Subsequentlly, not only chromaticism but also rhythmic motion builds to levels unimaginable in the quiet first half. The other such moment occurs near the end of BWV 656, a set of three variations on "O Lamm Gottes unschuldig" (ex. S7.27b). Here the meter and the *Affect* change for the penultimate line of the melody, producing a stunning moment plausibly associated with the line "otherwise we should have despaired" in the chorale text.[203] This does not last for long, however, and diatonic music returns at m. 107, concluding the piece with an apparent reference to the final phrase of the chorale, "Give us your peace, Jesus" ("Gib uns dein' Frieden, O Jesu").

The motet form of BWV 665, the variation form of BWV 656, and the dramatic moments in both are unusual within the "Eighteen" as a whole. Elsewhere Bach draws on current Italian style to create more integrated compositions, especially through the use of recurring passages (or at least recurring motives) reminiscent of those in Venetian ritornello forms. Only rarely is there an actual ritornello, in the sense of an introduction that recurs verbatim. But typically each phrase of the chorale melody is stated in long notes by one of the four parts, preceded and then accompanied by more lively music in the other voices. The analogy to a concerto movement or aria is underlined by the fact that the chorale melody or cantus firmus is usually embellished to some degree, just as a singer or solo violinist of the time might have embellished the music of a solo episode.

This does not mean that all these pieces sound like solo concertos by Vivaldi or Albinoni. The analogy to Italian style or form is often more subtle than that. Two of the most popular of these pieces, the gentle BWV 653 ("An Wasserflüssen Babylon") and BWV 654 ("Schmücke dich, o liebe Seele"), resemble a concerto movement only insofar as their interludes allude subtly to the opening introduction, making only the briefest of actual recapitulations (ex. S7.28).[204]The setting of "Komm, heiliger Geist" that opens the collection (BWV 651) has the constant motion in sixteenths that was once thought of as a "motoric" rhythm typical of Venetian concerto allegros. But although the figuration does have something in common with a Vivaldian violin solo, its initial presentation over a tonic pedal point is reminiscent of older German toccatas (cf. BWV 540, in the same key). In addition, the theme heard in the first measure is treated more like the subject of a fugue or invention than a ritornello (ex. S7.29). With its broken-chord texture, this piece also has something in common with the French tradition of harpsichord preludes and would find an echo in the C-major prelude that opens part 2 of the Well-Tempered Clavier.

---

[203] As argued by Williams (2003, 357), referring to line 6 of stanza 1, "sonst müssen wir verzagen." The passage in ex. 7.27a might similarly be associated with the text line "durch das bitter Leiden sein" (through his bitter suffering).

[204] The first three bars of BWV 654 recur at m. 82, just before the statement of the final phrasae of the chorale melody (shown in ex. 7.28).

The closest approach to an actual concerto movement perhaps takes place in BWV 661, the second of three settings of "Nun komm' der Heiden Heiland." This piece is a trio, scored imaginatively with the decorated chorale melody in the top voice, accompanied by two bass parts. One of the latter is played on the pedals, the other by the left hand (ex. S7.30a). The opening bass duo, using a subject derived from phrase 1 of the chorale, recurs multiple times, like a ritornello. But what would have defined this piece as being in concerto style for Bach and his contemporaries is probably the subsequent sequence, whose passagework in sixteenths over a "walking" bass line in eighths could have come straight out of an actual ensemble piece for strings (ex. S7.30b). This too is recapitulated, sometimes with the parts exchanged (ex. S7.30c).

The use of invertible counterpoint in recurring passages would be more characteristic of the solo episodes than the ritornellos of a concerto movement. Evidently, however, Bach here, as in the "Dorian" toccata, was focused more on "ideas" than on form as delineated in a modern textbook. Similar writing, imitating solo violins rather than cellos, makes up much of BWV 663 ("Allein Gott in der Höh' sei Ehr'"). Yet the most whole-hearted adoption of Italian style surely takes place in the two trios, BWV 655 and BWV 664 ("Allein Gott in der Höh' sei Ehr'"). Each nevertheless concludes with several phrases of the chorale melody played in the pedals, while the upper parts continue in trio-sonata style (see ex. 7.25).

That these exuberant Italianate pieces express affects uniquely associated with their underlying chorales might be doubted, as the alternate settings of certain melodies differ greatly in character. Of the original "15," two are settings of "Komm, heiliger Geist" (BWV 651–52), and there are three settings each of the Advent chorale "Nun komm' der Heiden Heiland" (BWV 659–61) and the Lutheran Gloria, "Allein Gott in der Höh' sei Ehr'" (BWV 662–64). The first setting of "Nun komm'" is meditative, combining the austere imitative manner of a chorale motet with the embellished melody of a "monodic" setting (ex. S7.31). The third setting of the same hymn is a lively example of "demonstration counterpoint," superimposed over entries of the chorale tune in long notes. The three upper voices work out a subject in eighth notes, then introduce the inversion (m. 45), and ultimately combine the two forms of the subject in stretto over the last phrase of the hymn (ex. S7.32a). The harsh character of the subject makes this piece the equivalent among the chorale settings of the "Dorian" fugue, with its dissonant strettos. Butdespite its rigorous counterpoint, even this piece reveals its affinity to the Italian concerto in a sequential episode. This, however, is developed in the same manner as the subject, recurring in a free inversion (exx. S7.32b–c).

Whether such artifices are as expressive as their technique is learned might be doubted, if judged by the type of performance common today, which is often labored and made ponderous by the use of large, heavily registered instruments. The organ in the Weimar chapel was relatively small, and despite their monumental proportions these pieces—even BWV 651, marked by Bach "for full organ" (*in organo pleno*)—may be best served by relatively light registrations. Obviously conceived as grand monuments, they can nevertheless be played in a way that focuses on agility and elegance, like the Italian-style music that seems to have inspired them.

A Kyrie, a cantata, and other Weimar vocal works (p. 123, following the end of the printed page, "visiting from Eisenach with music in hand")

Only a few of Bach's Weimar works fail to employ the new style, whether because they are early or because they are deliberately archaic. Both reasons may apply to the Kyrie in F (BWV 233a), which has been connected to Bach's study of the music of a much older Italian composer: Palestrina.[205] Conceivably it was written for the Weimar chapel, where the Sunday service included a setting of the Kyrie eleison ("Lord have mercy"). Later incorporated into the F-major Mass (BWV 233), it is a contrapuntal tour de force, combining a three-voice setting of the liturgical text with a chorale cantus firmus—the German Agnus Dei—in the top part. There is a second cantus firmus as well: a chant-like melody for the Lutheran litany (ex. S7.33).[206] Despite the allusions to Gregorian chant and (pseudo)-Renaissance style, such a design has nothing to do with Palestrina. Rather the work is, to some degree, a vocal equivalent of the chorale fantasia BWV 661. Both are "demonstration counterpoint," the present work inverting the main fugue subject in the Christe section, then combining both forms of the subject in the second Kyrie.

[205] Melamed (2012) shows that at Weimar Bach knew a variety of works by Palestrina, some of them possibly obtained from Weissenfels through Krieger and shared with Walther. Whether BWV 233a can be as early as 1708–10 (as suggested by Rathey 2006, 74, "on stylistic grounds") depends on whether Bach at the very beginning of his Weimar period was prepared to write something so systematically contrapuntal and also so different from every earlier known composition of his.

[206] Leaver (1993, 170) suggests that the associations of the two cantus firmi would have made the work appropriate for performance on Estomihi (the last Sunday before Lent). There is no evidence for his further suggestion that BWV 233a was originally the first movement of a lost cantata.

Another less certain case is that of the motet *Ich lasse dich nicht*, whose authorship has been disputed since its first publication in the nineteenth century.[207] Motets, in the German Lutheran tradition, were sacred polyphonic works without independent instrumental parts (other than the continuo). Many were, like *Ich lasse dich nicht*, for eight voices divided into two equal choirs. The texts might be drawn from the bible, chorales, or newly written poetry, but they avoided the fashionable elements of Italian recitative and aria. Direct and expressive musically where BWV 233a is abstract and contrapuntal, *Ich lasse dich nicht* sets an unusually brief text from the Hebrew Bible. Lutherans usually associated this verse with funerals, although it seems to have had special meaning for Duke Wilhelm Ernst. The obsessive musical rhetoric of Bach's setting arises through the echoing of the short phrases of the text between the two four-voice choirs. Whether or not Bach composed it, he might have led one or more performances in services marking Wilhelm Ernst's birthday.[208]

The ruler's birthday was certainly the occasion for another Weimar work by Bach. Many birthday poems for the ruling duke survive in Franck's 1711 and 1716 volumes of poetry.[209]Bach's only surviving composition written for such an event is an aria for the duke's birthday in 1713. Completely unsuspected before its discovery in 2005, BWV 1127 is an expanded version of the strophic songs that were a staple of earlier German Baroque composers. Typically for voice and continuo alone, such arias often included optional ritornellos for strings, played between the vocal stanzas. Here the ritornello is integrated with the vocal portion of the aria, following it without a break. Both employ the same basic motive, which Bach uses to set the opening line of the poem, also the duke's personal motto: "Alles mit Gott und nichts ohn' ihn" (everything with God, nothing without him). The vocal and instrumental portions of the aria are nevertheless each self-sufficient, the vocal section incorporating its own ritornello for continuo alone. This, in its first statement, comprises exactly fifty-two notes, representing the duke's age (ex. S7.34).[210]

Comprising no fewer than twelve long stanzas, the piece would have taken perhaps half an hour to perform in full—a potentially tedious act of homage, for the lively lines for soprano, four strings, and continuo leave little room for extemporaneous variation or embellishment.[211] Like a

---

[207] Hence the work's inclusion only in the BWV appendix as Anh. 159. Stylistic arguments for Bach's authorship (Melamed 1988 and Melamed 1995, 45–59) do not entirely dispel doubts raised by the absence of an original attribution in Bach's partially autograph manuscript score.

[208] Koch (2006, 60–61) shows that the text of the work (from Gen. 32:26) was invoked repeatedly in a sermon by the court preacher Klessen for the dedication of the new Weimar church of St. Jacob in November 1713. By then Bach had probably already had the score of the motet copied by his pupil Kräuter, who left that fall sometime between September 3 and December 9 (see Melamed 1988, 504n. 32).

[209] *Geist- und Weltliche Poesien*, 2 vols. (Jena: Bielcke, 1711–16).

[210] As pointed out by Maul (2005, vi).

[211] Bach's tempo mark *adagio* at the outset is inexplicable except as a warning to the continuo not to perform the initial passage too quickly.

litany, every stanza opens and closes with the same line (the duke's motto), which is thus repeated at beginning and end of each vocal section. This verse therefore resembles the type of single-line reprise that was common in early da capo arias and still found in some of Franck's cantata texts. Although comparable arias might have been heard at Weimar in the operas of the 1690s, more recent models could have been found in a volume by Philipp Heinrich Erlebach published just three years earlier.[212] Perhaps drawn from Erlebach's lost operas, these were stylistically intermediate between the folk-like strophic lieder of earlier German composers and the full-fledged virtuoso arias of Italianate opera. The fact that Bach is not known to have composed anything else even vaguely similar suggests that such music had little appeal for him. Nevertheless BWV 1127 shows how deliberately Bach invested even a simple German song with some of the counterpoint and virtuosity of his version of the new Italian style.

When Bach wrote BWV 1127, the primary meaning of the word *aria*, at least in Germany, may still have been a strophic song.[213] But earlier in 1713 Bach had demonstrated his adoption of not only a newer type of aria but the entire stylistic vocabulary of current Italian opera. This took place in the Hunt Cantata (BWV 208), a German example of the serenata: a quasi-dramatic work resembling a small opera in both its poetry and its music, typically commissioned for an aristocratic celebration of some sort. The 1716 volume containing Franck's birthday verses for the duke also includes the text for a birthday celebration for Duke Christian of Weissenfels. Bach's setting has been plausibly connected with his visit to that duke's territory in February 1713. It was repeated, with appropriate small changes in its libretto, to honor Ernst August of Weimar three years later.[214] Further works of this type would follow at Cöthen and Leipzig. These are often described as "secular cantatas," but for Bach and his contemporaries they were a type of musical drama (*dramma per musica*), even though the characters are allegorical and there is negligible plot or action.

Two of the four singers in the Hunt Cantata represent Diana (soprano), goddess of the moon and of the hunt, and her devoted Endymion (tenor); they would later be subjects of a serenata by Bach's youngest son Johann Christian.[215] The present work, however, barely alludes to their relationship before the god Pan (bass) and the pastoral goddess Pales (second soprano) arrive to sing the praises of the duke. Franck's text comprises fifteen movements, chiefly alternating between recitatives and arias; the two choruses (nos. 11 and 15) would have been sung by the soloists as an ensemble, like the occasional choruses in Italian opera of the period. The work as

---

[212] In the strophic arias "Nicht Jedermann ist es gegeben, der Liebe stets zuwider streben" and "Was einmal geschehen, mag immerhin gehen," nos. 23 and 24 from *Harmonische Freude musicalischer Freunde*, vol. 2 (Nuremberg, 1710).

[213] Hence Mattheson's (1713, 183–84) old-fashioned definition of the term.

[214] Franck's printed text makes no mention of the work's re-use to honor the junior Weimar duke. The dating of the latter version (known as BWV 208a) is based on the documented visit of two horn players from Weissenfels in April 1716.

[215] Christian's *Endimione*, based on a libretto by Metastasio, was premiered at London in 1772.

we have it opens with a simple recitative for Diana, but this might have been preceded by a sinfonia that became the opening movement of the First Brandenburg Concerto.[216]

Despite some unevenness in the arias, Bach's music is generally fresh and assured, perhaps surprisingly so if this was indeed his first effort in an exacting genre. The composition uses nearly all the important devices that Bach would employ in subsequent vocal works. Among these are certain formal designs as well as the contrapuntal or structural device known as *Einbau* (discussed below). Naturally the work also demonstrates Bach's complete mastery of both vocal and instrumental writing. It incorporates idiomatic parts not only for three oboes and bassoon but also two horns—recent additions to the orchestra, used here as symbols of Diana and the hunt. Writing for the horn, a valveless instrument in Bach's day like the trumpet, was not in principle very different from writing for the latter, and players of one instrument could probably manage the other. Still, Bach calls for virtuoso horn playing that might have been beyond the capabilities of the Weimar town musicians. When the work was repeated there in 1716, two specialists were brought in from Weissenfels, perhaps the same ones heard in the first performance.

By 1713, ternary or da capo (ABA) form had become the choice for the overwhelming majority of arias in Italian opera and other vocal genres. The form of an aria was normally signaled by that of its poem. Early da capo arias often used a single line as a reprise, but by 1700 the text for such an aria normally comprised two short stanzas of equal length, sharing an end rhyme for the final line. German poets tended toward somewhat greater diversity, also writing arias in other forms and varying poetic meters and line-lengths. Bach likewise avoided formula and convention in setting these texts, occasionally even ignoring a poet's indication for da capo form. This could be for music-rhetorical reasons, but sometimes sheer compositional variety seems to have been the motivation. In any case, to understand Bach's vocal music it is necessary to examine both text and music with care. The process may seem tedious, requiring a type of attention to both musical and verbal grammar that is now unfashionable even among scholars. Yet nothing less allows a performer or listener to see with what care Bach shaped his settings of poems that could have been treated through more conventional approaches.

Franck's libretto for BWV 208 includes seven da capo texts—four arias, two choruses, and a duet. The form is indicated by either the words *da capo* or the printed repeat of the opening line or lines. Bach set four of these texts in the conventional form, which by this date included ritornellos at the beginning, middle, and end of the A section; the latter incorporated two full statements of its text (see table S7.2 below). Hence the A section normally had a self-contained binary design, the first statement of its text modulating to a foreign key (typically the dominant), the second returning to the tonic. The central ritornello, although often abbreviated, articulates this tonal design by restating the opening idea, much as in a concerto movement. A fifth movement, the chorus "Lebe, Sonne," departs from this form only by omitting the opening ritornello. This was a device used occasionally in Italian opera when an immediate response to the preceding recitative was desired for dramatic reasons. In all five of these movements, the entire A section is repeated after the B section. Two other arias use a through-composed version

---

[216] As argued in 1961 by Johannes Krey; objections to the latter by Marissen (1993) cannot easily be proved or disproved.

of the form, in which the concluding statement of the A text differs from the first one; it therefore is written out in modified form.

Endymion’s aria “Willst du dich nicht mehr ergötzen” might have been a deliberately normal setting of a da capo text, except that Bach goes further than most Italian composers would have done. Here the B section has its own binary form, although without a central ritornello. The resulting design is shown in table S7.2. The aria is scored solely for tenor voice and continuo. The closest thing Bach ever wrote to a secular love song, its tortuously embellished lines express Endymion’s desire for Diana. Yet the words that Bach chooses to emphasize by long melismas are *Netzen* and *gefangen* (nets, captured), pointing in moralizing fashion to the snares or temptations of love.

Table S7.2. Endymion’s aria “Willst du dich nicht mehr ergötzen,” BWV 208/4

section:	A					B	
	rit.	lines 1–3	rit. (shortened)	lines 1–3	rit.	lines 4–6	lines 4–6
key:	d	d -->	a	d	d	F-->	C--> a
m.:	1	3b	13	14	19	21b	29

(rit. = ritornello)

That the same musical design could be employed for any text of similar form and dimensions, regardless of content or expressive character, is clear from its use for Pan’s little aria “Ihr Felder und Augen” (no. 14). Like Endymion’s aria, this is a continuo ariawithout obbligato instruments, but it is pervaded by the skipping rhythm of the *canarie*—a dance, a type of French gigue (or jig). Following that, the work ends with a grand chorus in essentially the same form, scored for the full ensemble—including hunting calls, sounded by the horns as all four singers rejoice in the duke’s “loveliest vista” (*lieblichste Blicke*). This line must have referred to a view from the duke’s hunting lodge of the countryside where he had previously slaughtered some of his animals. Today such behavior seems hardly fitting for a “Pan of his lands,” as Franck calls Christian in the third aria, but one cannot expect to find environmental awareness in an eighteenth-century text praising a provincial ruler.

Not every aria text receives the type of setting that the author or a reader of the poetry might have expected. The famous “Sheep may safely graze” (“Schafe können sicher weiden,” no. 9) compresses its A section into little more than a single periodic phrase, framed by ritornellos. Perhaps this represented the simplicity of the character Pales, whose unadorned part might have been sung by a boy. He nevertheless has a vocally more challenging part in the following four-part chorus. Here the A section consists of a permutation fugue setting a single verse, which hails the duke as the “sun of this territory” (“Lebe, Sonne dieser Erden”). It is striking that Bach employed the same device at the beginning of the first chorus in his first church piece composed as Concertmaster (BWV 182). There the first line (“Himmelskönig, sei willkommen”) has a similarly celebratory or invitatory character, addressed to Jesus rather than a worldly duke. But although both movements begin without a ritornello, the present chorus then continues with a

much longer contrapuntal development of the same subject by the instruments alone; could this have accompanied a dance or some other action?

Bach set the two other da capo texts in through-composed form. The first of these, Diana's opening aria, is a unique confection in which she joins the two horns in fanfares. The second of these ("Entzücket uns beide," no. 13) is an incipient version of what has come to be called "free" or "modified" da capo form. A duet for Diana and Endymion, it opens (after the ritornello) with their compact, dance-like setting of lines 1–3. These modulate to the dominant; when they return, after an intervening setting of lines 4–5, the A music is rewritten to end in the tonic. Bach might not have given much thought to his formal innovation in writing these two little numbers. Yet before leaving Weimar he would write many further through-composed settings of da capo texts. In his later vocal works this type would become a regular alternative to the conventional da capo aria. No one has come up with a convincing explanation for his adoption of this form, which is uniquely prevalent in his music during the first half of the century.[217]

The texts of the two remaining arias are bipartite, falling into two sections but without the distinctive two-stanza plan of a da capo aria. Thus the four lines of Pales's second aria, "Weil die wollenreichen Herden" (no. 13), follow the rhyme scheme ABAB. But because they form a single sentence, Bach treats the entire aria like the A section alone of a da capo aria, stating the entire text twice, with a cadence to the dominant in the middle.[218]Pan's first aria, on the other hand, divides clearly into two contrasting sentences of three lines each. The first calls a ruler "the Pan of his territory" ("Ein Fürst ist seines Landes Pan"), whereas the second describes a land without a ruler a "death-realm." Bach responds by dividing the music into two contrasting sections. The first half begins in C, ending in the dominant G; the second half begins (m. 38) by suddenly modulating to remote minor keys, the bass voice at one point plunging by the interval of a minor ninth to represent the surprisingly intense image of a *Todten-Höhle* (ex. S7.35). The aria nevertheless concludes with a restatement of the opening ritornello, affirming the poem's endorsement of the ruler's supposedly enlightened despotism.

Even the B section is pervaded by the splendid ritornello, which probably echoes a ducal military band of the time in its scoring for four-part double reeds and continuo. Bach accomplishes this through the device now known as *Einbau:* the repetition of the ritornello, or substantial portions of it, as the singer, instrumental soloist, or chorus adds one or more additional parts in counterpoint. The German word will be retained here because there is no suitable English equivalent.[219] Bach might have found models for this technique in works such as Telemann's cantata for Sexegesima Sunday 1711.[220]

---

[217] Later types of modified or abbreviated da capo forms are unrelated to Bach's. The most extensive discussion probably remains that of Crist (1988), with further considerations in Schulenberg (2011a).

[218] Actually this aria is a bit more complicated than that, as lines 2–4 are repeated near the end (from m. 25), after a second cadence to the subdominant.

[219] Brainard (1983, 39) credits the invention of the term to Neumann (1938, 53ff.), in the form *Choreinbau;* Dürr (1951, 133) extended it in the form *Vokaleinbau*. Jones, translating Dürr (2005, 19–20), renders this as "insertion"; other authors have used the expressions "in-building"

In the present aria, the first phrase of the opening ritornello is initially repeated between statements of line 1 of the poem. This repetition constitutes a so-called *Devise* ("device," as in heraldry), a music-rhetorical way of emphasizing the image or metaphor expressed in the opening words of "prince" as "Pan." *Einbau* begins with the next entrance of the instruments in m. 18, where they now restate the ritornello quite literally, save for transposition to G major; this accompanies lines 2 and 3 (ex. S7.36). They do the same in A minor after the singer has moved on to the dystopian second half of the text (ex. S7.37).

The compositional idea underlying *Einbau* had a precedent in certain continuo arias whose ritornello is repeated, almost as an ostinato, after the voice enters. Such is the case in Endymion's first aria, "Willst du dich nicht mehr ergetzen" (no. 4). In earlier works Bach had combined short phrases from an instrumental introduction with the voice. Now a much longer ritornello passage is superimposed over the vocal line, becoming the basis for substantial portions of an aria. These restatements of the ritornello are not necessarily literal, and the inner parts may be substantially rewritten. Yet the audible result is the juxtaposition of the ritornello with the singer's presentation of the poetic text, which receives its own melodic line.

The freedom with which Bach employs *Einbau* suggests that it was meant to serve expressive or dramatic purposes; it was not merely a demonstration of contrapuntal technique, which would have required an unaltered restatement of the ritornello. Nor was the combination of voice and instruments necessarily worked out in advance; in Pan's aria, as in many later ones, the free character of the counterpoint given to the voice suggests that the instrumental parts were composed first.[221] This does not mean the vocal part is unidiomatic. But it implies that Bach, who was first and foremost an instrumentalist, often conceived the ritornello of an aria independently of the text setting. The instrumentation and melodic ideas chosen for the ritornello would naturally be appropriate to the words, but the latter often received new music in the vocal part.[222] Such a procedure, seemingly antithetical to vocal composition, would have come naturally to an organist accustomed to writing introductions or ritornellos that preceded the entry of a cantus firmus in a chorale setting.

---

and "embedding." The same technique applied to an instrumental composition (such as a concerto) is called *Soloeinbau.*

[220] Sexegesima is the Sunday that falls sixty days before Easter. Bach may well have known Telemann's composition for that day in 1711 (TWV 1:630). His own Weimar composition for that day in the church year, BWV 18, was based on the same Neumeister text, and both works use similar scoring—and *Einbau*—for the one aria.

[221] In Bach's autograph score (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. Bach P 42 (3)), the vocal passages seem to contain more corrections in the lower parts than in the leading line for the first oboe. This suggests that the latter was repeated unchanged from the ritornello, the lower parts (including the bass voice) being adapted or added to fit.

[222] Brainard (1983), however, argued that Bach's compositional practice cannot be reduced to a simple scheme in which an instrumentally conceived ritornello "dominates" a subsequently conceived vocal line (or vice versa).

More Weimar vocal works (p. 129, following the end of the printed chapter, "that have made these two compositions famous")

Bach's first work as concertmaster, BWV 182 (*Himmelskönig, sei willkommen*), is an ambitious composition that transfers many of the features of the Hunt Cantata to the sacred realm. Two choral arias, the second of them in gigue rhythm, incorporate permutation fugues. The last of the three solo arias is, like Pales's little aria in the Hunt Cantata, another continuo aria with a virtuoso cello part, evidently a Weimar specialty. Palm Sunday, which commemorates Jesus's entry into Jerusalem as future "king of heaven," was an auspicious day on which to enter a new position at the Himmelsburg. The dotted rhythms of the opening sonata movement are sometimes thought to be an allusion to the French overture, supposedly an emblem of royalty. Yet the staccato accompaniment has nothing to do with overture style, as is clear from a comparison with the opening of BWV 61, a later Weimar work that indeed opens as an overture (ex. S7.38). The libretto, doubtless by Franck, includes five aria-style texts in all, and Bach sets each of these in da capo form—but two (nos. 4 and 6) are in the through-composed ("modified") version of this design. There is, on the other hand, only one short recitative, after the first chorus.

The absence of intervening recitatives between the arias was a feature that many of Franck's librettos shared with some of Neumeister's earlier cantata texts. It must have encouraged Bach to make the three solo arias at the center of the work as varied as possible: in instrumentation, key, and style. As their subjects turn from "powerful love" ("Starkes Lieben") to anticipation of the crucifixion, Bach turns from a grand bass aria with string accompaniment to a continuo aria for tenor, who must sing a writhing melisma on *kreuziget* ("crucify!"). There is no concluding "simple" chorale, as in so many of Bach's later works (and in Telemann's). Rather the work ends with a dance-like choral aria, preceded by an elaborate contrapuntal fantasia on a passion chorale. The latter recalls some of the more old-fashioned organ chorales (e.g., BWV 657, "Nun danket Alle Gott"). Whether the work as a whole constitutes an effective unity is an open question, as in the similarly eclectic BWV 21. But its broad dimensions and meticulous craftsmanship must have made a strong impact on listeners, especially if heard against less ambitious works by Telemann or the Dreses.

Bach's next work, for Jubilate (the third Sunday after Easter), was on a more painful topic. Franck's text begins with a series of nouns all representative of suffering: *Weinen, Klagen, Sorgen, Zagen, Angst und Noth* (weeping, grieving, worrying, trembling, pain and need). Bach prefaced this with an adagio sinfonia, comparable to that of BWV 21 but now with five string parts and the oboe as the lone soloist. The texture is again rhythmically stratified in a way that Bach would repeat in many further works, with different parts moving respectively in thirty-seconds, sixteenths, eighths, and quarters separated by rests (ex. S7.39). The following choral aria is this work's most famous movement; the A section, setting Franck's long list of woes, takes the form of a chaconne. Constructed over twelve statements of a chromatic bass line, it would much later be reworked as the Crucifixus of the B-Minor Mass (ex. S7.40). The French dance, which is also alluded to in the triple meter and the tendency of phrases to begin on the second beat, was not originally associated with lamentation. Bach, however, seems to have always understood it that way, from the early example in the Capriccio BWV 992 to the famous opening movement of Cantata 78.

In its original form, this movement is also notable for a canon hidden within the B section. Whether the contrapuntal device as such has any special meaning in this context is unclear, although it is used to set the word *tragen* ("carry"), a reference to bearing the cross (ex. S7.41). Bach returns to the idea of canon in the second solo aria, where it clearly "paints" the idea of following Christ (ex. S7.42). Franck and the ruling duke would certainly have nodded their approval of such a device, but how would they have reacted to the last aria? Here Bach returns to the so-called chorale "trope" first essayed at Mühlhausen or perhaps Arnstadt, adding a wordless chorale melody ("Jesu, meine Freude") to Franck's text (ex. S7.43). If surprised, they must not have reacted negatively, for Bach was allowed to repeat the device in seven of his remaining Weimar works, including the first movements of BWV 185 and 161. In both of the latter (composed consecutively during the following year), the chorale melody is repeated in the concluding movement, where it is now sung. This integrates the work, which approaches the status of what we would call a chorale cantata. But in BWV 12, as in BWV 182, Bach may not yet have been thinking in such terms, and the whole may not yet be greater than its individual parts.

The same seems true of the next few works. BWV 172, for Pentecost, opens with a grandly scored choral aria with trumpets and drums—Bach's first such effort since BWV 71 of 1708, unless BWV 63 really dates from the Halle visit of 1713. Those instruments are heard again in a bass aria (no. 3), but thereafter they are silent. The penultimate movement, a duet with another instrumental cantus firmus, is a compositional tour de force. Here Bach weaves together separate texts for the "soul" (*Anima*, soprano) and the holy spirit (alto), as well as the embellished chorale melody. Only a portion of the latter is used, as in the original Weimar version of Bach's organ fantasia on the same tune (BWV 651a). Franck's three stanzas of dialog, each comprising three lines for the soul and one for the holy spirit, must therefore be fitted to two, two, and four phrases of the chorale melody, respectively. Although scored—again—with solo cello accompaniment, the musical result may not be as engaging as the intricate geometry that underlies it.

Gaps and uncertainties in Bach's output during the next few months leave it uncertain how his vocal writing now developed. For the first Sunday in Advent, marking the start of the new church year on Dec. 2, 1714, he turned to a new libretto by Neumeister. Despite the latter's fame as founder of the new type of sacred cantata, Bach is known to have set only five of Neumeister's texts, two at Weimar and three later. Thus it seems remarkable that the libretto for this work was the same one used by Telemann at Frankfurt for the same day. Bach's setting has nothing in common with Telemann's, which opens that composer's second cycle of church pieces, known as the "French" *Jahrgang*. Telemann's composition is nevertheless overwhelmingly Italian in style; with BWV 61, however, Bach began the new church year with a real French overture (see ex. S7.38b).[223]

Bach had included overtures in at least two very early keyboard suites (BWV 820 and 822), but this might have been his first opportunity to write such a piece for an ensemble. His use of

---

[223] The score of TWV 1:1175, in a manuscript copy by Heinrich Valentin Beck, is in Frankfurt, Universitätsbibliothek, MS Ff. mus. 1285.

French rubrics in the autograph score shows his consciousness of the idiom: the heading *ouverture*, then *gai* for the quick middle section. He also follows older French practice in writing a single doubled violin part, which is divided only in one passage, although there are multiple viola parts (two, not three as in Lully's overtures). But unlike the opening sinfonias of several of his earlier cantatas, this overture is not a purely instrumental movement. Rather it incorporates a setting of the Advent hymn "Nun komm, der Heiden Heiland," which opens Neumeister's libretto. The treatment of of the cantus firmus is simpler than in the great organ works that Bach also based on it during the same period. The novelty of joining it to an overture must have seemed sufficiently innovative at this point, although several later "chorale overtures" by Bach (as in BWV 20) would make this one seem almost perfunctory. What is really surprising, from the point of view of chorale treatment, is the abbreviated form of another hymn, quoted in the final movement. That, however, was dictated by Neumeister's libretto; Telemann's setting also closes with just the last three lines of "Wie schön leuchtet der Morgenstern."[224] Bach's final chorus is therefore very short, perhaps too brief for it to have the impact evidently envisioned for it, as the violins ascend at the end to g‴—a height that Bach would exceed only in the "Laudamus te" of the B-Minor Mass.

It was perhaps for Christmas Day later that month that Bach wrote BWV 63, his most ambitious trumpet-and-drums piece yet. Not only the instrumentation but the temporal dimensions of each movement are somewhat larger than usual. The unique scoring with four trumpets (rather than the usual three) raises unanswerable questions about a possible performance somewhere other than Weimar. So too does the use of a libretto that may or may not have been by the Halle pastor Heineccius. Like BWV 172, the work opens with a choral da capo aria, as would many later celebratory cantatas such as this. Yet a thoughtful element intrudes within the A section, which makes its medial cadence in the unexpected mediant key (E minor). Perhaps this somehow reflects the awkward metaphor in the opening line of "etching" the day in metal and marble, like the inscription on a statue base.

There are no solo arias; Bach sets the two following aria texts as duets, albeit of very different types, reflecting their respective themes of grace (*Gnaden*) and rejoicing. These duets employ complementary voices (soprano and bass, then alto and tenor), modes (minor, then major), forms (only the first is a conventional da capo form, the second through-composed), and expressive characters (adagio, then a minuet, reflecting the reference to "rows [*Reihen*]" or rounds of dancers). Exceptionally, there are no chorales. The final chorus is another da capo form, but although its text is in exactly the same form as the opening movement—suggesting that the poet expected it to be sung to the same music[225]—Bach treats it rather differently. Now the first

---

[224] The lines are from the final stanza of Philipp Nicolai's hymn. Steiger (1989) explains the abbreviation as a poetic allusion to what was then a not unusual way of concluding a sermon, with a short quotation from a chorale. Like the litany in BWV 18 (Bach's other Neumeister setting from Weimar), it is unique in the composer's output.

[225] Movements 1 and 7 have the same poetic form (2 + 5 trochaic lines) and rhyme scheme, the short A section serving the same exhortatory or entreating function as in many seventeenth-century ternary arias. A number of the Neumeister librettos in Telemann's Eisenach cycle contain comparable paired aria stanzas which Telemann sets to variations of the same music.

trumpet participates as a fifth part in two fugues, on separate subjects, which constitute the largest portions of both sections.[226]In the B section, the first trumpet even plays a climactic final statement of a chromatic subject. This represents Satan, who, the text prays, will "never defeat us." The valveless (natural) trumpet can produce the chromatic notes of this line only with a slightly muffled or shaded quality, but this is appropriate as the instrument abandons its customary heraldic role (ex. S7.44).

Apart from the Easter work BWV 31, most of the remaining compositions for the Weimar chapel were on a smaller scale. The next three, including BWV 31, were also the last ones to include instrumental sinfonias. That of BWV 152 is a four-part prelude and fugue looking back to Reinken in both instrumentation and form. It includes viola da gamba, as does Reinken's *Hortus musicus*, together with recorder, oboe, and viola d'amore. The first half of the fugue uses fairly strict permutation technique, the only instance in Bach's instrumental music unless one counts the episodes in the last movement of the second Brandenburg Concerto (which might have originated as a quintet composed around this time).

How the fugal sinfonia of BWV 152 relates to the rest of the work, a rather subdued composition for the Sunday after Christmas, is not entirely clear. In BWV 31, on the other hand, the martial opening "sonata" is echoed in the ritornello of the following chorus. Such an opening, so different from that of Bach's previous Easter composition (BWV 4), might have been obligatory for an observance at a ducal court. Afterwards, however, this work, like many later ones of its type, diminishes in intensity. It culminates in a quiet chorale aria in which the soprano calls for death ("Letzte Stunde": final hour). An oboe obbligato and pedal points in the continuo give this movement an unexpected pastoral quality; violins and viola add an instrumental chorale which is then sung in a five-part setting to end the work.

Bach wrote a concerto-style sinfonia not only for BVW 31, performed at Easter 1715, but also for what was probably his previous vocal work. BWV 18 is sometimes thought to have been composed prior to Bach's promotion to concertmaster.[227] But despite some singular features, it makes sense as having been written between BWV 152 and BWV 31, for Feb. 24, 1715 (Sexagesima Sunday). Bach's second Weimar composition on a Neumeister text, it has a unique shape and scoring: a single aria and closing chorale, preceded by two recitatives, the second of which is punctuated by choral phrases from the Lutheran litany ("dear God, have mercy on us!"). Telemann had previously set this text as part of his Eisenach cycle; Bach's is a wholly distinct composition, with a unique instrumentation of just four violas (plus continuo).[228] The unique

---

[226] Bach would treat the trumpet similarly in many subsequent choral fugues, as in the "Gloria" chorus of the B-minor Mass. Another example occurs in the opening movement of the Leipzig work BWV 171, which became the "Patrem omnipotentem" of the same B-Minor Mass.

[227] As argued by Kobayashi (1995, 304), on the basis of his chronology of Bach's handwriting, and accepted by Wolff (2000, 133).

[228] Bach added recorders to double the two top violas for a repeat performance at Leipzig. Two points that Bach might have taken from Telemann are the scoring for voices and strings alone (no winds) and the division of the recitative passages in movement 3 between different singers.

scoring cannot be easily explained, although what may have been Bach's previous work, BWV 152, also lacked violins. As in the sinfonia of BWV 31, the ritornello of BWV 18 is a unison line resembling an organ pedal solo. Spitta compared it to a chaconne bass,[229]and like an ostinato bass line it accompanies some of the solo episodes (ex. S7.45). Perhaps the quiet scoring and repeated quarters evoke the falling snow and rain of the passage from Isaiah (55:10–11) which is subsequently sung as simple recitative—a rarity for a bible text in Bach's church pieces.

The quotations from the litany in Neumeister's text for the following movement obviously called for use of the corresponding melody. This was a very simple formula resembling a psalm tone. Although presence of the litany text makes the movement unique in Bach's work, the alternation of a quoted text with original verse, and consequently of chorale phrases with arioso or recitative, is less rare (see ex. S7.47 below). Indeed, the second vocal movement in Bach's next church work, BWV 31, alternates repeatedly between simple recitative and arioso, and others insert passages from chorales. The implicit dialog in the present work is between clergy, represented by soloists, and congregation, represented by the full ensemble. Today the prayers for deliverance equally from Turks, "papists" or Roman Catholics, and the devil are offensive, but they reflect political realities in Thuringia, whose much wealthier and more powerful neighbor Saxony had had a Catholic ruler since 1697. Bach had a personal interest in the matter, for his brother Jacob, in the entourage of Charles XII of Sweden, was probably still a virtual prisoner of the Ottoman sultan Ahmet III.[230]

Commentators from Spitta onwards have compared Bach's setting of the Neumeister text with Telemann's, naturally to the latter's disadvantage. If Bach knew the earlier work, he would have made a deliberate effort to surpass it. The sinfonia movement has no parallel in Telemann's composition, although in the latter the string accompaniment for the opening biblical recitative clearly refers to the falling snow or rain of Isaiah's text. In the unusual third movement, Bach takes a less literal approach to the lines from the litany, which Telemann harmonizes in simple (*cantional*) style (ex. S7.46). Bach writes a more colorful accompaniment for the recitative or rather arioso passages, and to represent the "murder, blasphemies," and other evils attributed to the perceived enemies of the Lutheran church he gives the cellist a "tumult" motive. Yet the words *Türken* and *Pabst* receive no special emphasis when they appear in the same line of the harmonized chant (ex. S7.47).

After Easter 1715, although evidently striving less hard than in his first Weimar vocal works, Bach continued to incorporate some remarkable inventions into these compositions. The idea of

---

Telemann, however, uses just tenor and bass, whereas Bach gives solos to all four voices. Spitta (1873–80, 1:490–95) already compared the two settings.

[229] Spitta (1873–80, 1:486).

[230] It is unknown when Jacob was able to return to Stockholm after the Swedish defeat at Poltava in 1709 and King Charles's escape to Turkey; the king himself made a famous return on horseback in October 1714. Jacob took the opportunity to study flute in Constantinople with Buffardin, the French virtuoso who was visiting at the time as part of a diplomatic delegation and subsequently taught Quantz at Dresden.

inserting fugue into Italian da capo and ritornello forms, which perhaps seemed to Bach a natural thing to do in choral arias such as those in BWV 182 and 172, was extended to both the ritornellos and the vocal passages in the opening solo aria of the next work, BWV 165, for Trinity Sunday (June 16, 1715). The text, chiefly on the blessings of baptism, is rather pedantic; the same might be said of the resulting composition, despite the presence of a lively melisma in the fugue subject to represent flowing water (*Wasserbad*, ex. S7.48a). Bach even inverts the subject for line 3, where the melisma now corresponds with the "book of life" (*Buch des Leben*, ex. S7.48b). A stretto for the strings and then a sort of second subject, sung to line 4, follow (mm. 25ff.), yet Bach never combines the voice with all four string parts simultaneously; could this have been because the singer was a boy with a weak voice?

It is hard to see any connection between this demonstration of fugal technique and the topic of baptism, and something similar could be said of the concluding aria of BWV 54, which also takes the form of a fugue. Resistance to sin is the watchword of the latter work, a little cantata of uncertain date for solo alto and strings. It opens on a grating dissonance on the word *Sünde* (sins, ex. S7.49); the texture, key, and dark, low scoring with two violas are all reminiscent of the Sixth Brandenburg Concerto, which surely was drafted around the same time—but when? The loss of the autograph score—a copy by Walther is the earliest source—and the use of a text published in 1711 by Lehms, as well as the absence of any known use for a work for solo alto, all leave the original purpose and date of the work mysterious.[231] Its closing aria has, however, an arguably more sophisticated design than the similarly conceived opening one of BWV 165. Both combine fugue with through-composed ternary form, but now, as the voice moves in the B section to thoughts of "resistance" (*widerstanden*) to the devil, the strings continue to accompany with entries of the original subject (ex. S7.50). The aria is a version for solo voice of what Bach had done in the final chorus of BWV 63 (see ex. S7.44), the chromatic steps in the subject now representing sin explicitly.

BWV 54 is a didactic work that presents challenges for both singer and listener. Far easier to like is the mellifluous BWV 161, one of the more convincing of those church pieces that purport to express a desire for death. Today the drooping figures for recorders in parallel thirds and sixths, heard in movements 1 and 5, are usually called "sigh" figures. These might less anachronistically be related to "sleep" (*Schlaf*), as in the recitative no. 4; they echo the "sommeil" scenes of French Baroque opera (ex. S7.51). The effect here is more reminscent of Telemann than is usual in Bach's vocal works; so too is the evocation of funeral bells later in the fourth movement.[232] There the addition of high repeated notes for the recorders, playing above slower pizzicato strings, intensifies a realistic effect used previously by Telemann (ex. S7.52).[233]

---

[231] BWV 54 has been placed before 1714 (Wolff 2000, 129, citing his edition in NBA 1/8, KB, 89), sometime during that year (see Dürr 2005, 254), and on Oculi, the third Sunday in Lent, that is, March 24, 1715 (Hofmann 1993, 17–18).

[232] In Thuringia and other German regions, the *Sterbeglocke* calling members of a congregation to a funeral is traditionally the smallest and highest of church bells.

[233] Bach seems to have quoted more directly from the same work (TWV 4:17) in the opening aria of his next church piece, BWV 162. This ("Ach, ich sehe") as well as the duet "Gott, du hast es

Less well known but perhaps more original is an aria from the work that Bach composed about eight weeks later, for the twenty-third Sunday after Trinity. As Franck approached the end of his first *Jahrgang* of church texts, he drew inspiration from one of his court responsibilities as keeper of the duke's coin collecting.[234]The metaphor of stamping medals or coins on the heart might seem less than inspiring for a composer. But the idea went back at least to a poem by Marini that was set around 1600 by Gesualdo, Luzzaschi, and Monteverdi. Bach is unlikely to have known their madrigals, and Franck (unlike Marini) surely intended the image to be taken with complete seriousness. It nevertheless inspired Bach to include, as the central aria of BWV 163, the uniquely scored "Lass mein Herz die Münze sein" for bass voice and two cellos. How the scoring reflects the text is, as usual, not entirely clear. It recalls the similarly inventive organ chorale BWV 660 in its low tessitura; inisistent repetitions at one point surely represent the striking of coins in a metal shop (ex. S7.53; compare ex. S7.31). The aria also demonstrates that the many virtuoso cello parts in the Weimar works must have been divided between at least two players; any of these might also have been the first performers of Bach's suites for unaccompanied cello.

Four further Weimar vocal works of some importance survive only in heavily reworked later versions: BWV 80, 70, 186, and 147. The first of these has already been mentioned. The three others, written for successive Sundays during Advent 1716, might have been intended for a complete setting of Franck's second poetic *Jahrgang*, whose texts they use. Yet it is puzzling that Bach seems to have composed neither the first work in the series (for the first Sunday in Advent) nor any further ones. Perhaps, after the death of the elder Drese on Dec. 1 (the day after Advent Sunday), Bach anticipated being named Capellmeister. When it became clear during the coming weeks that this was not to be, did he break off his collaboration with the court poet?

One feature of these works, which must have been a deliberate element of the new annual cycle, was the absence of recitatives. Franck, in some earlier librettos, had shown a tendency toward writing long recitatives. Bach had responded by often dividing these movements into several distinct sections, the last typically an arioso. Each of the present librettos instead comprises a chorus followed by four arias and a closing chorale. Why, in his third annual cycle of librettos, Franck reverted to an older form without recitatives, is unknown; could the ruling duke have come to desire church music that less closely resembled Italian opera? At Leipzig, Bach had recitatives added to these texts, composing these anew while revising the existing choruses and arias. Evidently he did not find the absence of recitatives to be a positive feature.

Another feature of these works in their original versions was their light scoring, with just strings and one or two wind instruments. Nevertheless, these works have been noted for their "tendency

---

wohl gefüget" from BWV 63 use practically the same theme shown in ex. S7.52a, whose sequential pattern perhaps stuck in Bach's ear.

[234] Franck had previously published a birthday poem for Wilhelm Ernst extolling the virtues of the duke's collection of medals ("Das glückwünschende Medaillen Cabinet"), in *Geist- und weltliche Poesien*, 1:282–84.

to large form."[235]This is especially clear in the chorus which—in a departure from most of Bach's later Weimar works—opens each of these compositions. That of BWV 70a is a particularly dramatic interpretation of Franck's text, treating all four voices as virtuoso soloists as they repeat a series of imperative verbs (in place of the poet's usual nouns): "Wake up! pray! pray! wake up!" (ex. S7.54).[236]The opening choruses of 186a and 147a are more poised and, unlike this one, essentially fugal. But all three share, for the first time in Bach's choruses, the extensive use of *Einbau*. In addition, Bach wrote particularly varied music for the arias, necessarily so as they originally followed one another without intervening recitatives. The last aria in BWV 70a lacks an initial ritornello, beginning and closing with arioso-like adagio sections. Its middle section, however, returns to the manner of the opening chorus, invoking the last judgement (*letzter Schlag*) with a vocal line that imitates trumpet fanfares, sung against unison strings (ex. S7.55).

The initial choruses of the following two works (BWV 186a and 147a) anticipate some of Bach's Cöthen cantatas in their use of a new type of quasi-rondo design, with A and B sections that alternate several times. This suggests that, as he began composing these pieces for a new church year, Bach was thinking creatively about musical form. He would always do so, of course—but by the beginning of 1717 he had evidently ceased writing new sacred vocal works and would not return to them for more than six years.

A Weimar Passion?

A possible exception to the absence of vocal compositions from 1717 would be the passion music that Bach is supposed to have performed at Gotha on Good Friday of that year. All traces of this work, including its libretto, have vanished, but a few movements in Bach's later vocal works have been postulated as having originated in a passion composed at Weimar and performed there or at Gotha.[237] Bach had been invited to Gotha, seat of the largest of the Thuringian duchies, to substitute for the dying Capellmeister Witt. But that the payment of 12 Taler that he received on that occasion would have covered the composition and performance of a full-sized passion seems unlikely. Bach had received the same amount for his performance as

[235] Dürr (2005, 645; the German original reads "der Zug zur großen Form").

[236] Because of the uncertain or lost musical texts of the Weimar versions of these works, examples S7.54–55 are based on the Leipzig revisions. Rifkin (1999) showed that the trumpet part was probably absent from the original Weimar version of BWV 70, at least in the opening chorus (ex. S7.54) and most likely in the bass aria as well (ex. S7.55).

[237] Glöckner (1995) lists six movements which, in his view, could have come from a 1717 passion mentioned by Hilgenfeldt in 1850: the chorales "O Mensch, bewein" and "Christe, du Lamm"; the arias "Himmel, reiße," "Zerschmettert mich," and "Ach windet euch nicht"; and a four-part chorale setting. To these Glöckner adds the aria and accompagnato BWV 55/3–4 (both "Erbarme dich!") and possibly BWV 55/5 (the final chorale setting). He notes that "Himmel, reiße", a chorale aria, uses a form of the cantus firmus ("Jesu, deine Passion") that matches Witt's Gotha chorale book.

well as travel expenses when, still a mere organist, he visited Halle in 1713.[238] Although he was now a concertmaster, his Gotha payment was no more than that of an alto named Vogt, paid during the same month.[239] The following month the Cöthen Capellmeister Stricker received twice as much for a visit.[240]

This points to Bach's having provided something less than a monumental oratorio for Good Friday, such as he would later perform at Leipzig. Any original music that Bach performed or directed at Gotha might have been no more extensive than the church piece he apparently wrote for Halle or the relatively small passion oratorio that Bach believed to be by "Keiser." Bach's contribution to the "Keiser" passion, copied out around 1712 at Weimar, was once thought to have been fairly extensive but is now believed to have been limited to two "simple" chorale settings.[241] The "Keiser" work is nevertheless significant as having possibly been the very first passion oratorio of the type that Bach would later compose and perform at Leipzig. If it did originate at Hamburg, then Sebastian's insertion of several movements foreshadowed the pastiche process by which Emanuel Bach would create twenty-one annual passion oratorios in that city for performances in 1768 through 1789. Indeed, Sebastian was already doing the same at least occasionally during his last decade or two at Leipzig.

Although Sebastian clearly studied and perhaps performed the "Keiser" work at Weimar, that he might have created an original work of this type, as opposed to a pastiche of some kind, is entirely uncertain.[242] A book of texts for the Good Friday service in the Weimar court chapel was printed in 1709, but who composed or performed the "songs and arias" included alongside the prescribed gospel verses is unknown.[243] The fact that Bach's Weimar parts for the "Keiser" passion include one for harpsichord, not organ, could reflect conditionsat a time when the organ was under repair, as it was during the period when Bach made his copy. That situation also raises the possibility that a performance took place not in church but at court or in some private

---

[238] NBR, 65 (no. 46a), from Wollny (1994, 32).

[239] As noted by Geck (2000, 83). He cites no source, but Glöckner (1995, 37) provides the information.

[240] Ranft (1984, 166).

[241] Melamed (2005, 85–86). Bach's manuscript parts (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. 11471/1) were dated "1711/12 (bereits 1710)" by Kobayashi (1995, 295). This would make it contemporary with Telemann's Eisenach *Jahrgang*, from which it is stylistically not far removed.

[242] The hypothesis rests mainly on a few laconic documents brought to light by Glöckner (1995). Signs that a few movements in Bach's extant passions derive from earlier works are clear enough, but there is no evidence that these were taken from a complete setting or that the latter was composed around 1717.

[243] The printed service book, described in Koch (2006, 45–46), was reissued in 1719; apparently the only known copy was destroyed in the fire at the Weimar Amalienbibliothek in 2004. The phrase *Liedern und Arien* could refer to simple chorales.

venue—not for the liturgy but perhaps as a way of trying out what might have seemed, around 1712, an interesting new type of passion music. In fact, by then a more finished and integrated passion libretto had been written by the Hamburg poet Brockes, to be set to music during the next few years by Telemann and Handel, among others. But Bach might not have learned of such works until somewhat later, and in 1717 the idea of an oratorio-style passion remained new.

Our understanding of the late-Baroque oratorio passion depends largely on the two exceptional examples based on the gospels of John and Matthew that Bach eventually composed at Leipzig. Liturgical passions by Bach's contemporaries, including Telemann, and even Bach's own lost St. Mark Passion (to judge from its surviving libretto) were shorter and simpler. In 1717, Bach's ideas of what such a work might be like would have been shaped by relatively slight works like the "Keiser" passion. Even if he had already conceived of something much more ambitious—surpassing passions by Telemann and "Keiser," just as his regular Sunday church cantatas did theirs—it would have been unrealistic to bring such a composition to an unfamiliar court, expecting it to be well performed and well received. Even the "Keiser" passion would have brought to Bach's attention a new, potentially exciting way of making the Good Friday liturgy more vivid. Whatever thoughts he had about that in spring 1717 would have been set aside, however, in the course of the events that led to his move to a court where elaborate church music was avoided and secular instrumental and vocal compositions were the ruler's passion.

Chapter 8

The Leipzig organ test (p. 131, following the paragraph break, "a renovation of the organ at St. Paul's church")

Assessment of the instrument, which had become the largest in Saxony, was difficult because of various limitations and stipulations placed on the builder, Johann Scheibe of Leipzig. Bach, brought in as an outside expert and by now probably a regional celebrity, was apparently chosen in preference to (or default of) the local and more senior musicians Johann Kuhnau and Daniel Vetter, respectively city cantor and organist at St. Nicholas, the principal city church.[244] Bach's report gave the appearance of fairness to both the builder and the university authorities, making it "possible to conclude from J. S. Bach's report . . . either that [it] was a very fine organ . . . or that it was mediocre."[245] A more recent consideration of all the evidence concludes that Bach's opinion of the instrument was on the whole very positive, especially with regard to its inclusion of several unusual colorful stops.[246] The same appraisal finds that Bach implicitly criticized the university authorities, whose somewhat contradictory requirements gave the organ builder trouble. If so, this was the first of several increasingly aggravating differences with the university that would continue after Bach's installment in the Leipzig cantorship, a little more than five years later.

Hence, immediately upon his escape from Weimar, Bach again found himself in a potentially tricky situation. He visited Leipzig, however, as a respected organ virtuoso and newly appointed Capellmeister of a princely court, and his family and possessions must already have been safely removed to Cöthen. Whether or not this was his first visit to Leipzig, it would have allowed Bach to renew his acquaintance with Kuhnau, last seen at Halle the previous year. He also would have taken a first-hand look at a city, churches, and organs that he would get to know much better in the not very distant future. Both Kuhnau and Vetter were aging, and anyone could have supposed that Bach might be a candidate to succeed one of them. At this point, however, Bach could not compete with either one as a published composer. During the last years of the previous century, Kuhnau had issued a series of sumptuously engraved volumes of keyboard music. Among these were two volumes of "Keyboard Practice" (*Clavier-Übung*), as well as the Biblical Sonatas which Bach's older brother had copied out. Vetter had more recently issued two sets of simple organ chorales. These evidently proved popular with organists, perhaps also with amateurs seeking devotional repertory for home use.[247] None of these publications comes close to Bach's

---

[244] Kuhnau had been considered (BD 2:68, commentary to no. 86); Vetter subsequently wrote a letter endorsing Bach's findings (BD 1:166–67, commentary to no. 87).

[245] Williams (1980–84, 3:130), citing the different readings of two previous commentators, Arnold Schering and Ernst Flade. Williams (2016, 184) subsequently opined that Bach might have been "a little too trusting of the builder."

[246] This had been Vetter's conclusion; L. E. Butler (2016) considers not only Bach's report but subsequent documents concerning the organ and its maintenance.

[247] *Musicalische Kirch- und Hauss-Ergötzlichkeit*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1709–13).

music in terms of compositional sophistication or depth of expression. But Bach's works, circulating only in manuscript copies if at all, remained unknown outside a small circle of students and aristocratic court audiences. Still, his "test" (*Probirung*) of Scheibe's work must have included a public performance of some kind; possibly he played on other organs in the city as well. The impression left on knowledgeable listeners is likely to have persisted through the years that Bach would now spend living some forty miles to the north.

Anhalt and Cöthen (p. 132, following the paragraph break, "enjoying greater personal freedom")

In moving to Anhalt, Bach also relocated from the Saxon to the Prussian circle of political influence in Germany.[248] For several generations the princes of Anhalt had been allied with the neighboring margrave-electors of Brandenburg, who shared their Calvinist version of Protestantism. Anhalt was practically encircled by domains controlled by Brandenburg, whose ruler had been elevated in 1701 to "King in Prussia." During Bach's lifetime, Leopold I of Anhalt-Dessau served three successive Prussian monarchs as a military officer, becoming known to Frederick the Great as "the old Dessauer." Cöthen, meanwhile—where three successive princes took the throne as children (one was even born posthumously)—was officially under Prussian "protection" during the regency for Bach's future patron. But Leopold of Cöthen, after studies at the Prussian Knights' Academy in Berlin, had turned down a military appointment in Brandenburg. Beginning in 1710, he traveled to England (where he visited the library at Oxford), Italy, and Austria, returning home only in 1713, two years before coming of age and taking over rule of his domain from his mother.[249] One consequence of this was that, when the so-called soldier-king Friedrich Wilhelm I, on *his* accession in 1713, dismissed most of the Prussian court musicians at Berlin, several of them moved to Cöthen. Among them was the Capellmeister Stricker, who had provided music for the Gotha court (as Bach also did) before coming to Cöthen in 1714. Before Bach's arrival he had gone on to serve the Count Palatine of the Rhine, but there remained six other players who had been previously employed at Berlin—a royal capital to which Bach himself would soon travel, and where his three most talented sons and a grandson would spend parts of their careers.

That the move to Cöthen reflected a purposeful long-term strategy on Bach's part is doubtful. Yet after his arrival he would have known that, although the current Prussian king took little interest in music, other members of the family had been and continued to be active patrons of the art. Corelli's Opus 5 violin sonatas, for example, had been dedicated to the wife of the first Prussian king, and the latter's nephew Christian Ludwig—who like all his close male relatives was a margrave of Braudenburg—maintained the family tradition of love of music. Later,

---

[248] All the territories in which Bach worked were officially parts of the Upper Saxon Circle (Obersächsischer Reichskreis). That territorial division within of the Empire, however, had been losing its relevance as its two largest components, Prussia and Saxony, grew into dominant, mutually antagonistic states.

[249] Leopold's grand tour is documented by a diary kept by his page Emanuel Leberecht von Zehmen, described by Hoppe (2000, 27) and now available online in the Herzog August Bibliothek's digital library (http://diglib.hab.de/wdb.php?dir=mss/ed000004).

writing to his old friend Erdmann, Bach describe his years at Cöthen as the happiest of his life, suggesting that he might have been content to stay their forever.[250] Those words, however, were written at a time of great frustration in Leipzig, and Bach may orginally have seen Cöthen as only a temporary haven. He might even have held out hope for a return to Weimar, whenever the childless Wilhelm Ernst would be succeeded by his nephew Ernst August.

Any such fantasies, however, could not have been seriously entertained; life was too unpredictable. A year or two previously he could hardly have imagined that he would soon become Capellmeister at a court whose ruler's Calvinism banned elaborate church music from his chapel. Yet Prince Leopold's beliefs did not prevent him from enjoying a luxurious lifestyle that included sumptuous secular music. His lavish spending on the latter, only somewhat curtailed after his marriage in 1721, was among the things that made him a poor ruler. But it led Bach, who was well taken care of, to see Leopold as his greatest patron until the prince's death in 1728.

Leopold and Heinichen (p. 134, following the first paragraph break, "the boundary between liturgical and secular music")

That Leopold was a serious musician in his youth is evident from the fact that during his Italian tour he apparently studied with the German composer Heinichen. Heinichen, after several years at Rome and Venice (where he composed two successful operas), became Electoral Saxon Capellmeister in 1717.[251] Although nominally equivalent to Bach's, his was a far more powerful and prestigious position. Electoral Saxony, to which Leipzig belonged, was, next to Brandenburg-Prussia, the most dominant power in the region. Its two principal cities of Dresden and Leipzig were the largest and wealthiest in northeast Germany, at least until the rise of Berlin under Frederick the Great.[252] The ruling duke-elector, moreover, had been elected king of Poland in 1697, making his capital city Dresden (like Berlin) the seat of a royal court. Heinichen had previously worked for the courts of Weissenfels and Zeitz, both ruled by cadet lines of the electoral Saxon family. He was, moreover, a graduate of the Leipzig university and had already published a treatise on basso continuo realization.[253] Today Heinichen's prolific music seems mediocre, in the up-to-date Italian manner but lacking the complexity of Handel or the *galant* suaveness of Hasse—to name two younger contemporaries who also went to Italy to further careers in opera (Bach's son Johann Christian would follow them).

---

[250] BD 1:67 (no. 23); NBR, 151 (no. 152).

[251] Leopold's study with Heinichen is documented by Gerber (1812–14, vol. 2, col. 616), who does not cite his source and gives no details about the nature of the prince's studies.

[252] By 1750 Electoral Saxony had two million inhabitants (half a million more than Prussia) and 147 towns or cities (Czok 1982, 27–28).

[253] *Neu erfundene und gründliche Anweisung* . . . (Hamburg, 1721); an expanded version, *Der General-Bass in der Composition* (Dresden, 1728), would be one of the most important German treatises of the century.

This may be one reason why, although mentioning several other composers who wrote chiefly Italian vocal music—including Handel and Hasse—Emanuel Bach did not list Heinichen among those whom his father "esteemed highly in his later years."[254] Yet Sebastian must have been intensely aware of his fellow Saxon, just two years his elder, who had enjoyed the fruits of travel and a university education. Heinichen had become Capellmeister of a royal court at a time when Bach could gain a similar title only in a minor principality—nor would Heinichen ever have to labor as a cantor. Although only Heinichen's theoretical writings ever appeared in print, Bach must have come to know some of Heinichen's music in manuscript copies during his years at Cöthen. For if Telemann was the unofficial model composer for the Weimar court, thanks to his Neumeister settings, at Cöthen it could have been Heinichen who was most esteemed, at least until Bach arrived.[255]

Life and music at Cöthen (p. 134, following the second paragraph break, "a full four-part ensemble")

Hunold, the court's preferred librettist until his death in 1721, also wrote at least a few celebratory poems for Cöthen's sister courts (he lived in nearby Halle). Yet during Bach's time the Anhalt princes as a group do not seem to have cultivated the arts with the same intensity as their Saxon and Thuringian neighbors. Of the other Anhalt residences, only Zerbst would leave a musical legacy comparable to Cöthen's, thanks to the long but often unhappy employment there of Johann Friedrich Fasch, Capellmeister from 1722 until his death in 1758.[256] In the seventeenth century, Prince Leopold's ancestor Ludwig I had been a founder and first president of the Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft (Fruitbringing Society). A literary organization modeled on the learned academies of Renaissance Italy, it was dissolved in 1680. It would, however, be a model for the Correspondierende Societät der Musicalischen Wissenschaften (Corresponding Society of Musical Sicences), founded by Bach's learned friend Mizler in 1738. But Bach knew few if any such persons during his Cöthen years. Although various vocal and instrumental soloists seem to have visited fairly frequently, to maintain contact with intellectuals and artists and, more important, to remain conversant with current musical trends, Bach himself would have had to travel to more cosmopolitan centers. Fortunately, the Prince seems to have supported him in this, and indeed Bach is known to have made more trips during his five-plus years at Cöthen than during any other like period of his life.[257]

---

[254] BD 3:289 (no. 803); NBR, 400 (no. 395).

[255] Two works attributed to Bach, the Italian cantata BWV 203 and the "Little Harmonic Labyrinth" BWV 591, are sometimes assigned to Heinichen, but on flimsy grounds.

[256] See Reul (2011) for a detailed account of the situation faced by Fasch at Zerbst. At the end of Fasch's life, C. P. E. Bach and his family were his visitors at sorry time during the Seven Years' War, when Berlin was under threat of Russian occupation and Zerbst itself (its prince absent) was occupied by Prussian trooups.

[257] Wolff (2000, 208) lists 47 trips to 24 or more destinations during the period 1703–50; at least eight of these took place between 1717 and spring 1723.

Where Bach lived at Cöthen is not entirely certain, but he assuredly rented rather than owned his lodging. This needed to be large enough to accommodate not only his growing family (including a few students) but also the rehearsals that he was paid to hold at home.[258] Given the small size of the town, he cannot have lived very far from either the palace or the Lutheran church of St. Agnes, where Bach and his family worshipped. The latter had been founded in 1694 by Gisela Agnes, mother of Prince Leopold. She had retained her Lutheran faith after marrying his father Emanuel Lebrecht. Hence, as at Lüneburg, the ruler's morganatic marriage to a low-ranking member of a different denomination guaranteed some limited tolerance for diversity in worship. As his father died in 1704 when Leopold was just ten years old, Gisela Agnes—who had been raised to the rank of imperial countess by her son's namesake Emperor Leopold I—ruled as regent for the next eleven years. Her power was limited by Prussian oversight of the territory, but at least within the city and court she must have remained influential until shortly before Bach's arrival.

He would have met her in 1716 if he had attended the marriage of Ernst August of Weimar to her daughter at Nienburg Castle, which was her personal residence. As a parishioner of St. Agnes's church, moreover, Bach was a recipient of her spiritual patronage. Although he had no musical responsibilities there, he must have been familiar with the organ by Johann Georg Müller, who had also worked on the instrument by the Thayßner brothers in the town church of St. Jacob. As the latter, like the court chapel, was now used for Reformed services, the upkeep of organs in both places must have been for their use in concerts (as at Amsterdam) or in non-liturgical services of some sort. Presumably Bach had access to all these instruments, especially that at St. Agnes, whose organist Christian Ernst Rolle served under him as court musician from June 1722. But how often or under what circumstances Bach played in any of these churches is undocumented, and the organs themselves do not survive.[259]

The loss of relevant sources also leaves unclear what music Bach and his colleagues provided the court throughout the year. Bach scholars have long supposed that his work at Cöthen focused on instrumental music. Yet the previous Capellmeister and his wife had both been singers, as was the prince himself (in addition to his capabilities as a string player). All this suggests serious interest in vocal music, likely including sacred works—for it is by no means certain how completely Prince Leopold eschewed elaborate church music. The family as a whole had leant toward Calvinism ever since the reign over all of Anhalt of Prince Johann Ernst, who died in 1586. His successors gradually adopted elements of Calvinism, but Anhalt-Zerbst, north of Cöthen, had reverted to Lutheranism in 1644 and remained in that confession throughout Bach's

---

[258] The most recent investigation (Heeg 2008) finds that Bach probably rented from the cloth merchant Johann Andreas Lautsch, moving in 1719 into a second, newly constructed, building also owned by the latter. Heeg rules out the possibility (raised by Leaver 2017, 172) that Bach lived in the same building as the Lutheran pastor Paulus Berger. According to Bunge (1905, 29), who cites no source, Bach complained of a noisy water mill close to his first residence; this disturbed rehearsals there.

[259] Their dispositions are known only from sources well after Bach's time there (see Wolff and Zepf 2008, 42–45).

(and Fasch's) time in Anhalt.[260] Bach presumably had no regular duties in the court chapel, but even the cantor of the Calvinist school in Cöthen may have found some use for one of Bach's more elaborate Weimar church pieces, BWV 21.[261] On the other hand, Bach's fragmentarily preserved Cöthen version of the soprano cantata BWV 199, although conceivably prepared for a court performance there, could have been intended for use elsewhere.[262]

Whatever the precise circumstances involving individual works, there can be little doubt that during these years Bach performed regularly in both vocal and instrumental chamber music. One advantage of joining a court such as Cöthen's was that a favored musician could work closely with a music-loving ruler, establishing a personal bond if not exactly a friendship. Sebastian seems to have succeeded in this with Leopold, as Quantz and perhaps Emanuel Bach did later with Frederick the Great. The latter's realm was far larger, but in his private concerts the king interacted almost as an equal with his best players and singers. Naturally the hired musicians still had to observe distinctions of rank. Yet anecdotes suggest that both ruler and servants could enjoy some relaxation of traditional etiquette, as when Quantz coughed at a mistake by the king, who then expressed concern for the latter's health.[263] No such anecdotes survive from Cöthen. There, however, a prince might have interacted with brilliant musicians in a way that was not possible with other servants or even members of his own family. The musicians could have responded by putting greatercare and effort into their work than they would have done in public concerts or worship services. Their rewards, apart from higher pay, would have included opportunities for travel and, at least for the Capellmeister, a greater degree of self-agency than Bach could have enjoyed in any of his previous positions. A musician in such a situation might also have been able to hope for a certain paternal understanding from a sympathetic prince, as when Fasch managed to secure an advance on his salary in order to pay off some mysteriously acquired debt.[264]

---

[260] The date 1596, sometimes given as that of the adoption of Calvinism in Anhalt, in fact marked the occasion when the senior prince Johann Georg I and his co-reigning brother Augustus first publicly took communion according to the Reformed rite. Ludwig I of Anhalt-Cöthen adopted the Reformed confession in 1616. Lück (2011) traces the denominational history of Anhalt (see especially pp. 58, 61–62).

[261] Maul and Wollny (2003, 97–99) identify Johann Jeremias Göbel as copyist of an alto part.

[262] As with BWV 21, a Cöthen version of BWV 199 is documented only by the chance survival of a source that can be placed in those years—in this case Bach's own manuscript parts for violin, viola da gamba, and continuo notated in D minor. Hofmann (2013) argues that these were probably prepared for use away from Cöthen, but he cannot entirely refute earlier suggestions of a performance there with Bach's second wife Anna Magdalena as soloist.

[263] The earliest source for this oft-repeated anecdote appears to be Friedrich Nikolai, *Anekdoten von König Friedrich II. von Preussen*, vol. 3 (Berlin and Stettin, 1789), 257–58; further discussion in Henze-Döhring (2012, 97–99).

[264] As recounted by Reul (2011, 280–81).

There is no suggestion that Bach ever required that sort of assistance. But an indulgent solicitness on Leopold's part could be read into the substantial salaries afforded both Sebastian and his second wife, as well as the granting of permission to go on frequent, extended trips. Visits to other courts in the region were not purely personal; a musician such as Bach might have served in a minor diplomatic capacity, cultivating friendly relations with neighbors and regional powers by providing compositions and musical advice during visits. The same trips could also serve for recruiting musicians or gathering music as neededat home. A traveling musician could also serve as a spy—not that the lines separating spies from musicians or dipomats were clearly drawn. Surely Bach was expected to note and report back anything on his journeys that would have interested his employer. This might have been particularly the case when visiting closely related courts, including those of Brandenburg-Prussia and the other Anhalt principalities. We have no documentation of such activity, but one would not expect such things to be written down. The fact that Bach traveled as often as he did is implicit evidence that his journeys were seen as beneficial to the prince, if only by enhancing his reputation as the patron of a great musician.

Trips around Anhalt (p. 135, following the paragraph break, "knowledgeable professionals and amateurs alike")

It seems likely that during these years Bach continued to "test" organs, as he had done earlier in his career. Most of his journeys as Cöthen Capellmeister, however, probably had some relationship to his formal role as a court musician. One imagines that he traveled to other regional centers for princely birthday celebrations and the like, just as visitors like the Merseburg Concertmeister Lienike and J. G. Vogler, director of the Leipzig Collegium Musicum, came to Cöthen for special occasions.[265] Yet we have no explicit documentation for organ examinations or other local trips by Bach during the Cöthen years. The closest thing to this is a payment made in August 1722, for the provision of birthday music for Prince Johann August of Anhalt-Zerbst.[266] That prince was, like Leopold of Cöthen, a capable amateur musician. He would have a close relationship to his Capellmeister Fasch, who joined his court only a few weeks later.[267]

---

[265] Payments to both, alongside two others, are recorded in an undated entry from the court accounts (BD 2:72 [no. 93]; NBR, 87 [no. 76b]). The editors of BD place this on Dec. 16, 1718, six days after Bach's performances of BWV Anh. 5 and 66a for the Prince's birthday. "Linigke" is presumed to have been a member of the same family of musicians to which the Cöthen cellist Carl Bernhard Linike, previously at Berlin, belonged. Johann Gottfried Vogler was a violinist as well as organist; he is not known to have been related to Bach's Weimar pupil Johann Caspar Vogler. Bach evidently paid these men himself, then was reimbursed by the court treasurer.

266

Whether Bach was actually present is not explicit in the court record (BD 2:85 [no. 114]). But Maul (2007, 93–94) shows that the "initiator" of Bach's commission was the chancellor Georg Rudolph von Kayn and that, in the absence of a Capellmeister at Zerbst, performances were probably led by the copyist Johann Friedrich Wagner.

[267] Reul (2011, 266) notes that Fasch's position at Zerbst carried a heavier workload and lower salary than Bach's.

Zerbst is less than twenty miles from Cöthen, and perhaps short journeys between cousin residences were regarded as routine duties of an Anhalt Capellmeister and not specially noted. Bach had undertaken a more extensive journey a year previously, in August 1721, when he traveled to Schleiz, seat of Count Heinrich XI Reuss, some ninety-five miles south of Cöthen. Nothing is known of his activities on that trip except that he traveled via the Reuss family seat of Gera.[268] This suggests that he also passed through the Saxon residences of Zeitz and Weissenfels, as well as the Prussian-controlled university city of Halle.

Within the complicated genealogy of the Counts of Reuß (who all bear the name Heinrich), Bach's host was a great-grandson of Count Heinrich II Reuß zu Gera. It was for the latter, known as Posthumus, that Schütz wrote his *Musicalische Exequien* in 1636; Heinrich IX himself was dedicatee of Telemann's six sonatinas of 1718 for violin and continuo. Bach's business in Schleiz might have involved "testing" organs for the court.[269] On the way there he could have renewed old acquaintances, caught up on news (especially about organs and available positions), and exchanged music and musical ideas. The most important of the possible stopping-off points would have been Weissenfels, whose ruling Duke Christian had been the recipient of Bach's Hunt Cantata and would later name him titular Capellmeister. Weissenfels was now home of the trumpeter Johann Caspar Wilcke and at least two of his four daughters, one of whom, Anna Magdalena, would soon join the Cöthen court as a singer.

Return to Hamburg (p. 141, replacing the first sentence after the paragraph break, "During the following months Bach traveled to Hamburg, where he gave a famous organ recital but refused to make the payment necessary for receiving an appointment as organist.")

However depressed and despondent Bach may have become after losing his wife, his desolation cannot have lasted very long, for within four months or so he was on his way to Hamburg, making the most ambitious journey since his youth. This was apparently in connection with a position that had opened up with the death of Heinrich Friese, organist at the church of St. Jacoby. Friese was a musician of no known distinction, but his predecessor had been Matthias Weckmann, pupil of Schütz and one of the most original German composers of keyboard and vocal music of the mid-Baroque. The pastor of the church was Neumeister, Telemann's friend and collaborator, librettist for at least two of Bach's own works (BWV 18 and 61). But whether Bach was really interested in this position is unclear. It would have been a step down, in both prestige and salary, from his present one, and it is possible that he was actually prospecting for a more significant job, that of the aging cantor Joachim Gerstenbüttel. Bach seems to have brought with him one of his most ambitious Weimar church pieces, BWV 21, perhaps even performing it

---

[268] The visit was documented by entries in a now-destroyed book of court accounts; these showed payments for lodging and transportation through Gera (excerpts in BD 2:81 [no. 107]; NBR, 93 [no. 85]).

[269] This possibility is raised by Wolff and Zepf (2012, 23); the instruments in question were in Gera.

as a sort of pre-audition for Gerstenbüttel's position—which would, however, be taken by Telemann the following year, and only after him by a member of the Bach family.[270]

The truth might have been that Bach simply needed to get away from rural Cöthen, returning to a great city where he perhaps spent some of the happiest times of his youth. The long journey (close to 200 miles each way) could not have been undertaken lightly. Yet Bach presumably obtained permission and made the necessary arrangements only after Friese's death on September 12, 1720. The trip culminated with a famous two-hour organ recital which Bach played in St. Catharine's Church, where as a student he presumably had heard Reinken play. This performance anticipated the auditions for Friese's position, in which four other candidates competed on November 28.[271] By then Bach had departed for Cöthen, but among the auditioners was Reinken himself—close to one hundred years of age, according to Mattheson—who had already heard Bach's recital.[272] Bach must have been deeply gratified by the praise he received from Reinken after playing for half an hour the chorale "An Wasserflüssen Babylons" in "various ways" (*auf verschiedene Art*), that is, in a series of variations: "I thought this art had died, but it lives in you."[273]

As when Bach played seven years previously at Halle, the exact sequence of events is unclear. What seems to have happened is that Bach gave his performance and only afterward was invited to apply for the position as organist. The job was offered to him, despite his absence from the official audition; he apparently told the Hamburg authorities that the Prince had called him back to Cöthen. By December 19 he had declined their offer, and the job went to one Johann Joachim Heitmann. The latter, in keeping with local tradition, paid no less than 4000 marks for the privilege of accepting the offer. The kickback was subsequently deplored by Mattheson, who (somewhat unfairly) accused the successful candidate of improvising better with his coins than with his fingers. Neumeister, he said, had preached at Christmas that year that even an angel that played divinely and wished to become organist at St. Jacoby's would have to fly away if he had

---

[270] Emanuel succeeded Telemann in 1768, twelve years after the latter performed Emanuel's Easter cantata W. 244. The practice of unofficial "pre-auditions" seems to have been common; at Leipzig, during his final year, Sebastian would see performances of church music by not only his two oldest sons but his actual successor Harrer. That Bach performed BWV 21 at Hamburg in 1720 is suggested by Mattheson's reference to it five years later (see chap. 7) and by the survival of several manuscript parts prepared at Cöthen (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus ms. Bach St 354, group 2).

[271] As recorded in minutes of the St. Jacoby church council; extracts in BD 2:77–78 (no. 102); NBR, 89–90 (no. 81).

[272] Mattheson's claim (1722–23, 255) that Reinken, whom he calls Reinike, had been born in 1623, is doubted by more recent biographers; the organist may have been only eighty at the time (see, e.g., the *Grove* entry by Ulf Grapenthin).

[273] The story in the Obituary (BD 3:84 [no. 666]; NBR, 302 [no. 306]) could have come only from Sebastian himself, who must have recalled Reinken's words with considerable pride.

no money.[274] These comments suggest that Neumeister and Mattheson might have deliberated together to bring Bach to Hamburg. In any case they were probably expressing the common frustrations of creative artists faced by hard-headed church administrators.

Sale of offices was common in early-modern Europe, and it is hard to believe that Bach would have gone to Hamburg unaware that this was a condition of the position.[275] Therefore it seems most likely that he never seriously expected to become organist at St. Jacoby's, arranging his visit and his performance at St. Catherine's to win fame and probably a good fee (and plenty of good food and drink). His performance might have included the G-minor organ fugue BWV 542/2, whose subject Mattheson later gave to applicants in a subsequent organ audition.[276] Perhaps, too, the "various ways" in which he elaborated the chorale melody "An Wasserflüssen Babylons" incorporated the fantasia BWV 653, perhaps as the grand finale after a series of simpler improvised variations.[277] That this recital was indeed an audition, whether or not officially so, is clear. For playing on the Babylon chorale—a regular feature of Saturday Vespers at Hamburg, according to the Obituary—seems to have been expected of candidates there for organ positions. It would therefore have made sense to prepare by studying Reinken's own enormous fantasia on the same melody—as Bach surely did, having copied out Reinken's work as a student (see fig. 3.1). Weckmann had played on that chorale in his audition in 1655,[278] and organists must have understood the hymn as having a special relevance for their instrument own, thanks to the famous mistranslation of Psalm 137, on which the chorale text is based.[279]

---

[274] *Der musikalische Patriot* (Hamburg, 1728), 316; extract in BD 2:187 (no. 253); NBR, 91 (no. 82). Four thousand Hamburg marks would have been equivalent to 1333 Taler, more than three times Bach's annual salary at Cöthen—about twice what Friese had been making at St. Jacoby's (according to Williams 2016, 210).

[275] Kremer (1993) relates the situation at St. Jacoby's to general practices at Hamburg.

[276] Mattheson (1731, 1:34–35), in a discussion of organ auditions, reproduces the subject and countersubject of BWV 542/2. He explains that these were given to candidates as a basis for "preluding" (*zu präludiren*, = improvising?) during a competition in 1725 at the Hamburg Cathedral, where Mattheson was cantor. A version of the subject had been published in 1700, in the form of the Dutch tune "Ik ben gegroet" (see BD 2:220, commentary to no. 302). Hence Bach or Mattheson could have known the melody prior to Bach's visit.

[277] In later years Sebastian was reported to begin his performances by playing something that was written down (BD 2:397 [no. 499]; NBR, 334 [no. 336]). Wilhelm Friedemann's "improvisations" probably incorporated substantial portions of written compositions, a practice he could have learned from his father (see Schulenberg 2010, 61–62 and 105).

[278] According to Johann Kortkamp's chronicle; the relevant portion is translated by Snyder (2007, 228).

[279] As observed by Williams (2016, 212). The misunderstanding of St. Jerome's *organa* (meaning something like "instruments"—not necessarily musical ones) led medieval illustrators to show little portative organs hanging in willow trees.

Anna Magdalena Wilcke (p. 142, following the first full paragraph, "meeting some of his musicians")

Even if Bach did stop in Weissenfels in 1721, by then Anna Magdalena may already have been working at Cöthen, where on June 15 her presence at Bach's St. Agnes Church was recorded.[280] Three months later she stood alongside Bach as godparent for the son of a court official, on which occasion she was described as a singer in Leopold's court.[281] Her appointment is likely to have been made on Bach's recommendation. The dearth of resident singers in the little town probably made the recruitment of good visiting performers an important part of the Capellmeister's job, and after Kellner's engagement in nearby Weissenfels, some forty miles away, a pupil of hers would have been a desirable addition to the Cöthen roster. If, in engaging a young female singer for the court of Cöthen, Bach also engaged her in marriage, no one at the time is likely to have thought it amiss.[282]

There is no question that Anna Magdalena was genuinely, seriously talented. Had she not married Bach, she might have emulated her teacher as a touring virtuosa. Before her nineteenth birthday, she seems to have been paid twice what her father received for performances as visiting musicians at Zerbst.[283] During the same period, two sisters, daughters of the French page-master, worked at the Cöthen court as "singing maids"; they later sang at Berlin and Hamburg.[284] But Magdalena evidently outshone them, for after her marriage she seems to have been treated (like Keller) as the equivalent of a chamber singer. Her annual pay was second only to Bach's among the court musicians, so that after their marriage their joint annual pay of700 Taler well exceeded that of any of their colleagues.[285] Perhaps it was in anticipation of this new income and an expanded family that Bach began renting a second pew at St. Agnes's, starting in October 1721.[286] Even before the wedding in December 1721, he and Magdalena must have been

---

[280] That she and Bach both took communion on June 15, 1721, was probably not a coincidence, as noted by Wolff (2000, 216).

[281] "Jungfer Magdalena Wilckens, fürstl. Sängerin allhier" (BD 2:82 [no. 108]).

[282] Schubart (1953, 49) suggested that Bach might have simultaneously offered her employment and requested permission to marry her, while visiting Weissenfels on the way to or from Schleiz in summer 1721.

[283] Schubart (1953, 48) considers these as most likely having taken place between Easter and June 24, 1721.

[284] "Singe-Jungfern" (Schulze 2013, 293–95, citing Smend 1951 and tracing their subsequent career).

[285] Anna Magdalena first appears on the regular court payroll in May 1722, receiving 16 Taler and change each month, for an annual total of 200 Taler, half Bach's salary (BD 2:68 [commentary to no. 86], trans. in Smend 1985, 189n. 25). Her yearly pay was soon increased to 300 Taler (NBR, 94 [no. 87b]).

[286] BD 2:79 (no. 103).

performing together at least occasionally for the prince. Any objections to their both remaining on the court payroll would have been met by the reply that the previous Capellmeister, Stricker, and his wife (also a singer) had been joint employees as well.

Despite her evident gifts, Magdalena may never have performed publicly in the modern sense. As with the *concerto delle dame*, the so-called Three Ladies at Ferrara more than a century earlier, the limits of respectability for the daughters and wives of many German church musicians probably ended at the palace doors. The wife of the Dresden Capellmeister Lotti, the prima donna Santa Stella, could appear onstage in his operas, earning the two of them an enormous salary, dwarfing that of Bach and Anna Magdalena.[287] But the women who sang at the Hamburg opera were not married to the Germans who furnished much of the repertory. Magdalena might already have known that at Leipzig a woman could not be heard in church—not even the wife of the director of church music. Decorum might also not have permitted her to sing in other public venues, including the coffee house that saw performances by the Collegium Musicum.[288]

As regrettable as they seem today, such restrictions were not necessarily viewed as frustrations in an age when distinctions between the genders were considered essential and salutary. Besides, eighteenth-century musicians did not necessarily aspire to large public audiences like those of today. The highest honor was to perform privately for an aristocratic patron, as Bach and Anna Magdalena did for Prince Leopold and Quantz and Emanuel Bach would do for King Frederick "the Great." Ranking beneath that were performances for learned gatherings of friends and colleagues, as in the Italian and German academies of the day or the salons of the French intelligentsia. When, in the later eighteenth century, something like the modern tradition of public concerts began to emerge, the sponsoring organizations could describe themselves as "academies," as at Berlin and London—implying something more high-minded and sophisticated than mere entertainment or recreation.

There is little reason to doubt that Sebastian composed or revised certain works for Anna Magdalena to perform in private court or "academic" performances. The new copy of the solo cantata BWV 199 prepared at Cöthen might have been for such an occasion, as also the later BWV 204—on a text by Hunold, the librettist for several Cöthen works. Hunold, incidentally, although remembered now for the occasional texts set by Bach, was known in his day as a satirist. Like Bach's later collaborator Picander, he could write in a ribald, satirical mode (albeit in novels, not librettos); could this have been one reason that Sebastian, and maybe also Magdalena, found his poetry congenial?

---

[287] 10,500 Taler according to Fürstenau (1861–62, 2:105).

[288] Although it has been asserted that women might have heard or even performed in concerts there (most recently by Yearsley 2019, 160), Zimmermann had to agree not to allow women entry to his coffeehouse. As he frequently petitioned the authorities to shut down illegal competitors, he is unlikely to have flouted his own operating license, nor is there any evidence that he did (see Hübner 2018, 46).

Family and life at Cöthen (p. 143, following the paragraph break, "Bach continued to receive his full salary (as did Anna Magdalena)")

It would be understandable if the prince's marriage caused his attention to turn away from music. Still in his first years of rule, he must have been just beginning to grasp the realities of managing a would-be absolutist court in a relatively poor region of the Empire. Financial stress would have also come from the settlement of a dynastic dispute that had led Leopold to send troops into territories assigned to his mother and younger brother. In fact it is surprising that there was not a greater retrenchment in spending on music. There can be little doubt, however, that the princess failed to share her husband's genuine mastery of and zeal for music. Leopold himself was probably devoting less time to private music making, and Bach's palace performances might have received less attention than before. That Leopold nevertheless continued to favor him after the princess's death is clear. There was no reduction in his or Magdalena's salary, although at least three departing musicians were not replaced—nor was Bach himself, after leaving in 1723. Rather, Bach would retain the title of Capellmeister after his departure for Leipzig, just as Telemann had done when he left Eisenach for Frankfurt.

Bach's marriage took place at home "by command of the Prince." This may have been customary for second marriages, but it also apparently let him get a good price on wine for the celebration, and it excused him from paying the usual fee to the church (which later complained).[289] We must suppose that the event saw many members of the extended Bach and Wilcke families visiting the town; it might have been necessary to take care that the accompanying musical performances did not rival those which attended the prince's own wedding eleven days earlier. We can also suppose that a young woman of the time, no matter how talented, would have been excited by the prospect of marriage to an established Capellmeister sixteen years older than she. Moreover, having grown up at two courts, Magdalena would have understood the restrictions as well as the advantages that such a position entailed. The unmarried and childless Kellner, her presumed teacher, could lead a life untrammeled by domestic concerns. Magdalena, however, was entering a household that already included four surviving children, and she must have understood that henceforth she would be expected to produce and raise more of them. She would bear no fewer than thirteen over the next two decades, seeing seven of them die. For twenty years she would be "as close as one woman can be to being continuously pregnant."[290]

This did not prevent Anna Magdalena from maintaining her career as a court singer. She and her husband would continue to travel to Cöthen and Weissenfels for performances after the move to Leipzig. Such activity would have been facilitated immeasurably by the family's growing

---

[289] The marriage is documented in records of the court church (BD 2:83 [no. 110]; NBR, 93 [no. 86]), the purchase of wine, at a special price from the Ratskeller, in the Cöthen city archive (BD 2:83–84 [no. 111]). Some months after Bach's departure, a memo was filed in the Lutheran church records complaining that not only Bach but the daughter of an apothecary had married without paying the stipulated 10 Taler (BD 2:120 [no. 158]).

[290] Thus Knoll (2016, 274), who includes a handy table showing the number of living members of the immediate family at every moment from 1707 to 1809.

prosperity and the continuing presence of Friedelena Margaretha. Ten years older than Sebastian, the sister of the late Maria Barbara must have served as a sort of *mater familiaris*, overseeing the household and carrying out domestic responsibilities that otherwise would have fallen to his wife. To be sure, in a family that had grown as prosperous as this one, the more mundane chores could now probably be undertaken by servants.[291] Also still present and doubtless contributing in various ways was Catharina Dorothea, Sebastian and Maria Barbara's first child, who never married. Living in a very different sort of society, few present-day readers can even imagine what types of relationships might have formed between children, parents, and step-parents in such a household, nor do we have records to document them. Even the critical matter of musical education is largely hidden from us, although we must assume that this, together with religious indoctrination, was understood to be one of the chief domestic duties of both parents. In this Sebastian might have taken over from Magdalena when the children, or perhaps only the boys, reached a certain age—nine, in the case of Friedemann; that at least was when he received the famous music book inscribed with his name, discussed below.

During the months preceding and following his marriage in December 1721, Bach received family news of a more somber nature. His oldest sibling Johann Christoph, who had been perhaps his most important teacher, died at Ohrdruf in February 1721. His other surviving brother, Johann Jacob, died at Stockholm in April 1722 while still in the service of the king of Sweden. Sebastian must have remained in touch with at least Christoph, whose son Johann Bernhard had apprenticed at Weimar and, until 1719, at Cöthen.[292] Forkel believed that, after Christoph's death, Sebastian recovered the manuscript of keyboard music which had been the subject of his surreptitious moonlight copying. But Forkel also thought that Christoph had died much earlier.[293] In fact Christoph's musical possessions must have passed to his three sons, all musicians.

Sebastian's only surviving sibling was now his older sister Marie Salome, living in Erfurt and married to the wealthy fur merchant Johann Andreas Wiegand. Bach's mother, born Maria Elisabeth Lämmerhirt, had come from another Erfurt family of fur traders. When her sister-in-law, Maria Catharina Lämmerhirt, died in September 1721—that is, around the time of his engagement to Magdalena—Sebastian was supposed to have inherited an amount equal to rather more than his entire annual salary. By an odd coincidence, at the time of his first marriage he had inherited a smaller sum from Maria Catharina's husband (his uncle Tobias Lämmerhirt). Now,

---

[291] We know of one servant at Cöthen who happened to serve as godmother to a soldier's daughter in 1721 (BD 2:81 [no. 106]).

[292] Bernhard recalled his studies with Sebastian "at the keyboard as well as in composition" ("sowohl im Clavier als composition," BD 2:202 [no. 277]), in an autobiographical note recorded at Ohrdruf probably during the 1720s.

[293] "he did not recover it [the "moonlight" manuscript] till his brother's death, which took place soon after" ("dem bald darauf erfolgten Tode dieses Bruders," Forkel 1802, 5; trans. in NBR, 426). The so-called Johann Andreas Bach Book (Leipzig, Musikbibliothek, III.8.4), containing early works of Sebastian alongside older music by Buxtehude, Pachelbel, and others, went to Christoph's youngest son Andreas.

however, his sister Marie Salome moved to contest the will. Upon learning of this some six months later, Sebastian sent a letter to the Erfurt town council objecting to her proposal. He did this on behalf of Jacob as well as himself, but, by the time that his objection had been sustained and a settlement reached that December, his brother had died without receiving his share, leaving a widow but no surviving children. Sebastian's letter is politely vague about the specifics, which were evidently well known at Erfurt, where the Lämmerhirts were among the elite. But the letter hints at battle lines and alliances drawn between siblings. Bach indicates that he has learned about this only through some unofficial channel, suggesting that he kept himself informed about matters affecting his financial rights and opportunities through a network of well-placed friends and relatives.[294]

Sebastian's household had not grown since their arrival in Cöthen, for Maria Barbara's last child, Leopold August, had lived less then a year, nor are they known to have taken in additional boarders or students. Magdalena's first child, Christiana Sophia Henrietta Bach, was born in spring 1723, probably a few months before the family's departure for Leipzig.[295] She would live only a little more than three years—during which time three more children would be born. Meanwhile the three oldest boys, Friedemann, Emanuel, and Bernhard, were continuing their education, the last two presumably joining the first at the St. Agnes school. Magdalena would have observed the distinct personalities of the two oldest boys beginning to emerge: Friedemann's moody introversion, Emanuel's outgoing cheerfulness. Gottfried Bernhard might already have been showing the disastrous impulsiveness and shiftiness that would make him (not Friedemann) the black sheep among the children.[296] Given the primitive understanding of child psychology at the time, any "bad" traits might well have been reinforced by punitive parental responses to unintentional youthful failings.[297]

Despite the loss of his first wife, the traditional view of Bach's life at Cöthen is that it was an idyllic period of professional gratification and personal happiness. This, however, depends on a

---

[294] Bach's letter, reacting to news of which he "seems to be informed" ("nun eüßerlich vernehme"), is in BD 1:28 (no. 8), trans. in NBR, 94–95 (no. 89). It is supplemented by commentary in BD 1:29–30 and several further documents excerpted in BD 2:82–87 (nos. 109, 112, 117, 118). Wolff (2000, 490n. 82) gives Bach's share of the legacy as 50 florins, but this appears to be an error for the amount inherited from Tobias in 1707 (mentioned in BD 1:29). NBR, 95, gives the sum as "approximately 550 thlr.," Boyd (2006, 75) as "about 500 thalers."

[295] The loss of a baptismal record means that her birthdate and the names of her godparents are unknown.

[296] Kulukundis (2017) reconstructs Bernhard's character; evidence for Friedemann and Emanuel's personality in their youth is preserved in a recollection by the historian Jacob von Stählin (BD 5:235 [no. C895b]; see Wollny 2010, 129), who was a childhood acquaintance at Leipzig.

[297] R. L. Marshall (2017, 15–16) hints at this, suggesting that Sebastian was an "outsized, overbearing father"; he quotes the latter's letter complaining of Bernhard's "impenitent heart" (*verstocktes Herz*, BD 1:107 [no. 42], trans. in NBR, 200 [no. 203]).

few lines in a letter written by Bach several years afterward, when he was beset by problems at Leipzig and had just attended the funeral of his favorite patron Prince Leopold.[298] A person as driven and ambitious as Bach could never have been entirely satisfied in any environment. Ever striving, and likely expecting each family member to do the same, such a character would have exacerbated the anxieties and tensions that a strong-willed parent inevitably creates in his children. Although instructed by both religion and family tradition to be a good father and husband, those expressions would have meant to Bach something very different from what they mean today. He and his wives successfully raised no fewer than five professional musicians among the boys. Yet he could not prevent one (Bernhard) from having an abortive career and a short life. Another, supposedly the most talented (Friedemann), lived much longer but proved to be a chronic underachiever. Lacking first-hand clinical knowledge, we cannot psychoanalyze the long-dead members of a family that belonged to what was, in many respects, a remote, foreign culture. But we should not doubt that Sebastian was capable of treating both wives and children badly, psychologically if not physically. No one at the time would have held Bach responsible for the collateral damage as he pursued his own extraordinary career and pushed his sons in the same direction. Their failures would have been viewed as products of either their own faults or an inscrutable destiny, their suffering an unavoidable side-effect of the pursuit of personal distinction and family advancement.

Practically the only meaningful documentation for Bach's life from this time takes the form of music. Even this survives very fragmentarily; for instance, we have only a fraction of the vocal music that Bach wrote for the court. Two documents, however, have long been supposed to provide insight into Bach's family life: the little keyboard books (*Clavierbüchlein*) for Wilhelm Friedemann and for Anna Magdalena. The first was, according to Sebastian's title page, presented to his first son a little after the latter's ninth birthday. The second is supposed to have been a wedding gift, as it is dated 1722, at the latest a year after Bach's second marriage.[299] Both are manuscripts in oblong form, suitable for setting on the music rack of a harpsichord or clavichord.

Friedemann's book suggests a close musical relationship between father and son, the former having written into the book some basic teaching material as well as a series of increasingly difficult preludes and other pieces. The boy entered some music as well, including what are likely his early efforts at composition.[300] Both manuscripts, however, seem to have become as much compositional workbooks for Sebastian as personal music collections for their dedicatees;

---

[298] The famous letter to Erdmann of Oct. 28, 1730 (BD 1:67–68 [no. 23], trans. in NBR, 151–52 [no. 152]).

[299] Friedemann's book is now in the Yale University Library in New Haven (without shelf mark). There are actually two *Clavierbüchlein* for Magdalena, from 1722 and 1725; these are Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. mss. Bach P 224 and P 225, respectively.

[300] For a more detailed survey of the contents, see Schulenberg (2006), chap. 10.

Magdalena's now consists largely of Sebastian's first drafts of the French Suites.[301] It is often asserted that these pieces were intended for her musical delight and edification, but a twenty-one-year-old singer probably did not possess the substantial mastery of the keyboard necessary for playing many of them. When Sebastian gave her a second book, in 1725, it became filled largely with much simpler pieces by other composers. Although perhaps intended for her, these must also have been used in teaching the younger children. The second book eventually passed to her stepson Emanuel, who had already copied some of his own early compositions into it before leaving home for university studies in 1734. Friedemann does seem to have treasured his book. Rather than selling it—as he notoriously did some of Sebastian's other autograph manuscripts—he passed it on intact to his own pupil and amanuensis, the distant cousin known as the Halle Clavier Bach.[302]

The Leipzig audition and appointment (p. 146, following the paragraph break, "'highly praised by everyone who could judge it'")

We do not know how Bach had spent the previous year. After his marriage at the end of 1721, we know only of the possibility of trips to Zerbst in August, to perform birthday music for Prince Johann August, and to Erfurt in connection with the Lämmerhirt inheritance. After preparing the annual birthday cantata and New Year's music for Prince Leopold in December 1722, Bach might have turned to writing the two cantatas which he presented at Leipzig on February 7 (Estomihi Sunday). Yet the autograph scores and performing parts for Graupner's two cantatas were written on Leipzig paper, suggesting that he was not given the texts for these until after his arrival.[303] Bach, too, seems not to have completed his assignment until he was at Leipzig, adding wind parts and a final chorale chorus to the second cantata (BWV 23) perhaps only after gaining a better idea of what the local forces were capable of.[304]

---

[301] The volume originally comprised some 75 sheets, but two-thirds of these were removed at some point. Conceivably the missing pages included simpler music or fair copies of pieces copied for or by Magdalena.

[302] This Bach, named Johann Christian like Friedemann's youngest brother, was from the Meiningen branch of the family; their exact relationship is uncertain. A painting of this J. C. Bach by Friedrich Georg Weitsch is often reproduced erroneously as a portrait of Friedemann, with an attribution to a non-existent "Wilhelm" Weitsch; see Lacher (2005, 223; cat. no. W59).

[303] Graupner's cantatas, *Aus der Tiefen* and *Lobet den Herrn*, are preserved in autograph score and parts on paper with Leipzig watermarks (according to the library catalog cards for Darmstadt, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek, Mus. mss. 431-1 and 431-2, online with (scans of the manuscripts) at http://tudigit.ulb.tu-darmstadt.de/show/sammlung23. Autograph material survives only for the second of Bach's two cantatas (BWV 23).

[304] The final chorus is absent from the composing score, which contains only the first three movements (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus ms. Bach P 69). Wolff (2000, 222) supposes that Bach's manuscript parts for the concluding chorus were copied from a previously composed passion "which Bach brought along to Leipzig in his baggage." The movement was re-used in the St. John Passion (version of 1725) and in the first St. Matthew Passion of C. P. E. Bach (in 1769).

This might have been a risky thing to do, for the chorale could not have been part of the original libretto. The author of the latter may have been none less than Gottfried Lange, effectively both mayor of Leipzig and head of the search committee.[305] Yet, as at Weimar, Bach appears to have supplemented a given text without suffering any backlash. What else he might have brought for the occasion is unknown. Although he was not being auditioned as an organist, he surely brought along keyboard pieces as well as performing parts for recent chamber compositions, if only for informal concerts or "academies" in which he might have been asked to participate during his visit. Would he also have brought music for teaching, such as the *Orgelbüchlein* or the little pieces in the music books for Magdalena and Friedemann? even the Well-Tempered Clavier? That a job candidate might present a portfolio of written work seems common sense to a present-day dean or search committee chair. But the idea might not have occurred to anyone at a time when objective evaluations of job applicants carried no greater weight than their perceived status or reputation. Age, ethnicity, gender, religion, and marital status were all considered legitimate, indeedessential, points of consideration. A university degree surely carried some weight, but so did a court title, preferably from a high-ranking ruler. A family name might be sufficient to qualify for a position, as when the count of Arnstadt went looking for Bachs—likewise a few lines of cursory recommendation from a famous teacher or previous aristocratic employer.

While all this was going on, Magdalena was pregnant with her first child. Meanwhile there was still much to do after Bach's selection by the council. He had to obtain his dismissal from Prince Leopold, who granted Bach permission "to seek his fortune elsewhere" on April 13.[306] He then had to present his acceptance of the job offer, which in turn had to be approved by the "Three Councils" of Leipzig. This was the larger body which ratified the decision previously taken by the smaller governing council for the year (*Enger Rat*).[307] Having been previously burned by Telemann and Graupner, some councilors were probably suspicious of any courtly Capellmeister. Before voting unanimously for Bach, two of them placed certain stipulations into the record. Councilor Platz, who previously had seemed to insist on mediocrity, observed that Bach would have to "accommodate himself" to teaching. He admitted, however, that Bach was capable of doing this and had accepted it as a condition of employment. Councilor Steger, after mentioning that Bach would hand off some of his teaching to other instructors—the deal that had also been offered to Telemann—insisted that Bach must avoid writing "theatrical"

---

[305] Lange, who proved to be one of Bach's allies on the council, presided over the ruling *enger Rat* for the year (see below). He had previously written poetry and opera librettos.

[306] "seine Fortun vor itzo zu suchen" (BD, 93 [no. 128]; NBR, 101 [no. 96]).

[307] Leipzig's council was divided into three parts, each headed by a burgomaster. In any given year, one of these part-councils took responsibility for routine matters. Important decisions—including election of a music director—were taken by the "Three Councils" as a body (details in Siegele 1983, 8–9). Bach's letter accepting the provisional offer made by the *Enger Rat* is dated Leipzig, April 19, 1723 (BD 1:175 [no. 91]; NBR, 102 [no. 97]). There are two complementary accounts of the meeting of the Three Councils on April 22, in BD 2:93–95 (no. 129), partial trans. in NBR, 102–3 (no. 98); and in BD 2:96–97 (no. 130).

compositions.[308] What this meant was unclear; Steger had preferred Graupner, who had once been a composer of operas, like Telemann. The sacred vocal works that Graupner had composed for his audition were in the now-customary Italianate manner, derived from opera. Perhaps the objection was to simple ("secco") recitative, which both Bach and Graupner avoided in their audition pieces. Bach would, however, routinely use simple recitative in his music for Leipzig. Yet his church music would never be as theatrical as that of Telemann, whose passions and cantatas sometimes include named characters.

[308] "Zur Informtion der Jugend müste [*sic*] er sich accomodiren. . . . "hätte er solche Compositiones zu machen, die nicht theatralisch wären." BD 2:94 (no. 129); NBR, 103 (no. 98).

Chapter 9

Bach's musical activity at Cöthen (p. 154, following the paragraph break, "if Bach did not do the same for his own ensemble")

Prince Leopold was already collecting music prior to Bach's arrival; acquisitions during his Grand Tour had included printed works of Lully.[309] Now that he had an ensemble of virtuosos, he would have wished to hear the music he had gathered by French and Italian composers of the recent past as well as the present. Later, at Leipzig, Bach's repertory for the Collegium Musicum appears to have been similar,[310] and this could explain why his own compositions for instrumental ensemble, now so popular, make up only a small fraction of his output. Performing recent music by others would have given Bach ideas for his own compositions, and he doubtless made creative contributions—rescoring, or adding elaborate continuo realizations—to works that he found in or added to the court repertory. Pisendel's surviving scores and parts from Dresden, where he directed the court orchestra, reveal him in effect arranging many works for himself and his fellow players.[311] If Bach did the same, a substantial part of his work at Cöthen could have consisted of editing and sometimes revising other people's music. That Bach had no reluctance about doing this is clear from his earlier and later reworkings of works by contemporaries (Vivaldi, Telemann, Pergolesi) as well as composers as old as Palestrina.

To be sure, there is evidence for the loss of five cantatas,[312] yet portions of these may survive in later parodies. The question therefore is whether the hints of lost music—chiefly in the form of stray movements incorporated into later compositions—represent the tip of an iceberg or, rather, a substantial portion of a small body of work. Whatever the case, Bach certainly kept himself and his musicians busy, for the weekly rehearsals that took place at his house, for which he was compensated, imply equally frequent performances at court. A comment by the cantor of the Reformed church at Cöthen implies that these rehearsals were known in the town, perhaps even

---

[309] Hoppe (1986, 27) lists the prince's musical acquisitions during 1711, including three of Lully's operas—possibly volumes from Ballard's sumptuous complete edition in full score, if not the smaller vocal scores printed in the early eighteenth century.

[310] Glöckner (1981, 68–75) lists surviving manuscripts copies of works likely performed by the Leipzig Collegium Musicum, including cantatas, concertos, and suites. Stauffer (2008) adds additional items.

[311] See, e.g., Oleskiewicz (1998, 271–72) on Pisendel's autograph revisions of the solo violin part in an early work by his pupil Quantz.

[312] That is, the birthday music for 1718 and 1720 and New Year's cantatas for 1720, 1723, and one other (BWV Anh. 5, 6, 7, 8, and 197). Other likely losses include music for Leopold's wedding in 1721 (if this was not BWV 202) and for the funeral of Leopold's first wife in 1723.

open to interested listeners; in a small, quiet place, music performed in a private home might have carried some distance.[313]

What was played or sung, how it was rehearsed, and who actually listened are all unknown. For that matter, what the writer meant by "practicing and working out" is equally uncertain. The words *probieren und exerzieren* suggest a simple reading or try-out followed by something more intense, but not necessarily the detailed working out of passages as in a modern orchestral rehearsal. One function of any *Probe* would have been to insure that performing parts copied by hand from a composer's score contained no serious errors. Yet serious errors do occur in surviving parts from the period that we know were used. Musicians must have been accustomed to improvising their way around mistakes—and doing so without writing corrections into the parts. Indeed, it would have been unthinkable for musicians to put their own markings into parts that were the personal property of either the prince or the Capellmeister—nor is it likely that they were permitted to take parts home to practice.

How great a contrast this represented to Bach's activity at Weimar is also unclear, for we do not know the extent of his secular or purely instrumental musical activity there. When he left Weimar for Cöthen, he must have understood that he was abandoning any expectation of writing sacred vocal music on a regular basis. But was this a frustration? Or had he never been as committed to sacred music as he seemed to indicate in his farewell letter to the Mühlhausen authorities? His output at Cöthen looks like a decisive turn away from his predominantly religious work for Weimar. Perhaps he could justify his new emphasis on instrumental music and secular vocal compositions as a form of devotion, useful for training himself and others for future music making in the Lutheran church. Yet, even at Weimar, did he regard his sacred vocal compositions (and organ chorales) as central to his work, or were these secondary to other things? At Leipzig he would write out huge cantatas in ink in a single draft, with no substantive revision. Yet he also continued to work painstakingly and methodically on instrumental music. A substantial quantity of the paper alotted to Bach at both Weimar and Cöthen might have been used for sketching and drafting keyboard and chamber music. Although quite a bit of autograph material survives for these compositions, it is mostly in the form of fair copies, such as the autograph manuscripts already mentioned. Evidently it was the latter, rather than the routine church music, that he (or at least his heirs) later regarded as his major work.

Vocal works

Compositions for Leopold's birthday (Dec. 10) and New Year's Day seem to have been the only new vocal music that Bach was expected to provide regularly at Cöthen. Producing these would have involved, first, commissioning the poetry (from Hunold in Halle until his death in 1721); then engaging soloists—often visitors; finally, crafting music with those soloists in mind, just as was done in operas of the time. Bach's compositional process in these works must have been somewhat different from that at Weimar, where most texts were by the court poet and soloists were usually colleagues. It certainly differed from his better-documented procedure at Leipzig

[313] The cantor's entry of Sept. 22, 1722, quoted in BD 2:70 (commentary to no. 91), refers to weekly musical rehearsals (*Exercitium musicum*) by the "most famous virtuosos" (*berühmtesten Virtuosen*).

for sacred works. There he would produce scores very quickly, usually during the days immediately before their performance, as probably did his more prolific contemporaries Graupner and Telemann.

Only two of Bach's vocal works for Cöthen survive in their original forms: BWV 134a and 173a. Portions of three others are known from later reworkings: BWV 66a, 184a, and 194a.[314] Today these are all described as secular cantatas, but at least BWV 66a and 134a are are more properly designated serenatas. The term then referred to a type of unstaged drama typically involving allegorical gods and goddesses, as these do. Bach continued to compose such music at Leipzig, usually on commission or for special occasions involving visiting aristocrats. Whereas the earlier Hunt Cantata, his first work of this type, was essentially Italian in style, Bach now drew on French dance for both rhythm and form. Thus the closing movement of BWV 173a is a minuet, that of BWV 184a a gavotte.[315] Although the dates of these works are not entirely certain, Anna Magdalena must have performedin some of them; it cannot have been irrelevant that Kellner, her probable teacher, had begun her career singing in Lully's operas.[316] Clearly, French as well as Italian vocal music was valued at Cöthen, and the prince's performers needed to understand the very different performance styles of both. Bach, like Kuhnau and other German composers, must also have prided himself on his ability to meld both with native counterpoint.

Relating Bach's vocal music to his more numerous instrumental compositions of the period is an uncertain task, as his work in each genre tended to follow its own logic. But the focus on dance rhythms is an obvious commonality. One also hears occasional motivic or thematic echoes, as in the use of frenetic motivic work based on repeated turning figures (ex. S9.1). Bach's vocal music for Cöthen includes what may be his most transcendentally jolly duet aria, "Es streiten" from BWV 134a, perceptibly echoing Telemann even as it surpasses him. There are also novelties such as the strophic aria "Unter seinem Purpursaum" from BWV 173a, in which bass and soprano soloists sing Leopold's praises, first individually, then together. Their successive stanzas are set as a minuet with two doubles in "ascending" keys (G–D–A); the vocal phrases alternate with increasingly lively settings of the same melody for strings, joined by flutes in the two variations. Yet as charming as this and other works may be, the overall level of seriousness is lower than in the Weimar vocal works, the challenges to listener if not performer fewer. Although Bach found ways to incorporate much, perhaps most, of his Cöthen vocal music into later sacred works—some two years later the minuet aria became the duet "So hat Gott die Welt

---

[314] We also have one later vocal work for Cöthen, composed in 1726 for Princess Charlotte Frederike's birthday (BWV 36a), as well as movements from the music for Leopold's funeral in 1729. These were both based on other compositions (BWV 36c, 198, and 244). Texts alone survive for five more works.

[315] Both movements, in binary form, include voices only for the reprise of each half. Bach reused the music at Leipzig for the sacred cantatas BWV 173 and 184, probably performed consecutively on May 29–30, 1724.

[316] Schulze (2013, 281) mentions productions of *Psychée* and *Theseé* at Wolfenbüttel, followed by Italian operas at Hamburg and elsewhere.

geliebt” in Cantata 173—the instrumental music surely constitutes the major accomplishment of his Cothen years.

It is usually assumed that Leopold’s Calvinism prevented Bach’s organ music and cantatas from being performed in his chapel. But some of the surviving texts are religious and a few were even printed with titles pointing to their use in church, although perhaps technically not as part of the liturgy. The widespread use of dance forms had no bearing on the appropriateness of the music for sacred use, as is clear from Bach’s repurposing these compositions for the Leipzig churches. Only in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries did this lead to embarrassment among his admirers. Discomfort for some increased when Friedrich Smend, a German theologian and musicologist, showed that the surviving librettos for several further Cöthen compositions, now lost, could be fitted to existing music from later works.[317] In fact the adaptation of existing music for new texts had been a widespread practice since the Renaissance; the term used, *parody*, implies no disrespect and certainly nothing satirical. When Schütz published a sacred parody of a famous secular duet by Monteverdi, it can have been meant only as homage to the still living older composer.[318] During Bach’s time, popular opera arias could be reworked as movements of sacred cantatas; at Grimma, a town near Leipzig with a famous choir school, an aria sung by an abandoned princess in Hasse’s opera *Cleofide* became a response to Jesus’s torture and mockery.[319]

The most important of Bach’s Cöthen vocal compositions were probably the two written not for the court but at the end of Bach’s time there, for the Leipzig audition. Both share features with his secular cantatas of the period, as in the use of solo voices for extensive passages in what are otherwise choral movements. A chorus in the second cantata, BWV 23, combines minuet style with allusions to French rondeau form, although Bach had already done this in two of the works written for Advent 1716 at Weimar.[320] On the other hand, the opening chorus of the first cantata (BWV 22) incorporates a short but intensively worked out four-part permutation fugue—practically Bach’s last example of that austere type. The second cantata concludes with a grand but equally austere chorale fantasia. This was a late addition apparently composed after Bach’s arrival at Leipzig; it presumably supplemented the libretto that had been supplied to Bach for his audition. Yet it is nominally in the same key as the opening chorus of BWV 22, sharing with the

---

[317] This was a major theme of Smend (1985), originally published in 1951.

[318] Schütz’s “Est steh Gott auf,” incorporating much of Monteverdi’s *ciaconna* “Zefiro torna e di soave accenti,” appeared in part 2 of his *Kleine geistliche Concerten* (op. 9, 1639).

[319] In the cantata *Auf mit freudigen Getrümmel*, whose opening number was originally the aria “Son qual misera columba” from Hasse’s opera *Cleofide* (it is preserved in Dresden, Landesbibliothek, Mus. ms. 2477-E-536).

[320] In the opening choruses of BWV 186a and 147a; both make a double da capo, producing an ABABA form.

latter some motivic ideas as well.[321] For instance, the oboes play ascending slides or *Schleifer* (g″–a″–b-flat″, etc.) in the opening ritornellos of both movements.

Perhaps, then, by adding this chorus Bach meant to draw the two works into a larger unity. Both also incorporate the ornately expressive oboe writing that Bach had been cultivating since his Weimar years. The prevailingly dark, minor coloration and the absence of any really lively music leave both works somewhat monochromatic. These features might only reflect caution in writing for the Leipzig musicians or listeners, yet they were consistent with the texts and the liturgical occasion, anticipating Lent. Even so, with these two compositions Bach's Leipzig auditors got a taste of his capabilities in both strict and *galant* types of music—a sampling of what he had explored at Cöthen, in compositions not only for the prince but for himself and his pupils.

The idea of writing in a *galant* style might well have been on Bach's mind during this time, given the types of music that were of interest not only at courts but in the fashionable city of Leipzig. Literally meaning "gallant," the French word was sometimes used by Bach's German contemporaries to mean little more than "stylish" or "in vogue." For his pupil Kirnberger, on the other hand, the word had the more specific, technical connotation of a certain relaxation of the traditional rules of counterpoint.[322] Today we apply the term to music by composers ranging from Vivaldi to Mozart, implying something between the Baroque and the Classical or containing elements of both. The core idea, for us as for Bach's contemporaries, is the presence of a transparent texture that allows a catchy or expressive melody to resound, without becoming enmeshed in complex counterpoint or dissonant, chromatic harmony. Toward this end, eighteenth-century composers wrote even large orchestral scores in just two or three real parts, with undivided violins that might be doubled by flutes and oboes. Counterpoint in such a work might be limited to a simple bass line, sometimes joined to a single inner part that moves largely in parallel thirds or sixths with the melody.

Today regarded as simplistic and inexpressive, this type of texture was regarded at the time as encouraging expression, as it gave the melody unrivaled prominence. Although present in innumerable French dances and vocal works, the style as we recognize it today was most at home in *opera seria*, the type of Italian opera that dominated the eighteenth-century European stage. From there it inspired much of the instrumental as well as the vocal output of Bach's contemporaries. Bach himself cannot have disapproved of it, for he gave his pupils many examples of such music to study (as in the little keyboard books). They imitated it in their own compositions. Bach himself often wrote at least the initial passages of many of his own works in much the same style. Yet he cannot have thought that, by subsequently working a *galant* opening

---

[321] Identifying the tonalities of BWV 22 and 23 is complicated by the fact that the final movement of BWV 23 opens in G minor and ends in C minor; moreover, at some point Bach transposed BWV 23 to B minor, replacing the original oboes with oboes d'amore. Wolff (1991, 131ff., and NBA, vol.I/8.1–2, KB, 48) described these as last-minute changes carried out just before Bach's audition, but see Rifkin (2003, 574), who also argues for the elimination of ripieno vocal parts in Bach's subsequent performances.

[322] See Sheldon (1975, 261–62), who cites several of Kirnberger's publications from 1776 and later.

idea into a chromatic texture, he made his music *less* expressive. Many of his Cöthen works, like the Leipzig church cantatas, can be seen as deliberate efforts to incorporate a *galant* idiom into something more distinctively Bach's own.

Bach's collections (p. 156, following the first paragraph break, "reconstructing hypothetical originals")

Bach's penchant for revising and recasting both individual works and entire sets has long been known. In recent years it has been argued that Bach went beyond selecting an appropriate group of compositions and polishing them up: he took pains that the total number of notated bars or measures of music in a finished or "perfected" collection, as it has been called, added up to a particular figure, often divisible by 100. Moreover, the numbers of bars within subsets of pieces or movements of a collection sometimes seem to form simple ratios such as 1:1, 2:1, and the like. It is not unthinkable that Bach might have planned both the six violin solos and the six sonatas for violin and keyboard to contain precisely 1200 measures, even if the count in the latter set (only) includes repeated bars. Nor is it necessarily through sheer chance that the inventions and sinfonias (in Bach's revised autograph score) contain precisely 1032 measures, divisible into various symmetrically arranged groups.[323] Findings of this sort need to be examined skeptically; "proportional parallelisms" can be found readily even among random numbers. Yet the possibility must be taken seriously that Bach was counting bars and adding or deleting measures as he revised pieces for inclusion in some of his collected sets.[324]

Bach's predecessors and contemporaries in the arts often played with numbers. Poets might count the number of letters in a line or a poem, relating these to a patron's birthday or the like. Numerical or geometric planning was essential for a craftsman or artisan laying out the dimensions of a physical structure, such as a building or a musical instrument. Music theory defined each melodic interval in terms of a ratio governing the lengths of the pipes or strings that produced it. An instrument maker constructing a harpsichord would start by laying out a pattern, and the scaling of string lengths and the guages of their wire diameters followed more or less regular geometric progressions.

---

[323] E.g., 516 bars in the inner eighteen pieces and the same number in the six preceding and the six following them. Without the C-minor sinfonia—the last piece in Kayser's copy, Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. 219, and missing from Friedemann's music book—the collection comprises 1000 bars, perhaps a clue to its prehistory (according to Tatlow 2015, 164–68).

[324] A critique of Tatlow's hypothesis by Bakker (2015) points out some obvious problems, but only a competent number theorist could calculate the probability that Tatlow's results could have resulted by chance. Shepherd (2021, 196) concludes that "the data neither proves nor disproves *[sic]* that Bach intentionally used proportions," but, like Melamed (2021), he has tested only one trivial finding of her theory: that many of Bach's collections can be partitioned into groups of bars whose numbers form simple proportions. More to the point would be to determine the probability of finding round-number measure counts in whole collections and simple ratios between counts of this type within or between entire sets of compositions.

Closer to the practicalities of actual music making was the planning of musical manuscripts and printed editions, or the choreography of dances for the stage. These activities required the actual counting of measures and their arrangement into ordered schemes, usually according to some symmetrical pattern governed by simple ratios. Anyone writing out a musical manuscript would have to plan, as precisely as possible, the number of pages required and the number of bars falling on every page, in order to avoid waste of precious paper. Number and proportion were therefore intrinsic elements of a musician's daily activity, and their incorporation into everyday practice must have been close to universal among German composers of Bach's generation. Bach, however, seems to have gone beyond his fellows in the pervasive character of the numerical planning that went into his finished collections.

Students of Bach's music have long sensed his playing with numbers in some fashion. Commentators have discovered meaningful symbolisms in the particular number of measures, or notes, or other elements of given compositions. One instance has already been observed in BWV 1127, Bach's birthday aria for Duke Wilhelm Ernst. But apart from special cases, or the conventional associations held by a few small numbers, such as 3 (which might represent the Holy Trinity of Christian belief in any number of compositions), numerical symbolism appears to have been of limited significance for Bach. Rather he seems to have adopted a silent numerical "harmony" as an essential feature of collections that he deemed worthy of dissemination.

Harmony had been defined by music theorists from ancient Greece onward as the product of intervals represented by small-number ratios. An octave, for instance, was formed by two strings of which one was twice the length of the other. More recent writers related the number of measures in a piece to their duration in time, and some Baroque composers may have computed the size of a composition, that is, the number of measures that its score must comprise, according to the time that it would need to fill.[325] It is possible that some of Bach's contemporaries continued to envision some such system, which hearkened back to the mensural theory of the Renaissance. But quarter notes in Bach's music do not necessarily move twice as fast when notated in cut time, as opposed to common time. Time signatures such as 3/2 and 6/8 in general cannot have retained their original proportional significance, although this did not prevent Bach and others from sometimes using notation that seems to reflect the prescriptions of earlier theorists.[326] Individual measures in eighteenth-century music neverteless vary greatly in their temporal dimensions, depending on tempo and meter. Any calculation relating the duration of a composition and the physical dimensions of its score must be very imprecise.

---

[325] Tatlow (2015, 116–18) cites remarks to this effect by Praetorius (1619) and Bach's friend Mizler (1754), and Siegele (2013) traces Mizler's prescription of 350 bars = 25 minutes back to an older equation of Praetorius (80 *tempora* or breves = 7.5 mins. or 1/8 of an hour). He finds that an intermediate figure of 105 or 108 bars = 7.5 minutes held during Telemann's (and Bach's) early years.

[326] 3/2 originally signified that three half notes were to occupy the time previously taken by two; the signature therefore marked a tempo relationship, although in practice it had become a way of writing triplets. Within the "St. Anne" fugue (BWV 552/2), the successive signatures for cut time, 6/4, and 12/8 seem intended to function in this manner, reflecting the piece's formal resemblance to an early-Baroque canzona or capriccio.

If Bach indeed engaged in "proportional" planning, it would have been of a very different nature, focusing on the relationships between numbers rather than on the numbers themselves. It would have disregarded the actual durations of measures or compositions in time, sometimes even counting silent measures, repeats, and the first and second endings of sections. And it would raise questions of why and how: what was the point of introducing numerical relationships that are purely notational? what sorts of revisions was Bach willing to carry out in order to fit existing pieces into collections organized in this way?

This activity could have had nothing to do with the number symbolism that has also been discovered in Bach's music, often in connection with esoteric mysteries discernible only to the writer making the claim. It may be that, at a time when modern experimental science, with its reliance on mathematical modeling, was just becoming known to the educated public, play with numbers seemed somehow meaningful in itself. In fact, to understand numbers in this way was a pre-scientific habit, going back to magical Platonic thought. Echoes of the latter continue to resonate in the writings by older contemporaries of Bach such as Werckmeister, whose prolific publications on the organ remained influential during Bach's lifetime. Perhaps, too, Bach saw devotional significance in the mere act of incorporating esoteric number schemes into his music. Doing so might have made his music appear to be a learned "art" or discipline equivalent to mathematics or philosophy.[327] Certainly the results could have been aesthetically pleasing, if only to Bach and his God (for no one else may have known about it).

When might this have begun? It has been argued that the twelve concerto transcriptions copied by Johann Bernhard Bach around 1715 already constituted a "perfected" collection, giving potential new meaning to Forkel's famous comment that by studying Vivaldi's works Bach learned "order, connection, and proportion."[328] It may seem improbable that Bach would have fitted arrangements of music by other composers into such a set. Yet the first six works reportedly comprise 1400 bars, the last six 1750 (counting repeats). Producing original works containing stipulated numbers of measures certainly would not have been a significant challenge to a composer who had already mastered every aspect of the art of music. It was already assumed that compositions of the same genre and form should be of roughly equal length, comprising movements that were also roughly equivalent in size. As a result, *approximate* "proportional parallelisms" would turn up regularly. Only some tinkering would be necessary to achieve the exact proportions required by Bach's schemes: adding a measure here, removing one there. These are among the sorts of revisions that Bach undertook in many pieces, where they have traditionally been interpreted as free compositional refinements. Bach's style, free of the suffocating regularity of phrasing that characterizes the music of many lesser (and especially later) composers, encouraged such tinkering. He might have come to see this as a regular part of the process of "perfecting" his collections of pieces.

---

[327] This was the topic of Mizler's 1734 Master's thesis, written at Leipzig (*Quod musica ars sit pars eruditionis philosophicae*).

[328] Tatlow 2015 (256), citing Forkel (1802, 23) on "Ordnung, Zusammenhang und Verhältniß in die Gedanken." Bernhard's copy of BWV 972–83 is in Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. P 280.

Proportions also played a role in the construction of individual movements. Commentators have long noted symmetries in the structures of pieces, which sometimes fall into precisely equal halves, thirds, or quarters. Some have observed more complex proportional relationships between sections, whereas others have discovered"modular" thinking in the construction of certain movements out of discrete segments.[329] Even in movements that fail to reveal precise symmetries between individual sections, adding together the lengths of the outer and the inner sections, respectively, may yield sums that form simple proportions.[330] The basic modules of a composition may consist of regular four- and eight-measure phrases, or they may comprise units of thirteen, seventeen, or other prime numbers of bars.

If Bach indeed endeavored to create "proportional parallelisms," it would mean that by the time he left Cöthen, and perhaps by the time he arrived there, he was regularly plotting out individual pieces in terms of geometric or arithmetic designs. The loss of his composing manuscripts prevents us from reconstructing any such method. Nor would these findings have obvious implications for how we hear or perform his music. They would suggest, however, that Bach conceived the composer's task as one of filling out a given design. Many a piece must have begun as a melodic or harmonic idea inspired by a libretto, a dance rhythm, or the contrapuntal combination of a subject with one or more countersubjects. But once the composition had been set in motion, its completion was subject to larger arithmetic or geometric considerations. These could change, resulting in large-scale revisions to the music, as when Bach incorporated the preludes originally composed for Friedemann Bach into the "perfected" collections of inventions and the Well-Tempered Clavier. Even the "ground plan" of an entire collection might be revised, as Bach appears to have done for the Art of Fugue at the very end of his life.[331]

Although some of the sets of pieces already mentioned were completed at Cöthen, others were not finalized until later. This suggests that when he made the move to Leipzig, Bach brought with him a number of unfinished or as yet "unperfected" projects, including the French Suites and possibly the cello suites. There were probably also many orphaned movements, including individual preludes and fugues that would eventually be incorporated into a second volume of the Well-Tempered Clavier. The miracle of Bach's achievement in all these collections is that their esoteric structure vanishes in performance. So too do virtually all signs of their having been cobbled together, even in pieces that underwent multiple revisions at different stages of his career.

Yet although Bach's obsessions with number and proportion have no direct sounding result, the fact that he worked in this way may be one reason his music sometimes lacks the clearly articulated, predictable forms of later composers. He probably viewed musical form not as a dynamic or dramatic series of evolving passages, as in a Classical sonata-allegro, but as a geometric design made up of small units ("modules"). These could be combined or detached,

---

[329] As by G. G. Butler (1999) and Swack (1999), respectively.

[330] Geuting (2006) offers numerous demonstrations.

[331] Bach's manuscript of the *Art of Fugue* (Berlin, Staatsbiliothek, Mus. ms. Bach P 280) contains a tantalizing reference to *ein anderer Grund-Plan* added in an unidentified hand.

snipped or expanded, to complete a large pattern. Epecially in fugues and other through-composed pieces, phrases could elide into one another or could be extended by an almost arbitrary number of bars—or only by a few beats. Within a piece created in this way, new matter could be inserted or existing matter deleted without producing obvious discontinuities. The result was beautiful, expressive, and musically coherent even when the purpose was to fill out an abstract design.

This approach to composition did not rule out the possibility of creating stunning virtuoso movements that build gradually to a climax, as occurs already in the Weimar organ works and continues in movements from the concertos. But many compositions juxtapose regularity and pattern at the large scale with ambiguity or arbitrariness locally. A grand two- or three-part design, or a regular alternation between ritornellos and episodes, may comprise numerous short eliding phrases that avoid falling into periods or other regular groupings. The music is almost invariably catchy and constantly engaging, thanks to its continuously inventive surface. And some pieces do employ large-scale verbatim repetition or transposed recapitulation that makes them easy to analyze, to break them down into readily understood patterns. Nevertheless there is, despite Bach's reputation for rationality, a certain randomness in the actual content of many pieces—in the precise way that one motivic idea follows another, or a given passage does or does not come back later in the same movement.

Bach was not the only musician keenly interested at the time in creating systematic sets of compositions. Inspired by Corelli's six dozens of printed chamber works, by 1720 Telemann had published half-dozens of solo and trio sonatas as well as what he called "sonatinas" for violin and continuo. Mattheson, who in 1714 published a dozen keyboard suites (in two sets of six), five years later issued his *Exemplarische Organisten-Probe*. This consisted of twenty-four exercises in figured bass realization with commentary.[332] Despite their incomplete notation, these exercises or *partimenti* are finished compositions. Traversing all twenty-four keys, they must have been a model and spur for Bach's Well-Tempered Clavier. Mattheson's previous major publication, the *Beschütztes Orchestre* of 1717, had been a long-winded verbal reply to Buttstett, a pupil of Pachelbel, on the related issue of whether the old theory of mode was still tenable. It is conceivable that Bach, who probably had sympathies on both sides, completed his Well-Tempered Clavieras a musical response. Yet in emulating his predecessors' collections, Bach surpassed them so thoroughly that the results represent a higher order of complexity and achivement.

Inventions and sinfonias (p. 158, following the second paragraph, "the completion of Part 1 of the latter work")

Exactly how and when Bach conceived these sets is, as usual, unknown. That he originally called the two-part inventions preludes (*praeludia*) suggests that he first imagined them within the context of the simpler, more traditional pieces in these same music books. Yet the inventions are of a distinct type, perhaps suggested by the *bicinia* of the Renaissance—two-part vocal or

---

[332] Mattheson subsequently expanded this publication as the *General-Bass-Schule* (1731).

instrumental pieces that had echoes in Baroque organ music.[333] Now the subject is not a chorale melody but a newly invented theme, that is, an *inventio*. The Latin term, also used in the elementary study of rhetoric, meant something like *theme:* a phrase or idea on which a writer expounds. But Bach's ideas, and his means of elaborating them, are purely musical, even if one can draw fanciful parallels between the techniques of verbal rhetoric and musical composition (as Mattheson did a few years later).

In his fair-copy manuscript, Bach laid out the inventions and sinfonias so that each one occupies a single opening, allowing the player to complete it without turning the page. Some, mostly those with longer subjects, are true double fugues in two voices. Those with shorter initial ideas employ a looser variety of imitation. One (in C minor) is almost entirely a strict canon, whereas another (in E) is a sonata form or rounded binary, with no initial imitation at all. Bach at some point reworked the first invention, demonstrating how its chief motive could be systematically embellished across the piece's complete duration (ex. S9.2a). Another type of lesson is evident in the extra layers of ornamentation present in manuscript copies by pupils, including Wilhelm Friedemann and Sebastian's Leipzig students Kayser and H. N. Gerber (ex. S9.2b). As simple and familiar as they may seem today, no one previously had written anything quite like these pieces. Bach's title suggests that they purport to be traditional, and students ever since have thought of them as such. Yet they were actually a new type, within which Bach invested as much craft as in more ambitiously proportioned compositions.

In the sinfonias, as in the WTC, Bach's counterpoint is sometimes barely manageable by one player at a single keyboard. The inner part is often divided between the two hands in surprising ways, and the player must sometimes make rapid shifts of the hand or exchange fingers on sustained notes.[334]A few passages require the hand to stretch as far as a tenth or to execute parallel sixths, and it is often necessary to release held or tied notes well before the end of their written duration (ex. S9.3). Evidently Bach was aiming at the same free interplay of the parts that characterizes his *pedaliter* organ music or a contrapuntal trio sonata. Indeed, in writing the sinfonias Bach may have glimpsed the idea behind the organ sonatas, which employ similar textures, but with the three parts more idiomatically deployed onto two manuals and pedals. To be sure, by this point Bach had probably composed at least a few actual trio sonatas, and he might already have been playing them in impromptu arrangements at the organ.

Both sets are as varied in form and style as any Bach collection. Among the sinfonias, despite the allusions to the trio sonata, it would be hard to identify any piece as being particularly close to an

---

[333] Bicinia are found among organ chorales from Sweelinck to Pachelbel; a setting of "Allein Gott" (BWV 711) is the only example attributed to Bach, and his authorship has been disputed. There are also a few chorale variations in two parts with a decorated cantus firmus, including the initial variation in each of BWV 766, 767, and 768.

[334] Friedemann's keyboard music makes similar demands (see Schulenberg 2010, 274–75), but Emanuel Bach (1753, chap. 1, para. 88) later disparaged the use of finger substitution, at least as called for by unnamed French musicians. This was probably a reference to François Couperin, whose *Art de toucher le clavecin* (Paris, 1716, rev. ed., 1717) frequently prescribes it, albeit to maintain legato rather than intricate counterpoint.

actual trio-sonata movement. At least two of these—the sinfonias in C minor and B minor—may have been drafted before the trio character of the pieces was clear in Bach's mind, for his writing them out in three strictly maintained parts is to some degree a notational fiction. The sinfonias in G minor and A minor are comparable in that they incorporate idiomatic keyboard writing found nowhere else in Bach's music, although they more clearly maintain three real parts throughout. Yet the sinfonia in G minor also resembles the best French harpsichord music of the time in its delicate exploitation of the instrument's timbre in the upper register.

Both the two- and three-part pieces usually divide thematic material equally between the voices. In the sinfonia in E-flat, however, the two top parts, playable entirely by the right hand, echo one another with cantabile figures in dotted rhythm. Meanwhile the left hand provides a bass composed from a distinct arpeggio motive, treated as a quasi-ostinato. As in certain "monodic" chorale preludes, this division between the hands can only have been deliberate and invites performance on two manuals. Despite the technical difficulties posed by the three-part pieces—which reach their height in the gentle-sounding sinfonia in B-flat—Bach probably did intend pupils to study both the inventions and sinfonias before moving on to the WTC. Doing so would have made the latter less daunting than it seems to players who attempt it after learning only a few movements from the inventions or from the suites. Yet if (as his title suggests) Bach intended the inventions and sinfonias as preliminary exercises for the WTC, he sometimes got ahead of himself, writing things that presuppose some knowledge or experience of the larger work, whose composition must have largely preceded the smaller pieces.

The Well-Tempered Clavier (p. 166, following the first complete paragraph, "turned those hours into minutes")

The E-major fugue in book 2 is one of the surprisingly small number in the WTC that represent "demonstration counterpoint." Like earlier examples, it exemplifies a variety of traditional contrapuntal devices in successive sections: stretto, rhythmic diminution, and inversion (ex. S9.4). In book 1, the very first fugue reveals particularly intensive development of its subject in stretto; the three-part fugue in D-sharp minor methodically treats its subject in stretto, inversion, and two levels of rhythmic augmentation; and the A-minor fugue does something similar in four parts. In book 2, the gigue-like fugues in C-sharp minor and G-sharp minor are both double fugues in three parts, and the fugue in the related key of F-sharp minor is a triple fugue, again in three parts.

But although these and some other pieces take a systematic or pedagogical approach, the majority of movements in both volumes demonstrate other aspects of counterpoint: airy three-part fugues with *galant* subjects (E-flat, book 1; B-flat major, both books); the playful development of simple subjects that are little more than motives of a few notes (F major, book 1; C-sharp, book 2); exercises in dissonant harmony that are expressive but involve no particular contrapuntal ingenuity (F minor and B minor, book 1). Some pieces, preludes as well as fugues, are rigidly constructed; the A-minor prelude of book 2 is perhaps the most austere in this regard, a binary form whose two 16-measure halves are almost exact mirrors of one another.[335] The fugue in F-sharp from the same book is almost equally schematic in construction, yet *galant*

---

[335] This is a more rigorous example of a plan first used in the E-major invention.

rather than chromatic in expressive character. It is essentially a French dance (a gavotte), its second half composed largely of passages recapitulated from the first.[336]

Gerber's testimony—second-hand, unfortunately—suggests that Bach, like Chopin, sometimes taught by demonstration. We can imagine that he would have pointed out salient compositional features of the pieces as he did so. One wonders whether he also provided instruction in how to play them, for, like the sinfonias, the preludes as well as the fugues often tie the fingers into knots. No conventional system of fingering can apply to every passage. For scales, one often must resort to old-fashioned "paired" fingering (e.g., 3–4–3–4), and the thumb must often be used for accidentals. Occasionally, too, the notation, taken literally, asks for notes to be held out longer than is possible by two hands at one keyboard. Pedals, which were available on some clavichords and harpsichords, would have provided little help, and, as in the sinfonias, it is clear that Bach did not expect every note to be sustained its full duration. Emanuel later wrote that unslurred notes are held only half their written length,[337] and although this could not have been intended to be taken always literally, it sounds like the sort of thing a teacher might have told pupils. The notation of the WTC represented to some degree an ideal, not a sounding reality, as becomes even clearer in the violin solos discussed below.

The English and French Suites (p. 168, following the first paragraph break, "as Rameau and other French composers were doing at the same time")

The importance of dance in French musical culture of the period has been heavily stressed in recent music historiography, to the point that its cultivation elsewhere, in Germany and even in Italian opera, may have become somewhat obscured. Just as understanding the French language was essential for a European courtier of the time, knowing the basic steps of the courante and minuet was probably taken for granted among the elite. Choreographed *divertissements* had been a feature of every act in French opera since the time of Lully, but ballets were also common inserts in Italianate opera as performed at Hamburg, Dresden, and Berlin. We have already seen how Bach, like his contemporaries, incorporated arias based on French dance types into his vocal works. In Germany, therefore, a professional musician needed to know the tempo, meter, and distinctive rhythms that characterized each of the many dances imported from Italy as well as France. Some musicians, moreover, probably served as dancing masters, employed by members of the middle and upper classes to teach not only dance steps but basic social comportment. As the latter included the bows and other gestures that were a part of everyday life, a certain basic choreographic literacy must have been shared by every educated person of the time, including members of the Bach family.

This does not mean (as is sometimes asserted) that Bach's dance music could be danced to. Although drawing on traditional types, some of his dance movements incorporate melodic embellishments that would have slowed the tempo, making for unidiomatic choreography. The frequently asymmetrical phrasing, which could incorporate odd numbers of bars and displaced

---

336 Measures 12–32 are reprised in mm. 44–64, and mm. 40b–44a in mm. 76b–80a.

337 C. P. E. Bach (1753–62, vol. 1, chap. 3, para. 22).

accents, might similarly have thrown off any but a seasoned professional dancer. Like dance pieces by Froberger as well as contemporaries, Bach's are stylized, sometimes remote from their ostensive models. Already by Froberger's time, the allemande had ceased to be danced at all, at least in the form found in keyboard suites. The minuet remained a common social dance through the eighteenth century, but others such as the sarabande were increasingly confined to theatrical choreography, if danced at all.

Some movements in Bach's suites are only nominally dances. These seems especially true of those bearing the title *corrente*, the Italian form of the word *courante*. In theory this signified an Italian version of the dance (as found in Corelli's music), but in practice Bach attached it to sonata-like allegros notated in 3/4. Other ostensive dances seem misabeled; the sarabande from the E-minor English Suite is, somewhat surprisingly, a polonaise, and the anglaise of the French Suite in B minor may originally have been called a gavotte, despite the absence of an upbeat. Any specific feature of a given dance, such as the accented second beat of the sarabande, was merely one of several stylistic elements that could be selected and combined with others, even those associated with other dance types. Hence Bach, like his German contemporaries, had grown accustomed to treating the traditional dances with considerable freedom by the end of the Weimar period.

One dance type, the gigue, persisted into the eighteenth century in several distinct rhythmic variants; it also came to be associated with fugue, a texture rare in other dances. Today the Irish or English jig remains a familiar dance, its straight-legged hops shared with quick Baroque gigues from both France and Italy. But there are also slower varieties, such as the siciliana, which became a popular type of slow movement in Italianate arias, sonatas, and concertos.[338] Nearly all jigs of the eighteenth century and later are in compound meter (6/4 or 6/8), but an earlier French type in common or cut time appears in about half the examples by Froberger. This type persists in suites by Kuhnau—and in two of Bach's.

It is a modern myth that the notation of these duple-time gigues was meant to be "tripletized." Bach surely was emulating examples by Froberger and Kuhnau when he included gigues of this type in the First French Suite and the Sixth Partita. Nor can it be coincidental that these are among his most austerely fugal dance movements, in minor keys and approaching the WTC in their dissonant, counter-intuitive harmony. In both pieces, moreover, the subject is inverted after the double bar, as also in the gigues by Froberger and Kuhnau shown in example S9.5. Bach's most intensive example of "demonstration counterpoint" in a gigue, however, occurs in the movement that concludes the Sixth English Suite. A stunning display of both contrapuntal and manual virtuosity, this piece comprises two halves that are nearly mirror images of each other.

---

[338] Vivaldi wrote a siciliana as the slow movement of the D-minor concerto (op. 3, no. 11) that Bach arranged for organ as BWV 596. Comparable movements occur in the early-eighteenth-century repertory from Dresden and Berlin preserved in Brussels, Bibliothèque Royal, ms. 15115, which includes works by the Cöthen musicians Stricker and Freytag, e.g., in sonata no. 12 by "Loillet," no. 21 by Heinichen, no. 35 by Böhmer, no. 42 by the young Quantz, the anonymous no. 53, and Freytag's own siciliana in no. 16, although it is of a somewhat different type.

As such it anticipates the three-part mirror fugue—another gigue—that Bach included in the *Art of Fugue* some two or three decades later.[339]

Other dances in Bach's suites also incorporate imitative counterpoint, although usually less rigorously. This is particularly true of the English Suites, which although longer and more complex than the French Suites are probably on the whole earlier. The impression of the English Suites as more weighty stems partly from the fact that they begin with lengthy preludes. But the dance movements in these suites also tend to be more contrapuntal in texture, with thicker and more dissonant harmony.[340] Only two of the English Suites are in major keys, and one of these, distinct in style and movement types, was probably added to the group only when Bach finalized the set at Leipzig.[341] Otherwise, the relatively sober character of the English Suites could reflect an earlier origin at Weimar, the lighter French Suites (which are evenly divided between major and minor modes) being more in keeping with Bach's known output at Cöthen.

The notation in both sets of suites eventually included detailed markings for ornaments, that is, appoggiaturas, trills, mordents, and the like. Symbols for these ornaments had been normal elements of French keyboard and lute notation since the seventeenth century, and, with the exception of Froberger and Mattheson, the composers mentioned previously had taken pains not only to indicate the ornament signs but to explain what they meant. Bach's printed volumes of keyboard music would lack both theornament tables and the thorough marking of appoggiaturas (*ports de voix*) that had been an essential elements of French publications since the later seventeenth century. Vocal treatises make it clear that singers cultivated them with equal assiduity, although the ornaments were less commonly notated in vocal music.

It is possible that the expressive little appoggiaturas, which Kuhnau and other Germans called *Accente*, were passing out of fashion by the time Bach published his partitas. In the definitive manuscript copies of the English and French Suites, however, his pupils Kayser and Altnickol marked them thoroughly, using Bach's distinctive version of the little commas or hooks that signified this ornament in the music of d'Anglebert and certain other French composers. Their omission from some modern editions has contributed even now to their disregard by many otherwise scrupulous harpsichordists. Yet together with other ornaments these appoggiaturas are, as much with Bach as with Couperin, an essential element of melodic lines like those of ex. S9.5c. Their presence shows that Bach understood and emulated the most subtle elements of

---

[339] Detailed analysis in Schulenberg (2006, 296–98).

[340] Nevertheless, Tatlow (2015, 356–58) finds that the dance movements in each set contain precisely the same number of measures (1380), the preludes adding exactly half that number to the English Suites (690). One could count the measures in different ways, and different versions or sources might yield somewhat different results, but evidently Bach brought the two collections into a complementary "proportional" relationship at Leipzig.

[341] This is English Suite no. 1 in A, whose prelude is distinctly shorter than the others and which also contains an extra courante with two doubles. These unusual features could have been products of the need to fill out the "proportional" design revealed by Tatlow (see previous note).

French practice. He would have heard this in performances by his best-trained contemporaries, including Anna Magdalena.

Bach followed Fischer, Kuhnau, and Mattheson in opening the English Suites with preludes. These were conceived not improvisationally, like traditional French or Italian examples, but contrapuntally, like Kuhnau's, although on a broader scale. The opening movement of the First English Suite is a three-part invention, like the prelude in the same key from book 1 of the WTC.[342] The five other preludes, all much longer, are keyboard equivalents of the quick concerto movements that Bach might have been writing at the same time, or preparing to write. Grandly designed, they differ from most actual concerto movements in their large-scale ternary or da-capo forms. Yet they clearly allude to the alternating ritornellos and solo episodes of contemporary Venetian concertos, with virtuoso passagework in both types of section. Yet the allusions to the concerto remain only that: surface resemblances which, on closer scrutiny, look only roughly like what one finds in actual works by Albinoni and Vivaldi, or even in Bach's own concertos.

All five preludes are imitative, the one in E minor (no. 5) a genuine fugue in three parts. A comparable fugue in the prelude of the D-minor suite (no. 6) is preceded by a separate preludial passage, probably meant to be played in the same allegro tempo.[343] Although all these preludes are basically Italian in style, the countersubject in the F-major prelude (no. 4) uses a dotted motive common in French overtures.[344]Yet the first episode of this same prelude introduces a type of soloistic figuration also found in the Fifth Brandenburg Concerto (ex. S9.6). Here, at the beginning of the movement, the allusion to a concerto-like alternation between "tutti" ritornello and "solo" episode is clear. Yet only in the prelude of the third suite is this maintained unambiguously to the end of the movement. There a heavily scored opening section corresponding to a "tutti" demonstrates in an exciting way how to create a crescendo on the harpsichord (ex. S9.7a). After a cadence, this gives way to a fugal episode that could almost have been written for two violins and continuo, like the solo passages of Bach's "Double" violin concerto BWV 1043 (ex. S9.7b).

Subsequent episodes are chiefly in just two parts, as is almost the entire A section of the prelude of the A-minor suite. This opening section, comprising almost exactly the same number of measures as the subsequent B section, is far too long to be a ritornello in the usual sense. Modern commentators have puzzled over whether this design, which Bach used elsewhere as well, is a

---

[342] The prelude adds an opening flourish and a closing expansion to four or even five parts. The flourish, the one improvisatory feature of the movement, recurs in the chorale prelude BWV 738; the subject of the main part of the prelude seems related to a gigue by Dieupart (see Schulenberg 2006, 282).

[343] On the tempo of the opening section and its interpretation by modern players, see Schulenberg (1999).

[344] The motive recurs in Bach's first "orchestral" suite BWV 1066 (first movement, mm. 50–53, first violin and oboes); he might have found it in m. 2 of the first movement in Dieupart's *Six suites*.

"concerto" or a "da capo" form.[345] He does seem to have associated ternary or da capo form with grand instrumental movements of various sorts from the time of the English suites onward. But to view such movements as conflating "ritornello" and "da capo" form is a sort of category error that would not have occurred to Bach, who simply was not bound to the formulas and labels through which his music has been subsequently analyzed.

The allemandes and courantes of these suites, and to some degree the sarabandes as well, follow types found in suites by Dieupart and Couperin—not the older north-German varieties found in the manuscript anthologies of Bach's older brother and imitated in a few early efforts by Sebastian's himself. Echoes of recent French music are, however, combined with imitative counterpoint, not unlike that found in the inventions (ex. S9.8). The incorporation of such counterpoint into the idiomatic "brisé" texture of the allemande, with its written-out broken chords, is not without awkwardness for the player. Yet although Bach's French contemporaries might have found this sort of polyphony pedantic, he and his countrymen would have understood it as a praiseworthy infusion of German "harmony" into the French idiom.

The courantes of the English Suites are basically of the French type, yet they are deliberately international in style, incorporating Italianate walking or running basses. Unfortunately, the latter tend to neutralize rather than enhance the asymmetrical rhythm and phrasing, which rarely achieve the subtlety of genuine French examples. If the courantes of these suites are among Bach's least successful efforts, the sarabandes are among his most profound. Three of them are followed by written-out variations, albeit of distinct types. The sarabande of the sixth suite is followed by a double, a "broken" variation comprising arpeggiated chords, as in suites by older German composers. More up to date are the *agrémens* attached to the sarabandes of suites 2 and 3. Their original notation shows that they were suggested by Couperin, whose first *ordre* of harpsichord pieces, published in 1713, followed up four movements with ornamented versions of their melodic lines. Bach's ornaments likewise were originally limited to the upper part. But he subsequently extended the written-out embellishment to the lower voices.

Despite their French title, Bach's *agrémens* are closer to the Italianate embellishments of Corelli and Vivaldi. Those written into the sarabande of the third suite resemble embellishments in the sinfonias of the Weimar cantatas and in the slow movement of the First Brandenburg Concerto (ex. S9.9).[346] Alos shared with the latter is the composition over pedal points or within prolonged dissonant harmonies. Exceptional for a dance movement, the sustained bass notes of this sarabande cannot be easily played without pedals, and they must be restruck if they are to sound as written. Like a similar pedal point at the end of the A-minor fugue of WTC (part 1), they

---

[345] Other examples include the "Wedge" fugue for organ (BWV 548/2), fugues from the C-major sonata for solo violin (BWV 1005) and the Prelude, Fugue, and Allegro for lute (BWV 998), and the first movement of the Fourth Brandenburg Concerto (BWV 1049), which G. Butler (1999) describes as a "concerto 'nach Sonatenart.'"

[346] Even in the earliest source, a copy by Bach's pupil Kayser (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. Bach P 1072), both versions of the third sarabande are fully written out. But the *agrémens* for the sarabande of suite 2 were originally notated only on a single, separately written out upper line, as in the first courante and the gavotte from Couperin's *Premier Ordre.*

suggest that Bach had at hand a pedal harpsichord, perhaps the same one used for the Fifth Brandenburg Concerto.

The dances of the first three French Suites remain close to those of the English Suites, the courante, sarabande, and gigue of the first suite, in particular, being contrapuntally conceived. Elsewhere in the French Suites, Bach seems to have deliberately simplified the texture. By the time he was completing the last two suites (at Leipzig), he was writing lighter music whose transparent textures and innovative writing for the keyboard resemble those of the Partitas, which he had already have begun to be compose. Nevertheless, although relatively simple and more *galant* in style, the French Suites seem to have required more drafts than the more complex but also more traditional English Suites. Several alternative movements, including an abandoned prelude, suggest that some experimentation preceded the final makeup of the set. The results, particularly in the last two or three suites, are more immediately gratifying to hear and to play than almost anything else in Bach's keyboard music.

Thus the allemande of the Fourth French Suite resembles the simpler arpeggiated preludes of the WTC. The allemandes of Suites 5 and 6 look on the page much like the flute sonata BWV 1034, which perhaps was written around the same time, shortly before or after the move to Leipzig (ex. S9.10).[347] Dieupart's suites had existed in versions for violin (or recorder) and continuo, providing possibles models for these modestly contrapuntal allemandes. Further suggestions for the general texture of the French Suites could have been found in Couperin's *Concerts royaux*, published in 1722 and, like Dieupart's suites, intended for either harpsichord or melody instrument with continuo.[348] The allemandes in Couperin's *Concerts* are very different from the complex examples in the composer's first book of harpsichord pieces. There the elaborate notation precisely indicates the *brisé* texture, which, however, sounds much simpler in the execution. Mastery of that notation would have been an important element in Bach's initial assimilation of the French style. But by the 1720s the rich, somewhat dark harpsichord sonorities that it entailed were losing favor to thinner textures appropriate to the newer *galant* idioms. Couperin himself published hardly any allemandes of the old type after his first book, and Bach too favored more lightly scored allemandes in the later French Suites and the Partitas.

Another innovation in the French Suites is the "monodic" type of sarabande found in Suites 2, 3, and 5. Comparable to the little chorale preludes in the keyboard books for Friedemann and Magdalena, these consist of an embellished melody in the upper part accompanied by (usually) two clearly subsidiary lower parts. The latter can even be played on a separate (quieter) manual

---

[347] The lateness of the sources and the fluent writing for flute suggest that BWV 1034, like the trio sonata BWV 1039, is not an early work. Jones (2006–13, 2:103) suggests 1726 or 1727 for both works, reflecting the presence of one or more accomplished players also heard in the Leipzig cantatas of ca. 1726

[348] The *Concerts royaux* might also have inspired the E-minor invention (ex. S9.2b). This does not sound far from Couperin, especially when played with all the ornaments found in Gerber's copy, which is dated Leipzig, January 22, 1725.

in several of these movements (ex. S9.11).[349] The Partitas contain no sarabandes of this type, but Bach would return to it two decades later in the "Aria" that provides the basis for the Goldberg Variations.

Music for solo violin, cello, and flute, plus a few other chamber works (p. 175, following the first paragraph break, "Bach's distinctive brand of chromatic harmony")

The unique qualities of the unaccompanied sonatas and suites naturally raise the question for whom Bach wrote this music. Unfortunately, we have no answers apart from the obvious possibilities among the violinists and cellists who worked at Weimar and Cöthen. None of these is known to have been a great virtuoso, but, as we have seen, Bach's Weimar cantatas include an aria with two solo cellos (and potentially a third on the continuo part).[350] This suggests special cultivation of the instrument there, as does the Third Brandenburg Concerto, likely composed at Weimar and requiring three cellos.

The cello was a relatively new instrument at the time, invented around 1660 at Bologna and only gradually making its way north into Germany. Not yet a regular member of the basso continuo group when Bach first used it in BWV 71, the instrument might still have been played in some places *dalla spalla*, that is, held on the shoulder rather than resting between the player's calves.[351] But if cello playing and composing for the instrument were still somewhat experimental at Mühlhausen, at Weimar and Cöthen the cello was a core member of the ensemble. Cellists there must have performed in concertos not only by Bach but by Vivaldi and other Italians. Therefore at least some of the six cello suites had probably reached their familiar form by the time Bach reached Cöthen. Like the keyboard suites, however, they continued to receive refinements, and the famous manuscript copy by Anna Magdalena, preserving an early version, can no longer be considered their principal source, despite its origin in the Bach household at Leipzig.[352] Indeed, copying errors in Magdalena's manuscript, made for sale to a

[349] BWV 753, shown in ex. 9.16, is a fragment in Friedemann's keyboard book (its sole source); for a completion, see Schulenberg (2006, ex. 10.3).

[350] The aria is "Lass mein Herz die Münzen sein" from BWV 163 (see ex. S7.53). Only Bach's score survives, leaving details of the intended scoring uncertain.

[351] There is no reason to think that players at Weimar or Cöthen used that approach. On the other hand, cellists did not use endpins regularly before the nineteenth century, although this did not prevent virtuosos from playing more challenging passages than those in Bach's suites. It is not entirely certain that Bach's *Violoncello* at Mühlhausen was even the same instrument; its part in BWV 71 is quite high, and the instrument serves as bass to the recorder chorus, not as a member of the continuo group.

[352] Magdalena's copy (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. Bach P 269) probably dates from around 1730; it was the basis of early editions, including the original one in the NBA (vol. 6/2). This was superseded by the edition of Ulrich Leisinger (Vienna: Wiener Urtext, 2000), who first recognized the significance of later copies derived from Bach's lost revised autograph; Andrew Talle's revised edition for the NBA appeared in 2016.

noble amateur, force one to wonder how well she understood this music (including the significance of slurs for string instruments). Despite her capabilities as a singer, the idea that she might even have been the composer of these pieces, as promulgated in an Australian dissertation and subsequently promoted in press releases and a short film, is utterly implausible.[353]

Bach's writing for solo melody instruments is sometimes viewed as music that contains its own accompaniment. This, however, misses the point that these compositions involve simultaneously sounding, equally significant, melodic lines—even if the polyphony is entirely implicit, as in the flute partita. There, as in any other Bach work, the figuration composes out a three- or four-part texture such as is suggested in example S9.12; performing the music requires the player to hear and project each part, especially the bass. Today players of melody instruments do not always receive the necessary training in harmony and voice leading, which might have been more common among professional musicians who began their musical education as choristers and (as Quantz advised flutists) learned to improvise figured bass realizations at the keyboard.[354]Some violinists, moreover, would have been accustomed to reading shorthand notation similar to that used in some of Bach's keyboard manuscripts, in which solo passagework was represented by three- or four-part chords (ex. S9.13).[355] As in Bach's solo pieces, most of the notes are not held as written; rather the notation indicates lines that the player must "hear" mentally. Doing so will, among other things, encourage phrasing in long, coherent lines, rather than mechanical subdivisions of each beat.

None of the preludes of the cello suites is exactly in concerto style; three of them—in suites 1, 2, and 4—rather resemble the type based on broken chords which occurs so often in keyboard music (ex. S9.15). The third prelude, although also harmonically inspired, resembles that of the third violin "partita" in combining scale figures with arpeggios. In the prelude of the sixth suite, the use of an instrument with an extra top string allowed a special timbral effect (*bariolage*) to be extended into a higher tessitura than would be possible on the ordinary instrument (ex. S9.16).[356] The passage exemplifies Bach's interest in exploring new sounds, a fascination with the

---

[353] The argument, founded on incompetent "forensic" study of Bach's handwriting, incorporated basic misunderstandings about Bach sources, the compositional process of Bach's music, and even the status of women in early modern Germany. For the opinion of a prominent Bach scholar that this is a "stupid thesis," see the report by Tim Cavanaugh in *National Review*, Oct. 29, 2014, http://www.nationalreview.com/article/391379/bogus-bach-theory-gets-media-singing-tim-cavanaugh (it is unfortunate that this article, which appeared in a publication founded by a prominent conservative and amateur harpsichordist, seems intended to serve an anti-feminist agenda).

[354] Quantz (1752), chap. 10, para. 18.

[355] The work illustrated here may not have been originally composed by Bach; preserved in his autograph score from the mid-1740s (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. Bach P 614), it apparently to have served as the opening sinfonia for a cantata.

[356] Thus in mm. 23–33 the repeated e', which forms an internal pedal point, can be played on an open string, alternating with fingered notes played on lower strings.

sensuous side of music that is often overlooked by those focusing on the intellectual aspects of his compositions.

The fifth suite, the most French of the works for cello, is also the first one to include a French courante, as opposed to Italian *correnti*, like Corelli's. The Italianate style of the first four courantes might have seemed appropriate for an instrument that was relatively new, perhaps still regarded as distinctly Italian. French string ensembles had instead employed the *basse de violon*, lower and larger than a cello, and the fifth suite suggests inspiration from the French repertory for lute and viola da gamba. Indeed, its opening movement expands upon that of Bach's E-minor lute suite BWV 996, which, although lacking a full-fledged initial "dotted" section, proceeds to a fugue with a similar dance-like subject in triple meter (ex. S9.18). It is no surprise, then, that the Fifth Cello Suite likewise exists in a version for lute, or perhaps for lute-harpsichord (BWV 995).[357] In its original version, however, the counterpoint of the fugue remains largely implicit; unlike the opening section of the overture and other movements, the fugue contains few chords. To suggest the phraseology of a fully realized fugue, Bach instead repeats the subject in different keys (as in ex. S9.18b); the section also alternates between thematic (expository) and episodic passages. Telemann would do much the same a decade or two later in writing a fugue for unaccompanied flute—a challenge that Bach avoided in his own solo flute piece.[358]

In the sixth suite, following the extraordinary prelude, the subsequent movements likewise go beyond those of the other cello suites in their variety of rhythm and figuration and in their exploitation of the chordal possibilities of the instrument. That Bach could now compose something like the beautifully singing sarabande, with its numerous parallel sixths, suggests that, since writing the first five suites, he had learned a good deal about cello playing—or at least about playing on the special instrument used here and in a few Leipzig cantatas.

Bach's title for the violin solos is now usually adjusted to *partita*. The latter word, however, which originally meant a score, had the distinct meeting in the earlier Baroque of "variation," as in some of Bach's early chorale settings. By 1726, however, Bach was using the expression *partita* for the keyboard suites printed as the first part of his *Clavierübung* (see chap. 13). Whatever shades of meaning the different forms of the word might once have conveyed were probably by then forgotten.

---

[357] Bach's autograph manuscript of BWV 995 (Brussels, Bibliothèque Royal de Musique, ms. II 4085), written around 1730, is in score notation, presumably for performance on a keyboard instrument. A clever argument that the work was originally for mandora (Cole 2019) is hard to evaluate, given the absence of documentary evidence and the simple nature of the extant repertory for that instrument, a type of lute whose use in more sophisticated types of music may have been limited to doubling bass lines.

[358] Telemann's example— in the sixth of his twelve unaccompanied flute fantasias (TWV 40:7)—goes further than Bach to suggest imitative counterpoint within a monophonic texture. The archetypal fugal subject, written mainly in eighth notes, becomes incorporated into leaping passagework in sixteenths when the subject is repeated at the dominant.

Corelli's Opus 5 had been divided between six sonatas of the so-called church type, with fugues, followed by six *sonate da camera* (chamber sonatas); the latter were effectively suites with preludes.[359] Bach's six solos alternate between the two types—the only instance of this sort of organization among his collections, although something similar could be found in publications by Albinoni, Telemann, and others. Bach's earliest sonatas had been modeled on examples by Kuhnau and other German composers of the late seventeenth century.[360]Now, although following Corelli for the overall design of the first two sonatas, Bach was never one to fall into a rut. The inspiration for the third opening adagio came from elsewhere, perhaps one of Telemann's concertos for four unaccompanied violins (ex. S9.21; compare ex. 7.6). The second movement, although still a fugue, is now an enormous example in ternary form, like the prelude of the Fifth English Suite. It is, moreover, notated *alla breve*, like an archaic ricercar, and in addition to including a regular, chromatic countersubject it develops the main subject in stretto and inversion (ex. S9.22). With this fugue, then, Bach showed that he could write "demonstration counterpoint" for a single violin. This was incorporated, moreover, within the same large da capo form used in virtuoso pieces for organ and lute, although these (BWV 548 and 998) are probably later compositions.

The sonatas continue with slow movements of contrasting types. The third movement of the first sonata is a siciliana, the slow Italian gigue that was a favorite at Dresden and which Bach incorporated into several concertos and many arias. Each work concludes with a quick movement in binary or sonata form, as did three of Corelli's *sonate da chiesa;* Bach's examples, naturally, are more up-to-date. Each of these concluding movements is composed mainly of passagework in small note values, looking to a modern player like a *moto perpetuo*. Yet, as in similar movements for keyboard, cello, and flute, Bach doubtless assumed expressive nuances and breaths between phrases.

The Presto of the first sonata was originally notated in "double" measures: paired measures in 3/8, with a full barline following only the even-numbered bars (ex. S9.23). This type of notation also appears in a few keyboard pieces: the prelude of the Third English Suite, the first passepied of the Fifth English Suite, the A-minor sinfonia, and the corrente of the Sixth Partita in its original version. Composed over a decade or more, these movements share motion in running sixteenths, and Bach clearly intended to group their measures in twos. How, or whether, this was meant to be expressed in performance is uncertain, yet it is an indication of the thought that Bach was devoting to the proper notation of his music; another was the rewriting of certain works in half, or double, their original note values.[361]

---

[359] The Italian expressions (*sonata da chiesa, sonata da camera*) do not occur within the original edition of Corelli's sonatas. There one finds a dance title (*Giga*) even among the "church" sonatas of the first *parte*, in the concluding movement of Sonata 5.

[360] Apart from the one-movement instrumental sonatas that opened several early cantatas, these included the similar keyboard sonata BWV 967 and the toccata-like BWV 963, as well as the embellished transcriptions of sonatas by Reinken (BWV 965 and 966).

[361] The concluding gigue of the sixth harpsichord partita was originally written in half its published note values, as were several movements from the Art of Fugue, and the B-minor

With their prelude-and-fugue openings and relatively lightweight concluding movements, the solo violin sonatas, like the majority of eighteenth-century instrumental works, move from "big" to "smaller" sorts of music. The same is less clear in the first and third partitas and not at all in the second one, which concludes with the most famous single movement in the violin solos, the great chaconne. If the latter was an invocation of orchestral music, the inclusion of doubles in the first partita was an echo of writing for keyboard. Here Bach perhaps followed the example of an unpublished suite by Froberger in which each dance is likewise followed with its double.[362] Closer to Bach, however, was a suite published in Niedt's *Handleitung zur Variation* of 1706 to illustrate variation technique. Niedt's volume demonstrated how to compose an entire suite as variations on a recurring figured bass line. Bach had used this technique for the first two dance movements in an early work (BWV 833), and it is also found in BWV 965, originally by Reinken.

In the violin partita Bach surpasses both Niedt's workaday examples and his own early efforts, making each double as different as possible from the preceding dance. For instance, the allemande—really an entrée, with a persistent, energetic dotted rhythm—becomes a gentle series of slurred sixteenths (ex. S9.24). Yet the double conforms to Niedt's definition of such a movement as a "broken variation," that is, one composed of broken chords.[363] This is also how Bach varies the sarabande, although using triplets rather than the simple eighths favored in earlier German suites. The courante, however, was already comprised largely of arpeggios. Bach's double for this, as well as for the bourrée, is a virtuoso re-composition of the original, using constantly changing patterns of figuration.

The second partita opens with the four movements that had become conventional by this date in suites for harpsichord, yet in their unusually broad dimensions they anticipate the great chaconne that follows them. Even the sarabande, on the page the shortest of the dances, is expanded in this partita by a coda, practically unique in Bach's works. French dances often ended with a *petite reprise*, a final restatement of the closing phrase. But the coda of the sarabande is new music, providing a quiet ending before the gigue—which is a big virtuoso *moto perpetuo*, like the concluding movements of the sonatas.

Bach gives the title of the concluding movement in Italian (*ciaconna*), as he does for many of his dance pieces. Yet he is inconsistent in matching the style of a movement with the language of its title. Here the music combines the underlying French form and dance rhythm with Italianate melodic embellishment and virtuoso passagework. Chaconnes were not uncommon in French suites, and it might have been only a lack of sympathy for variation forms that prevented Bach

---

prelude from WTC2 was similarly renotated. The doubling of note values did not affect the drawing of bar lines; Tatlow (2015) counts both 3/8 bars of a "double" measure.

[362] Many of Froberger's suites, like Kuhnau's, contain doubles for individual movements, but only Suite 23, unpublished before the twentieth century, includes doubles for all four movements.

[363] Niedt (1706, f. 53v), "eine gebrochene Variation."

from including one in any of his suites for keyboard or instrumental ensemble.[364] Only with the much later Goldberg Variations would Bach return to a well-established tradition in the Empire of writing transcendent instrumental variation sets, here realized for solo violin. Bach probably could not have known Biber's now-famous Passacaglia for unaccompanied violin, preserved in a unique manuscript copy at faraway Salzburg. Biber's colleague Muffat, however, had published impressive chaconnes for both solo keyboard and string ensemble.

Bach's chaconne comprises 64 statements of the four-bar ostinato, phrase 1 recurring as variations 32 and 63; the D-major section (variations 34–52) follows shortly after the first of these restatements, constituting a little more than a quarter of the piece (see ex. 9.7). Otherwise there are no verbatim recapitulations, but an *arpeggio* passage at the end of the D-major section (variations 51–52) echoes a longer one that precedes the end of the longer opening section in D minor (variations 23–30).

As systematic as the construction of the movement may appear, it is not precisely symmetrical; the first section alone, all in D minor, constitutes slightly more than half of the piece. Each of the three sections, however, makes a carefully gradated increase in motion or energy, achieving maximum intensity at a different point. This occurs two thirds of the way through the first section, in variation 22, where slurred thirty-second notes reach the highest note of the entire piece (g‴). Halfway through the middle section, in variation 44, a crescendo created by expanding chords achieves its peak density. Variations 61 and 62, with their non-stop triplets, constitute a final climax just before the final double phrase. Yet the concluding D-minor section never achieves the intensity of the first one, maintaining a more elegiac character due partly to its shorter duration, partly to the more static character of three central variations (58–60). These are built around an internal pedal point, with *bariolage* figuration resembling that of the prelude of the Sixth Cello Suite (ex. S9.25).[365]
Bach might have placed the D-minor partita at the end of the violin solos, which then would have concluded, as do the English Suites and the later harpsichord Partitas, with a monumental work. Instead the set finishes like the French Suites, with a relatively light work in E major. This is the only one of the violin solos to which Bach is known to have returned in later years, arranging it for lute or keyboard as BWV 1006a.[366] At some point he also added orchestral parts to the prelude, using it as a sinfonia in several Leipzig vocal works.[367] That Bach remembered and

---

[364] There are several chaconnes in the vocal works, notably the opening chorus of Cantata 78 (see chap. 11).

[365] There is a similar series of variations (57–61) near the end of Biber's passacaglia, which contains almost the same number of phrases (65) and also returns periodically to its opening phrase—commonalities suggesting that, even if Bach did not know this piece, he and Biber thought alike in some ways.

[366] This version, if played at a keyboard instrument, seems to require pedals (see Schulenberg 2006, 362); it survives only in the score notation of Bach's autograph manuscript from the 1740s.

adapted this suite in later years was a sign of its popular, indeed entertaining, character, which it shares with the last three or four French Suites. As in the cello suites, Bach filled out the set with a work which, if not later in date, was the most fashionable and lively of the group.

The only other work from around this time in which Bach incorporated something like a variation movement is the E-minor flute sonata. It follows the same four-movement plan as the violin sonatas, with a fugue in second place whose episodes mimic concerto solos. Even the fugue, however, is more *galant* than any movement in the violin sonatas, and the opening Adagio is a duet for flute and an equally lyrical bass line. The most distinctive movement might be the third, a sort of aria in through-composed ternary form, with a quasi-ostinato bass and a charming Italianate melody. Bach's concertos and cantatas also include movements constructed over ostinatos, but none has a bass like this one in broken chords, which give it the appearance of a later Alberti bass (ex. S9.26).

Other solo chamber works

Bach's instrumental music also includes a few pieces for the lute, which continued to be used as a continuo instrument until the mid-eighteenth century and possibly even into the nineteenth at a few German courts. Different varieties of lute took many shapes and bore various names. Although Bach owned one at his death, we have no information as to what type it was and whether he could play it. He must have known many lutenists during his life, including the famous Dresden player and composer Sylvius Leopold Weiss. We know that Bach made an arrangement of one of the latter's lute sonatas, but there is no evidence that he composed any of his own lute music for Weiss.[368] One work, the suite BWV 995—an arrangement of the Fifth Cello Suite—was for a Leipzig book dealer and amateur lutenist. The fact that Bach's surviving autograph manuscripts for these pieces are written in score notation, rather than the tablature used by lutenists, suggests that he played this music on keyboard instruments. Presumably he left it up to lute players to transcribe the music into their own notation—in the process making the necessary adaptations for it to be playable on their instruments.[369]

The earliest of Bach's surviving lute compositions, BWV 996 in E minor, must have been written no later than his first years at Weimar. It contains several points in common with the little praeludium BWV 895, which must date from the same period.[370] The earliest source even

---

[367] In the wedding cantata BWV 120a of perhaps 1729, the original music for solo violin is arranged for solo organ, with string accompaniment; to this Bach added trumpets and timpani for the council election cantata BWV 29 from the 1730s.

[368] The arrangement, listed as BWV 1025, exists in two versions (one fragmentary). These were evidently products of an experiment, as explained in NBA 6/5, KB, pp. 77–79.

[369] Thus BWV 995 survives in a version transcribed into lute tablature, as does the suite BWV 997; further on this topic in Schulenberg (2006, 361, 364).

[370] The two share a few turns of phrase, and the fugues of both are based on very simple subjects. Could BWV 895 have been originally written for lute too?

describes it as being for lute-harpsichord (*Lautenwerk*), a type of keyboard instrument fitted with gut strings and without dampers to imitate the sound of a lute.[371] No such instrument survives; modern examples, some fanciful, are based on Adlung's description.

After acquiring such an instrument for the Weimar court, Bach apparently had a more costly one made for the Cöthen court, but the documents recording its purchase and presence there are lost.[372] As neither Weimar nor Cöthen employed a lutenist as such, it could be that Bach sometimes used the court lute-harpsichord to accompany chamber music there—or to play the suites and other pieces, whether for keyboard or for solo stringed instruments, that he was now gathering into sets. Yet even if Bach himself played these pieces as keyboard music, BWV 996 differs in texture and tessitura from an ordinary harpsichord piece. Modern lutenists have differed as to how idiomatic any of Bach's music is for their instrument, but these pieces were certainly imagined for the large lute-type instruments of the late Baroque, with their multiple deep bass strings, even if they are most often heard today in guitar arrangements.

Among other miscellaneous pieces probably from Weimar or Cöthen is a puzzling "Fuga" for violin and continuo (BWV 1026). It resembles the fugues from the three unaccompanied violin sonatas in style and form but is somewhat simpler and less sophisticated in its motivic work and harmony. It might have served as a preliminary exercise for the fugues in the unaccompanied sonatas, although virtually the entire piece is built out of the chain-of-suspensions sequence that is the basis of the main subject. Together with the suite BWV 1023, this might have been the sort of thing that Bach, disdaining the monodic textures of ordinary violin sonatas, wrote as an early essay in virtuoso string writing.[373] BWV 1023 proceeds curiously from a rhapsodic, Biberesque prelude to an allemande and gigue which, again, seem to foreshadow the unaccompanied solos. Another violin sonata, BWV 1021, is probably a later composition, related to Bach's teaching at Leipzig.

The organ sonatas (p. 177, following the first complete paragraph, "in ways that more clearly declare their independence from fugue")

Bach's revision of several earlier compositions for inclusion among the organ sonatas was a continuation of work during the late 1720s that had produced several church cantatas that

---

[371] The words *aufs Lauten Werck* on the title page of BWV 996, in Walther's copy, are not original (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. Bach P 801/22). The most complete account of the instrument is by Adlung (1768, 2:133–43; partial trans. NBR, 366 [no. 358e]), including annotations by Bach's pupil Agricola and reflecting familiarity with instruments by Johann Nicolaus Bach of Jena.

[372] These were first reported by Bunge (1905, 29); see Ledbetter (2002, 28 and 348n. 41).

[373] Another work for violin and continuo, the C-minor sonata BWV 1024, is not attributed to Bach in either of the surviving manuscript copies. One of these (Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek–Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Mus. ms. 2-R-3.2) is in the hand of Pisendel, who seems more likely to be the composer although there is no evidence of this in his copy.

included obbligato organ. Several movements in those cantatas were based on instrumental pieces; among these are arias and a chorus that Bach produced by adding vocal parts to an existing instrumental structure, as in other cantatas from that season. One aria that is not known to have been based on anything earlier nevertheless looks very much like an organ trio, at least until the voice enters.[374] It seems, therefore, that during this period Bach's thoughts were turning back to types of music in which he had specialized at Cöthen, even if much of the music in the organ sonatas was newly composed at Leipzig.

The combination of strict three-part writing with *galant* melodic ideas in these sonatas has a parallel in the early trio sonatas that the young Emanuel Bach was writing, perhaps as composition exercises, just as his father was putting the collection together.[375] During the same period, Friedemann collaborated with Magdalena on a manuscript copy of Sebastian's organ sonatas.[376] Friedemann later told Forkel that his father had put them together for him, but Forkel also thought they were written in the composer's "most mature age," which was hardly true.[377]

If Bach's other pupils made any use of these works, they could have studied them more readily at a pedal clavichord than a church organ, where access and practice time would have been limited.[378]Whatever the instrumental medium, these pieces, even more than the organ chorales and praeludia, concentrate the player's attention on the independence of the parts, with the two manual voices often flying across one another in opposite directions. Some of the thematic ideas, as in the inventions, look as if they were meant to provide practice in particular aspects of keyboard technique. The final movement of Sonata 1 has a leaping subject, shared by hands and feet (ex. S9.27a).[379] In the finale of Sonata 3, on the other hand, Bach mercifully confines the criss-crossing triplets to the manuals (ex. S9.27b). In both of these sonatas, however, statements

---

[374] This is "Wie jammer mich" from Cantata 170, first performed on July 28, 1726. Further discussion in G. G. Butler (2007).

[375] All seven of Emanuel's Leipzig trios were composed in 1731, according to a list of his compositions published after his death (C. P. E. Bach 1790).

[376] Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. Bach P 272. Friedemann's portion of the copy, comprising a little more than the first half of the set, seems to have been a replacement for pages by Magdalena that became lost or damaged.

[377] Forkel (1802, 60) writes that Bach "hat sie für seinen ältesten Sohn, Wilh. Friedemann, aufgesetzt . . . in dem reifsten Alter des Verfassers."

[378] Speerstra (2004) devoted a chapter (pp. 32–51) to the nineteenth-century "rumor" that these works were originally for clavichord, concluding that "there is some unresolvable ambiguity about Bach's intentions" although "they make for convincing performance music at the pedal clavichord" (p. 93). The title *Orgel-Sonaten* is present in the autograph (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. Bach P 271) only on a title page added by the collector Georg Poelchau; Bach describes each work as *Sonata . . . à 2 Clav: et Pedal* (sonata for two keyboards and pedals).

[379] Bach must have remembered this when he wrote the fantasia on "Jesus Christus unser Heiland" in part 3 of the Clavierübung (BWV 688).

of thematic material in the pedals are often simplified, as in some of Bach's early organ music. This is one sign that the works shown in example S9.27 were not originally for a single keyboard instrument.

From copying out organ books by Grigny and (probably) other French composers, Bach knew contrapuntal trios in which the two hands, playing on separate manuals, were joined by the feet on the pedals in rigorous three-part writing. The style of those older organ trios, however, had little in common with the Italianate trio sonatas that Telemann and even Couperin were writing by the second decade of the eighteenth century. At least one of Bach's chorale trios, BWV 664a ("Allein Gott"), must date from roughly the same period as some of the music included in the organ sonatas. For it is entirely comparable to them in style and form, apart from the entrance of the chorale melody in the pedals at the very end. Bach, who was studying Corelli's trio sonatas by the time of the early organ fugue BWV 579, had probably done so by scoring up such works (printed in parts) and trying them out at the organ or clavichord. Now he or his pupils were making organ adaptations of more up-to-date works by Fasch and Telemann. His own trio sonatas, as well as sinfonias from the cantatas in trio texture, could be and were arranged in similar manner.[380] Yet the only fully authenticated transcriptions of this type by Bach himself are those incorporated into the organ sonatas, for which no original versions survive.[381]
The view that three of the sonatas incorporate transcriptions from older works depends partly on stylistic analysis, partly on the character of Bach's autograph manuscript. The latter shows that the relatively pristine notation of certain movements must have been copied from earlier scores. In other movements, however, Bach was composing or actively revising, as is evident from cross-outs and other corrections made in the course of writing down the music. Musical features may also provide hints about the origin of certain movements. In particular, some movements are prevailingly contrapuntal in texture, whereas others are "concerto-like," to make a distinction drawn during Bach's lifetime by his one-time pupil Johann Adolph Scheibe. The quick first movement of the sixth sonata looks especially like an allegro from a concerto, beginning with a ritornello-like passage in which the two hands play the main theme in unison, on separate keyboards of course. Such writing is unique in the six sonatas, but a number of other apparent borrowings from concerto form have been noted in other movements from both this set and others.

Scheibe's published comments about Bach led to a bitter controversy (see chap. 12), but he was a capable composer and an often perceptive writer on music. His remarks on "fugal" and "concerto" styles reflect a difference that was probably recognized at the time, but finding it in

---

[380] Organ arrangements exist of individual movements by Fasch and Couperin (BWV 585, 587) and by Bach himself (from BWV 21, 166, 1014, 790, and 1039); the original composer of at least one arrangement, BWV 586, is unidentified composer (see Dirksen 2010a, 27–28).

[381] The view that at least some of the organ sonatas were preceded by ensemble versions was first rigorously argued by Eppstein (1969, 15–26) and has been refined by Butt (1988) and Dirksen (2003 and 2010a). Two movements (Sonata 3, mvt. 2, and Sonata 4, mvt. 1) survive in alternate, although not necessarily earlier, versions for instrumental ensemble, and Hoffmann (1999) traced the outer movements of Sonata 1 to a lost trio in B-flat for recorder, oboe,and continuo.

Bach's music and using it to deduce a chronology is far from straightforward. Modern readers of Scheibe have tended to assume that his special category of "concerto-like sonatas" (*Sonaten auf Concertenart*) was rooted in formal design, which loomed large in twentieth-century understanding of musical style generally. But what was paramount for Scheibe was texture: whether the music was contrapuntal or homophonic, that is, whether composed polyphonically or with a single part dominating the texture.[382]

Arias and concertos were naturally homophonic, in Scheibe's view if not Bach's. This made them more fashionable and up-to-date (*galant,* in the language of the time, although Scheibe does not use this expression). On the other hand, sonatas for Scheibe were originally contrapuntal, in "fugal style" (*Fugenart*). Even fugues, however, could assimilate features that Scheibe regarded as proper to the concerto, as when Corelli, Telemann, and eventually Bach incorporated "twisting and varying" passages—that is, soloistic figuration—into the episodes.[383] Six trios that Telemann published in 1718 include simple examples of movements in "concerto" style. These could have provided models for the more elaborate examples in Bach's organ sonatas and the works with obbligato keyboard. For that reason, even when Bach writes a sonata whose outer movements allude clearly to designs used in concertos, as in the Sixth Organ Sonata, there can be no certainty that this was a significantly later composition than one whose quick movements are conventional fugal or sonata-form types, like the first sonata. The autograph score of the sixth sonata contains more alterations than the first, but even the most heavily corrected movement in the set remains cleaner than a typical composing score.[384] It is therefore impossible to use either the appearance of Bach's manuscript or analysis of the musical style to deduce, with any precision, when these pieces originated—a conclusion that must apply equally to the remaining works discussed in this chapter, most of which have similar histories.

The third sonata begins with a four-measure adagio, but this is the only allusion in the set to the four-movement design of a "church" sonata. This movement was indeed heard in church, as it occurs also as a sinfonia in one of Bach's first sacred cantatas for Leipzig.[385]The autograph of the latter looks very much like a composing score, making it unlikely that this movement derives from an earlier Cöthen trio sonata. Indeed its form, more a free invention than a strict fugue, is not typical of imitative trio movements, although it adheres clearly in the "fugal" style. The first movement of Sonata 5, on the other hand, is a sort of dialog between two distinct motives; Sonatas 2 and 6 open with *galant* parallel thirds and (as noted previously) even parallel unisons, an imitation of orchestral texture (ex. S9.28). Each of these opening movements could be considered concerto-like: the initial flourish of Sonata 5 resembles that of the concerto BWV

---

[382] Further discussion of Scheibe's *Sonate auf Concertenart* (described in his *Critischer Musikus*, 675–78) and modern (mis)interpretations in Schulenberg (2008, 60–73).

[383] Scheibe describes these "wenig kräuselnde und verändernde Sätze" as elements of sonatas "in concerto style" (*auf Concertenart*, Scheibe 1745, 676; trans. in Schulenberg 2008, 95).

[384] Dirksen (2010a, 214–15) lists corrections, which are most numerous in movement 1 of the Sixth Sonata.

[385] BWV 76, performed on June 6, 1723, just six days after his formal installation as cantor.

1053, and the opening section of Sonata 6 acts like a textbook ritornello, alternating with solos for the right hand, then the left, and finally both together.

Second and third movements are similarly diverse. Some take binary or sonata forms; others—notably the final movements in Sonatas 2 and 4—are full-fledged fugues, with full participation by the bass (pedals). Even movements that share a formal design are of contrasting types; the closing fugue of Sonata 4 has an expressive *galant* subject, interrupted by sighing pauses, whereas that of Sonata 2 is an old-fashioned *alla breve* theme, with stretto episodes alternating with passages based on a contrasting second theme.

Most of the slow movements are fugal or at least imitative, but that of Sonata 2 is a sort of duo-aria: the two upper parts alternate in presenting a long "singing" line and an accompaniment in smaller note values (mostly slurred "sigh" figures). This type of movement recurs in the obbligato-keyboard trios, but as with so many passages in these sonatas, parallels can be found in simpler examples by other composers (ex. S9.29). To be sure, similar textures occur in chorale settings, including the one trio in the *Orgelbüchlein* ("Ich ruf' zu dir," BWV 639).

"Slow" is not an entirely accurate adjective for these central movements. Most of them—even the adagio of Sonata 3, later incorporated into the "Triple" Concerto—contain figuration in thirty-seconds (ex. S9.30). These need to move fleetingly, but without disturbing the pacing in long dotted-quarter beats. Similar writing occurs in the opening movements of the keyboard-and-violin sonatas in B minor and E major; it might be traced to the written-out embellishment of Italianate solo violin music. But melodic embellishment in these movements is incorporated into a stricter metrical framework and rendered motivic, the individual figures of embellishment developed in sequence and imitated between the two upper parts.

Sonatas with obbligato keyboard (p. 179, following the first paragraph break, "the equally *cantabile* part for the keyboard instrument)

Many years later, Emanuel Bach wrote to Forkel to point out the enduring appeal of Sebastian's "clavier trios," which according to him remained attractive fifty years after their origin.[386] The expression is usually interpreted to mean the sonatas for violin and obbligato keyboard, which at the time would have been regarded as keyboard pieces with violin accompaniment. But the term could have applied equally well to the organ sonatas, which Emanuel, or someone known to him, would soon afterward praise in print for their *galant* style.[387]As the writer was defending Sebastian against unfavorable comparisons with Handel, it would not have helped the argument to point out that in either collection Bach incorporated *galant* themes into intricate contrapuntal structures. One can imagine Bach smiling as the apparently simplistic opening theme of Sonata 2, with its sweetly *galant* parallel motion (see ex. S9.28b), becomes enmeshed in increasingly complex contrapuntal combinations. At the same time, what seems at the start to be a clearly articulated alternation between ritornellos (or expositions) and episodes grows less transparent.

---

[386] BD 3:279 (no. 795); NBR, 388 (no. 389b).

[387] In the so-called Comparison of Bach and Handel, BD 3:441 (no. 927); NBR, 406 (no. 396). Speerstra (2004, 48) gave a strong argument that the expression referred to the organ sonatas.

The first of the violin-and-keyboard sonatas opens with a more sophisticated example of the same thing: parallel motion in the keyboard introduction of the opening Adagio yields to a contrapuntal texture, after the violin has made an aria-like entrance (see ex. S9.31 below). On the whole, however, these sonatas are more massive and more complex than the ones for organ, if less supremely challenging for either player. The set was assembled earlier than the organ trios, but the same uncertainties with regard to origin apply. Despite the parallel thirds and sixths sometimes present within the harpsichord accompaniments, these pieces generally avoid the *galant* mannerisms imitated in the organ sonatas. This might mean that the latter are later in origin, but it could merely signify that Bach had different aims for the two sets.

Still, the more regular recapitulatory patterns and more clearly articulated versions of early sonata form present in the organ sonatas probably are signs of a relatively late date—but the question remains, how *much* later than, say, Bach's initial move to Cöthen? Ideas about musical form could have evolved rapidly during intensive compositional work within a given genre. It is interesting, too, that Bach seems to have used a rare sort of "subdominant" recapitulation not only in a few of these sonatas but in the opening duet of BWV 23, composed at the end of the Cöthen period. A "subdominant" recapitulation occurs when the final section of a sonata-form movement restates the first one a fifth lower, thereby modulating back to the tonic. Today associated with Schubert, it was also a logical way to fill out a geometrically conceived formal design based on "modular" thinking.[388]

The extraordinary opening of the first sonata makes it clear that this work, at least, could not have originated as a conventional trio sonata. Here the keyboard part, already comprising three voices, serves as accompanist to the violin, which enters, like a vocal soloist, on a sustained note (ex. S9.31). The violin's initial *messa di voce* echoes a type of entry common in arias and slow sonata movements. But to have the soloist sneak in almost unnoticed, against what seems to be the main theme but in fact becomes a motivic accompaniment, was a stroke of genius; it anticipates much later Classical, even Romantic, approaches to texture and scoring. By placing this first in the set, Bach declares his independence from existing types of trio, even though the first five pieces are all "church" sonatas in four movements, with quick fugues (or strongly contrapuntal allegros) in the second and fourth places.

The first five sonatas are less homogeneous than their four-movement schemes might make them appear at first glance. Three of them conclude with relatively easy-going, if still fugal, movements in rounded binary or sonata form. In the F-minor sonata (no. 4), however, it is the second movement which has a central double bar, a more rigorous through-composed fugue coming last. The latter is a Vivace in 3/8 time, which might have signified a minuet. With a chromatic subject, however, it is hardly lightweight, and a canonic episode (at m. 103) leads to a

---

[388] Anson-Cartwright (2013) lists twelve instances in Bach's vocal works (p. 256; BWV 23 is the earliest) and eighteen in instrumental compositions (p. 276); the majority of the latter probably date from before Bach's move to Leipzig. The tabulation includes five inventions and sinfonias, three movements from the violin solos, and three preludes from part 1 of the WTC; it omits three movements from the organ sonatas (BWV 525/2, 530/2–3) and one from the sonatas for violin and keyboard (BWV 1014/1).

climactic stretto passage (mm. 124ff.). The counterpoint relaxes in most of the slow movements, but in Sonata 2 both of the latter are canonic, freely so in the opening movement, but with the violin strictly leading the right hand of the keyboard throughout the Andante.

The singing melodic lines in the slow movements are often accompanied by broken or repeated chords, but the texture can also be contrapuntal, as in the opening movement of the F-minor sonata. The latter, incidentally, is the clearest instance of ritornello form in any of these sonatas: the harpsichord introduction later alternates and combines in *Einbau* with the sustained violin melody, which even begins with a "motto" (*Devisen*) entrance. Another ritornello-form movement, although eventually removed from Sonata 6, actually *is* an aria, or at least Bach's arrangement of one. This was the Cantabile movement of BWV 1019a, an early version of Sonata 6. Here the harpsichord plays music given to the soprano soloist in the aria "Heil und Segen" from the Leipzig cantata BWV 120; the violin part is essentially the same as that of the *violino concertante* in the aria, where it plays the leading line of the ritornellos.[389] Although Bach eliminated this movement from the violin-and-harpsichord sonatas, it shows how closely he regarded vocal and instrumental forms. In other movements of this type, the two players exchange roles, producing the "duo-aria" type described above in the Second Organ Sonata. Thus in the second Adagio of Sonata 3, the harpsichord provides a repeated-note accompaniment also found in some of Vivaldi's concertos.[390]The violin then takes this up, producing the texture imitated by violin alone in the third movement of the C-major unaccompanied sonata (ex. S9.32; cf. ex. S9.21).

Another fashionable type of slow movement occurs with the siciliana that opens Sonata 4 (ex. S9.33). In binary form, this came from examples by Vivaldi and other contemporaries, but they rarely used it as an opening movement, and Vivaldi's movements of this type are often purposefully simple in melodic style and texture. Bach complicates the harmony through frequent use of the flat second degree of the scale (so this siciliana is also Neapolitan). And although he makes this a violin solo, like many of Vivaldi's, by incorporating several distinct motivic ideas into the keyboard accompaniment he makes the latter more than a written-out continuo part. Textbooks on accompaniment from Mattheson to Kirnberger suggest that keyboard players were expected to "vary" a basic contino realization by breaking chords and adding figuration with passing notes. Movements such as this one suggest that, before reaching Leipzig, Bach had grown accustomed to improvising a motivic type of accompaniment, realizing the figured (or unfigured) bass in a way that turned it into an essential part of the texture.[391] Written-out examples in these sonatas provided instruction in that technique while anticipating later eighteenth-century styles of written-out accompaniment.

---

[389] A similar process evidently created the third movement of the First Brandenburg Concerto, which exists also as the opening chours of Cantata 207 (not its original version). The slow movement of the Fifth Brandenburg Concerto (also in G major) reveals similar treatment of the solo harpsichord, as the equivalent of the soloist in an aria.

[390] As in Vivaldi's op. 3, no. 9, transcribed for harpsichord as BWV 972.

[391] Compare, e.g., the harpsichord's broken chords in the slow movement of the concerto BWV 1053 and in the aria "Heute noch" from the "Coffee Cantata." The latter is the sole instance of such an accompaniment in a vocal work, unless BWV 203 really is by Bach.

The fugues in these sonatas range from old-fashioned, somewhat rambling, through-composed examples in C minor (mvt. 2) and F minor (mvt. 4) to the virtuoso ternary type present in the preludes of the English Suites and the organ sonatas. The E-major sonata (no. 3) includes two fugues of the latter type, albeit with a "modified" or written-out "da capo" in the first Allegro. Three other sonatas (nos. 1, 2, and 4) end with allegros in rounded binary form whose imitative counterpoint is only slightly less rigorous than that of an actual fugue. Thus in Sonata 4 Bach introduces a new subject after the double bar but demurs from combining it with the main theme, producing instead a sort of double da capo form (ABABA). In the F-minor sonata (where the binary-form movement occupies the second position), a new theme introduced in the second half does then serve as a countersubject. Bach repeated this device in the gigues of the third and fourth harpsichord partitas, which might have been composed at about the same time, perhaps around 1725.

The sixth work of the set, again an outlier as in the Cello Suites, cost Bach considerable trouble. In G major, it underwent at least two overhauls, resulting in the replacement of all but the first two of its five original movements. Three "solo" movements wound up elsewhere: A "Cembalo solo" (mvt. 3) became the corrente of the Sixth Partita for harpsichord, and a "Violino solo e basso accompagnato" (mvt. 5) became the Tempo di gavotta of the same work. As already noted, a Cantabile from the second version (mvt. 3) recurs as the aria "Heil und Segen" in the council election cantata BWV 120; both extant versions probably derived from a lost earlier aria.

The final version retains a unique five-movement design, with a central allegro for harpsichord alone framed by two transitional slow movements. This new "Cembalo solo" is a sonata-allegro movement in E minor that could equally well have served as a prelude in part 2 of the WTC—which, however, has a different sonata-form movement as the prelude in this key. The presence of such a movement within a "violin" sonata remains an anomaly, as does the inclusion of a quick movement in the relative minor. At least Bach composed a new Allegro to end the sonata, rather than repeating the opening movement, as in the earlier versions. This was a plan that Bach followed in a few vocal works, and although the symmetry might have been pleasing, it would have made for an unsatisfying conclusion to an otherwise unstintingly original collection.[392]

All three versions of the sixth sonata lack independent slow movements, a largo and two adagios all functioning as bridges between the allegros. Each of these movements nevertheless is contrapuntally conceived, with expressive chromatic counterpoint recalling the three-part inventions. It is the outer movements of the final version, however, that most strongly distinguish this sonata. Both are lively examples of the "concerto-style" allegro in ternary form. The opening movement recalls the prelude from the Third English Suite: after a quasi-orchestral opening section or ritornello, it proceeds to a fugal episode, with entries of a new subject in all three parts. The final movement, although a later addition to the sonata, is remarkably similar to the first. Although in 6/8 rather than common time, it differs formally only in the transfer of the fugal element from the B section to the A section. It is as if, in revising the sonata, Bach

[392] Telemann sometimes repeated an opening chorus at the end of a work; a late example is his *Donner-Ode* of 1756. Bach did the same in the Weimar version of Cantata 172 and later in part 3 of the Christmas Oratorio.

eliminated the repeat of the opening movement but retained the idea of making the final movement very much like the first. He now also placed the odd movement for solo keyboard closer to the precise center.[393]

The remaining obbligato-keyboard trios do not seem ever to have been gathered into an "official" set.[394]They are preserved independent of one another, and one movement recurs mysteriously in an English manuscript copy, arranged for organ; this version appears to derive from an otherwise lost trio-sonata version. A few details in the B-minor sonata with flute likewise point to a trio-sonata origin. As we have them, these are probably all Leipzig works, perhaps prepared for the Collegium Musicum. Yet at least the G-minor gamba sonata (BWV 1029) must be much earlier. Not only does it share the closing flourish of its first movement with an early concerto by Telemann; the closing movement also includes a B section whose new theme is marked *cantabile*—the same expression that marks a counter-theme in the last movement of the Fifth Brandenburg Concerto. The second movement of the same work also recalls the corresponding movement of the Sixth Brandenburg Concerto, which is comparable in type although not in form (in the gamba sonata, it is probably the keyboard whose sustained melody was meant to be the main line at the outset; see ex. S9.35).

The G-minor work, like the sonatas with flute in A major and B minor, opens with passages that function, at least initially, like ritornellos. Those in the G-minor and A-major sonatas have melody lines for just one of the two players, allowing the other to make a delayed entrance like a soloist, introducing a new theme. That fact might, however, have made these pieces seem *unlike* a concerto to Bach's listeners, for whom a concerto began with a passage involving all the players (the *tutti*). To be sure, stylistically the opening movement in each of the three sonatas closely resembles a concerto allegro. The B-minor sonata even proceeds to a soloistic passage for the flute, with a distinctly accompanimental keyboard part; the two players later exchange roles.

The various movements in these sonatas as we know them may have had diverse origins, but where some of them originated can be only a matter of speculation. The B-minor flute sonata continues with a fugal Presto that would resemble movements in the keyboard-and-violin pieces if it did not suddenly stop after a half (Phrygian) cadence, giving way to a gigue-like Allegro. Five of the first six notes in the themes of the two movements are the same, but otherwise they are entirely distinct (ex. S9.36). The breaking off of serious a *alla breve* fugue in favor of a lighter gigue is unique in Bach's work and not a little strange. It has grown familiar to flute players, for whom this sonata is mandatory recital and audition material. Yet one wonders whether there is not some explanation, perhaps involving numbers, that has yet to be discovered. Portions of the keyboard part in the concluding Allegro again look like a written-out continuo part, something absent from the quick movements of Bach's other sonatas. A few such passages

[393] At twenty-one measures, the newly composed Adagio (mvt. 4) is exactly the same length as the Largo (mvt. 2), but the new Allegro exceeds the first one by nineteen measures.

[394] Tatlow (2015) does not mention these pieces, although the outer movements of the G-minor sonata contain exactly the same number of measures (111) if one counts the initial upbeat of the opening Vivace.

do occur in the harpsichord concertos; does this suggest a Leipzig origin? A manuscript copy of the keyboard part in G minor does not necessarily point to an early version with oboe in place of flute, for the solo part is unsuited for a double-reed instrument. Yet it probably does reflect some prior form of the sonata, otherwise lost.[395]

We have a few more tangible hints about the origin of the A-major sonata, despite the fragmentary nature of the surviving autograph score. Bach began copying it onto the unused staves at the bottoms of pages onto which he had written out the double concerto BWV 1062. Someone later cut away a number of these staves. That left a gap of some forty-six measures that editors have filled in various ways, while puzzling over the original form of the movement and the reasons for the deletion.[396] The work does seem originally to have been a conventional trio sonata, and the second movement is shared with one of the organ sonatas.[397]The finale—perhaps the most impressive movement in all these miscellaneous sonatas—is an extended, grander version of the quasi-ternary form that concludes the violin-and-keyboard sonata in E. So welcome is the final restatement of the main theme in this movement, after chromatic middle passages to remote keys, that Bach, exceptionally, assigns it to the two upper parts in unison. This is a refinement of the unison "ritornello" that opens and closes the first movement of the G-major organ sonata (ex. S9.37; cf. ex. S9.28c).

The remaining sonatas of this type, those for gamba in G and D, are of distinct varieties. The G-major sonata was transcribed by Bach around 1740 quite literally from the work that became the trio sonata BWV 1039. All four movements are of types already seen in the keyboard-and-violin sonatas; the third movement, consisting essentially of arpeggiation, also recalls preludes from the WTC, although it has a closer parallel in movement 3 of the F-minor violin sonata (exx. S9.38a–b). Bach rewrote the harpsichord part of the latter; its stylistic provenance is clearer in its original form (ex. S9.38c).[398] It must be said, however, that from the point of view of sonority neither the

[395] A reconstruction has been published by Hofmann (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf und Härtel, 2014), who argued (1998a) that the surviving part was transcribed from an original for violin and lute with optional bass-line instrument.

[396] See Marissen (1988); the present author's reconstruction is online at http://4hlxx40786q1osp7b1b814j8co.wpengine.netdna-cdn.com/david-schulenberg/files/2016/03/bwv1032_1_completion.pdf)

[397] Eppstein (1969, 90–102) traced the music to a trio for flute, violin, and continuo. Marissen (1985), arguing from corrections in the autograph score (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. Bach P 612), suggested that the original wind instrument was a recorder, the original key C major. That Bach was reworking the piece, while copying the original violin and continuo lines into the harpsichord part of the surviving autograph, is suggested by a cancelled sharp in m. 28 of the first movement; this originally would have been a figured bass symbol.

[398] The original version is that of the collected set of ca. 1725; the revision is preserved only in later copies, including one by Altnickol (Berlin, Staatsbiliothek, Mus. ms. Bach P 229). One could trace this type of harmonically inspired sonata movement to passages in Vivaldi's works, as in the slow movement of the quadruple concerto op. 3, no. 10, which Bach adapted for four harpsichords (BWV 1065).

gamba version nor the one with two flutes is an unqualified success. In this third movement, neither pairing of instruments resonates or blends as well as two violins might have done in the likely original scoring.

The D-major gamba sonata is a mystery, as none of its four movements corresponds closely with types seen in the other works. Unlike the other gamba sonatas, moreover, it calls for the seven-string instrument, descending to the notes C and BB (on the AA string) in the final section of the last movement. The latter is a strangely asymmetrical Allegro which, in this concluding section, abandons its previous contrapuntal texture in favor of flashy solos first for the harpsichord, then the gamba. These give the impression of having been inserted into an existing composition, perhaps to produce something better suited to public performance. But as the sources are all posthumous, it is impossible to say anything definite about the origin of this sonata.
Surely, however, the D-major gamba sonata achieved its familiar form only at Leipzig, perhaps as a deliberately eyebrow-raising complement to the relatively staid sonata in G. The English writer Charles Burney later reported that Carl Friedrich Abel, son of Sebastian's Cöthen colleague Christian Ferdinand Abel, had studied with Bach in Leipzig around 1740.[399] Burney knew and admired Bach's youngest son Johann Christian, who produced a famous series of concerts in London with the younger Abel. Is it possible that, while in Leipzig, the latter not only met the child Christian but performed this sonata at one of Sebastian's Collegium concerts? These would then have had their echo decades later in his own London concert collaborations with Christian.[400]

The Brandenburg Concertos (p. 187, following the paragraph break, "not the elaboration of a cadence")

The pre-history of the Brandenburg Concertos has been a favorite field for speculation, including supposed reconstructions of early versions. It is possible that Bach originally wrote the fifth concerto for the Mietke instrument which he acquired for the court in 1719. The familiar version includes an enormous harpsichord cadenza occupying sixty-five measures toward the end of the opening allegro—more than a quarter of the complete duration of the movement. The later versions of the cadenza include a few bass notes that cannot be held out as written unless they were envisioned for an instrument with pedals. Pedal harpsichords (and clavichords) were exceptional but not particularly unusual. Bach's older brother Christoph might have owned

---

[399] Burney (1782, 1018); further discussion in Heartz (2014, 169).

[400] In this connection it is curious that an early song (*Lied*) by Christian, "Herr Nicholaus Klemm," published at Berlin in the early 1750s, appears to quote the opening theme of the G-minor gamba sonata.

one,[401] and the harpsichord that Sebastian acquired for Cöthen in 1719 may have been a pedal instrument.[402]

Unlike the two big violin solos in Vivaldi's "Grosso Mogul" concerto, which likely inspired it, the long harpsichord "caprice" is based on motives from the main body of the movement. Like the long solos in another Bach concerto (BWV 1052) or in Handel's later organ concertos, it might have been partly improvised in early performances. If so, it could have evolved toward its present form through ad hoc additions, only one of which is documented by the surviving sources. Although long and full of rather recursive passagework, the cadenza is not unusually brilliant or particularly difficult to play. Yet the gradual unveiling of the harpsichord from its usual obscurity in the continuo section must have been an exhilarating surprise to those hearing the concerto for the first time.

Although the style of the fifth concerto seems most consistent with a Cöthen origin, at least the first concerto probably goes back further, to the Weimar period, where its postulated origin as the sinfonia to the "Hunt" Cantata may be reflected in the remarkable scoring of the opening ritornello. This superimposes canonic horn calls in triple rhythm over very different music for strings and woodwinds (ex. S9.39). Horn calls return in the minuet, and brass fanfares, which had evidently fascinated Bach since the time of the early Capriccio BWV 992, continue to pop up in later works, sometimes with religious overtones, sometimes perhaps simply as novelties.[403] The same concerto includes a solo part for *violino piccolo*, a small instrument tuned a minor third higher than normal. The part has a true solo function only in the third movement, taking the role of a singer in what seems a quite literal transcription of a lost aria, in through-composed ternary form.[404]

An early form of the second concerto has also been proposed. Its essential parts are those of the trumpet, recorder, oboe, and violin, which, with the continuo, make up its *concertino*. These are the only parts heard in the slow movement, and they also play alone in the expositions of the concluding fugue. There they are joined by the ripienists only in a recurring sequential episode, composed in five-part invertible counterpoint.

---

[401] The Aria variata (BWV 989), copied by Christoph Bach into the Andreas Bach Book, appears to call for pedals, as does the sarabande of the Third English Suite, a roughly contemporary work.

[402] As pointed out by Besseler (1956, 25), citing the Cöthen court account that records Bach's reimbursement on March 1 for fetching the harpsichord from Berlin, in BD 2:73 (no. 95); NBR, 87 (no. 77).

[403] In sacred works a fanfare could signify battle or the last judgement (as in Cantata 127); no such meaning is evident in the second gavotte of the First Orchestral Suite (BWV 1066). On fanfares see Boyd (1996) and Hofmann (1995 and 1997).

[404] Bach's adaptation of a vocal movement for instrumental use here is comparable to his procedure in the Cantabile movement of BWV 1019a. The same lost aria was the basis for the opening chorus of the Leipzig secular cantata BWV 207.

In the third concerto, Bach's autograph score shows the rubric *Adagio* and a fermata on the second chord, either of which might have been interpreted by contemporaries as signs for improvisation. Yet the absence of a slow movement causes the two allegros to be juxtaposed directly against one another, pointing out the stark contrast between them. The first movement, although alluding to da capo form, is actually quite free in design, whereas the second is as schematic a sonata form as can be found in music before the Classical period.[405] Today one tends to hear both movements played quickly if not mechanically, but even in a good performance it is difficult to avoid the effect of a whirring machine in the closing allegro. Perhaps this was even Bach's intention, at a time when calling a piece of music mechanical or geometric would not have been an insult.

The fourth concerto offers a different sort of puzzle in Bach's designation of the two woodwind instruments as *fiauti d'echo*, an expression that has yet to receive a completely convincing explanation.[406] Bach's usual term for recorder was simply *flauto*, as in the later version of the work that replaces the solo violin with harpsichord (BWV 1057). The harpsichord version includes as well a newly busy bass line, in two passages where the recorders were originally the only soloists (at mm. 168 and 293 in the first movement). If this was typical of how Bach normally realized a bass line, it points to an impulse to attract attention to himself. His extraordinary facility at adding new counterpoint on the spot must have been admirable, yet it might have seemed superfluous if it turned an accompaniment into a solo, and it probably should not be emulated today by performers whose level of skill falls short of Bach's.[407]

The diversity of the Brandenburgs extends beyond their scoring. Concertos by Vivaldi, Marcello, and Telemann occasionally incorporate fugal ritornellos, but entire movements in the form of fugues are rare. Bach, however, concludes three of the concertos with fugues (nos. 2, 4, and 5). He also indulges his fascination with strict canon, not only in the canonic minuet of Concerto 1 but in a canonic accompaniment to the climactic violin solo of no. 4 (mvt. 3, mm. 105ff.). There is also a second harpsichord solo in no. 5, at the exact center of the last movement; this takes the form of a fourteen-bar canon (mm. 163–76).

---

[405] The entire "exposition" (mm. 1–12) is restated a minor third lower in the course of the "development" (mm. 17–28), then again as a "subdominant" recapitulation to close out the movement (mm. 37–48). The rigorous recapitulation scheme was probably suggested by comparable things in binary-form movements from the "Marcello" concertos that Bach knew (see below).

[406] The most thorough discussions remain those of Marissen (1991 and 1995a). He concludes that the expression refers to metaphorical echoes (perhaps those represented by dynamic markings in the second movement) rather than a special type of instrument.

[407] Kittel (1808, 3:33), one of Bach's last pupils, reported that his teacher might add "masses of harmony" (*Massen von Harmonie*; NBR, 323 [no. 317]) to a student's meager continuo realization, but this was in the performance of a church cantata with a harpsichord (*Flügel*), where heavy chords—not a new line of running counterpoint—might have been needed to keep the ensemble together.

All these canons are more playful than learned. So too is the incorporation of the opening ritornello theme of the third concerto into a double fugue, with a new countersubject. This occurs at the point where one is led to expect a "da capo" repeat of the first section (mm. 78ff.; see ex. 7.26). The fugue does not continue beyond a third entry, but, when the same thing happens in the C-major triple concerto, one could suspect that Bach enjoyed teasing listeners with the expectation of hearing a fugue even if he did not fulfill it.[408]Equally playful, perhaps, is the way Bach signed his name in the first movement of the second concerto. Within a recurring episode its bass line three times states the BACH motive, the last time in untransposed form. The passage's sudden *piano* dynamic level and shifting chromatic modulations make it stand out against the exuberant diatonicism of the rest of the movement (ex. S9.40).

Other concertos (p. 189, following the end of the printed page, "a newly elaborated bass line (Example 9.11)")

Whether any of the harpsichord concertos constituted parts of a "perfected" set is uncertain, although suggestive bar-counts have been found.[409] The massive autograph manuscript containing Bach's scores is a composite, the main part of which seems to have been conceived as an integral set of six concertos. The first of these, the D-minor work known as no. 1, may be the biggest and most virtuoso in style of the seven works that Bach finished. But it is closely rivaled by no. 6, his arrangement of the Fourth Brandenburg Concerto. The latter, if indeed meant to round out the collection, does so by standing apart from the others through its expanded instrumentation (with two recorders) and concluding fugue. Also standing apart, however, is a seventh complete work, the G-minor concerto BWV 1058 (a version of the A-minor violin concerto), as well as the aborted arrangement of the D-minor oboe concerto.

What makes these solo concertos engaging in any version is their unique combination of virtuoso display for the soloist with Bachian counterpoint and harmony. The allegros reveal the same understanding evident in the Fifth Brandenburg Concerto of how to build up to an extended solo passage that serves as a climax. This takes place within movements that can approach seven or eight minutes in duration. So extended a time frame is rare in concertos by other composers prior to the 1740s, but it is common in Bach's organ works, in which he probably first developed this sense of long-range musical form. He made an even closer approach to writing a concerto allegro in the A-minor harpsichord prelude BWV 894/1, doubtless a Weimar piece. Bach or, more likely, a pupil eventually turned this into an actual concerto movement as the opening allegro of the Triple Concerto BWV 1044.

Like the preludes of the last five English Suites, BWV 894/1 could have served as a preliminary exercise in writing a virtuoso keyboard piece in concerto style, perhaps even before the idea of writing an actual keyboard concerto had occurred to anyone.[410]The formal plan of this prelude is

---

[408] This occurs in the first movement of BWV 1064 at m. 43.

[409] Among the concertos for one harpsichord, Tatlow (2015, 364–65) counts a typically round number of 1600 measures in the first four concertos, with another 1020 in BWV 1056–57.

[410] Further analysis of BWV 894/1 in Schulenberg (2006, 145–46).

repeated, in large part, in the first movement of the great D-minor concerto. This allegro contains no fewer than three extended solo passages. Two of these can be described as *perfidiae*—extended passagework based on broken chords—by virtue of their mesmerizing sequential construction. This takes place over pedal points, which heighten the sense of growing urgency (ex. S9.41). Evidently designed originally for violin, these passages must have called for the *bariolage* technique also employed in the violin chaconne and the prelude of the Sixth Cello Suite. Their immediate inspiration, however, probably lay in the solo capricci of Vivaldi's "Grosso Mogul" concerto.[411] The virtuoso rambling of the latter is now integrated into a cumulative design for the movement as whole, just as in the Fifth Brandenburg.

Another important compositional idea in these concertos is that of composition over an ostinato bass line—often one that is presented at the outset of a movement by all parts in unison. This idea too could have come from Vivaldi, who used it in the A-minor "double" concerto from his op. 3 (no. 8); Bach transcribed this for organ as BWV 593. The same principle underlies two concerto movements known to date from his Weimar years, the opening sinfonias of Cantatas 18 and 31. His interest in the technique may be surprising in view of his avoidance of variation form, but he probably understood it as a variety of *Einbau*, the "inlay" of additional counterpoint within an existing structure. The set of six harpsichord concertos begins with a unison ritornello, as does the triple-harpsichord concerto in D minor. It was probably present as well at the opening of the other triple concerto, in C (see below). By the time he adapted the D-minor work for harpsichord, Bach had extended the idea of *Einbau* to a higher level, enfolding the entire slow movement into the first chorus of Cantata 146 through the addition of four vocal parts. The initial sinfonia of that cantata derives from the same concerto, with additional parts for two oboes and taille (tenor oboe); the final movement would be the basis of the opening sinfonia of BWV 188.

If the grand, long, often dazzling but slightly incohate D-minor concerto emerged from the same environment as Bach's big Weimar organ works, the relatively concise, crisply articulated designs of other concertos suggest that these were significantly later. Some of them, at least, might have been composed around the time he was working on the relatively unpretentious, relatively *galant* French Suites and organ sonatas. Three of these concertos conclude with dance-like movements whose ritornello form might more accurately be described as that of a rondo; in this they recall the dances *en rondeau* of Couperin and other French composers.[412] The clearest example of this is in the E-major violin concerto BWV 1042, which Bach arranged for keyboard as BWV 1054; this ends with a minuet in rondeau form. In two other concertos (BWV 1053 and 1055) the ritornello of the final movement, although not clearly representing a specific dance type, is relatively concise, its restatements more or less verbatim.[413] Bach would have known

---

[411] As suggested by Rifkin (1988a, 5).

[412] Some of the "optional" dances in the suites represent simple examples of this design; the rounded binary form of ex. S9.14 can also be described as a simple rondo form with a single contrasting section (ABABA).

[413] The final movement of BWV 1056 in F minor is probably also a minuet, but the dance quality is obscured by vehement string chords and other disruptions. The closing rondeau-like

French rondeaux from the repertory preservved in his older brother's keyboard books. Modern performances often rush through such music, aiming at virtuoso display but missing the allusion to elegant choreography that would have seemed self-evident wherever the French style was appreciated.

The surfaces of these more *galant* concertos are not necessarily sweeter or less portentous than others, although that is surely the case with the A-major work (BWV 1055). The latter almost certainly derives from a concerto for oboe d'amore, an instrument apparently invented at Leipzig around 1720 and perhaps not known to Bach until his arrival there for the audition of early 1723. He seems to have hit upon a routine way of writing for it only after experimenting during his first year there.[414] Another work probably for oboe in its lost early form is the E-major concerto BWV 1053 (originally in E-flat?), perhaps most notable for its gorgeous siciliana.[415] Bach had found an alternate use for this movement by the time he incorporated it into a harpsichord concerto; its striking chromatic harmonies had proved appropriate for the aria text "Stirb in mir" ("Die in me") in Cantata 169 of 1726.

The quick movements of these concertos in A and E are concise and perky. But the F-minor harpsichord concerto (BWV 1056), also thought relatively late, is a dour work, with prickly melodic lines. Yet this as well as BWV 1055 gives the soloist passages in triplets, a rhythm favored in Bach's more *galant* keyboard partitas. All three movements of BWV1055, moreover, resemble sonata allegros. So too does the first movement of BWV1056, whose third movement is a precisely divided binary form.[416]

The brevity, relative simplicity, and almost predictable formal designs of BWV 1056 recur in the C-minor work for two harpsichords (BWV 1060). Its final movement is not far from the through-composed sonata form common in Emanuel's concertos of the 1740s. Even listeners unconcerned with musical design can perceive a certain neatness characteristic of *galant* music in the presence of long stretches of recapitulated matter: in both quick movements, the second half consists largely of transposed restatements of passages from the first half. The 2/4 meter of the opening movement in both concertos also points to a relatively late origin.[417]

---

movement of BWV 1055 recalls that of the flute sonata in the same key (A), although the latter was probably originally in C.

[414] As pointed out by Rifkin (1983).

[415] Wolff (2008, 106) asserts that reconstructions for oboe are "problematic" because of the key and long passages in sixteenths. Rifkin, however, had demonstrated the practicality of his version in his recording (1983) with soloist Stephen Hammer.

[416] In the first movement, the first two solo entrances (in mm. 21 and 39) correspond to the exposition and development of a later sonata-allegro form, whereas the restatements of the ritornello theme at mm. 71 and 87 (the latter by the soloist) correspond with the retransition and the return (beginning of the recapitulation). The final movement is divided precisely in half by the ritornello in the dominant at m. 113.

417

Bach's own version of the C-minor work is now less well known than reconstructions with the original solo instruments (oboe and violin); these rival in popularity the concerto for two violins (BWV 1043). The latter also exists in a keyboard version (BWV 1062), again in C minor. The high points of both double concertos, as in BWV 1056, are their slow movements: a singing arioso in the latter, singing duets with fugal imitation between the soloists in the double concertos.

None of these movements is particularly well served by their keyboard adaptations, despite Bach's addition of some expressive embellishment in the solo concerto (see ex. 9.10). There was less opportunity for embellishing the slow movements of the double concertos, which at first glance look very similar to one another, aiming at an untroubled serenity. Yet the concerto for two violins reveals its (probably) earlier origin by following a less systematic plan, avoiding the exact recapitulations present in BWV 1060. Again, how *much* later BWV 1060 might be is impossible to say. Its motoric figuration is not unlike that of the Brandenburg Concertos, and its original version could still be from Bach's Cöthen years. Nor is heavy use of recapitulation necessarily a "late" feature, being found already in the Third Brandenburg Concerto (mvt. 2). The texture at m. 9 (mvt. 1) and elsewhere, where a legato melody for one soloist is accompanied by more lively figuration for the other, occurs also in the Fifth Brandenburg, although Bach might have found it in works by Vivaldi (ex. S9.42).

Such passages, presumably conceived for a singing oboe accompanied by a fluid violin, are not entirely successful in the extant version for two harpsichords. Played on identical-sounding, non-dynamic instruments, the melody and its accompaniment are less readily distinguishable from one another, and the verbatim recapitulations seem pedantic. In the work for two violins, on the other hand, the clear distinction between the sustained subject and a more active countersubject allows the version for two harpsichords to retain its expressivity (ex. S9.43; compare ex. 7.7). The novelty of seeing and hearing Bach play this music with a pupil might have been sufficient in the first performances of the double-harpsichord concertos. But we must regret his apparent failure to save the earlier form of BWV 1060, which would have been more colorful than the keyboard version if not as striking as the Brandenburg Concertos.

The triple concertos BWV 1063 and 1064, in D minor and C major respectively, likewise might have sounded more interesting in their early versions, but attempting to trace their origins raises difficult questions. For instance, did the opening ritornello of the C-major concerto always include the independent string parts now present there? Or did all parts originally double the bass line, as at the beginning of the D-minor concerto (ex. S9.44)? If the latter, did the two works form a deliberately composed pair?[418] Each closes with a fugue, or at least a fugue-like movement—but in other respects the D-minor work is almost the opposite of the brighter BWV 1064. The latter is more Vivaldian in its opening movement, less so in its Adagio, where instead BWV1063 has a siciliana.

On 2/4 time as an innovation of the early eighteenth century, see Williams (1993, 1994).

[418] Tatlow (2015, 65–66) counts 950 measures between the two works and suggests that there might have been some further, unrealized plan to group them with other concertos.

This siciliana must originally have been in binary form, like similar movements in many of Vivaldi's concertos; in its extant version, BWV 1063 has the first harpsichord vary each repeat. The slow movement of BWV 1064, on the other hand, has a complex ritornello form that looks as if it originally started, like the first movement, as just an ostinato bass line. That bass, incidentally, reveals thematic parallels to the E-minor flute sonata, suggesting some affinity between the two works despite their very different scoring and ambience (ex. S9.45).

Whatever its precise form, the original version of BWV 1064 surely involved three equal soloists, probably violins.[419] In the D-minor concerto, although the relationships between the soloists differ from movement to movement, the first solo part is distinctly more prominent. It predominates in movement 1 and is the *only* soloist in movement 2; the others share parity with it only in movement 3. This feature recalls the Brandenburg Concertos, where in no. 1 the principal violin is a full-fledged soloist only in movement 3, and the solo trumpet is completely absent from the middle movement of Concerto 2. Could BWV 1063 have been scored originally like the Fourth Brandenburg, with its leading violin part and two secondary soloists (two recorders)? Also more like the Brandenburgs than the concertos with one and two soloists is the use of quasi-ternary forms for the opening allegros and of fugues in final ones.

Rescoring these two rather different works for harpsichords only exacerbated the problems noted previously in the works for one and two soloists. To some degree this is compensated for by the dramatic deployment of extended solo passages in the quick movements. In the first movement of BWV 1063, all three of these passages are for the first soloist. The concluding fugue of BWV 1064, on the other hand, assigns lengthy episodes to soloists 3, 2, and 1, respectively. The last of these passages is the longest, filled out with the most colorfully varied figuration. Yet it ends quietly, in a quizzical, unaccompanied monophonic passage (ex. S9.46). If Bach wrote this part for himself to play, its conclusion was an uncharacteristically restrained ending to one of his most complex and hard-to-grasp ensemble works.

The "orchestral" suites (p. 193, following the end of the printed page, "his Eisenach cousin Johann Bernhard Bach")

In each of these works, the initial French overture is by far the largest single movement. After its opening section in dotted rhythm, it proceeds to a fugue similar to the fugues in many of the sonatas, alternating between expositions and soloistic episodes. The concerto-like style of the latter is particularly clear in Suites 2 and 3, where these include passagework for solo flute and first violin, respectively. On the other hand, in Suite 1 the episodes are assigned to the double reeds as a group, in Suite 4 to the whole string section, and they are not particularly virtuosic in style. Nevertheless, the analogy to ritornello form in all four movements has led to the term "concertante fugue" for these passages, which are often taken to be characteristic of a type of late-Baroque "concerted overture." Joshua Rifkin, however, has shown that this is another genre whose apparent conventionality is due to the fame of Bach's own examples. These were

---

[419] G. G. Butler (1997, 244) proposed that BWV 1064 was originally written in late 1718 or early 1719, when four string players are thought to have visited Cöthen. One must wonder, however, how many other visits, there or to Leipzig, were not recorded.

preceded by rather different manifestations of the same underlying idea, in a few works by Telemann and Handel.[420]

Among Bach's models for these suites must have been an *ouverture* for four-part strings by Telemann; a keyboard transcription survives in one of Christoph Bach's collections.[421] The fugue in Telemann's overture, based on a subject also heard in the first choral movement of Cantata 21, includes episodes in which the first violin occasionally stands out from the other strings. As in Bach's Suite 3, however, nothing distinguishes this as a solo part, and if there were multiple players on the first violin part, all presumably would have participated in the episodes as well as the expositions. The result is nevertheless an incursion of Italian concerto style into an ostensibly French overture. Hence for Bach these movements were further instances of the same genre-mixing that led him, already at Weimar, to incorporate a French overture into a church cantata (BWV 61).

There was never a standard sequence of dance movements for *ouvertures* as there was for keyboard suites, and in the eclectic make-up of his suites, Bach followed earlier German composers such as Kusser and Muffat. Both had studied with Lully, whom Kusser imitated quite closely. Both, too, like Fischer, published their suites in collections that Bach could have known. Yet Bach was writing in his own mixed style already in the very early keyboard suite in Lullian style, BWV 822, whose fugue includes an outrageous chromatic episode. BWV 822 proceeds to an air and a gavotte en rondeau, movement types that recur in his later orchestral suites alongside others both traditional and new (table S9.1).

Table 9.1. The movements of the four "orchestral" suites

BWV:	1066	1067	1068	1069
	overture	overture	overture	overture
	courante	[gavotte]*	air	bourrée 1–2
	gavotte 1–2	sarabande	gavotte 1–2	gavotte
	forlane	bourrée 1–2	bourrée	menuet 1–2
	menuet 1–2	polonaise–double	gigue	réjouissance
	bourrée 1–2			
	passepied 1–2	menuet		
		badinerie		

*called rondeau

---

[420] Rifkin (2007, 25–26, esp. the long footnote 49, which is practically a self-contained essay on the subject).

[421] The original work is TWV 55:Es4, preserved in Darmstadt, Landesbibliothek, Mus. ms. 1034/33 (available online at http://tudigit.ulb.tu-darmstadt.de). Christoph Bach's manuscripts include several other arrangements of orchestral *ouvertures* as well.

Allemandes were almost never written for ensembles. This is especially true of the rhapsodic type in which Froberger had specialized—although, strangely, the overture of the second suite quotes one of Froberger's allemandes (ex. S9.47).[422] Each of Bach's four orchestral suites includes at least one gavotte and one bourrée—dances that were not particularly common in suites by French composers, but to which Bach seems to been attached in his youth. Each of Bach's suites also contains one oddball movement. The forlane in Suite 1 is something like a moderately paced gigue. The titles of the badinerie and the réjouissance that close Suites 2 and 4, respectively, suggest they might be considered character pieces rather than dances.

The most famous movement in all these works must be the air from Suite 3, whose title also occurs in the harpsichord suites. There it is attached to lively pieces of no particular dance character. Here the music does suggest (in keeping with the title) something sung, although lugubrious romantic interpretations obscure the derivation of this piece from "walking" Corellian andantes. It certainly could not have been envisioned as an an "Air on the G String" prior to the nineteenth century, when August Wilhelmi published it in an arrangement that required a solo violinist to play the melody in high positions on the lowest string.[423] This favorite nineteenth-century device helped the melody cut through an accompaniment that included obbligato lines assigned to orchestral violins and viola. The effect is remote from what Bach had in mind, yet to single out this movement for such treatment was a Romantic way of recognizing that here Bach indeed imagined something heard in no other Baroque suite.

Although avoiding imitative counterpoint (except in the overture), Suite 1 resembles the English Suites in attempting to combine the subtlety of French rhythm with a contrapuntally saturated texture. The results must be considered mixed; it is hard to argue with the opinion that "much of the thematic invention strikes one as somewhat colourless and relatively conventional," and that the work is "therefore likely to be relatively early."[424]The B-minor suite satisfies the two impulses more successfully. There is, for example, a canonic sarabande, recalling not only the canon in the minuet of the First Brandenburg Concerto but also a much earlier sarabande with a canon by Louis Couperin. The polonaise is followed by a double in which the melody is copied into the bass, over which the flute plays a capricious obbligato (ex. S9.48). Here Bach was actually repeating an idea from Suite 1, whose second passepied is a variation of the first with a new countermelody for the oboes. Such writing corresponded with the *contreparties* added by Couperin for a third hand in a few of his harpsichord pieces.[425] One wonders whether this

---

[422] Froberger's Suite 19 was one of ten that were published at the end of the seventeenth century; it is the only one whose allemande develops its opening phrase imitatively, as Bach also does in the overture to BWV 1067.

[423] The title was simply "Air," with the direction "auf der G-Saite" placed at the beginning of the solo violin part. A copy of the original publication in the Loeb Music Library at Harvard University is dated "1879?"

[424] Jones (2006–13, 2:85).

[425] As in "La Juillet" from the second book of *Pièces de clavecin* (1717). Another type of *contrepartie* for gamba occurs in movements from Couperin's *Concerts royaux* of 1722.

variation, whose wide leaps make it particularly idiomatic for the flute, was absent from the original violin version. They give the added upper part a playfulness and a brilliant virtuoso quality that subvert the dance's usual somewhat formal character.[426]

Modern performances of the two D-major suites tend to suffer from overbearing brass parts, and as a result the two works tend to sound alike despite their substantial differences. In Suite 3 the schematic design of the fugue suggests that it might have been the earliest of all these suites. Practically a permutation fugue, it falls into a highly symmetrical ABA′BA form; the verbatim da capo recalls the fugal preludes of the English Suites.[427] More telling, at least with respect to its origin, is the fact that Suite 3 gives all the essential melodic material in the dance movements to the violins. Its hummable dance tunes, moreover, make it probably more popular than Suite 4. The latter, however, is distinguished by more inventive scoring and sometimes subtle rhythm.

That Bach thought most highly of the fourth suite is suggested by the fact that he adapted the opening movement for use in Cantata 110 for Christmas 1725. Yet the closing "Rejuvenation" movement almost contradicts its title. Not only is it characterized by a complicated, polonaise-like rhythm but there is also a surprising passage in the minor mode, with chromatic syncopations, just before the end. This echoes a recurring minor-mode passage in the dotted section of the overture, with hair-raising dissonances.[428] It is as if Bach recognized that the most rousing type of music is even more sublime when leavened with tears.

[426] That even this movement might be entirely plausible as violin music was demonstrated in a spirited performance by Les Bostonades with Abigail Karr as solo violin, playing Werner Breig's reconstruction of the original version (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf und Härtel, 2003) at Boston on May 25, 2018.

[427] The fugue in BWV 1069 contains even more recapitulation, but one of the restated passages is a repeat of the opening section at the dominant (mm. 69–86 recapitulate mm. 28–45). This is a formal device that seems more characteristic of Bach's music from Cöthen and Leipzig; it occurs in some of the inventions as well as the opening fantasia of the third harpsichord partita, BWV 827.

[428] Measures 19–21 are recapitulated in mm. 182–84.

Chapter 10

Leipzig (p. 197, following the first paragraph break, "famous as Bach's critic (see Chapter 12)")

The university, founded in 1409, was famous for having been the site of a public debate involving Martin Luther in 1519. During Bach's time orthodox Lutheran theology remained one of its chief subject areas, but it was also the academic home of the writer Johann Christoph Gottsched from 1725 onward, one of the leading figures in the German Enlightenment (*Aufklärung*). Older than the university and no less famous was the St. Thomas School, a boys' Latin school founded in the early thirteenth century in association with the city's second church, also named for St. Thomas. The older church of St. Nicholas was the city's senior place of worship, attended by the highest officials.[429] It, too, had a school attached to it, but the Nikolaischule never attained the stature of the St. Thomas School, nor was it meant to serve the musical needs of the community as a whole. Students at St. Thomas assisted in music making at both principal city churches as well as in two more recently built (or rebuilt) churches, St. Peter's and the so-called New Church. They were also heard occasionally in a fifth church, St. John's; this was located just outside the city walls, and Bach was responsible for its music only on feast days. Separate from these city churches was the church of St. Paul, which served and was administered by the university.

Despite its wealth and cultural prestige, Leipzig was only the second city of Electoral Saxony. Dresden, some seventy miles to the east, was the seat of the ruling duke-elector Friedrich August I, who in 1697 had been elected king of Poland as well. His realm had previously dwarfed the lands of his distant relatives in Thuringia, including the dukes whom Bach had known at Eisenach and Weimar. Now it expanded by perhaps tenfold as Friedrich August extended his reign over the neighboring kingdom to the east—although how much control the king actually exerted over the Polish aristocracy that elected him is an open question. Ruling there as Augustus II, he certainly added to his already considerable wealth (at Poland's expense), and Dresden was for several decades the most brilliant cultural center in Europe under him and his successor, Friedrich August II (Augustus III).

To be elected Polish king, Friedrich August had had to convert from Lutheranism to Roman Catholicism. Although his Saxon subjects remained Protestant, a Catholic monarch required a suitably outfitted religious establishment, including musicians. In this he was encouraged by a strong alliance with the emperor, who sent religious advisers; the two exchanged music and musicians as well. In fact Catholic singers and composers had been working at Dresden since the retirement of Schütz in the 1650s. But the need to display wealth and power befitting a king led to an unprecendented build-up of the court's musical resources during the second and third decades of the eighteenth century, giving Dresden not only a superb opera but the best orchestra in Europe. Many of the same musicians served in the Roman Catholic chapel, established in what had formerly been one of the bastions of German Protestantism. Services initially took

[429] Braatz (2009) provides no documentation for his assertion that the St. Thomas Church is older; the Nikolaikirche was established in 1165 according to its website, whereas St. Thomas is apparently not documented before 1212, when the choir and school were founded, although remains of a church on the site date back to "around 1160" according to the church website.

place in a converted court theater, but Friedrich August II eventually built the beautiful Catholic court church (with an organ by Gottfried Silbermann) that remains one of the landmarks of the city.

Leipzig, too, saw the establishment of a Roman Catholic chapel in the ruler's Pleissenburg castle, which served as royal army barracks and seat of the royal governor from 1710 onward. Hence Leipzig, like Erfurt, saw officially sanctioned worship by two denominations, and although the vast majority of the local population remained Lutheran, Catholic services there were heavily attended by visitors during fairs. There is no evidence that these services ever involved Bach, nor is there evidence for elaborate music making there. Yet Bach must have been aware of the services taking place there, and it is not impossible that he attended or even participated occasionally in the music, especially after his appointment as court composer in 1736.

Having previously visited Dresden for the planned musical contest with Marchand in 1717, Bach surely anticipated returning there in one capacity or another to acquaint himself further with music and musicians in the capital city. But at the time of his arrival in Leipzig, he must have focused on quickly establishing himself and taking up his extensive and varied responsibilities there. Like Telemann, who had found himself in similar circumstances first at Frankfurt and now in Hamburg, Bach needed to negotiate an environment where he served not a single autocrat but an array of politicians, clergy, locally influential magnates, and, to some degree, an actual public.

Bach's most important relationships initially must have been with Lange and other sympathetic members of the city council who had steered him through his appointment. These men were not musicians, but they dealt regularly with the appointments of organists and other matters involving musicians in the city's churches and schools. At least some of them, including Lange, considered themselves knowledgeable about the basics of music and its performance—sufficiently so to serve as auditioners for organist and cantor candidates. Surely possessing a basic practical understanding of music were Bach's colleagues in the St. Thomas School as well as the local pastors, with all of whom he would interact on a regular basis. Bach would also have occasional dealings with other members of the city's governing apparatus, from the three mayors (who served on a rotating basis) to individual council members, not all of whom had favored the selection of a "Capellmeister." On occasion, too, he would need to interact with officials of the ruling elector, not to mention distinguished visitors to the city fairs. Prince Leopold is not known to have visited Leipzig during Bach's time there, but other rulers, including the elector himself, made occasional visits.

Saxony, like other European polities of the period, was in the midst of a generations-long conflict between a would-be absolute monarch—the elector—and, in the cities, a local elite that desired at least local autonomy. Some states, notably Prussia, were true monarchies in which the cities had lost most of their traditional rights. In Saxony, despite the ruler's royal pretensions, the power of the elector was less absolute, in part because of his need to respect his subjects' rejection of his own Catholicism. Local politics was therefore in part a matter of negotiating degrees of dependency versus autonomy with regard to Dresden. Yet the court remained the ultimate arbiter of all essential matters, even those involving the Lutheran church, which remained under central control, despite the elector's Catholicism.

Whether there existed clear lines of demarcation at Leipzig between “court” and “estate” factions, that is, those opposing and favoring local autonomy, respectively, is less clear than might be supposed from certain modern writings.[430] Individual councilors could be co-opted by receiving honors or special appointments from the court. Decisions about matters such as the election of a school cantor might depend more on private views of music and education than on larger political calculations. Personalities loomed large, too. Kuhnau, Bach’s predecessor, had had poor relationships with students and younger musicians, but whether this was because of or the source of his opposition to “operatic” music is impossible to say. Bach, who was friendly with Telemann, might have learned much from conversations with his fellow applicant for the cantorship, who had once led a collegium at Leipzig that competed with Kuhnau for talented musicians. The opposition to “operatic” music expressed during Bach’s appointment process might have reflected personal animus toward the collegium musicum founded by Telemann; this was now run by Schott, organist at the New Church. Rather than seeing such an organization as competition, as Kuhnau evidently had done, Bach probably meant to cooperate with it from the beginning. Indeed, he would have to do so to realize his ambitious musical aspirations, which would require more and better performers than were available in the School alone.[431]

Bach’s Leipzig librettists (p. 200, following the first paragraph break, “for royal birthdays and name days”)

In his sacred and “congratulatory” works, Picander naturally avoided the sexual references and other obscenities that so offended Gottsched. Bach could hardly have been unaware of these, but he evidently saw in them no reason to avoid working with the popular poet. His own high-mindedness was of an older sort than Gottsched’s. Probably uninterested in the emerging Enlightenment, he would have been more concerned that his vocal compositions should propound orthodox Lutheran teachings. Gottsched’s artfully moralizing poems may have been more fashionable, at least among the university-educated. But Picander probably spoke more directly to the middle-class public of the 1720s and 1730s, and he also enjoyed substantial support from the upper class and the aristocracy, to judge from the many works commissioned from him and printed in several volumes of poetry. These cannot be considered great monuments of literature, but they must have been prized as commemorations of locally significant occasions, and they reveal more than competent facility as a poet.

That Bach was personally close to Picander is evident in that the latter’s wife was godmother to Bach’s second-to-last child, Johanna Carolina. She would live until 1781, dying just six days before her older sister, the widowed Elisabeth Juliana Frederica Altnickol. On the other hand, Sebastian’s frequent setting of Picander’s poetry during the 1720s and 1730s cannot have raised his standing in the view of Gottsched, the most influential literary critic in Germany. The latter is

---

[430] The idea was developed at length by Siegele (1983–85).

[431] Gloeckner (1985) traces musical politics at Leipzig prior to Bach’s arrival, depicting Kuhnau as at odds with and critical of Telemann and others. Telemann, however, referred to Kuhnau respectfully in his two autobiographies, and Maul (2018, 134–36) argues that Kuhnau’s supposed rivalry with him has been exaggerated by scholars.

said to have “had nothing but contempt for Picander.”[432] Yet Gottsched did not fail to note that “in Saxony the Capellmeister Bach is head and shoulder above his peers,” and he was complimentary to him elsewhere.[433] It is easy to see Bach’s apparent alignment with Picander as against Gottsched reflected in the later controversy between Bach and Gottsched’s admirer Scheibe. Both controversies manifested themselves in a series of polemic exchanges, although that between Bach and Scheibe never went beyond the literary to the legal level, as did Picander’s.[434] But clearly Bach shared with Picander a combative personality, and the two took the side of an older aesthetic against a newer, more “enlightened” one. The same alignment is evident in Bach’s controversies with the administration of the St. Thomas School, especially during Bach’s last two decades.

The authors of the majority of Bach’s Leipzig vocal works remain unidentified, although they seem to have included students at the university. It may be that Bach came to prefer collaborating with individuals who lacked the authority and seniority of a pastor or a university instructor; perhaps, too, he simply enjoyed working with younger people, more than with fellow members of the official class. Nevertheless Bach had to maintain professional or working relationships with the latter, as also with his colleagues at the St. Thomas School and his fellow musicians. The latter included the students who performed under his direction in the churches and the Collegium Musicum.

As in other Lutheran cities, the clergy were headed by a superintendant. When Bach arrived, this was Salomon Deyling, also a professor at the university and one of the two who examined Bach for his theological competence. Deyling had signed the document approving Bach as cantor, but he was otherwise left out of the hiring process and, in protest, skipped Bach’s official installation on June 1, 1723. This must have been only a symptom of a larger if still petty power struggle between clergy and council, for there was a also a lay overseer for each church—which for St. Thomas’s was none other than Lange. But however tightly the latter may have wished to control the local churches, the latter were under the ultimate supervision of the Saxon electoral consistory in Dresden.[435] Moreover, local clergy might claim the right to approve such things as the selection of hymns and texts for cantatas. When in 1739 Bach failed to obtain permission ahead of time for a passion performance, the latter was apparently cancelled.[436] Despite having worked in some degree of closeness with pastors in past positions, at Leipzig Bach does not

---

[432] Scott-Prelorentzos (1982, 12).

[433] In Leipzig publications of 1728 and 1740; extracts in BD 2:184 (no. 249) and 387 (no. 483).

[434] Gottsched brought charges before a university court, which required Picander to apologize and pay a fine; see Otto (2007, 109–10).

[435] Nevertheless, approval of Bach’s appointment appears to have been granted immediately, contingent on his passing the theological examination: BD 2:101 (no. 136).

[436] This is implied by a somewhat mysterious note in the council minutes (BD 2:338–39 [no. 439]; NBR, 204 [no. 208]). Leaver (2017, 175) observes that Deyling would have approved librettos used for church pieces throughout Bach’s time.

seem to have had a similar relationship with anyone, preferring to collaborate with lay professionals such as Picander or with students.

Other musicians at Leipzig (p. 200, following the second complete paragraph, “and one of them objected?”)

Any school choir director is familiar with the phenomenon of students who fail to appreciate the need for discipline in learning music, attending rehearsals, and the like. Some must have chafed under Bach’s demands even as others—those with real musical talent and a capacity for hard work—thrived. Even if Bach eventually grew alienated from those around him, the opportunity to work for him was a strong inducement for talented young musicians to come to Leipzig. Apart from schoolboys, future professionals who already could boast some musical accomplishment, such as Agricola and Altinickol, continued to arrive right to the end of the 1740s. Many attended the university while also studying privately with Bach and, apparently, serving as informal assistants, singing or playing in cantatas and assisting in the copying of manuscripts, perhaps even the direction of performances.

To what degree the city’s eight official town musicians also worked alongside Bach is not entirely clear, in view of their deficiencies (see chap. 11).[437] At least the trumpeter Gottfried Reiche and probably his apprentices and assistants performed for Bach regularly. Reiche’s portrait by Haussmann, in which he proudly holds a coiled trumpet, is an indication of his high social status, approaching that of Bach.[438] Haussmann, now best known today for his later portrait of Bach, also painted other members of the Leipzig intelligentsia, including the writer Luise Gottsched and the university professor and rector August Friedrich Müller, who commissioned BWV 205 from Bach.

The handful of other official town pipers or fiddlers seem also to have belonged to relatively well-off, climbing middle-class families. At least one of the *Kunstgeiger*, Johann Friedrich Caroli, had university training; at his death he owned several violins, two oboes, a “flute” (recorder?), and a “bass.” Another, Johann Caspar Gleditsch—whom Bach listed as first oboist in 1730—included booksellers among his uncles. Bach and Gottsched wrote a wedding cantata for the marriage of a cousin, and a son became professor and director of the Berlin botanic garden, known there to Agricola and Emanuel Bach.[439] At his death he owned enough instruments to furnish a whole orchestra, as well as an inn with gardens.

---

[437] Schering (1941, 150) provides the basic list of musicians, each of whom must have had asssistants and apprentices, as Bach’s father had done at Eisenach.

[438] Heyde (1988) described the brass instrument in the painting as a new type transitional between older horns and trumpets, but Dahlqvist (1993) questioned the possibility of an accurate reconstruction based on Haussmann’s portrait, concluding that it “should be regarded as a trumpet; in any case, he [Reiche] apparently used it as such” (p. 185). Dahlqvist also rejects the view that it is a *Jägertrompete* (hunting trumpet).

[439] The information here about Gleditsch and other city musicians is from Schulze (1985). Some of Gleditsch’s instruments were old, and a keyboard (*Claffier*) was unusable (“ganz

Yet even so prosperous a musician could not count on his sons being able to follow him, given the limited number of positions funded by the city. On the rare occasions when a place opened up (due to the death of the incumbent), Bach was one of those tasked with auditioning applicants. If he was as uncompromising in this as he was in other things, auditioning his fellow musicians in the city must not always have endeared him to them. A local player who was unsuccessful would need to seek a position elsewhere or find work in another capacity (for instance, as an intrument maker). The narrow range of opportunities for professional musicians and the relatively low status of anyone who failed to find municipal employment must have been among the reasons Bach sent his two (eventually three) oldest sons to university. He nevertheless also prepared his sons and many students for careers as organists. This was a profession distinct from that of city or town musician, one in which a pupil of Bach was more likely to find employment, albeit while competing with fellow students for any significant position.

When Bach arrived at Leipzig, the organist of the New Church—Schott, with whom he had competed for the cantorship—was also director of the Collegium Musicum. Bach would not officially take over the latter until Schott's departure in 1729. But cooperation between the two is evident in Bach's performances before that date of large-scale works, including the secular cantatas BWV 205 and 207. These could not have been undertaken without the involvement of Schott's collegium—something that would not have occurred during the cantoriate of Kuhnau, who had come to be opposed to the "operatic" music of the two collegia. An even closer relationship must have evolved between Bach and Schott's successor, Carl Gotthelf Gerlach. An organist who had studied at the St. Thomas School and the Leipzig university, if not with Bach himself, Gerlach was hired on Bach's recommendation.[440] Yet when Gerlach took over the organ at the New Church in 1729 it was not he but his teacher Bach who became the director of Schott's collegium. Gerlach, however, would later direct the Collegium for a two-year period, and like Schott he would also substitute for Bach in the churches when the latter traveled away from Leipzig. Gerlach, moreover, seems to have accompanied Sebastian and Magdalena on at least one trip to Weissenfels, performing there as an alto.[441] Perhaps this was an exceptional case, but it may also be an indication of the type of professional ties that Bach established generally with younger musicians after settling into his position.[442]

Bach's position

---

unbrauchbar"), but his *Fischhof* was worth 3200 *Taler*, a very substantial sum. The wedding cantata (BWV Anh. 196 of 1725) is lost.

[440] As recorded in council minutes, BD 2:192 (no. 261).

[441] BD 2:188 (commentary to no. 254). Also present on this occasion (Feb. 23, 1729) were "Herr Krebs und deßen Frau," presumably Bach's former pupil Johann Tobias Krebs and his wife. As Bach was now external Capellmeister at Weissenfels, he must have been at least partly responsible for assembling the visiting musicians for this birthday celebration of the duke's.

[442] Maul (2013, 142), however, questions whether Bach and Gerlach were always on good terms, in view of the controversies discussed in chap. 12.

When Bach and his family arrived at Leipzig, the School and churches had been functioning without a cantor and music director for nearly a year, since the death of Kuhnau in June 1722. The latter's chief prefect or assistant, Johann Gabriel Roth, had evidently served adequately as a temporary substitute and probably continued to assist Bach, easing the transition for the latter.[443] But clearly the city leaders expected Bach to get to work quickly, improving the standard of music-making both inside and outside the churches. Barely a week after his arrival, Bach had commenced a period of intensive work during which he provided new sacred cantatas on an almost weekly basis. This would continue for two years, and during the following two years new compositions would appear only somewhat less regularly.

Whether Bach eased himself into this routine, composing a number of works while still at Cöthen, or plunged into it suddenly is uncertain. Even before his move to Leipzig, he had probably presented a Pentecost cantata at the university church.[444] It was only two days after giving his first regular Sunday cantata (BWV 75), at St. Nicholas's, that he was introduced officially to his students and colleagues in the school, in an installation ceremony on June 1. On that occasion, the town council signaled its authority by having its representatives formally present Bach to the school's rector and students. The latter offered two musical performances of an unspecified kind, at the beginning and end of the ceremony. But things did not go exactly as planned. The absent Deyling saw to it that *his* representative, the pastor of St. Thomas's Church (Christian Weiss), interrupted the proceedings to convey the local consistory's approval of Bach's appointment and to offer his own good wishes. As insignificant as this may seem, it made a sufficient impression on the council's officials for them to place a long report of it in the city records.[445] Evidently it was important to both clergy and council to assert some degree of control over the cantor. Bach would eventually demonstrate considerable independence from both, not necessarily to his advantage.

Bach's only official title appears to have been that of cantor in the St. Thomas School. Yet he was also understood to be *director chori musici*, that is, music director in the city's five

---

[443]Wolff (2000, 491n. 2), citing Hans-Joachim Schulze, quotes from a later autobiographical document of Roth's and a letter of recommendation for him.

[444] This would have been Cantata 59, thought to have been heard on May 16 as part of the university church's "old service." Bach's participation on that occasion is recorded in his long petition to the elector of Dec. 31, 1725 (BD 2:39 [no. 12]; NBR, 124 [no. 119]). The watermark evidence, however, suggests that even Bach's first regular works for Leipzig were written on paper obtained there.

[445] In addition to a memo by the town clerk Menser (BD 2:107–9 [no. 145]; NBR, 106–8 [no. 104]), these and related matters were subjects of correspondence over the next ten months between the Dresden consistory and Deyling. He was eventually reconciled to Bach's being permitted to delegate his non-musical teaching duties to Pezold (see BD 2:136–38 [nos. 175, 177]; NBR, 109–10 [nos. 106–7]).

churches, including St. Thomas's, with additional duties in the university church.[446] As in his previous positions, most of his responsibilities were described somewhat casually, if at all. The formal pledge which Bach had made to the council early in May included a list of duties, alternating somewhat randomly between those in the churches and those at the school. These responsibilities supplemented the usual ones to respect authorities, live modestly, and not travel without permission; in addition Bach was to:

bring the music in the two chief churches "into good standing" (*in gutes Aufnehmen*)
train the boys for instrumental as well as vocal performance in the churches, so as to avoid having to pay professionals
assure that church music does not "last too long" and does not "make an operatic impression"
admit only musically capable or trainable boys into the school, unless otherwise allowed
provide boys for any "musical occasion" demanded by the city councilors, but not for funerals or weddings out of town without permission (a rule Bach evidently flouted)
teach in the School, arranging for a substitute at his own expense (that is, for non-musical instruction, as had previously been offered Telemann)
take no position at the university without permission of the council.[447]

Some of these stipulations reflected the council's anxiety not to yield any power or prerogative to competing authorities, especially the university. On the other hand, little was said about the music that Bach was to provide—only the two vague, negative proscriptions—or how he was to dispose the musical forces under his direction. A little more was laid out in a new edition of School regulations published that fall. As in Bach's previously held positions, however, precedent and custom must have dictated most of Bach's activities, both in the School and in the churches. It may also be that the councilors had a limited understanding of how Kuhnau or any other music director of the period actually worked. This could explain the elementary way in which Bach tried to explain things seven years later, in his "sketch" of the proper constitution of the local church music (discussed further in chap. 11).

Certainly most of the merchants and lawyers for whom Bach now worked could have had limited appreciation for how Bach's talents and abilities differed from those of a typical musician of the time. Yet, merely from regular attendance at services at St. Nicholas's or St. Thomas's, councilors would have formed a general idea of how someone in Bach's position was to act publicly. This included his frequent, visible participation in weddings, funerals, and civic ceremonies of various types. During these he would be joined by some fraction of the school's population in their function as choral scholars, that is, paid singers of hymns if not of more elaborate music. Whatever the council thought of Bach's music or his teaching, moreover, he was to some degree their representative at events regarded as important in the life of the city, or at least of its elite. He must have received at least grudging respect for bringing honor to the city

---

[446] The Latin phrase appears in a newspaper report of Bach's first regular Sunday performance on May 30 (BD 2:105 [no. 140]; NBR, 108 [no. 105]). Another report described him as "Collegii Musici Direct[or]" (BD 2:104 [no. 139]; NBR, 106 [no. 103]), probably understanding the expression in a general sense and not as a reference to a specific performing organiation.

[447] Selected and re-ordered from the document of May 5, 1723 (BD 1:177–78 [no. 92], trans. in NBR, 104–5 [no. 100]).

through performances before the king and other notables, especially when these received favorable notices in newspapers read across the northern part of the Empire.

Financial aspects of Bach's position (p. 202, following the first complete paragraph, "(as in services at the minor churches)")

Bach's salary at Leipzig was surprisingly low, given the broad range of duties expected of him, without breaks for Sundays or holidays. His annual base pay of about 100 Taler was only a quarter or so of what he received at Cöthen, and Anna Magdalena no longer received anything.[448] On the other hand, the family now enjoyed free housing, and, like many other municipal employees of the time, Bach received additional payments from a complicated set of sources, sometimes in return for specified services. For instance, there was an annual allowance of wine, and every year Bach received 13 Taler and change for the four annual performances of the "old service" at the university. The latter amount, however, was less than he had been led to expect during his hiring, leading to a protracted dispute with the authorities during the next few years. Another disappointment came when the regulations governing the St. Thomas School were published in a revised edition toward the end of 1723; these reduced certain payments due to Bach for supplementary services.[449]

A further aspect of these regulations that must have upset Bach was their promulgation by the city council apparently without consultation of the school faculty, including the new cantor.[450] In modern terms, they constituted a change in working conditions, perhaps even a breach of the understandings given to Bach during his interview for the position. Among other changes, as compared with the old regulations that had been in effect since 1634, was the fact that the cantor's selection of *alumni* to sing in the *Cantoreyen* was now subject to the approval of the rector. This suggests an agenda on the part of the council to transform what had been primarily a choir school into an institution of general learning; it was to be a basis for conflict with Bach from the very beginning of his appointment. He would not forget the slights concerning his pay; years later he brought them up again while pursuing another issue.[451]

---

[448] Bach received 87 Taler and change annually in cash, another 13 Taler and change for firewood and grain (BD 2:102–3, 119, and 335 [nos. 137, 157, 435]).

[449] These were the so-called *Accidentien*, paid out for such services as leading the boys in performances for weddings and funerals and in carol singing during the Christmas season.

[450] As argued by Maul (2013, 54). Maul (2018) shows that tension between partisans of a "musical" as opposed to a "liberal-arts" or "humanities" focus at the St. Thomas School went back to at least the early seventeenth century—and to what extent teachers at the school had been subject to conflicting political and financial pressures arising from its peculiar status as a municipal institution serving the often contradictory purposes of local grandees, sacred as well as secular.

[451] The so-called Battle of the Prefects; see chap. 12. The initial complaint over *Accidentien* was mentioned in a report by the city secretary dated Dec. 3, 1723 (see BD 1:176 [commentary to no. 91]). Bach referred to it in his bitter petition to the city council of Aug. 21, 1737 (BD 1:98 [no. 40]; NBR, 192–93 [no. 194]).

Bach was not one to overlook any opportunity for improving his financial situation. Nor would he set aside the grievances that began to build up already during his first months at Leipzig, as he realized that all that he thought had been promised him would not be forthcoming. To judge from his letters, he felt the slight to his honor (*Ehre*) as keenly as the monetary loss. This was a characteristically eighteenth-century response, but the financial injury surely rankled as his family grew and his superiors in the school received higher payments for certain services.

Further income nevertheless came from endowments of various kinds, sometimes requiring annual memorial performances of motets or the like.[452] Bach also earned money from the sale of printed librettos for his church music—which, like printed concert programs in Europe today, were not furnished free of charge. Other important sources of income, albeit subject to seasonal fluctuations, were weddings and funerals, for which he was entitled to a certain statutory amount. There was also the possibility of higher sums, as when a wealthy donor commissioned a new work or more elaborate music than was strictly necessary. Further private payments might be earned through private instruction of the sons and daughters of the local elite, who probably valued the prestige of lessons from an acting Capellmeister.

Nevertheless Bach probably never made as much as he had been led to expect during the job search—as much as 1000 Taler a year. That he nevertheless managed reasonably well, at least on a purely monetary level, is evident from recent estimates of his total Leipzig income. These confirm, in round terms, the 700 Taler in annual income that Bach mentioned in his 1730 letter to Erdmann.[453] In some years Bach might have received substantially more, thanks to payments for organ tests or gifts from aristocrats. In later years he also earned significant amounts from sales and rentals of books, music, and instruments.[454] His direction of the Collegium Musicum, which began officially in 1729, may have been compensated only with "food and drink," furnished by the innkeeper or coffee house owner who hosted it.[455] But like print publications, which also probably brought in little actual cash, this activity would have served as marketing, advertising the availability of lessons, commissioned compositions, and private performances from Bach.

Life and teaching at Leipzig (p. 203, following the one complete paragraph, "in royal appointments at Berlin")

Little is known about the daily lives of Bach's pupils or the many others who, as resident *alumni* or *interni* at the St. Thomas School, or as students at the Leipzig university, received instruction

---

[452] Examples in NBR, 110–11 (no. 109).

[453] BD 1:67 (no. 23); NBR, 152 (no. 152), confirmed by Heber (2017).

[454] A newspaper notice printed at Leipzig shows that by April 18, 1729 Bach was already acting as sales agent for publications by Heinichen and Walther (BD 2:191 [no. 260]; NBR, 139 [no. 140]).

[455] Heber (2017, 124).

of some kind from Bach or another member of the family. Over the years, Bach must have gotten to know hundreds of boys, some of whom earned from him signed letters of recommendation for later employment. These letters, however, are usually very brief, comprising just a sentence or two that attests to the student's competency in some combination of singing, playing, and composing. A few slightly more effusive testimonials—as for students named Wild and Wecker early in Bach's Leipzig period—might reflect a higher level of attainment. Yet the recipients of relatively detailed letters did not necessarily have particularly distinguished careers.[456] Bach did not bestow praise extravagantly, and a letter for one Hübner suggests that his keyboard skills could stand improvement: "no doubt he will, with further work at the organ, show his ability to new advantage."[457]

More telling is the survival of music manuscripts copied by certain pupils, whether for their own use or for Bach. These show that certain students had access to his scores and could be entrusted with preparing copies for sale or for use in performance. At least one such pupil have followed Bach from Cöthen to Leipzig: Bernhard Christian Kayser, son of a Cöthen lawyer, went on to study at the Leipzig university, eventually serving the Cöthen court. Such a student is unlikely to have acted as a mere apprentice or assistant, although he might have served Bach as a sort of personal secretary, as Bach's cousin Johann Elias Bach later did.[458] Kayser was responsible for important manuscripts of keyboard music, including an early copy of the WTC.[459]

The handwriting of several other boys who were resident students in the St. Thomas School at the time of Bach's arrival has been identified in the performing parts prepared for church cantatas during these years. Such students probably served further musical functions as well, perhaps even leading rehearsals and performances. Among these were Christian Gottlob Meißner, Johann Christian Köpping, and Johann Andreas Kuhnau (nephew of Bach's predecessor). Another notable student, Johann Ludwig Krebs, came in 1726 from Weimar, where his father Johann Tobias had studied with Bach. The younger Krebs became a significant

---

[456] Friedrich Gottlieb Wild and Christoph Gottlob Wecker both competed unsuccessfully for a cantorship in Chemnitz. Bach's testimonial for Wild is dated May 18, 1727: BD 2:127 [no. 57]; NBR, 134–35 [no. 134]; a later letter for Wecker is from March 20, 1729 (BD 1:129]no. 60]; NBR, 131 [no. 129]).

[457] "Ist auch nicht zuzweifeln, daß bey etwanigen bevorseynden avancement derselbe mit überkommenden Orgelwercke seine habenden Wißenschafften fernerweit excoliren." Letter for Jacob Ernst Hübner, BD 3:628 (no. 56b), trans. in NBR, 126 (no. 122).

[458] Johann Elias Bach, grandson of Sebastian's uncle Georg Christoph, lived with Sebastian's family from 1738 to 1742; his correspondence on behalf of the latter is edited in Odruch and Wollny (2000).

[459] Kayser, previously known only as "Anonymous 5," was identified by Andrew Talle (2003, 155–67).

organist and composer, one of the few Bach pupils to publish music emulating that of his teacher.[460]

Such a student might eventually serve as a prefect, as Roth had done, with responsibilities that included leading the singing of chorales and perhaps more elaborate music, especially at the lesser churches. Even leading simple hymns required a certain level of musicality and personal reliability; a boy standing in for Bach would need to maintain a steady beat, if nothing else. The selection of prefects would prove to be a contentious issue in later years, following changes in school rules and personnel after 1730. These had the clear intention of limiting the boys' involvement in music and Bach's authority over them as musicians.

Yet however much some of his superiors might have wished him to be more of a schoolteacher, there can be no question that Bach was hired on the strength of his capabilities as a Capellmeister. He had, moreover, been led to anticipate being allowed to undertake private work as a musician, not only at Leipzig but (with permission) elsewhere, for organ tests and princely performances. Like Telemann at Hamburg, he soon was taking advantage of the opportunities available in a major city. His first known commissions at Leipzig date from 1725, when he produced two works honoring professors at the university.[461] During the following year he began the serial publication of his *Clavierübung*, issuing the first of six harpsichord partitas which would appear in a collected second edition in 1731. As regularly as Bach would have been seen as cantor in the school and director of music in the two main churches, he was also becoming a fixture in the broader social and cultural life of the town, at least among the elite, and his name was growing familiar to connoisseurs across northern Germany.

Church records indicate when Bach and family members attended confession and took communion—the former still undertaken on an individual basis, as in the Roman Catholic church today. From this we know that the family's father confessor was initially Christian Weiss, who had represented Deyling at Bach's installation and who "frequently" preached before the Queen.[462] Whether Bach formed a close personal relationship with such a figure is unknown. But his professional association with members of the Leipzig clergy, some of whom also taught at the university or amassed substantial libraries, could have influenced his own aspirations as a reader and book collector. His personal library never approached the size of one these pastors' (which are known from published estate catalogs). Like theirs, however, it leaned heavily toward orthodox Lutheran theology. Together with other clues—such as his apparent aloofness from Gottsched and Scheibe—it appears that Bach, although well informed by the standards of his own generation, was not sympathetic with the emerging intellectual and literary trends of the German Enlightenment.

---

[460] Several of Krebs's publications bear the title *Clavierübung*, like Bach's. Eight little preludes and fugues for organ, listed as BWV 553–60, were once thought to be Krebs's but are more likely to be the work "of a southern composer such as J. K. F. Fischer" (Williams 2003, 142).

[461] BWV 36c and 205, the first for the birthday of an unidentified academic, the second for the name day on August 3 of August Friedrich Müller, later rector of the university.

[462] Leaver (2017, 156–57) provides details about subsequent pastors who served this role as well.

Sebastian's sons, especially Emanuel, probably shared Gottsched's distaste for once-fashionable styles of poetry.[463] Living in a rationalistic age, they may also have tilted away from the old post-Renaissance humanism to which Sebastian's training and personal preferences had inclined him. Immediately after Bach's death, his former pupil Agricola praised him as a musical equivalent of Isaac Newton.[464] This, however, suggests that Bach, or at least his students, failed to grasp the profound differences between traditional scholarship and the new mathematically modeled experimental science. One of Bach's fellow instructors at St. Thomas, Johann Heinrich Winckler, nevertheless became a published physicist and a member of the British Royal Society.[465]

It would not be surprising if Bach, during his first few years at Leipzig, was largely absorbed in his professional musical and educational activities. These might have included a certain amount of reading, especially of old-fashioned sacred poetry that could potentially serve as texts for sacred cantatas. One could imagine that with time, after Bach had produced a core repertory of compositions for church use, he turned increasingly to theological writings of less immediate relevance to his compositions. But given his protestations about having no time to write long letters and other documents, he must not have spent many hours merely reading. He is more likely to have used whatever free time he had for engaging with musical visitors to Leipzig, who seem commonly to have paid him their respects and, in some cases, performed with him in concerts or church services.
Payments for the latter are rarely recorded, and it is only through random remarks in other documents that we know, for example, that two lutenists visiting Leipzig in 1739 played (together with Friedemann) in Bach's house, or that the composer and keyboard player Hurlebusch paid a visit perhaps a few years earlier.[466] Hurlebusch's visit was remembered because he made a fool of himself, insisting that his own mediocre music could be instructive for Bach's pupils. The anecdote was retailed as an example of Bach's modesty; Sebastian treated the visitor with respect, despite the latter's obvious incompetence. If this was typical of Bach's behavior, it suggests that he could get along well with lesser musicians—an essential skill for

[463] Emanuel implicitly shared his contemporaries' criticisms of librettos set by Telemann (see Schulenberg 2014, 145–46). The sacred music that he performed at Hamburg, although occasionally borrowing from Sebastian's vocal compositions, hardly ever incorporated the latter's arias or other settings of "madrigalesque" poetry.

[464]

In a polemic letter dated Aug. 8, 1750, excerpted in BD 2:485 (no. 620); NBR, 358 (no. 349).

[465] Winckler was also librettist for the lost BWV Anh. 18, a cantata for the rededication of the School after its expansion and renovation in 1732.

[466] For the visit of the lutenists Weiss and Kropffgans we have Johann Elias Bach's draft of a letter dated Aug. 11, 1739 (BD 2:366 [no. 448]; NBR, 204 [no. 209]. The author of the "Comparison of Bach and Handel," possibly C. P. E. Bach, mentioned that Hurlebusch on his visit played a printed minuet with variations (BD 2:443 [no. 927]; NBR, 408 [no. 396]). This might have been the opening work of his *Compositioni musicali* (Hamburg, ca. 1735).

one of his talent and position. It suggests, too, that other famous musicians, such as the Dresden flutists Buffardin and Quantz, would not have been reluctant to play with him.

Whether these particular musicians ever visited Leipzig or joined Bach in performances is a matter of speculation. It is reasonable to suppose, however, that wealthy music lovers in both Leipzig and Dresden would have been glad to host traveling musicians for convivial music making. On such occasions, professionals might perform alongside capable amateurs.[467] Bach might have brought performing parts for sonatas and concertos used previously at Cöthen, now constituting part of the repertory of the Collegium Musicum at Leipzig. Essentially a musical club, the latter represented only a slightly more public variety of domestic or social music making.

The predominantly sacred nature of Bach's official work at Leipzig has inevitably influenced views of his life and output as a whole. Those views might have been very different had more of his secular vocal works survived in their original forms.[468] For instance, printed librettos identified only in 1994 document Bach's composition of cantatas for two local weddings in 1729; these must have been fairly routine events. More important for Bach's social standing would have been the cantata "honoring the high presence in Leipzig" of Duke Christian of Weissenfels in January 1729.[469] Weissenfels was one of the minor Saxon duchies, politically subservient to the elector, but any duke was nominally a very high aristocrat, just one step below a king. Bach had written his Hunt Cantata sixteen years earlier for this same duke. Having lost his court title with the death of Prince Leopold of Cöthen the previous November, Bach would have been eager to gain a higher one. Indeed, before the end of the following month he had been named "Capellmeister von Haus aus" to Duke Christian.[470] This made him, once again, the social equal of Telemann and other highly honored composers.

Although the music for the cantata honoring Duke Christian is lost, the text identifies it as an early version of a work that Bach repurposed sixteen years later to honor Joachim Friedrich von Flemming, the Saxon governor of Leipzig. The composition survives only as the wedding cantata *O holder Tag* (BWV 210), extant in a version from around 1740. Bach is known to have provided music for some sixty weddings at Leipzig; BWV 210 is one of just six for which we have music.[471] He must have often re-used existing compositions, but even then, as in this case,

---

[467] Accounts of such gatherings were given by Burney, among others. He describes an impromptu concert given in his honor at Hamburg, where he heard music by C. P. E. Bach performed by a "band . . . not in such constant practice as to be under exact discipline" (Burney 1775, 2:255, mispaginated as 254).

[468] This was an important theme of Williams (2016, e.g., p. 331).

[469] Tiggemann (1994) reproduced the libretto for this as well as the wedding cantatas of 1729.

[470] He is so designated in the document recording his presence for Duke Christian's birthday celebration on Feb. 23, 1729 (BD 2:187–88 [no.254]). This was the same occasion noted previously for Bach's having performed with one or two pupils.

[471] Tiggemann (1994, 10).

his name and title could appear prominently on a printed title page, associating him with the noble or haut-bourgeois honoree. The texts are often anonymous; did Bach himself commission them from a student or colleague?

Music for a visiting duke would have been particularly important. If, as seems likely, Anna Magdalena sang the work for Duke Christian (the extant version is for solo soprano), we can imagine a private performance to which, however, prominent members of the city hierarchy were invited. On such occasions, Bach would have served in effect as a courtly Capellmeister, presiding over the local collegium musicum just has he had done at Cöthen. After the initial excitement of his arrival at Leipzig had worn off, this, rather than his quotidian liturgical duties, might have been the sort of event for which he now lived.

If so, Bach's life at Leipzig must be seen as encompassing more than the petty squabbles with city and school officials that dominate most accounts of his time there. It has become customary to imagine Bach as growing embittered and disillusioned as his initially attractive official position deteriorated. Yet the disappointments and disputes that are recorded in surviving documents must be balanced against signs that Sebastian was a successful and respected member of the high bourgeoisie. The Leipzig Collegium was no mere *Capelle* of paid performers but a voluntary association that included well-to-do, learned amateurs, some of them probably as capable as professional musicians. Directing it, as Bach did officially from 1729 onward, gave him an honored place among the city's intellectual and cultural elite. Leipzig might not yet have known the vigorous concert life of Handel's London or Telemann's Hamburg, but it was moving in that direction. In the absence of a regular opera theater, moreover, Bach's performances would have carried additional weight, relatively speaking, in local musical life.

The Collegium Musicum (p. 210, following the paragraph break, "a modern concert series")

As capable as many of the participants undoubtedly were, most were students, and "any musician" could be heard at these gatherings.[472] This implies a fairly informal setting, with no predetermined program or even a fixed roster of performers. A routine meeting of the group may have resembled less a modern concert than an "academy": a convivial gathering of like-minded music lovers, reading through compositions rather than presenting them formally for a large public audience. On the other hand, a set of "laws" for a "newly reconstituted" collegium of 1729—not necessarily, but probably, Bach's—includes a schedule of fees, fines for late arrival, and references to "overtures" used to begin programs.[473] Audiences as large as 150 or 200 have

---

[472] Thus Mizler, who nevertheless assures readers that "there are always good musicians among them" ("sind immer gute Musici unter ihnen") and that there are "usually listeners on hand who know how to judge the value of a capable musician" ("sind auch mehrentheils solche Zuhörer vorhanden, die den Werth eines geschickten Musici zu beurtheilen wissen"). BD 2:278 (no. 387); NBR, 186 (no. 187).

[473] These *leges* for the "Neu aufgerichteter Collegium Musicum," preserved in St. Petersburg, resemble those for similar organizations elsewhere. They do not name the director but are signed by students known to have been in Leipzig at the time, as shown by Schabalina (2012, English summary in Shabalina 2014, 44–45)

been postulated, but it is not certain that every copy of the librettos printed for these occasions was for those actually in attendance. Printed texts could also have served for marketing, and some copies surely were sent to honorees, government officials or censors, even collectors and newspaper publishers in other cities.[474]

Bach devoted considerable effort to the Collegium from 1729 onwards. New music written for it might have been limited to occasional vocal works and the small number of later sonatas and concertos mentioned in chapter 9. Yet we also have evidence of his revising older works and preparing new copies of repertory by other composers.[475] These efforts were part of a broad shift in the character of Bach's work that took place after he had been in Leipzig for some six years and had produced most of his music for the church. The change might have been due to several factors: exhaustion after the busy schedule of the early Leipzig years; frustrations over pay and working conditions in the School and churches; perhaps even a personal crisis.

Evidence for this last has been seen in two documents from 1730 which together suggest considerable anxiety and unhappiness. (These, the *Entwurff* and the letter to Erdmann, are taken up in chapters 12 and 13, respectively.) Yet the developments of 1729 and 1730 also repeated a pattern from earlier in Bach's life, as bursts of intensive work in certain genres—organ music, sacred cantatas—were followed by fallow periods. The dearth of relevant of sources forces us to leave open the question of his state of mind as the decade drew to an end. It could be that, far from being seriously hampered in his professional activities or unsure of his direction, Bach deliberately turned to consolidating his existing repertory of both instrumental and vocal music, having made a deliberate decision to cut back on the creation of entirely new works.

---

[474] It is suspicious that the numbers of printed librettos cited by Wolff (2000, 360) are for performances of BWV 205a, 207a, 214, and 215 (150 each) and BWV 206, 213, and Anh. 12 (200 each). These were all homage cantatas for the ruling house, as were the works performed outdoors, in the elector's presence, for which much greater numbers are recorded (BWV 215 and Anh. 11 and 13).

[475] Rifkin (2007, 12–14) discusses, in particular, copies of several overtures ("orchestral suites") by the Eisenach composer Johann Bernhard Bach, likely performed after Sebastian's takeover of the Collegium in 1729.

Chapter 11

Bach's librettos and his "music-writing procedures," especially in the Leipzig cantatas (p. 231, following the second paragraph, "how these were dealt with in rehearsal and performance can only be conjectured")

It is uncertain to what degree Birkmann produced original texts, as opposed to pastiches drawn from works by other authors. More generally, it remains unclear to what degree Bach himself chose or reworked his texts, thereby determining the sequence of movements (choruses, recitatives, arias) in a given composition. His reluctance to write substantial verbal documents did not necessarily signify a willingness to let others do all the work of selecting or creating librettos. For certain periods, especially during 1724–25, his church works follow a consistent textual plan that suggests close collaboration with a like-minded poet. Collaboration of a different type is evident in the many parodies—repurposed works with new texts—that Bach produced throughout the Leipzig years.

Unfortunately, hypotheses put forward about the authors of the anonymous texts have tended to prove untenable.[476] This leaves Ziegler, perhaps Birkmann, and certainly Picander as Bach's chief known librettists at Leipzig—the last of these the most important, having collaborated with Bach on several of the latter's greatest and largest vocal works, sacred as well as secular, original as well as parodied. Picander's special talent for satire, although derided by the high-minded Gottsched, probably made him particularly well prepared to carry out the serious poetic craftsmanship required by a parody—which also demanded real sensitivity to the existing music to which the new text would be sung.

Although Picander might have seemed up-to-date, Bach was hardly an innovator in his choices of texts. In later years he might have recognized the old-fashioned character of his librettos, which in an increasingly rationalistic age remained baroque in their focus on intense but sometimes artificial metaphors, and on vivid descriptions of sin and suffering. Such poetry failed to reflect the "enlightened" views of Gottsched and other *galant* readers, becoming increasingly unfashionable by the time of Bach's death. With two sons studying at the Leipzig university, where Gottsched taught, Sebastian must have known something of how such poetry was coming to be viewed; Scheibe, in his critique of Bach's music (see chap. 12), reflected Gottsched's intolerance for it.

Friedemann seems to have inherited his father's tolerance if not enthusiasm for old-fashioned sacred poetry, setting the latter in his own works and repeating many of his father's compositions. Emanuel, who personally knew many up-to-date writers, set texts chiefly by the latter and at Hamburg largely avoided performing Sebastian's choruses and arias. He did, like at

---

[476] These include the conjectures that many church works from Bach's first twelve-month period were by the elder Christian Weiss, pastor of St. Thomas's, as proposed by Wustmann (1910), and that those for the second such period were by Andreas Stübel, former conrector of the St. Thomas School, as suggested by Schulze (1999, 116) but not mentioned in later writings by the same author.

least one fellow student, set a Picander text in an early work.[477] As an adult, however, he may have been embarrassed by his father's taste in poetry, perhaps already as a student at the Leipzig University during 1731–34.[478] If so he held a view that would continue to foster resistance to Sebastian's sacred works through the nineteenth century.

Scholars have taken extraordinary efforts to reconstruct Bach's "music-writing process," starting with the mechanics of actual writing. These were very different in Bach's day from those of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, when printed music paper was readily available, as were pencils, pens, and erasers of various types. For Bach, ink had to be mixed, quill pens cut from feathers, and staff lines ruled by hand. Changing anything already written down was also difficult, often requiring literal cutting and pasting. Sixteenth-century composers had drafted music on erasable slate tablets, but this seems no longer to have been the practice in Bach's day.

Bach was not alone in composing even large contrapuntal movements in single ink drafts in full score; Telemann, Graupner, and other composers more prolific than Bach must have done the same. But Bach's Leipzig scores were evidently the products of an extraordinarily intelligent and nimble mind that could grasp the essence of a poetic text and almost instantly imagine an utterly original plan for setting it to music. He could then work out, apparently in his head, the myriad details of realizing that plan artistically while also determining more mundane things, such as how many pages of music paper would be needed, or how many measures or bars each movement of the score would contain. All this might have proceeded as he physically ruled each sheet with the appropriate number of staff lines and only then began to write actual notes onto the paper. Performing parts for the individual singers and players similarly were copied out in ink after planning and ruling each sheet with the needed number of staves. Scholars have identified dozens of copyists, most of them students or family members, either by name or by placeholders such as "Anonymous 5."

Even in scores not intended for further dissemination, the beauty of Bach's musical handwriting has often been noted, the flowing contours of the individual symbols reflecting the shape and direction in a way not seen in the more angular handwriting of less practiced or less accomplished musicians. For Bach the physical aspects of notating music were inseparable from creative or artistic ones; preparing a score was not merely a matter of writing notes but of planning its layout. This meant considering the extent of each piece not only in terms of musical structure and duration in performance but also in terms of paper and ink, even the time required for actually writing it out. By the time he reached Leipzig, Bach must have written out so much music (both his own and that of other composers) that the process was largely intuitive and subconscious—except in the "perfected" collections that he seems to have begun assembling before reaching Leipzig. The cantatas do not seem to have been planned out that way, at least

---

[477] In the cantata *Ich bin vergnügt mit meinem Stande* (see Wollny 2010); its text is related to that of BWV 84, composed a few years earlier in 1727. Johann Friedrich Doles, who studied with Sebastian in the early 1740s, was the composer of another Picander text (see Melamed 1996).

[478] On Emanuel's literary aesthetics, see Schulenberg (2014, 139–47). When Emanuel later set to music an entire volume of sacred poetry by the Leipzig pastor Gellert, he probably knew that the latter had also argued for and written comedies of the type approved by Gottsched.

originally. But the years that saw the creation of most of the cantatas also saw the revision of many of the instrumental works. Eventually he began editing some of his more important sacred vocal compositions in similar ways (as discussed in chap. 13).

The Leipzig church cantatas (p. 250, following the first complete paragraph, “effortlessly florid violin part”)

Like the Brandenburg Concertos, many cantatas combine esoteric formal and technical elements with captivating melodies that any listener could tap his or her foot to. Yet there are also works whose austere construction and sometimes relentless dissonance or unvarying texture are offputting, perhaps intentionally so. Some, too, can seem hectoring in the way moral instructions from the bible or more recent writings are hammered out with an unyielding musical rhetoric.

For instance, a repeated four-note motive for the words “Herr wie du willt” (Lord, as you wish), derived from the underlying chorale melody, is sung and played throughout the opening chorus of Cantata 73. It is obviously effective from a purely rhetorical point of view (ex. S11.1). Yet to a modern listener it can grow tiresome. Such an example suggests that Bach, like a good pastor, might season certain lessons with delight and even levity. His ultimate aim, however, was not to please but to direct and instruct. Still, even for mediocre texts on seemingly uninspiring subjects, such as the need to avoid hypocrisy or flattery, Bach could discover engaging musical ideas that have lives of their own.[479]

During this first year Bach often composed movements of much the same type within a period of a few weeks. Thus the cantatas for three successive Sundays during August and September begin with chorale choruses, although these are not chorale cantatas in the usual sense.[480] Three other cantatas from the first cycle open with bible verses set as archaic choral fugues in *stile antico*.[481] Yet in every work Bach finds some new wrinkle, never exactly repeating himself. He inserts recitatives into one of those chorale choruses (BWV 138), or he inverts the answers of the fugue subject (in BWV 179). Every opening chorus is contrapuntal, yet few are strict fugues, rather combining elements of fugue with elements of ritornello form and even ternary (ABA) aria form. Hence any attempt to classify works or individual movements into types quickly runs into problems, as “types” begin to overlap or to incorporate elements from other types. Rarely can Bach’s choices of compositional techniques, such as the inversion of a fugue subject, be related to the words or topic of the text. The mere use of difficult technical devices might have seemed to Bach an act of devotion; for modern listeners these add to the spectacular variety of the music, springing from Bach’s irrepressible musical imagination.

To be sure, Bach continues to follow the principles of musical rhetoric. As in earlier vocal works, these lead him to invent musical images relating to individual words, and to emphasize the latter through melismas and other devices. Nearly every aria and chorus—even fugal ones—

---

[479] Flattery: Cantata 181; hypocrisy: Cantata 179.

[480] BWV 25, 138, and 95, for the thirteenth through fifteenth Sundays after Trinity.

[481] BWV 179, 64, and 144.

opens with a ritornello whose melodic ideas are suggested in some way by the topic of the text. The relationship is not always based on simple imagery, nor does it follow the conventions (inspired by Wagner's operas) that were assumed by Romantic commentators such as Schweitzer. Yet there are instances of obvious pictorialism, as when a twisting violin line in a Christmas cantata represents the "hellish snake" that Jesus is come to destroy (ex. S11.2).

Instrumentation plays an important part of this, and although Bach's musicians at Leipzig may not have been as expert as those at Weimar or Cöthen, over the years he must have had many highly accomplished performers at his disposal. He certainly could call on a greater number of distinct instruments than previously, employing them to produce a greater variety of instrumental timbres. Only now, for example, in the first aria of Cantata 13, could he accompany a tenor voice with the combination of two recorders and solo oboe da caccia (ex. S11.3). A special tenor oboe with a flaring metal bell (like a horn), the oboe da caccia was apparently invented at Leipzig; the earliest known examples are those of the Leipzig woodwind maker Johann Heinrich Eichentopf.[482] The precise, exquisite sense of instrumental color evident in Bach's choice of such an instrument echoed his experience with diverse organ stops. It is one reason why these works cannot be fully represented by performances using "modern" instruments, even though the latter can certainly convey other aspects of these multifaceted compositions.

The annual cycles

The sacred vocal works from Bach's first years at Leipzig are the only part of his work to survive primarily in autograph composing scores, which reveal the actual steps involved in his "music-writing process."[483] From these it is clear that Bach wrote most of his Leipzig vocal works as single drafts, composing in ink directly into full scores. Alterations of course took place, and occasionally Bach deleted or inserted passages. Typically, however, only details, such as ornament signs and figured bass symbols, were added after the initial drafting of the Leipzig cantatas, as individual performing arts were written out—Bach sometimes adding performance markings to notes already entered by a copyist.

If he had not realized it earlier, Bach would now have come to understand what any good pastor or regular churchgoer recognizes even today: that a *Jahrgang*—literally a path through the year—is a virtual journey through all the crises and triumphs, joys and sorrows, that one experiences in real life. These are expressed through emulation of and identification with the figures, chiefly Jesus himself, whose histories are told in the prescribed readings from the bible for each day, from which the authors of chorale poems and librettos drew their themes. Bach, by

---

[482] The instrument was first adequately described and illustrated by Karp (1973); for its use in Bach's music, see Burgess and Haynes (2004, 74–77). The oboe da caccia is distinct from both the ordinary tenor oboe or *taille*, used in double-reed sections like that of the First Brandenburg Concerto, and the modern English horn or *cor anglais*. Although use of a similar instrument in two of Bach Weimar works has been postulated, Hofmann (2018) shows that a viola was the more likely original solo instrument there.

[483] So called by Marshall (1972, 1:43).

setting to music a year's worth of such poetry, and by doing it so effectively, encompassed practically the entire range of human feeling in his music. This is one reason why even those who do not share his religious beliefs can nevertheless find emotional and spiritual sustenance in these works.

At the time Bach began writing this music, he was already a practiced master. Thus, as one surveys the successive compositions, one can hardly speak of his gradually perfecting the art of writing a cantata. It would be more accurate to speak of continuous variation within several distinct templates. Any stylistic evolution that one perceives in surveying the repertory was the product of deliberate fashioning, not compositional development in the sense of training or gradual acquisition of mastery. Given their number, it is possible to delineate only the general outlines of these cantatas and point to a few particularly distinctive or unusual works. Every one is a masterpiece, repaying engaged study, with text (or translation) in hand.

The first *Jahrgang*

The first annual cycle began with the cantata for the first Sunday after Trinity on May 30, 1723. It continued through Cantata 184 one year later, when May 30, 1724 was the Tuesday after Pentecost (what Bach performed on the following Trinity Sunday is unknown). We catch glimpses of uncertainties and improvised solutions to problems that arose during those first twelve months on the job. For instance, after writing large fourteen-movement works for the first two Sundays, Bach turned to smaller new works and revised older ones for the next few weeks. Yet even BWV 24 and 167, the relatively brief third and fourth new compositions of the period, include substantial choruses—but not at the beginning of either work, where such movements would subsequently tend to fall.[484]Bach may soon have come to regard the designs of these works as unsatisfactory, but an opening aria is not necessarily the mark of a lesser cantata. That of BWV 167 is scored for only tenor and strings, yet it expounds at length on its theme of praise for divine love, incorporating two extraordinary melismas on *preiset* ("praise," ex. S11.4). This was the first of many long, vocally demanding tenor arias that continue into Bach's second year, suggesting that right from the start he knew he could call on at least one unusually capable tenor.

The heterogeneous character of the works from the first twelve-month period, often attributed to the participation of several distinct librettists, might also reflect deliberate choices by Bach as he explored varying approaches. Still, twenty-six of the thirty-six new works open with bible verses (*dicta*), usually followed by alternating recitatives and arias and a concluding chorale. Most opening *dicta* are for chorus, but three are for solo voices, resembling arias although never so called in either librettos or Bach's scores. The choral settings take various forms. The one that opens Cantata 179 is a straightforward fugue. More often Bach treats each clause of the bible verse in distinct ways, reserving strict fugue for a concluding clause. This may be preceded by a more freely polyphonic setting of the opening clause. Such a chorus can be likened to a prelude and fugue, although the sections rarely are separated by a complete pause. Often, moreover, the initial clause ("prelude") is repeated toward the end of the movement, producing a ternary form (as in the opening movement of BWV 69a).

---

[484] Cantata 24 has a *dictum* chorus in the form of a prelude and fugue as third movement, and both works end with chorale choruses comparable to those at the ends of BWV 75 and 76.

Any of these various designs can serve the rhetoric of the text. Presenting a part of the text as a fugue subject was a way of underlining it, and two related (or antithetical) clauses could be treated as subject and countersubject (see ex. S11.6 below). In doing so Bach was also demonstrating his compositional virtuosity. His first council election cantata for Leipzig, BWV 119, even sets its opening *dictum* within a French overture. He had treated a chorale in similar fashion with Cantata 61 at Weimar, although in this case the middle section is not a fugue. The previous day, on August 29, 1723, Bach had combined a "prelude-and-fugue" *dictum* for the voices with an instrumental chorale cantus firmus. This made Cantata 25—one of the great, expressive masterpieces of Bach's first cantata cycle—also an instance of "demonstration counterpoint." As in his keyboard music, Bach saw no contradiction between profound expression and complex structure. For the next two weekends, however, Bach wrote cantatas that open with straightforward chorale choruses, not *dicta* (BWV 138 and 95). Then on Sept. 19 he returned to the previous model, although the fugue that opens Cantata 148 is disguised by having the three lower voices accompany the first statement of the subject (by the soprano; ex. S11.5). Bach masks the entries of the subject in many subsequent choral fugues that possess the same grand, imposing character. Bach retains this basic approach in one of the last new works of this *Jahrgang*, BWV 67, whose opening movement seems at first to be a choral aria but is essentially a double fugue; the principal subject incorporates a long note as a symbol for the New Testament injunction to "*hold* Jesus Christ in remembrance" (2 Tim. 8) (ex. S11.6).

Earlier in his first year at Leipzig, on Oct. 3, 1723, Bach returned to the idea of "demonstration counterpoint" in the opening chorus of Cantata 48. This is another setting of a plaintive or pleading *dictum* (ex. S11.7). This chorus seems at first to be built around paired vocal entrances, like certain movements in the secular cantatas for Cöthen. These, however, combine with restatements of the ritornello theme, constituting *Einbau;* simultaneously they join with phrases of the chorale melody "Herr Jesu Christ, du höchstes Gut," played as a canon between slide trumpet and two oboes. The chorale, which is one of praise or even rejoicing, is repeated at the conclusion of the work. As the cantata opens, however, it is part of a somber web of up to nine independent contrapuntal parts; the drooping lines delineate the New Testament line "I am a wretched human" (Rom. 7:24). This same cantata also incorporates a second chorale, sung as the third movement. The melody receives perhaps the most extreme dissonant, chromatic harmonization of any in Bach's "simple" four-part chorale settings, deepening the emphasis on the "strife and pain" that "follow sin" (ex. S11.8).[485] The effect is particularly striking as the melody is one of the simpler chorale tunes, usually heard in a plain diatonic major-mode setting.

After another two weeks, Bach began a new approach, offering cantatas without choral movements (apart from a concluding four-part chorale harmonization). Given the one-on-a-part constitution of the choir in most of the preceding works, the sound of these "solo cantatas" was not necessarily very different from the latter. The first of these, BWV 89, again opens with a *dictum*, now set as a dark arioso for bass voice with a full instrumental complement of oboes,

---

[485] The presence of a second chorale movement here and in several subsequent cantatas is often taken as an indication that Bach was now working with a new librettist; Wolff (2000, 270) and Dürr (2005, 27) provide details.

horn, and strings.[486] The movement is clearly a stand-in for an opening chorus, the reduction to a bass soloist justified by the first-person voice of the text (from the prophet Hosea). The usual sequence of recitatives and arias follows. But a so-called solo cantata could be more dramatically conceived, as in the two following works, BWV 60 and 90.

Cantata 90 opens with an arresting tenor aria warning sinners of their "terrifying" (*schrecklich*) end. Although scored with strings only, it is a masterpiece of dramatic musical imagery, the virtuoso writing for first violin and then voice "painting" the torture and shrieks mentioned unstintingly in the text. Cantata 60 is essentially a dialog between alto and tenor, representing the named characters "Fear" and "Hope" respectively (*Furcht* and *Hoffnung*). The tenor, although representing hope, is accompanied in the opening duet by tremolos for the strings, which symbolize fear. Meanwhile the alto sings the chorale "O Donnerwort" (O word of thunder, doubled by horn). Seven months later, this chorale would be the subject of the first cantata of the second *Jahrgang*. Yet this movement already finds a creative way to incorporate a chorale into a cantata, as the hymn becomes part of a dialog (ex. S11.9). Only in the penultimate movement does a third voice appear, singing a soothing arioso that quotes the voice from heaven in Revelation ("Blessed are the dead that die in the lord"). Bach naturally assigns these words to a bass soloist. The cantata ends with Bach's famous four-part chorale setting of a melody whose first phrase spans a tritone; the unusual melodic interval was an original part of the melody, by Bach's Mühlhausen predecessor J. R. Ahle. (ex. S11.10).[487]

The diversity of approaches taken in these works for the Trinity season would continue for the remainder of Bach's first year at Leipzig. In addition to the formal or structural diversity of these cantatas, one can also point to variety in their emotional or dramatic designs. Despite its alarming final chorale, the expressive arc of Cantata 60 as a whole is one from consternation or suffering to repose and comfort. The two contrasting affects are represented in various ways over the course of the work, not least in the contrasting melismas for alto and bass singers in a pair of complementary ariosos, the one chromatic and tortuous, the other steady and diatonic (ex. S11.11).

The assurance eventually acknowledged by the alto seems to bear out a modern view of Bach's cantatas as internalized dramas: each one delineates an evolving emotional state, like the operas of his day.[488] The earlier Cantata 25 had followed a similar emotional design, realizing it, however, through very different musical means. Its opening movement also incorporates a chorale, but this is played by a solemn choir of cornetto and trombones, accompanying a dissonant "prelude and fugue." These set the dismal words from Psalm 38, "There is nothing healthy in my body." By the time the cantata is over, however, we have been treated to a

---

[486] The opening ritornello, in C minor, recalls the organ prelude in the same key (BWV 546/1).

[487] Alban Berg quoted Bach's setting in the final movement of his Violin Concerto, thereby implying that Bach's chromatic chorale harmonization was a forerunner of twentieth-century twelve-tone composition.

[488] This view was put forth by Kerman (1956, 51), who described Cantata 78 as "a religious drama of conversion . . . in a special sense. . . . The piece dramatizes the victory over doubt."

delightful soprano aria in which three recorders represent the "high choir" in which the soul hopes to sing alongside the angels.[489]

Not every cantata follows such an emotional arc. The opening chorus of Cantata 105 begins with a harsh, chromatic ritornello for strings and double reeds. Fragmentary vocal entries (representing consternation?) give way to an animated fugue; its subject emphasizes the word "living" (*Lebendiger*), despite the negative sense of the phrase as a whole, "for no one living is righteous." The soprano aria that follows is accompanied by tremolo strings, which return in the closing chorale, gradually slowing down (ex. S11.12).[490] Clearly this work was *not* meant to dispel fear and trembling, as Cantata 60 evidently was.

Many other works also progress emotionally in somewhat unexpected ways. It is not unusual for a holiday cantata that opens with a grand ceremonial chorus to end quietly or thoughtfully, as if to remind the listener that the holiday exists for more than celebration. Such a plan might also reflect the fact that, at least when performed during the first part of the service (before the sermon), the cantata was followed by the chanting of the Credo and other relatively quiet items.[491] It is striking that for August 15, 1723, a day of no particular liturgical significance (the twelfth Sunday after Trinity), Bach composed Cantata 69a, which opened with his biggest prelude-and-fugue chorus to date.[492] This chorus, "Lobe den Herrn," is sometimes thought to have been composed previously; apart from the Magnificat BWV 243a, it was Bach's first Leipzig composition to employ full choirs of three trumpets (with timpani) and double reeds (three oboes and bassoon). Yet as the work proceeds it grows quieter, concluding with a thoughtful aria in B minor (a prayer for protection) and an understated final chorale ("Whatever God does is done well"). The trumpets and drums are not heard after the opening movement.

Even works for major feast days can have comparable trajectories. Cantata 65, for Epiphany 1724, opens with another big prelude-and-fugue chorus, albeit with horns and recorders instead of trumpets and drums. But the librettist's (?) decision to close with a minor-key chorale—two stanzas from "Was mein Gott will"—tempers the mood at the end. To be sure, the magnificent opening movement is balanced by the penultimate tenor aria. Its dance-like rhythm (minuet) and grand scoring, with pairs of horns, recorders, and double reeds (oboes da caccia), recalls Bach's most ebullient Cöthen numbers. And the overall design of this work, for the last day of the extended Christmas season, is not unlike that of the preceding cantatas for the second and third

---

[489] Bach would again use three recorders to represent an angel choir in Cantata 122 (for the Sunday after Christmas 1724); in the later BWV 175 they have the more common pastoral association.

[490] The slurs over the repeated notes indicate so-called bow vibrato or slurred tremolo (see Carter 1991), a device foreign to "modern" string playing.

[491] Bach noted the somewhat special order of service for the first Sunday in Advent into his old score of Cantata 61, written for that day in Weimar and re-used at Leipzig (BD 1:248 [no. 178]; NBR, 113 [no. 113]). Wolff (2000, 256–57) gives a more detailed plan for an ordinary service.

[492] Bach later adapted the cantata as BWV 69 to mark a council election, perhaps in 1742.

days of Christmas and for New Year's Day: an opening fugal chorus gives way to arias that are predominantly dance-like and tuneful. These are interspersed with extra seasonal hymns, somewhat like the Christmas interpolations which Bach inserted into the Magnificat that December. Equally appealing to Bach's congregations, no doubt, was the dance-like aria "Was die Welt in sich hält," heard on the third day of Christmas. Its gavotte rhythm and concerto-like first violin part again recall secular things from Cöthen (ex. S11.13)—even though such things here symbolize the temptations of the physical world.

The cantatas for the second and third days of this Christmas season had opened with fugal choruses of very different types.[493]That of Cantata 40 is the second part of a "prelude and fugue" chorus, but, exceptionally, the fugue treats the same two clauses as the "prelude" (1 John 3:8), and the second subject derives from a simple repeated note first heard in the ritornello. There it seems to be mere accompaniment, but when taken up by the voices it becomes clear that it represents Jesus "destroying the works of the devil" (ex. S11.14a). The anticipated victory is celebrated in the penultimate aria, one of the most difficult of Bach's tenor solos from a year marked by many such movements. This aria incorporates two extraordinary horn parts as well.

The cantata for the following day was far more austere, opening with a choral fugue that alludes to the *stile antico* in its *alla breve* notation and the absence of ritornellos or obbligato instruments; a solemn trombone choir doubles the voices and strings. Such a movement is nevertheless more motile than the quasi-Renaissance polyphony that it emulates. The repeated "turn" motives in the subject are a Baroque rhetorical device, marking the word *erzeiget* ("revealed" or "shown," ex. S11.14b). They are not easy to sing, making this movement as tricky to execute as many an aria, despite its archaic (or pseudo-archaic) character. Bach's next cantata, for New Year's Day 1724 (BWV 190), is incompletely preserved, but its opening movement was another massive fugal chorus (with chorale citations as well). In this work, moreover, the trumpets and drums return to provide flourishes between the lines of the concluding four-part chorale, thus starting the new year with a bang.

The absence of choral movements in several "solo" cantatas that followed the Christmas season probably lightened the load of Bach and his musicians, but only to a degree. The solo cantata heard on the Sunday after New Year's (BWV 153) involved less logistical preparation than the massive scores for Christmas and New Year's Days. Yet the vociferous evocation of stormy weather in its opening aria again demanded exquisite virtuosity from both the tenor soloist and the accompanying strings. Nor do these seemingly lesser works show any diminishing of Bach's compositional intensity. The storm metaphor was repeated a few weeks later in Cantata 81, in another virtuoso tenor aria with strings. Three times in the middle of the aria, however, the "stormy" ritornello is interrupted by recitative, as spiritual agitation is stilled by pious thoughts (ex. S11.15). Cantata 83, performed just three days later (Feb. 2, 1724), called for the same three solo voices used in BWV 81 (alto, tenor, bass); it includes sumptuously scored arias for the alto and the tenor, both in F major and with solo violin.

One wonders whether Bach's listeners—even Bach himself—understood that even these small-scale works surpassed anything that could be heard at Dresden. The difference lay above all in

---

[493] For Christmas Day itself, Bach repeated the Weimar-period BWV 63.

Bach's unstinting imagination. BWV 83 includes an unusual "intonation," as Bach labeled it, between the two concerto-like arias. Here a formulaic melody used for chanting parts of the liturgy alternates with recitative (ex. S11.16a). The result was a variation on a type of chorale movement found in other cantatas, in which recitative alternates with phrases of a hymn (ex. S11.16b). Something like it can be found in early works like BWV 106, and similar movements occur almost regularly in the cantatas of the second (chorale) cycle. Yet this particular realization of the idea is unique in Bach's works. Cantata 83, incidentally, was for Purification, one of several festivals that originally honored the Virgin Mary. In Lutheran tradition these were redirected toward Jesus, and the real subject of this cantata (signified by the "intonation" movement) is the presentation of the baby Jesus in the Temple. This explains Bach's regal settings of the arias here and of movements in other works for related occasions, including the Magnificat and Cantata 1.

After Easter Bach turned toward parody, composing, as in January, a number of small-scale works. Two of these (BWV 166 and 86) again assign an opening bible verse to soloists rather than chorus, but Bach finds ways to make these settings distinctive. In Cantata 86 the opening words of Jesus are assigned to the bass soloist, as was conventional. Yet Bach treats them as if part of a motet in *stile antico*, as in previous choruses of that type (ex. S11.17; cf. ex. S11.14b).

Two weeks later, in Cantata 44, Bach turned another gospel verse into an imitative duet for tenor and bass. This, however, is now answered dramatically by a chorus whose harrowing text ("whoever kills you . . .") spurs modulations to the remote keys of B-flat and E-flat minor; Bach gives a rare *piano* marking for these enharmonic passages (ex. S11.18). The following aria and chorale, however, seem almost perfunctory, at least by Bach's standards. The chorale movement is for tenor and continuo alone, and the treatment of the uninspiring text is not much better than correct. This was the last new work of the first cycle, and for the next two weeks, including the three days of Pentecost, Bach relied on repeats and parodies. Perhaps he was tired or was already working on the chorale cantatas of the second *Jahrgang*.

Jahrgang 2

In writing the chorale cantatas of the second yearly cycle, Bach was clearly following a plan determined firmly in advance. Yet the hurried character of the writing in both scores and parts tends to support the consensus of scholars that Bach (together with copyists for the parts) prepared these during the few days prior to performance. This would have been contrary to the practice of someone like Telemann, whose position as external Capellmeister required him to send works to Frankfurt and Eisenach well before they were needed there. Nevertheless, things evidently went smoothly until Lent 1725. It was normal at Leipzig for cantata performances to cease during that season. But by the time they recommenced at Easter, Bach had abandoned the plan of basing each new work on a single chorale (text as well as melody). The reason is unknown; one suggestion is that his librettist had died. Although Bach eventually filled a few gaps in the chorale cycle, his compositions for the remainer of the 1724–25 church year are of a different kind. Could he have experienced a falling out with his poet? Did he simply grow tired, either of writing chorale cantatas or from the hectic pace of composition that he had been maintaining? The following cantatas, mostly on texts by the Leipzig poet Marianne von Ziegler, include several that are notably smaller than most of those of the chorale cycle. No new

compositions are known for almost the first two months of Bach's third year as director, but he is thought then to have been traveling (see chap. 10).

As long as Bach was writing chorale cantatas, the use of a single hymn melody and its verses through the course of an entire cantata assured the type of unity beloved of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century commentators. It must also have appealed to Bach and his listeners, perhaps less for aesthetic reasons than because of the prestige and affection associated with the mostly venerable chorales that Bach chose for these works. Given his insistence on selecting hymns for congregational singing, the choice of chorale for each cantata must have been his, not the librettist's. Composing a *Jahrgang* of cantatas based on these hymns was apparently unprecedented; it was also the culmination of Bach's earlier chorale projects, which had had been confined to keyboard music, from the early "Neumeister" settings to the two Weimar collections of organ chorales.

The very first Lutheran hymnals, incorporating many texts by the Reformer himself, had appeared during 1524–25—precisely two hundred years before Bach began his project. The latter could have been a deliberate commemoration of that event, planned in conjunction with a poet equally well versed in these traditional songs.[494] It can be no coincidence that the chorales selected for elaboration in Bach's *Jahrgang* tend to be early ones associated with Luther himself. The combination of strict cantus firmus technique with paraphrase—the development of individual motives from the hymn tunes through imitation, sequence, and other devices—could also be traced back to the sixteenth century, although it had continued to be standard practice. Bach had already composed a chorus with these techniques to close BWV 23, one of the pieces for his Leipzig audition. Notable elaborations of this basic design took place in several works from the first *Jahrgang*, beginning with BWV 138 and 95.[495]
Another common movement type is the chorale aria (or "chorale trope"), which Bach had been composing since his early days at Mühlhausen. Among the examples from his first year at Leipzig was a rare instance for three voices, one of several austere terzets included in works composed during the last months of 1724.[496] Close to the chorale aria is a type that might be called chorale recitative. Here a soloist sings arioso or recitative accompanied by, or alternating with, a hymn tune. The latter can be played by instruments, sung by other voices, or even sung by the same soloist. In a chorale aria, however, it was probably Bach's choice to add a chorale to an existing text. In a chorale recitative, the insertion of hymn verses must usually have been

---

[494] As pointed out by Leaver (2012, 27), who notes the cultivation of chorales and chorale sermons by J. C. Olearius, Bach's former pastor at Arnstadt, as well as "a propensity to celebrate important anniversaries" at Leipzig.

[495] Written for the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Sundays after Trinity, respectively, both are exceptional works. BWV 138 is based on a chorale that alternates with recitative in the first two movements. BWV 95 incorporates no fewer than three chorale melodies in its first two movements, concluding with a fourth.

[496] In the terzet in BWV 122, soprano and tenor sing an aria text while the alto (doubled by strings) has the chorale. Two other terzets, in BWV 38 and 116, are without cantus firmus. Greer (1996) finds theological reasons for the scoring of such movements.

dictated by the poet; it was an extension of the common practice of alluding to bible verses as well as hymns through brief quotations. Of course, Bach could have specifically requested such texts; there are two chorale recitatives in BWV 178, performed relatively early in the series (July 30), and again in BWV 92 from the following January.

Each of the chorale cantatas ends with a relatively plain four-part harmonization of the melody. As in earlier works, however, this could be elaborated through the addition of obbligato instrumental parts or even ritornellos, although the latter are always shorter and simpler than those in the opening movement. Within the body of the cantata there may also be a "solo" chorale movement, in which one voice sings the melody against a more elaborate instrumental accompaniment. This too could be found in older works, such as the soprano cantata BWV 199. Finally, there is a rare type of movement in which Bach takes a stanza from a chorale poem and sets it as a regular recitative or aria; this occurs especially in several mostly later cantatas *per omnes versus*. These are cantatas whose entire text is taken from a chorale poem, so that any recitatives or arias in them are based on complete stanzas of the hymn.[497]

Only at the end of each cantata is the melody presented in a straightforward way (as in ex. S11.19a). The opening fantasia movement is far longer and more complex, typically developing the chorale melody in imitative counterpoint both before and after the voices enter (exx. S11.19b–c). Bach had previously used overture-choruses to open the church year at Weimar with BWV 61 (for Advent 1714) and in Cantatas 119 and 194, both for special occasions: a council election and an organ dedication. Cantatas 97 and 110 (for Christmas 1725) would follow during the next eighteen months. But of all these, only BWV 61 and 20 employ voices in the initial "dotted" section.

Of the four works that opened the second *Jahrgang*, with the cantus firmus appearing successively in soprano, alto, tenor, and bass parts, only the last, Cantata 135, opens with an "ordinary" fantasia movement, the ritornello theme being derived from the first phrase of the chorale melody (compare parts a and b in ex. S11.19). The tune is the one known today as the "Passion" chorale, after its use in several movements of the St. Matthew Passion. Like many chorale melodies, however, it originated as a sixteenth-century secular song, and Lutherans sang it throughout the year, in liturgical contexts ranging from Christmas to Good Friday.

The last of the chorale cantatas composed in regular succession, before Bach broke off work on the cycle after Lent, was BWV 127, whose opening chorus combines musical symbols pointing toward Good Friday and Easter. The "Lamm Gottes" melody, one of the two chorales combined in the ritornello, refers to Jesus, whose double role in Christianity as sacrificial victim and future king is the subject of the cantata. The dotted rhythm in some of the accompanying parts might be a symbol for royalty, thanks to its association with the French overture, although this movement is not really in overture style. When the voices enter, they present the main chorale melody line by line, developing each phrase in imitative counterpoint. Meanwhile the instruments continue to repeat the thematic ideas of the ritornello as accompaniment. At the end of the movement, the

---

[497] The only pure example among the original works of the second cycle is BWV 107, a possibly experimental work from early in the period (July 23, 1724). Cantata 101, performed three weeks later, is comparable, all movements using chorale stanzas either verbatim or paraphrased.

final line of the chorale text is combined (in *Einbau*) with a reprise of the ritornello. This produces a climax of musical complication, exceeding that of Bach's most complex chorale fantasias for organ composed previously at Weimar. Contrasting ideas that might have been distributed between manuals and pedals on the organ are now exchanged between vocal and instrumental choirs. The expressive affect is deepened by details that reflect Bach's careful reading of the text—as when the word *Leiden* (suffering) in the fifth phrase is represented by a slurred appoiggiatura, which is eventually repeated by the instruments in a remarkably dissonant passage (ex. S11.21).

It was in keeping with Baroque tradition that Bach's music "paints" the word *suffering*, even though the text as a whole is concerned with escape or freedom from the same. The contradiction recurs in countless works, including BWV 101 (ex. S11.22). Composed ten weeks into the chorale cycle, this proved to be one of Bach's most uncompromising works. The three arias are all in minor keys, as is the chorale itself, which is heard in some form in all but the second movement. Focusing on divine anger over sin, the cantata must have been meant to be difficult to listen to. Its beauty lies in the original ways Bach finds for developing the chorale melody, even in the two recitatives and the last two arias, of which only the final one is a conventional chorale aria. The second aria, at the center of the work, is a rushing type of minor-mode movement that Bach seems to have associated with urgency.

Another example in the same key followed just three weeks later to open Cantata 33. Both movements, moreover, use soloistic oboe parts—two oboes plus taille in BWV 101—to make the "rushing" effect more visceral. Yet Cantata 33 softens its tone in subsequent movements. This reflects a shift of focus, which in the opening chorus is on a cry of pain—"ich ruf dich an" (I cry to you) in the penultimate line, which surely sparked Bach's musical imagery for that movement as a whole. By the end, however, we hear expressions of assurance and praise. Cantata 33 therefore is an one of those internalized spiritual dramas to which Joseph Kerman pointed. The decision to make it so must have been deliberate, made by Bach perhaps in conjunction with the unknown librettist.

The famous Cantata 78 traces a similar emotional arc, and there is no obvious reason why the opening chorus should have taken the form of a passacaille, a French dance. But Bach had used much the same chromatic ostinato bass for the opening vocal movement in Cantata 12, composed at Weimar in 1714 and repeated at Leipzig the previous April. There, as in BWV 78, he seems to have associated the bass line with pain and suffering; this, however, is the richer and more expressive work.[498]As in the Organ Passacaglia, the line passes from key to key and from part to part, even being sung in inverted as well as original forms (as in ex. 11.4c). There is no fugue as such, but the longest of the "pre-imitation" passages for the lower voices is almost a self-contained fugue, serving as a climactic setting of the penultimate (seventh) phrase of the melody.

---

[498] The "Lamento" from the early Capriccio BWV 992 is constructed over a similar bass line, but the association of the latter with lamentation may not have been as universal as is sometimes supposed.

The duet in Cantata 78, whose pizzicato bass part makes it seem particularly light and cheerful to modern audiences, must have been heard somewhat differently by its first listeners, although Bach does little to make the cries of "help" and "hear me," addressed to "master Jesus," sound particularly pleading. More expressive are the tenor recitative and aria (with flute) that follow, as well as the ensuing accompanied recitative for bass, which concludes as an arioso that paraphrases the chorale melody. Modern audiences may fail to appreciate the intensity of these movements, whose texts describe the crucifixion in typically baroque images. The final aria expresses both rage over Jesus's death and confidence in eternal life, sentiments likely to be foreign to contemporary listeners. Bach sets these in a vigorous bass aria with a virtuoso oboe part; the loss of Bach's composing score deprives us of information about its early compositional history, but the imperfect fit between the musical and textual forms and the heavy reliance on *Vokaleinbau* suggest that this is a revision or parody of an earlier aria.

A relatively small number of works move emotionally in what might be considered the opposite direction from those discussed above. Cantata 99, after its delightful initial chorale chorus, proceeds to a duet in which a somewhat alarming chromatic motive, introduced in the ritornello by the flute, later accompanies the text's references to the "chalice of the cross" and "deadly poison" (*Kreuzeskelch*, *tödlich Gift*, ex. S11.23). This was one of the works from fall 1724 to feature solo flute; another, BWV 8, was one of the few works of the cycle based on a recently composed chorale. The composer, Daniel Vetter, had been organist at St. Nicholas's until his death in 1721 and was one of Bach's fellow examiners when the university organ was tested in 1717.[499] It must have been in memory of him that Bach concluded the cantata with Vetter's harmonization of the hymn, which he had written in anticipation of his own death.

The flute continued to play a leading role even in BWV 130, for St. Michael's Day (Sept. 29, 1724). There it represents the archangel as "prince of the cherubim" in the penultimate movement, a delicate gavotte aria. This stands in stark contrast to the militaristic character of the opening chorus, based on the melody then known in British America as "the Old Hundredth." The following bass aria continues the martial theme, as the three trumpets and drums continue as the sole accompaniment (apart from the continuo).[500]When composing this, Bach must have remembered another aria for bass voice and trumpets, "Heiligste Dreieinigkeit" from the Weimar cantata BWV 172. Like Cantata 12, this had been repeated the previous spring. In that work, however, the three trumpets represent the Trinity. Here they depict the angel's victory over the dragon, whose "guile" (*List*) is symbolized by a startling Neapolitan chord at the end of the B section (ex. S11.24).

This sonority incorporates a rare non-harmonic tone for the third trumpet; we may imagine Reiche and his assistants executing the entire aria with the same disregard for "rest or repose" (*Rast nur Ruhe*) which the anonymous poet attributed to the devil! Pictorial writing of a different sort occurs in Cantata 114, which Bach presented just two days later. Although the chorale urges

---

[499] Bach mentioned Vetter by name in his report, BD 1:165 (no. 87); NBR, 85 (no. 72).

[500] The trumpets were apparently replaced (or doubled) by violins in a repeat performance during the early 1730s, as shown by a set of parts one of which resurfaced recently, only to be sold by Sotheby's.

Christians to "be comforted" (*seid getrost*), the opening chorus accompanies it with one of Bach's more vociferous ritornellos. This is replete with energetic three-note motives *figure corte* and stabbing repeated notes, although these are later softened, as staccato dots are replaced by slurs (ex. S11.25). The familiar Bachian image of the world as a "vale of tears" (*Jammerthal*) is subsequently deepened by perhaps the most virtuosically expressive of all his arias with flute. This is one of Bach's rare "two-tempo" arias, switching to *vivace* for the more hopeful B section.[501]

Three weeks afterward, Bach introduced a new instrument into his vocal music: the violoncello piccolo, called for in Cantata 180 and, after another two weeks, Cantata 115.[502] Actually, one must wonder whether the beautiful tenor aria "Ergieße dich" in Cantata 5, performed the week before BWV 180 and variously ascribed to viola or violin in modern editions, was not also for this instrument. The part was copied into the original violin part but in alto clef, suggesting that it was played by the principal violinist, who might have doubled on the new instrument. The player is unidentified, but as with the flute there might have been a local specialist who was available during a limited period. Bach would write parts for the violoncello piccolo chiefly in works of the next few months, including four of the cantatas on texts by Mariane von Ziegler. As with the oboe da caccia, Bach's use of the instrument reflects his interest in special sonorities, more specifically for a tenor instrument capable of providing anything from a lively obbligato (as in BWV 180) to an expressive arioso melody (in BWV 115). More broadly, these works signal Bach's incessant exploration and experimentation—although they are in no way uncertain or tentative.

"Exploration and experimentation" extend to the harmonization of the chorale melodies. Most of these, having originated centuries earlier, have modal features that require some compositional ingenuity if they are to be reconciled with eighteenth-century tonality. This aspect of the chorales was known to Bach and his contemporaries, although they expressed it in different terms. Cantata 121, for the second day of Christmas, is based on the chorale "Christum wir sollen loben schon," which Walther identifed as being in the Phrygian mode.[503] Bach's four-part setting at the end of the cantata treats it as if in B minor, but concluding with a final half cadence on the dominant. The movement begins, however, in E minor, and within a tonal context this means that the final cadence comes as a surprise, something less than completely final.

---

[501] Many Bach arias, including "Das Unglück schwägt" from BWV 139, performed the following month, contain tempo changes, but by "two-tempo" is meant a da capo aria in which the middle section as a whole is in a contrasting speed.

[502] According to Vanscheeuwijk (2010, 185), the movement in BWV 180 can be played on a four-stringed instrument tuned an octave below the violin, whereas that in BWV 115 requires the instrument with five strings also called for in the Sixth Cello Suite. Bach's next aria with this instrument, in the New Year's cantata BWV 41, comes even closer to the idiom of that suite, which therefore is likely to date from around the same time.

[503] The melody is based on the Gregorian hymn "A solis ortus cardine." Walther (1732, 409ff.) lists chorale melodies as representing the various modes.

Such an ending might have reminded Bach and his listeners of the antiquity of the tune—or the mystery of the incarnation that its text celebrates. The opening movement of the cantata is also archaic: a chorale motet, with a large-scale tonal design similar to that of the chorale harmonization at the end of the work. The resulting tonal ambivalence is perhaps reflected in the unusual juxtaposition of arias a half step apart, in B minor and then C major. These are separated by only a brief recitative; Bach accomplishes the crucial modulation swiftly on the words *O Wunder* (oh wonder!), referring to the central topic of the cantata (ex. S11.26).[504]

Less than a week later, the chorale for New Year's Day presented a somewhat different challenge. Its melody, like its text, is reminiscent of the Lutheran litany: long and repetitive, comprising no fewer than sixteen phrases, all but two of them ending on either the first or the second scale degree. A change from quadruple to triple meter for four phrases (11–14) makes for little real variety. Bach nevertheless used this tune to end all three of his New Year's cantatas, each time bringing the first phrase to a surprising cadence not on the dominant, as one might expect, but on secondary *sub*-dominant, that is, IV of IV (ex. S11.27).[505] There was nothing obvious about the original melody to inspire this; perhaps it reflected a local tradition or the archaic litany underlying the chorale.

Bach fashioned the initial chorus as a large ternary form, turning the inner phrases of the chorale melody into a sort of fugue (as he had done in Cantata 78 and would do later in Cantata 140). Several cadences fall on the same secondary subdominant found in the concluding chorale harmonization; the opening ritornello even makes its first modulating excursion to that key, giving the movement an oddly piquant flavor despite its grand scoring with choirs of trumpets and oboes. The meaning of this strange modulation is, perhaps, revealed in the penultimate movement, a recitative that is interrupted by the choral singing of a line from the litany. That line pleads for victory over the devil, and it is sung to the same B-flat-major harmony heard at the first cadence of the opening chorus. Can it be a coincidence that this is also the same harmony sounded at a striking moment three months earlier in the cantata for St. Michael's Day—Bach's most recent previous work with trumpet and drums (ex. S11.28; compare ex. S11.24 above)?

Bach gave himself a break during the following weeks with the relatively simple chorale choruses that open the works for Epiphany and the following Sunday. Yet his invention hardly ceased. Cantata 3, for the second Sunday after Epiphany, opens with a lyrical duet for two oboes d'amore such as one might have expected in an aria. When the voices enter, it is the bass that has the cantus firmus—the only instance of this after Cantata 135. Four weeks and five cantatas later, Bach's regular production of chorale cantatas came to an end with BWV 127, already noted above for its use of a second, instrumental cantus firmus in the opening movement. The last work heard in the Leipzig churches before the silencing of "concerted" music during Lent, the cantata points forward liturgically toward Good Friday.

---

[504] Chafe (1991, 174) interprets this as an example of "tonal allegory"; further analysis in Schulenberg (1995, 227–33).

[505] There is also a plain four-part harmonization, BWV 362, which makes the first cadence on the dominant, although this too contains some surprises.

Indeed, Cantata 127 contains a prefiguration of one of the great moments in the Saint Matthew Passion, although the latter work was probably not composed for another two years. The penultimate movement of the cantata consists of a sequence of passages that Bach simply headed "Recit[ativo]"; some modern scores describe it as "Recitative and aria." In fact it comprises three elements: an accompanied recitative, a through-composed da capo aria, and three chorale lines interpolated into the latter (ex. S11.29). Bach had set similar chorale interpolations as ariosos within recitatives in cantatas for the two previous Sundays (BWV 125 and 126). Now Bach sets them as embellished quotations of the chorale melody, accompanied only by continuo, within a da-capo aria form. Tempo, meter, and instrumentation change for the newly written poetic lines, as the trumpet and strings return to provide a vivid premonition of the last judgement. Yet the aria portion of the movement adheres to Bach's idiosyncratic through-composed version of ternary form; indeed it is one of the most striking instances of that design, practically the last that he composed before the series of chorale cantatas came to a sudden close.

The Ziegler cantatas and others from mid-1725 through mid-1726

The trends that would mark Bach's later cantatas are not yet clear in the works for the post-Easter season of 1725. Those twelve cantatas suggest something more like pragmatism as Bach dealt with the apparent loss of his librettist. On Easter Sunday itself, Bach performed a parody of the birthday cantata performed about six weeks earlier for his former and future patron Duke Christian of Weissenfels (BWV 249a). The work survives in later form as the Easter Oratorio (BWV 249); it likely already included at least the first movement of the opening sinfonia. It is possible that, at this point, Bach was momentarily uncertain how to proceed. He seems to have written a new cantata for Easter Monday (BWV 6), then begun another for the following Sunday. But he broke off work on the latter after writing just seven measures of an opening ritornello, deciding instead to produce a cantata (BWV 42) that was part parody.[506]

Like the Easter cantata, BWV 42 incorporated an opening instrumental movement as well as an aria from an earlier secular work—a pattern that Bach would repeat in a number of subsequent cantatas for the third cycle.[507] Unique to BWV 42, however, is the use of the lively sinfonia—derived from an otherwise unknown concerto movement, with a solo double-reed trio—to introduce a gospel verse (John 20:19). The latter continues the narrative recounted in the passion and cantata heard at Good Friday and Easter.[508] However unpoetic the texts of BWV 6 and 42,

---

[506] The fragment, headed *J. J. Do[m]i[n]ica Quasimodogeniti [gap] Concerto* is in Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. Bach P 122. It somewhat resembles the opening of BWV 103, written into the same manuscript for performance two weeks later.

[507] Rifkin (1997b, 65–67) demonstrates that the sinfonia and first aria of BWV 42 probably derive from the lost birthday serenata BWV 66a, composed at Cöthen for Prince Leopold in 1718; Bach had also drawn on that work a year earlier in the cantata for Easter Monday 1724.

[508] The Easter Oratorio (BWV 249), whose early version was heard on April 1, 1725, lacks the narrative features of Bach's passions and other oratorios. But the idea of continuing the story narrated by the evangelist John is evident in Bach's approach to the libretto of BWV 42. Chafe (2014) elaborates at length on the "Johannine" character of Bach's compositions from Good Friday through Trinity Sunday 1725.

both reveal Bach as creative as ever; Cantata 42 includes two particularly fine arias, the first being of the rare "two-tempo" type, the second returning to the concerto style of the opening sinfonia.[509] After setting another anonymous text the following week in BWV 85, Bach then wrote the nine works on librettos by Ziegler. She eventually published them in sometimes substantially different forms; whether the versions set by Bach represent her early versions or incorporate his or someone else's alterations remains unknown.[510]

The third of these, Cantata 87 (for Rogate Sunday), is a small-scale "solo" cantata, but so is BWV 86 from a year earlier. The last five Ziegler cantatas also have relatively small dimensions. On the other hand, BWV 103, the first of the Ziegler cantatas, is a grander if not greater work than the Weimar cantata BWV 12, Bach's only earlier composition for Jubilate Sunday (both are eclipsed by the later BWV 146). BWV 108 (for Cantate Sunday), with its central choral fugue, is a larger work than the previous year's BWV 166 for the same day. A notable feature of Cantata 103 that seems to have been largely absent in earlier Leipzig cantatas, but which becomes more frequent in later compositions, is Bach's use of formal designs independent of those of the libretto. The opening chorus is musically in a sort of da capo form—with a central recitative section—although it never repeats the opening text clause.[511] The two arias are both in something like sonata form, despite having bipartite and ternary texts, respectively. On the surface, however, Bach continues to follow familiar patterns. He gives the tenor a virtuoso role in the ecstatic second aria, which includes a melisma of nearly one hundred notes on *Freuden* (joy). Yet the same aria gives an exceptional number of non-harmonic tones to the solo trumpet, perhaps reflecting the poem's antithesis between joy and tears (*Thränen*).

Although the choral movements in the subsequent Ziegler cantatas grow shorter; Bach remains inventive. He treats the initial chorus of BWV 128 in the usual way, as a grand fantasia on the chorale melody, presented as a cantus firmus. But in BWV 68 the melody is elaborated in the style of a siciliana, so that one hardly recognizes it as a hymn tune (ex. S11.30).[512]Cantata 183 opens with a dark ensemble of four low double reeds to accompany the warning "They will cast you out in banishment" (John 16:2), sung as recitative; this is as different as possible a treatment of this text from the duet and chorus that opened Cantata 44 a year earlier (shown in ex. S11.18).

---

[509] Dürr (2005, 280) also praises the music of BWV 6, "hard though it may be to find poetic qualities in the text." He regards the latter as likely to be by the same author responsible for the "dry, learned character" of BWV 42 (p. 96)

[510] Peters (2008, 140–42) traces the view that Bach himself altered the texts to "an error in chronology," concluding that "Ziegler herself revised the texts for her later publication." This does not, however, solve the problem that the librettos (as Bach set them) contain lacunae caused by the omission of certain rhyming lines.

[511] Bach takes the same approach in the gospel (*dictum)* chorus of the following cantata, BWV 108, which appears, exceptionally, as the fourth movement.

[512] After the opening chorus, BWV 68 reverts to parody for its two arias; there is no confirmation, however, for the suggestion (offered in Schulenberg 1995, 222) that the final chorus might also be a parody.

Distinctive woodwind scoring appeared again the following Sunday, with the three recorders that accompany the opening recitative and aria of Cantata 175, illustrating its pastoral theme of the Good Shepherd ("He calls his sheep by name," John 10:3). The last of Bach's Ziegler settings, BWV 176 for Trinity Sunday, might be the shortest of all his cantatas, yet it opens with an intense fugal setting of a rather bitter bible verse.[513]There is no ritornello, but the strings vigorously accompany each entry of the subject, passing from *forte* to *piano* as the melody expresses first the "spite" and then the "despair" of the text; this is accomplished through a rising scale and then chromatic "sigh" figures (ex. S11.31).

Jahrgang 3 and later cantatas

After Bach's trip to Gera at a time that should have marked the beginning of work on his third annual cantata cycle, new works appeared less frequently. Some revert to the main pattern of the first cycle, opening with a choral setting of a bible text; others follow different plans. As before, however, Bach's cantatas include large-scale masterpieces alongside more intimate works. If there is one common element in the diverse compositions of the third cycle and later, it is a subtle trend away from what might be called the sermonizing character of many of the earlier Leipzig cantatas. The music is no less beautiful or rhetorical than in earlier works. Yet one increasingly gains the impression of compositions that are less intent on delivering a religious lesson, more purely musical in inspiration. This is evident in works as different as the chorale cantatas *per omnes versus* and the compositions with obbligato organ. One senses it as well in long arias whose ritornellos take the form of fugues in trio-sonata scoring. A *galant* melodic surface may be embedded within a complex, esoteric structure, as in several lengthy chorale arias in the cantatas with librettos by Picander. This is the same juxtaposition of the fashionable with the abstruse that characterizes many of Bach's later instrumental works, such as the organ chorales published in the third part of the *Clavierübung* (1739).

If, after writing the Ziegler works, Bach had no regular librettist, that would explain his reliance on old texts by the Weimar poet Franck in two of the three subsequent sacred works. BWV 168 and 164 not only use Weimar texts but recall Bach's Weimar cantatas in their chamber-like scoring. The opening aria of Cantata 168, moreover, returns to something like Bach's Weimar style in its pervasive use of *Einbau*, as the bass soloist is persistently accompanied by the vociferously "dotted" ritornello (ex. S11.32). Both works nevertheless were almost certainly composed at Leipzig.[514] Yet whereas BWV 168 is as rhetorical as any Bach work, Cantata 164, performed four weeks later, hints at his growing preoccupation with learned counterpoint in the

---

[513] Jer. 17:9, customarily translated "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately corrupt." Ambrose (2005), however, renders it as "There is a daring and a shy thing about the human spirit." It may well be, as Ambrose argues, that "the Septuagint says that the heart is 'deep' and that man is difficult to fathom. The Lord alone understands him." But Bach shows by his setting that he understood the verse in the traditional manner.

[514] BWV 168 and 164 were performed on July 29 and Aug. 26, respectively; what Dürr (2005, 518) calls the "draft character" of their autograph scores from Leipzig makes a Weimar origin unlikely. The only other sacred cantata known from the summer of 1725 is BWV 137, a chorale cantata *per omnes versus* performed on Aug. 19.

canonic or fugal ritornellos of all three arias. The ritornellos of the final aria—actually a duet—even involve canons by inversion, and the two voices (soprano and bass) also sing in canon, at varying intervals.

Bach continued to use older librettos, especially by Lehms, during the next few months, which saw only a few large-scale vocal works. Already in August 1725 he performed the secular Cantata 205, among his very largest scores (see below). But most of the sacred cantatas, including seven of the eight written for Christmas 1725 and the following weeks, are relatively small in scale. This did not rule out the composition of extraordinary things like the two-tempo soprano aria that opens the work for the third day of Christmas. BWV 151 includes a virtuoso flute part, showing that he probably still had the use of the soloist for whom he had written so many outstanding parts during the previous year. Yet even Cantata 16, for New Year's Day 1726, is a somewhat puzzling minor effort, with a single horn as its brass component. It opens with a short cantus firmus setting of the German Te Deum, followed by a unique "Aria tutti" in which the full four-voice ensemble alternates with the bass voice alone. Two dialog cantatas from this same period for soprano and bass voices, BWV 57 and 32, are also lightly scored, with just a single independent woodwind part (oboe) added to the strings in Cantata 32. The latter is also remarkably operatic in style, recalling Bach's Cöthen *serenate*. The two singers join in a penultimate duet whose gavotte-like theme would find an echo in one of the most *galant* fugues from part 2 of the Well-Tempered Clavier (ex. S11.33).
It could be that Bach found the older librettos used during this period helpful for eliciting inventive compositional plans, distinct from those which he had been following for the past year and a half. Yet, apart from the remarkable Cantata 79, only the work for Christmas, on a text by Lehms, seems to have aspired to the level of achievement that Bach had achieved so consistently during the first two Leipzig cycles. By far the largest movement of this cantata was the opening chorus, created by adding new vocal and instrumental parts to the overture from the suite BWV 1069.

For all their grandeur, it is debatable whether this and other repurposed instrumental movements are as impressive as their original versions. The addition of voices, which in BWV 110 occurs only in the fugal part of the original overture, did not involve great ingenuity. Bach relied on a more conventional type of parody in the fifth movement of the same work, a duet for soprano and tenor that attaches a new text to one of the interpolations composed a year earlier for the Christmas version of the Magnificat. Now, however, this music is used somewhat incongruously for the "Gloria" text from Luke 2:44. It is impossible not to be stirred by the last aria, for bass with trumpet. Yet the choice of the librettist to conclude the work with the chorale "Wir Christenleut'" forced Bach to end the cantata in B minor, without brass or timpani.

One of the small number of sacred works from the second half of 1725 to contain entirely new music was the cantata for Reformation Sunday (Oct. 31, 1725). BWV 79 is more striking and original than the better-known Cantata 80, which Bach would arrange for this day in the church year probably a few years later.[515]He showed his affection, or pride, in BWV 79 by arranging

---

[515] The precise date of Cantata 80, originally a Lenten work (BWV 80a) from Weimar, is unknown. What Bach performed for Reformation 1723 is also unknown; in 1724 he presented a version of Telemann's cantata *Der Herr ist König* (TWV 8:6), adding parts for timpani and an

three movements from it in the masses in G and A. One of these movements, the opening chorus, originally set a psalm verse (Ps. 84:12), and here Bach returns to the free ternary design used for many comparable texts in the first *Jahrgang*. Yet the structure of the present movement is articulated more subtly than in earlier instances of the same design, even if it is at least as stirring. The beginning of the fugue is disguised by having the three upper voices accompany the first vocal statement of the subject, by the bass (ex. S11.34). By that point the subject has already been developed imitatively within the ritornello, where even the timpani are thematic: their pounding repeated notes become the basis of the fugue subject, evoking the martial character of the Reformation as understood in Bach's day.

At first, however, those notes are merely accompaniment to the main ritornello theme, played by two horns (ex. S11.35a). Even one unsympathetic with the work's religious subject can hardly fail to be roused by this theme, especially when it re-emerges miraculously in *Einbau*, returning in C major just as the middle section concludes in a cadence to E minor (ex. S11.35b). Not to give up a good thing, Bach repeats this ritornello theme in the third movement, where it now frames the verses of the chorale "Nun danket alle Gott." When, however, he arranged this material in the Gloria of the G-major Mass, he omitted the horns, re-assigning their lines to soprano and alto soloists.

For much of the winter and spring of 1726, Bach relied on cantatas by Johann Ludwig Bach to fulfill his church obligations. Only at the end of May did he again use his own music, in a series of major works that follow the path laid by Cantata 79. Seven of these also follow J. L. Bach, insofar as they use old texts from Meiningen; these incorporate both an opening Old Testament verse and, later in the work, one from the New Testament.

The first of these works was BWV 43, a two-part cantata for Ascension. Despite its grand opening fugue (based on Ps. 47:5–6), it leaves "a somewhat mixed impression" due to the almost routine—for Bach—character of the subsequent arias.[516] More distinctive is Cantata 88, performed on July 21, 1726. This is an ambitious work even though it lacks choral movements, its two bible verses being sung chiefly by the bass soloist. Four weeks earlier, Bach had commenced the post-Trinity season with one of his most expansive and expressive biblical choruses, in Cantata 39. Three comparable works would followed in August (BWV 187, 45, and 102) and another in September (BWV 17), all opening with fugal choruses of different kinds. The most memorable single movement among them, however, might be either the remarkably dissonant alto aria "Weh der Seele," in Cantata 102, or the two-tempo soprano aria "Gott versorget" from Cantata 187, both with florid oboe parts.

---

unspecified instrument Pfau (2018, 107–8) argues that Telemann had composed the work two years earlier for use during his audition for the Leipzig cantorship.

[516] Like the text for BWV 148 (see previous note), that of Cantata 19 is significantly different from the version published by Picander. In this case the libretto was adapted from an existing strophic poem, raising the question of whether the new version was by Picander, Bach, or someone else (see Dürr 2005, 699).

One more cantata, BWV 47, first heard on Oct. 13, 1726, would open with an impressive fugal chorus on a biblical text. Unlike the works based on Meiningen librettos, this one has no complementary *dictum* to open a second half. By this time, moreover, Bach had begun to focus on a very different type of cantata that gave prominent parts to one or two solo singers, sometimes also to solo organ. In addition, soon, if not already, he would be working closely with Picander, with whom he had already collaborated on several secular cantatas.[517]

The first of their sacred collaborations might have been BWV 19, for St. Michael's Day (Sept. 29, 1726).[518] This blurs the boundaries between genres, opening with a chorus in da capo form whose "A" text paraphrases a verse from the New Testament ("There was a great battle in heaven," Rev. 12:7). This A section is a grand choral fugue, but the form and style of the movement as a whole are close to those of the choral arias which Bach was now using regularly to open grand secular cantatas, including those written jointly with Picander.[519] More characteristic of Bach's sacred cantatas is the remarkable final aria, whose prayer to the angels takes the form of a graceful siciliana. To this a chorale melody is added by the first trumpet, which now appears gentle rather than military. Likewise in the final chorale, although Bach writes obbligato parts for brass and timpani, these avoid the aggressive flourishes of other grand hymn settings. Hence a work that starts like a typically militant St. Michael's piece ends rather thoughtfully.

Solo cantatas and cantatas with obbligato organ

Many subsequent works of both the third cycle and the so-called Picander *Jahrgang* would be on a smaller scale. One of the directions in which Bach now headed was signaled by Cantata 170, composed in July 1726 between two larger works. These were on texts from Meiningen, where Johann Ludwig Bach had composed the cantatas which Sebastian had recently repeated at Leipzig in lieu of his own compositions. BWV 170 also used an old text, by Lehms, but it is a solo cantata for alto—there is not even a concluding four-part chorale—accompanied only by strings and organ.[520]The latter, however, departs from its usual role as continuo instrument, furnishing a solo line in the final aria and *two* solo lines in the second, whose ritornellos look as if they originated in an organ sonata for two manuals and pedals (ex. S11.36).[521]

---

[517] Already during Bach's first cantata cycle, one work, BWV 148 (Sept. 19, 1723), seems to have been based on a poem by Picander, but more than three years would pass before their next possible collaboration in a church work.

[518]

[519] E.g., BWV 205 (Aug. 3, 1725).

[520] There is also an original part for oboe d'amore, but it merely doubles the first violins in the outer movements. Bach later wrote out a flute part to substitute for the organ in the final aria.

[521] As argued by G. G. Butler (2007). The organ part, however, lacks the bass, which in this movement is furnished by the upper strings alone.

Such writing suggests that Bach was looking for ways to add an organist—probably himself—to the vocalist or vocalists featured in the solo cantatas that he was now composing. Some instances of obbligato organ in Bach's Leipzig cantatas might have been necessitated by the absence of a needed woodwind soloist. But the period saw growing interest in such writing generally (notably by Stölzel) that would continue with the next generation in vocal works by W. F. Bach and Agricola.[522]

Bach's cantatas with obbligato organ raise difficult questions—and not only about how music for a virtuoso instrumentalist relates to such theological themes as tribulation (*Trübsal*) and assurance (*Zuversicht*). These are nearly antithetical concepts, yet in Cantatas 146 and 188 they are represented, respectively, by quick movements arranged from the concerto known to us as the D-minor work for harpsichord (BWV 1052). If Bach or his congregations wondered about the religious significance of such music, it did not prevent him from using at least seven further concerto movements in other Leipzig vocal works from this period, including the first movements of BWV 35, 49, 169, 156, and 174. All but the last two include solo parts for the organ, as does the opening movement of Cantata 29, for the council election of 1731. The latter is the sole instance of an organ sinfonia that originated in a secular (or at least a commissioned) work, the wedding cantata BWV 120a. It is also the only one of these movements based not on a concerto movement but on the prelude from the E-major violin partita.

It has been suggested that in some of these movements, at least, the organ might symbolize heaven, as it did in the architecture of the Weimar chapel.[523] Against this, however, must be countered its apparent use to represent "the world" in Cantata 169. Curiously, Cantata 194, originally composed for the dedication of the organ at Störmthal (near Leipzig) in 1723, at first entirely lacked organ solos. Only when Bach repeated the work at Leipzig on Trinity Sunday 1726 did he substitute solo organ for the second oboe (in the final aria), presumably due to the unavailability of the needed player.

The cantata movements derived from concertos raise questions about their lost original versions, from which the later harpsichord adaptations were made independently. The cantata versions lack pedal parts—one reason to doubt that Bach originally wrote them for organ concerts at Dresden.[524] Surely Bach would have included virtuoso pedal playing in an original concerto for

---

[522] Cron (2004) surveys the use of obbligato organ during the period; Stauffer (2010) relates Bach's use of organ solos to new fashions in organ building during the second quarter of the eighteenth century.

[523] For the organ as symbol of heaven, see Cron (2016).

[524] As suggested by Wolff (2008, 106–7, repeated in Wolff 2016, 60–61) on the basis of a 1725 report of performances of "preludes and various concertos with intervening quiet instrumental music in all keys" ("er . . . in Præludiis und diversen Concerten mit unterlauffender Doucen Instrumental-Music in allen Tonis.. . sich hören lassen," BD 2:150 [no. 193]; NBR, 117 [no. 118]). The correspondent for a Hamburg newspaper evidently had a weak grasp of musical terminology, making it impossible to know whether *Concerten* meant actual concertos; did he even understand that the "quiet instrumental music" which he heard might have been played on soft organ stops and not by accompanying instruments?

the organ. Instead the cantata movements are relatively simple to play, apparently close to the lost original versions and incorporating less written-out embellishment than the later harpsichord versions. Had Bach conceived the original solo parts for a keyboard instrument, he is unlikely to have written the types of figuration found in many passages, which seem clearly adaptations of things originally written for violin or oboe.[525]

Bach's use of obbligato organ, which evidently began almost accidentally when BWV 194 was adapted for use at Leipzig, expanded rapidly during the summer and autumn of 1726. Six weeks after performing Cantata 170, Bach gave the alto and organ soloists far more to do in BWV 35, on September 8. This work, again on a text by Lehms, is a relatively expansive cantata in two parts.[526] What occasioned it is unknown, but Bach had already written two other works, each exceptional in its own way, for this seemingly insignificant day in the church year.[527] Each half opens with one of the quick outer movements of an earlier concerto, now arranged for organ as the solo instrument and with added parts for three double reeds (oboes and *taille*).[528] The obbligato organ continues in the first aria, providing a florid solo line in the opening ritornello. One might explain the initial sinfonia movement as setting the stage for the "bewilderment" of spirit and soul expressed in this aria., but is harder to see the second sinfonia as somehow relating to the "disgust" for life which is expressed in the aria that closes the work.

After six more weeks Bach offered a similarly scored cantata, BWV 169, which again draws on two concerto movements. Now, after adapting the quick opening movement as an introductory sinfonia, he used the slow second movement as the basis for the last of the cantata's two arias. This movement, familiar to harpsichordists as the siciliana of the E-major concerto (and to oboists in modern reconstructions of the original version), was extensively remodeled. The result is a strikingly beautiful renunciation of the physical world ("Stirb in mir, Welt"), even if the words, by an unknown poet, do not fit the music as perfectly as is usual for Bach.[529]

---

[525] It is hard to agree with Wolff (2016, 75) that BWV 1052 and 1053 incorporate "idiomatic keyboard style and figuration throughout," as much of the figuration is entirely different from that found in any other keyboard music by Bach. The organ versions of movements from these works (as well as the early version BWV 1052a) are even less clearly in a distinct keyboard style.

[526] It is thought that when BWV 170 was first performed on July 28, 1726, a work by Johann Ludwig Bach (*Ich will meinen Geist*) preceded it before the sermon.

[527] The twelfth Sunday after Trinity; the other works are BWV 69a and 137.

[528] The original version was also the model for the harpsichord concerto with oboe (BWV 1059), for which Bach wrote only the opening ritornello before breaking off work in his autograph score (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. Bach P 234).

[529] The first aria of BWV 35, "Geist und Seele wird verwirret," is sometimes supposed to have been derived by a similar process from the slow movement of a concerto, but see chap. 9.

Four other cantatas, all probably composed during the next few years, gave equally prominent roles to the organist, most famously in BWV 146. Yet, as in BWV 110, whether the addition of voices to an instrumental movement proves effective in the realization could be doubted. The added vocal lines, although not inexpressive, are somewhat shapeless, having the character of an elaborate continuo realization; the ebullient duet for tenor and bass near the end is the real high point of the work. The novelty of hearing two concerto movements in church might have attracted interest to Bach from visitors who, in this case, might have been lingering after the Easter fair, in whatever year the work was performed.

Although the date of BWV 146 remains uncertain, several other cantatas of this type, including the dialogue Cantata 49, are firmly placed in fall 1726. The soprano singer in Cantata 49, perhaps an unusually talented boy from the St. Thomas School, is unidentified, but Bach's bass soloist in this and other works of the period might have been the university student Johann Christoph Samuel Lipsius.[530]Like other dialog cantatas—including the past year's BWV 57 and 32—Cantata 49 refers to the Song of Songs, as in the frank admission of the bass soloist in the first aria "I go and seek with longing." That sentiment is expressed in the unusual key of C-sharp minor; the florid organ is accompaniment replete with the triplet figures popular in the *galant* style (ex. S11.37).[531]This feature is shared with BWV 169; so too is the repetition of a verse between the first aria and the first recitative, so that the opening line of the bass soloist becomes part of a dialog with the soprano, accompanied by strings (ex. S11.38). After an elegant soprano aria, with one of Bach's loveliest trio-style ritornellos, the work concludes in a lively chorale aria. A duet of this type was a less secular-sounding conclusion than that of Cantata 32 (see ex. S11.33a); the ritornello theme, played by the organ and then echoed by the bass singer, is a decorated version of the popular chorale melody sung by the soprano (ex. S11.39).

Besides the cantatas for solo bass, presumably written for Lippius, during this period Bach also wrote similar compositions for tenor and soprano, respectively. The librettos of at least some of these cantatas appear to have been the work of Birkmann, then a twenty-three-year-old student of mathematics and theology at the Leipzig university and probably also a player in the Collegium Musicum.[532] Like many Lutheran poets of the period, Birkmann had a talent for incorporating familiar phrases into new contexts. His libretto for Cantata 49 is replete with biblical passages; that for BWV 56 expounds upon the "cross" idea, which Bach symbolized by placing a sharp—German *Kreuz*—on the operative word in the opening aria.

Cantatas 56 and 82 are only the best known of the solo and duo cantatas of this period. Bach's one cantata for solo tenor, BWV 55, and another for soprano, BWV 52, came a week apart toward the end of November 1726. Both are neglected by singers, probably because of the

---

[530] His receipts for payment during 1725–27 are recorded by Schulze (1984a, 46).

[531] The organ part is notated a whole step lower, as usual at Leipzig. The absence of a separate performing copy for the organist and the presence of the transposed organ part within Bach's autograph score (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. Bach P 111) strongly suggest that the composer played the solo part himself from his manuscript.

[532] As established by Blanken (2015, 21).

relatively unspectacular nature of the vocal parts. BWV 52 is best known for its opening sinfonia, taken from the same early instrumental work that produced the opening movement of the First Brandenburg Concerto. The grand instrumental prelude might have been ostensibly justified as a representation of the "false world" (*falsche Welt*), decried in the opening line of the recitative that follows.

Today one is more likely to hear the less pretentious soprano cantata BWV 84, first performed on the following February 9. Its two arias, both with oboe, beautifully represent the libretto's urging of contentment, then joy, while accepting one's lot. Picander later published a similar text of which this might be an early version—or possibly another of Birkmann's adaptations. Both librettos were known in the Bach household, for a few years later the young C. P. E. Bach composed his own solo cantata to Picander's libretto.[533] It can hardly be a coincidence that Emanuel eventually owned the autograph score of his father's secular cantata BWV 204, also for soprano, written during 1726–27 on the same moralizing theme; it bears the title "On Contentment" (*Von der Vergnügsamkeit*).[534] Although probably composed for the Collegium, not for the church, the latter is a major work. Exceptionally, all four arias—which are unusually long and elaborate—and even one of the recitatives extend a half step above Bach's usual soprano range (to b-flat″); the work clearly calls for a virtuoso soloist, pointing toward Anna Magdalena as the intended singer.

Bach's interest in solo vocal music during this period is further evident in several dialog cantatas, which although less familiar than the solo works for soprano and bass are equally beautiful. Apart from Cantata 49, already discussed, these include BWV 58, for soprano and bass, and BWV 157, for tenor and bass. Both were composed during winter 1727, but the first became a part of the chorale cycle on account of its two chorale arias (although these are based on different hymns). Cantata 157, on the other hand, might have become part of the Picander *Jahrgang*, having been prepared, presumably on commission, for a memorial service that took place on Feb. 6, 1727—the Thursday that fell between the first performances of Cantatas 82 and 84.[535]

By this date Bach and Picander must have agreed to produce their single greatest collaboration, the St. Matthew Passion, whose first version would be heard on Good Friday, a little more than

---

[533] *Ich bin vergnügt mit meinem Stande*, edited in *Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach: The Complete Works*, vol. 5/5.2 (2011). Wollny (2010, 120–21) dates Emanuel's autograph score to the period 1732–34.

[534] The work is the very last item listed in the posthumously published catalogue of Emanuel's estate (*Verzeichniß des musikalischen Nachlasses des verstorbenen Capellmeisters Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach* [Hamburg: Schniebes, 1790]; transcription online at http://www.cpebach.org/pdfs/resources/NV-1790.pdf). It survives as the autograph manuscript Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. Bach P 107.

[535] Picander recorded the date and occasion when he published the poem. A second, lost cantata (BWV Anh. 209) was also heard during the service, after the sermon. Hofmann (1982) argued that this was a parody of a lost Weimar composition by Bach and that Cantata 157 might also be partly a parody, incorporating string parts that were a later addition (not necessarily by Bach).

two months later. Prior to writing that work, the two may have worked together only on special commissions such as BWV 157. The theme of its libretto, Jacob's refusal to let go of the angel, was a common one in funeral texts, reinterpreted as a metaphor for Christian steadfastness. Following Buxtehude and other composers, Bach treats this subject in a dialog for tenor and bass, but the music juxtaposes *galant* surface and esoteric structure as in many of Bach's later, more chamber-like cantatas. The opening movement—the only actual duet in the cantata—combines flute, oboe, and solo violin with the two voices in a contrapuntal texture so dense that no one part emerges as the principal one. The two arias, although both on bipartite texts, are musically in sonata or through-composed ternary form. The first, for tenor, speaks of "holding" Jesus in asymmetrical, elegantly melismatic phrases for both voice and oboe d'amore. The second aria is more lively, the bass soloist becoming the fourth part in a fugal texture with flute and violin.

Probably the best known of the sacred Picander cantatas is BWV 156, which, after its opening sinfonia with solo oboe, continues with a chorale aria whose opening tenor phrase "paints" the poet's word *stehe* (stand) in a conventional manner (ex. S11.40). Yet the tenor line as a whole (which echoes the ritornello) is decidedly unconventional in its irregular phrase-lengths and melodic shape. Moreover, the six verses of the chorale melody, which the soprano begins singing a few moments later, line up irregularly with the five of the aria. A recurring syncopated motive in the instrumental parts (bracketed in the example) adds a further element of strangeness.[536] It seems related to the poem's image of standing "with one foot in the grave," yet all three of the newly composed contrapuntal lines have what seems a deliberately neutral emotional quality (another point in common with some of the chorale settings of the *Clavierübung).*

Less famous but perhaps more moving is another "solo" cantata, BWV 159, for the last Sunday before Lent. Its final aria "Es ist vollbracht" is, in the words of one commentator, "as poignant and beautiful" as the better-known aria bearing that incipit in the St. John Passion.[537]If, as is likely, the cantata was first performed in 1729, then the work heard six weeks later at Leipzig was Bach's St. Matthew Passion, composed two years earlier to Picander's libretto. The aria in Cantata 159 would have been the last one sung in church prior to the *tempus clausum*, when most church music ceased. Bach writes the aria almost like an accompanied recitative, ending, like the aria in the St. John Passion, with a restatement of the three opening words (ex. S11.41). The immediate melodic inversion of the melodic figure could be considered a sign of the cross on which these words were spoken (*Es ist vollbracht,* "it is accomplished").[538] In the aria they follow the repeated farewell "World, good night"—the same words sung after the slumber aria in Cantata 82.

---

[536] The pairs of slurred eighths in the instrumental parts (probably signifying bow vibrato) appear as syncopated quarter notes in the BG; the reading in ex. S11.40 is that of the earliest source, a posthumously copied set of manuscript parts (Leipzig, Bach-Archiv, Thomana 156).

[537] Robin Leaver, in Boyd (1999, 446).

[538] The device of repeating a phrase in inversion plays a structural role in a new allemande that Bach composed around this time for the suite BWV 819, which is in the same key of E-flat (see Schulenberg 2006, 307).

Cantatas 156 and 159 both probably date from winter 1729. Ruth Tatlow, noting the "series of blows" suffered by Bach's family during the surrounding years—including the loss of five children—wonders about Bach's thoughts as he composed such a work as BWV 156, with its premonition of death. The previous fall had seen the death of Christian Gottlieb at the age of three and a half; three weeks later, Regina Johanna had to be baptized at home "because of weakness [*Schwachheit*]"; she would die in 1733 before reaching her fifth birthday.[539] Anna Magdalena herself must have been weakened, perhaps to the point of death, by some of her frequent childbirths. Yet although Sebastian and Magdalena surely suffered, these were also years that saw Emanuel and Friedemann emerging as strong musicians in their own right. The same period also saw the serial publication of the *Clavierübung* and Sebastian's accumulation of commissions and the title of Capellmeister. Hard-hearted as it may seem, one must ask to what degree Bach was affected by the loss of children. Immersing himself in the composition of these increasingly intricate works might have been one way in which Sebastian could set aside even the deepest feelings of loss.

Not all the Picander cantatas are small-scale, cogitative works. BWV 174, for the Monday after Pentecost, opens with a sinfonia taken from the Third Brandenburg Concerto, expanded by the addition of horns, double reeds, and ripieno strings.[540] Yet the following two arias revert to the more subtle manner of other late cantatas, and the horns are not heard again. More consistently grand was the St. Michael's Day cantata BWV 149, whose opening choral aria is a parody of the final movement from the Hunt Cantata. The new work continues in a manner close to that of Bach's recent secular cantatas, with three dance-like arias (two of them, curiously, with solo bassoon).

On the other hand, BWV 171, probably for New Year's Day 1729, sets its initial psalm verse as a massive fugue, and it ends with a chorale setting that reprises the grand trumpet flourishes heard four years earlier in Cantata 41. The fugue was re-used as the "Patrem omnipotentem" of the B-Minor Mass, but it probably originated in an earlier lost work. A soprano aria with virtuoso solo violin was also a parody, from Bach's 1725 collaboration with Picander (BWV 205). One can, then, imagine the two sifting through earlier works for poetry and music that might be appropriate for those rare or special occasions on which Bach was still prepared to create new sacred cantatas. If, however, at some point in their conversations they raised the possibility of collaborating on a complete *Jahrgang*, there is little evidence that Bach followed through on that, despite their subsequent collaborations on other major works.

Of the few subsequent cantatas that contained entirely new music, the most familiar is BWV 140, whose opening chorale chorus has already been discussed. The solo chorale that follows, for tenor with unison strings, is well known to organists from its later adaptation as one of the six

---

[539] As Tatlow (2000, 8–9) notes, referring to BD 2:183 (no. 248).

[540] The only church work that Bach certainly composed during 1729, the work has been interpreted as sending a "message" to the Leipzig authorities about their reduction of musical standards for St. Thomas students (Maul 2018, 201)—but this presupposes that the latter would have taken a significant part in the performance of such a work.

“Schübler” chorales. Frequently unnoticed, however, is the strange independence of the ritornello melody from the hymn tune with which it is combined, creating “peculiarly discordant” harmony despite the “springy rhythms.”[541] Bach abandons this esotericism in the more conventionally cheerful second duet. The concluding chorale harmonization is, almost uniquely for Bach, written *alla breve* rather than in common time; did the larger note values connote a somewhat slower tempo than usual?
A few later chorale cantatas set stanzas of the chorale poem as their sole text (*per omnes versus*). Four of these works have no known liturgical occasion; thus they could not have been part of an effort to complete the cycle of chorale cantatas. They differ in various ways from the latter; for instance, BWV 192 comprises just three movements, without arias or recitatives. The opening movements of all four works avoid the “pre-imitation” which in Bach’s more contrapuntal chorale settings usually precedes the entrance of the cantus firmus. But apart from this they are diverse in form and style; BWV 97, for instance, opens with another overture-plus-chorale, which by this point might have lost its novelty value at Leipzig. These four compositions, however, may have been products of a special commission from the court of Weissenfels, which Bach served as external Capellmeister from 1729 until the death of the reigning duke in 1736.[542] They ingeniously set the stanzas of their chorales in arias, recitatives, and choruses that are close musically to secular cantatas which Bach continued to produce not only for Duke Christian but for local patrons and for civic occasions, even as his output of sacred vocal works diminished to a trickle.

The secular cantatas (p. 257, following the first paragraph, “the medley that serves as an overture”)

Already in 1725, Bach had produced the secular cantata that would prove to be his single most sumptuously scored work, BWV 205. This was for the name day of the jurist August Friedrich Müller, who was to become professor and rector at the university. Not only trumpets and oboes but horns and flutes join strings and four voices in a *dramma* involving Aeolus, king of the winds, and three other mythological figures. The music is splendid, and one imagines Bach enjoying the break from writing the chorale cantatas and other church pieces of the past two years, even though the absence of any real drama or profound expression makes the work hard to take seriously. Individual movements, while retaining some of the dance-like character of the Cöthen serenatas, are somewhat more extended, the counterpoint a little thicker and the melodic embellishment a little more florid (as in Pallas’s elegant aria with violin, “Angenehmer Zephyrus”).

The competititon between the Greek gods Apollo and Pan, which was the basis of Cantata 201, had been related in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, source of many Baroque librettos. It provided an ancient mythological model for the real-life musical contests that involved Bach and other Baroque musicians (Froberger and Weckmann, Handel and Domenico Scarlatti). Picander’s libretto could allude to any competition between true and false artists, even more to the distinction between a critical listener who could tell the difference between them and one who

[541] Williams (2003, 325).

[542] As argued by Pfau (2015). The other works in question are BWV 100 and 117.

could not. Apollo, the god of music and the arts generally—here called Phoebus—sings a beautiful minor-key aria expressing (remarkably) his love for the boy Hyacinth; he seems a stand-in for Bach. Yet the latter was, obviously, also capable of composing the rustic dance song given to Pan or Dionysus, whose two-tempo aria does not lack, however, for some interesting if short-winded chromaticism in its middle section. Less clear is who, if anyone in particular, their respective champions Tmolus and Midas represent. The latter is criticized by the god Mercury, organizer of the contest, for "mad ambition" and "puffed-up, swollen fervor." He might represent any philistine, anyone who guilty of arrogant ignorance with respect to the arts, for he has "many more such brothers."[543]

Bach's aria for Midas, after Apollo has given the latter donkey ears, has the violins imitating hee-haws, an obvious bit of comic characterization (as shown in ex. 11.6). Whether any Baroque dramatic music truly depicts roles or characters, as opposed to expressing abstract sentiments, is a matter for debate. But here and in his two subsequent dramatic cantatas Bach does seem to have successfully drawn at least the outlines of a few comic figures. Already in BWV 205 Bach gave Aeolus an aria that makes him something of a bumpkin; like the later one for Pan ("Zu Tanze, zu Springe"), it knocks some of the wind out of the god's grandeur (ex. S11.42). This is somewhat surprising, given the work's subsequent parody in honor of the Saxon elector, also named Augustus. Could this mean that Bach's grand serenata for Müller, with its concluding chorus of "Long live Augustus," was meant somewhat tongue-in-cheek, like Brahms's Academic Festival Overture?[544]

Bach wrote something similar in the first aria for the pompous father in the Coffee Cantata, whose confoundment by his independent-minded daughter is represented by another "repercussive" motive, obsessively repeated (ex. S11.42c). On a more sophisticated level, one could also see something ridiculous in the daughter's aria "Ey, wie schmeckt der Coffee süße." As lovely as it is, it expresses desire merely for a beverage—admittedly, one that in its eighteenth-century version was sweeter and probably more potent than the usual Western version today, resembling modern "Turkish" or "Greek" coffee. With its minor key, slow triple meter, and soft triplets, the aria employs the same musical language as a Song-of-Songs aria—like "Ich geh und suche mit Verlangen" from Cantata 49—or, for that matter, Apollo's love-song for Hyacinth. This is especially true as Lieschen pauses to sigh on a dissonant fermata (ex. S11.43).

Gottsched argued for comedy as a means for promoting moral rectitude—in effect, a middle-class substitute for opera seria, which ostensibly instructed the aristocracy in ethics and history. In 1736—two years after Bach is thought to have composed the Coffee Cantata—Gottsched's wife Luisa Adelgunda Victoria wrote the first example of what is known as Saxon comedy. By then Picander must have been well known for three satirical plays that have been described as

---

[543] From the translation by Ambrose (2005), who notes that the final recitative, spoken by Momus (Greek god of ridicule), refers to the ancient orator Quintus Hortensius Hortalus and the conservative Lucius Orbilius Pupillus—both of whom seem to represent unnamed enemies of Bach.

[544] The parody, BWV 205a, is thought to have marked the coronation of Augustus III in 1734.

"extremely vulgar and crude."[545] If these were performed publicly, as Picander's preface implies,[546] Bach might well have seen them. He might also have seen the first of Caroline Neuber's innovative comedies, staged at Leipzig (with electoral permission) during the 1727 Easter Fair—right after the first performance of the Saint Matthew Passion.

The Coffee Cantata is always presumed to have been written for concert performance at Zimmermann's coffeehouse. but this probably could not have been the case if Bach wrote it for Anna Magdalena, who would have been denied entrance there.[547] Audiences there would already have been accustomed to the performance of "dramas" in which allegorical figures praised members of the ruling class. By 1734 they probably had also witnessed a few more genuinely dramatic works, such as Handel's *Armida abbandonata*.[548] If it was known at Leipzig that Handel had probably composed this early work for the famous soprano Margherita Durastanti, that might have been an inducement for Anna Magdalena to sing it, as she perhaps also sang in the Coffee Cantata.[549] Although a concert piece, the latter resembled an intermezzo, like Pergolesi's famous *Serva padrona*, or a *Nachspiel* ("after-play") like some of Neuber's comedies. The middle-class status of its two characters—an overbearing father and his daughter, who seems to love coffee more than men—further allies it with both types of theatrical comedy from the period. The work may have been heard outside Leipzig; it seems to have been performed a few years later by C. P. E. Bach, while he directed a collegium musicum at the university in Frankfurt (Oder).[550]

545

Scott-Prelorentzos (1982, 8). Otto (2007, 136–37) notes that the early wedding quodlibet BWV 524 sets some similarly earthy lines and that frank acceptance of such things goes back to Luther.

546 Picander claimed that he wrote them for "service" (*Dienst*), not for the press (quoted by Maurer-Schmook 1982, 25n. 14).

547 Private performances elsewhere are of course possible, as envisioned by Yearsley (2019, 160).

548 HWV 105, which Handel composed at Rome in 1707, survives in a manuscript copy made jointly by J. S. and C. P. E. Bach (Darmstadt, Universität- und Landesbibliothek, Mus. ms. 986); Glöckner (1981, 50) dated it "with certainty" to 1731.

549 The question of female participation in coffeehouse concerts, especially by a cantor's wife, remains open. Women were explicitly invited to attend at least some performances there, as Schulze (1985b, 18–22) showed. For Durustanti's probable performance of HWV 105 at Rome in 1707, see the edition by Hans Joachim Marx in *Georg Friedrich Händel: Kantaten mit Instrumenten II*, Hallische Händel-Ausgabe, vol. 5/4 (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1995), p. xix.

550 As Wollny (1996, 9–10) suggests; Emanuel owned a copy made by two copyists at Frankfurt on the Oder (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. Bach St 81). Whether Emanuel was the "fremder Musicus" who also directed a performance of a coffee cantata at Frankfurt (Main) in 1739 is unknown; a newspaper announcement (in BD 5:161 [no. B 442a]) does not name the composer

The view that the father of the cantata represents Bach himself can probably be discounted. His daughter Elisabeth Juliana Friederica was too young to be the Liesgen of Picander's text,[551]and Schlendrian, the name borne by the father, was a comic stock character. The word means something like "Slacker," which is hard to understand as a self-reference unless intended ironically. Some listeners would have remembered the name from *Der akademische Schlendrian*, one of Picander's three satirical plays of 1726. In two of those works, Liesgen is another stock character, a self-possessed serving maid. Thanks to Bach's music, the characters in the Coffee Cantata possess a sturdiness that Picander could not have anticipated, particularly when the father complains in a chromatic aria about girls who have a stubborn streak (a "hardened mind," shown in ex. 11.7). Schlendrian's aria might have been a deliberate parody, with its exaggeratedly harsh dissonances and craggy melodic intervals. Those features make for a stark contrast with Liesgen's final aria, in which she appears to be prepared to take pleasure from something other than coffee (ex. 11.8).

The comedy of the Peasant Cantata is of a different nature, and its dedicatee Dieskau no doubt enjoyed the condescension of Picander's text, which is, however, free of any serious mockery of the peasants, despite the title in Bach's autograph score ("Cantata burlesque"). Dietrich himself must have had sufficient sophistication to appreciate Bach's music; he would later serve at Dresden as *directeur des plaisirs*, that is, overseer of court entertainments (including music).[552] As in some of Telemann's rustic evocations of country life, the texture is frequently reduced to two real parts, sometimes even one as parallel octaves are introduced in imitation of improvised counterpoint.[553] Most of the arias, so designated by Picander and in Bach's autograph score, are really lieder. But the recitatives are in Bach's usual style, apart from quotations from two popular songs which the violin introduces into the first recitative.

The overture, even the work as a whole, could be considered a quodlibet, recalling not only the early work of that type attributed to Bach but also the last movement of the Goldberg Variations, published the previous year. From such examples we might conclude that Bach genuinely enjoyed "peasant" music, but that he enjoyed even more working it into sophisticated settings. Not every borrowed melody is from "rustic" sources; one aria is based on the melody known as

---

or the performer, but the title is the same as in Emanuel's copy. Tickets cost 30 crowns, the "text" 12.

[551] As noted by Dürr (2005, 919). She might have been called Liesgen within the family, but she was only six years old when Picander's libretto appeared, and she went on to marry Bach's pupil Altnickol in 1749.

[552] As documented in the 1748 *Hoff- und Staats-Calendar*. Whether the first performance of BWV 212 took place in the little village or in Leipzig itself, where Dieskau served as royal governor, is unknown. Information on the work's origin as well as identifications of the songs which it quotes are gathered in NBA, vol. 1/39, KB, pp. 121–31.

[553] Zohn (2008, 497–98) describes Telemann's *style polonais*, found in his "Concerto alla polonese" (TWV 43:G7) among other works.

La Folia. This is heard first as a ritornello, then combined in *Einbau* with praise of the "dear, congenial" chamberlain, although the phrases of the aria and those of the borrowed melody are oddly uncoordinated (ex. S11.44).[554] Bach took care to give a real aria to each of the singers, whose parts are not simple; both arias are in da capo form, and at least one is a parody.[555] The bigger of the two, given to the soprano, looks like a minuet aria from Cöthen, with virtuoso variations for flute perhaps added for the occasion.

The motets (p. 258, following the last printed page, "when he first came to Leipzig")

Two of the motets attributed to Bach are at least partly arrangements of music by other composers: BWV 231 and BC C8, based respectively on the second movement of Cantata 28 and a motet by Kuhnau. Bach's authorship of two others has also been questioned. The Weimar-period "Ich lasse dich nicht" (BWV Anh. 159) has been previously discussed. "Lobet den Herrn" (BWV 230) might be an arrangement, based on a Latin setting of the same psalm verses (Ps. 117:1–2), but whether Bach was responsible for either version is uncertain.[556] It might have had an origin similar to the powerful but problematical fragment BWV 50, a more massive but equally disputed setting of a biblical *dictum*, in fugal form.[557]

The five assured motets are listed in table S11.1. The earliest of these, BWV 228, seems to have been inspired by a motet by J. C. Bach of Eisenach; the texts of the two works include a common verse (Isaiah 43:1), which both combine with a chorale.[558]Naturally Sebastian takes things much further than his older cousin, writing for double chorus and at greater length, although his text includes only one other verse. The second half of his motet, setting the verse shared with Christoph Bach, is a double fugue with a chromatic main subject (ex. S11.45). Christoph's setting at this point is expressive and rhetorical, interjecting sighs in the form of rests into the lower voices when the chorale begins. Sebastian's is dramatic, the two choirs merging into one at this point and singing in longer, overlapping phrases. Yet his is also a subtle work, combining its

---

[554] Compare Bach's chorale aria in Cantata 156 (another collaboration with Picander). The tune is famous from Corelli's use of it in the last of his op. 5 violin sonatas. Bach uses a slightly different version.

[555] This is the bass's "Dein Wachstum sei feste," which (somewhat incongruously) praises Dieskau with the music of Pan's comic aria "Zu Tanze, zu Sprunge" from Cantata 201. The soprano aria might be from the lost cantata BWV Anh. 9 (Dürr 2005, 888), although the melody recurs in the final movement of a trio by J. G. Graun in the same key (GWV C:XV:90).

[556]

Hofmann (2000) leaves the question unresolved.

[557] Dürr (2005, 705–6) judiciously summarizes the conflicting views of Rifkin (2000) and Scheide (2001).

[558] Other reasons for the early dating of BWV 228 are some parallels with choruses in the Weimar-period Cantatas 63 (mvt. 7) and 21 (mvt. 9) and the employment of a form of the chorale melody apparently not used at Leipzig (Melamed 1995, 60–61).

complex counterpoint with intricate recapitulation patterns. The two choirs frequently exchange phrases, and the setting of the opening words, "Fear not" (shared by the two verses from Isaiah), returns near the middle and at the end as a as a reprise.

Table 11.2. Five motets

BWV	date	text	design
225	1726–27	Singet dem Herrn (Ps. verses + chorale)	"prelude-and-fugue"–chorale aria–"prelude-and-fugue"
226	1729	Der Geist hilft (Rom. 8:26–27)	"prelude-and-fugue" (followed by chorale?)
227	before 1723?	Jesu, meine Freude (chorale + Rom. 8)	chorale variations alternating with variously set bible verses
228	before 1717?	Fürchte dich nicht (Is. verses + chorale)	through-composed with reprise
229	before 1732	Komm, Jesu, komm (Thymich)	through-composed strophic aria

The desire to emulate an older predecessor while fulfilling a special memorial commission might have inspired any composer to special efforts, and each of Bach's four later motets has a unique form. BWV 227, which was probably the next one, is a favorite due to its readily grasped design: six stanzas of the chorale "Jesu, meine Freude" alternate with verses from the Epistle to the Romans. Unlike BWV 228, which is dramatic or cumulative in design, BWV 227 is symmetrical, with a double fugue setting of the New Testament verses at the center. There the antithesis between "flesh" and "spirit" is represented by a melisma within the first subject; this is later combined with a second subject setting the second clause of the text (ex. S11.46).[559] Framing this fugue are movements of various types, placed according to a symmetrical scheme so that the second and the penultimate movements share melodic material; the work begins and ends with "simple" four-part settings of the chorale melody. Despite its unified or integrated appearance, BWV 227 as we know it was probably a compilation of movements composed at various times.

Something similar may be true as well of BWV 226. Its opening section, with its seemingly effortless antiphony between the two four-voice choirs, has been plausibly explained as the elaboration of a vocal duet—perhaps from Cöthen, to judge from the style. Only the second and (probably) concluding section, a fugue, may have been entirely new at the time of Ernesti's burial service, composed perhaps under extreme time pressure. There, as in the fugue of BWV 228, Bach made things easier on himself by writing in just four parts, the two choirs joined in unison.[560]

[559] Rom. 8:9; a third clause (Wer aber Christi Geist nicht hat") is set only homophonically, in a brief coda, probably because of its negative or concessive sense.

[560] For the compositional history of both BWV 227 and 226, see Melamed (1995, 63–89). Whether the chorale that concludes BWV 227 in many modern editions really belongs there is uncertain.

The "prelude-and-fugue" design of BWV 226 recurs—twice—in BWV 225, where two outer sections of this type frame a central chorale aria. The term *aria* here means a simple polyphonic setting of a strophic poem, such as Bach would have found in a number of compositions by his predecessors in the Old Bach Archive. Instead of combining chorale and aria contrapuntally, as in the chorale arias of the cantatas, this one alternates between chorale and aria phrases, sung by the two respective choirs (ex. S11.47a). Curiously, Bach also weaves a second chorale melody into the counterpoint of the "aria," first heard in the bass and then imitated by the soprano (S11.47b).[561]

The joyful character of the outer sections, based on verses from Psalms 149 and 150, might seem to rule out the use of this motet as a funeral piece. But it would be hazardous to make any assumptions along those lines. The subject of the first fugue is reminiscent of the chorus known today as the "Cum sancto spirito" of the B-Minor Mass; that movement probably came from a lost cantata written during the mid-1720s, hence contemporary with Bach's autograph score of the present work (ex. S11.48). Although written for double choir, this fugue treats the second choir like a group of ripienists, accompanying the first with echoes of the opening words ("Sing to the lord"). The effect, grand enough when sung by voices alone, might be doubly so with instruments, but Bach's surviving manuscript parts are for voices and continuo only.

"Komm, Jesu, komm" (BWV 229), probably Bach's last motet in the usual sense of the word, is a more subtle work. Like "Der Geist hilft," it has a connection to the St. Thomas School, for its text comprises two stanzas of a poem originally written for the funeral of a former rector. Jacob Thomasius had died at Leipzig in 1684, his son Christian in 1728 at Halle—where he was one of the founders of the university, after being banished from Leipzig on account of his unorthodox views. The poem is by Paul Thymich, who also had taught at the School, and Bach is likely to have known the lovely little setting by Schelle,, who had preceded Kuhnau as cantor there. Bach's motet is far longer, although he gives the second stanza (the eleventh of the original poem) in a short four-part setting, as if it were a concluding chorale. The first (main) part of the motet treats each of the poem's six lines at length; the last, which incorporates a quotation from John 14:6 ("[you are] the truth and the light"), receives an oddly repetitious treatment, perhaps one reason this motet is performed relatively rarely.

Little is known about the one-movement work *O Jesu Christ, meines Lebens Licht*, BWV 118. Although Bach himself entitled it as a motet, today it is best understood as an unusual sort of chorale chorus. It seems to have been originally composed for a funeral procession around 1736, and this explains its slow pacing and unique form, evidently intended to allow an arbitrary number of repetitions of the vocal portion, which is framed by solemn ritornellos. These were originally played by a trombone choir joined by two *litui*, a Latin word probably used as a learned archaism for horns. Bach later replaced the trombones with strings and added the customary continuo part, presumably for church performance indoors. The original version would have made a strong impression, with its unusual low-brass sonorities and measured

[561] This is the last phrase of the melody "Mach's mit dir, Gott," which is related in general character and subject matter to the "aria" text, although the latter contains no direct quotations from the chorale poem.

treatment of the chorale melody, which turns chromatic with the final line's mention of the "burden of sin" (*Sündenlast*). Although in B-flat major, the dark coloration and predominantly minor-key harmonies for three of the four chorale phrases give the work an otherwordly quality. This makes it a harbinger of the learned chorale settings for organ that Bach was perhaps already preparing for publication.

Chapter 12

Bach's situation at the time of the letter to Erdmann, and afterward (p. 261, after the second complete paragraph, "the war that was about to break out")

Although Bach obviously was unhappy, it is impossible to know how serious he was about wanting to leave Leipzig. Nor can we know whether Danzig was a particular goal or just one of many places where he had been fishing for another position. Danzig, more than 350 miles northeast of Leipzig, was officially a Polish royal city under the direct rule of Bach's sovereign Augustus II. Although not the seat of a university, it was (like Hamburg) a former Hanseatic City and the chief commercial center of its region. Its population, moreover, was heavily German and Lutheran, and it held an annual trade fair. Hence Danzig shared some of the status within Poland that Leipzig enjoyed within Saxony.

Bach probably did not know that Danzig, unlike Leipzig, had entered a period of decline. This was to accelerate after 1734, when, following the death of Augustus II, the city supported the wrong side in the War of the Polish Succession. After a long siege it was occupied by Russian troops, suffering serious damage and forced to pay reparations. It was therefore probably fortunate that Bach would remain at Leipzig for the rest of his life. If he indeed experienced a crisis during the latter part of 1730, he soon revealed the same resilience that he had shown at other times of misfortune, reconciling himself to his situation and making the best of it.

His output of sacred vocal music would remain drastically lower than during the first years at Leipzig. But in a series of new secular cantatas performed by the Collegium Musicum he would declare his loyalty to the Saxon regime, securing for himself an honorary court title. Several of these cantatas, together with parodies and revisions of other vocal works, would become the basis for a series of exemplary sacred compositions in the form of oratorios and masses. He would also assemble several sets of exemplary works for organ and keyboard, some new, some reworkings of earlier compositions. Several of these, including the second volume of the Well-Tempered Clavier, would remain unprinted. Others would join the series of publications that he had begun issuing in 1726, completed only after his death with the issuing of the *Art of Fugue*.

As substantial as they are, these projects could not have required more than a fraction of the time and energy that Bach had expended on sacred cantatas during the first few years at Leipzig. Even the considerable quantity of new music from the 1730s and 1740s seems small by contrast, unless Bach really did compose another two annual cycles of church pieces, now all but lost. It has been suggested that by the 1740s Bach was suffering from "burn-out,"[562] and although that may be an exaggeration, we have already seen how periods of productivity in Bach's life gave way to fallow ones. Age or illness does not seem to have been a factor until Bach's last year or two, for he continued to travel for organ "tests" and other performances at least until mid-1747. As in previous periods, moreover, the trips that we happen to know about may be only a fraction of those actually undertaken, sometimes accompanied by Magdalena and one or more students.

---

[562] As suggested by the headline of a journalistic report of the discovery of the "Fleckeisen document" (see below), "New Bach discovery raises question of burn-out" ("Bach-Fund: Burnout oder kluges Kräftemanagement?"), dated Dec. 27, 2013, in *Deutsche Welle*, online here (German version here).

Travel might not have been the only endeavor to which Bach now devoted increased time and effort, not least in order to earn additional money. The latter had always been a concern, to judge from some of Bach's early squabbles with the Leipzig authorities. The Erdmann letter deals with the subject at greater length and with less tact than one might have expected, as when Bach complains about his reduced income from funerals, thanks to good weather. Not mentioned in the letter but probably of growing importance during this period was the growth of what was becoming in effect a family business: the sale not only of music, in both printed copies and manuscripts, but compositions by others, as well as books. This activity would have demanded increasing effort from Bach himself, if only for overseeing and proofreading the work of assistants; correspondence as well as the actual copying of music manuscripts would both have required time and attention.

Many of the surviving manuscript copies of music made by members of the Bach household were intended for sale, not their own studies.[563] At some point Bach also began renting out or acting as a sales agent for musical instruments, including a fortepiano.[564] Emanuel would carry on similar practices, at least after reaching Hamburg; letters and other documents from him make it clear that this was a considerable enterprise, bringing in significant funds. It may be that Sebastian's activity in this regard was considerably greater than we know from surviving sources, at times overlapping with or displacing his official work as cantor or music director.

Manuscript copying as well as instrument storage must have taken place in the same suite of rooms within the school building that housed the cantor, his family, and (perhaps) assistants. Bach's business undertakings seem to have expanded after a substantial renovation of the St. Thomas School building during 1731–32. This saw the addition of two stories to the original three. As Bach, like the rector, was granted an entire wing of the building, he now enjoyed (rent-free) what was by the standards of the time a spacious although not luxurious home.[565] For a year, as work was underway, the family lived in rented rooms in the house of a law professor.[566] Planning for the renovation, which cost more than 12,000 Taler, had been going on when Bach submitted his *Entwurff;* this might be one reason the council made no response. That he now received a seemingly generous improvement of his living conditions might be surprising, but it was part of a program of improvements to the school as a whole. The downside, for Bach, was that this program also included a shift in focus from music to the liberal arts.
When the renovation was finished, Bach could enjoy a composing studio in a corner room on the second floor. This made him "one of the very few Leipzigers who had a daily 180-degree

---

[563] See, e.g., Beißwenger (2002, 13–14) and Tomita (2007, 71–72).

[564] Heber (2017, 120–24) gathers together the available information on Bach's music-selling and instrument sales and rental business, including costs and prices where known.

[565]

Wolff (2000, 406) calculates the total square footage at 802, based apparently on architectural drawings by the Leipzig master builder George Werner, which he reproduces.

[566] Christoph Donndorf; the cost was borne by the city (see BD 2:215 [no. 296]).

prospect" of the surrounding area.[567] The view would have encompassed the river Pleisse, mentioned in several of the secular cantatas. An adjoining room provided additional work space, but, as the kitchen was located on the same floor, together with the master bedroom, noise levels and privacy are unlikely to have met standards that would be expected today in a middle-class dwelling. Nevertheless, the living space was doubtless an improvement over Bach's previous dwellings. From his office it was just a few steps to the school music library (where he may or may not have kept his own compositions). A few more steps took him to the "auditorium" or lecture hall for the *secunda* class, which Bernhard was attending at the time of the Erdmann letter.

Among the few compositions that Sebastian completed while the renovation was in progress was the popular BWV 140. The first cantata written in his refurbished studio might have been the lost one for the rededication of the building on June 5, 1732. Only the libretto by Bach's colleague Winckler survives, but the opening chorus was re-used in the Ascension Oratorio. If the latter retained its original musical features, this was a grand movement with trumpets and drums, in the same *galant* style that Bach used for the opening choruses in many of his secular cantatas of the period. Such music would have been appropriate for the reopening of a building whose remodeling mirrored the ongoing shift from the baroque toward the fashionable rococo style of the mid-eighteenth century.[568]

Whether or not this music reflected Bach's own feelings about the School, his activities during this period and for the next few years suggest some renewal of spirits and energy, if in fact these were ever much dampened. At the end of August 1731, Bach, as was customary, led a performance of the annual council election cantata. This was the sumptuous BWV 29, whose opening sinfonia includes a solo organ part, by way of introducing the splendid choral fugue that a year later became the "Gratias agimus" of the B-minor *Missa*. Bach presumably played the organ part himself, traveling shortly afterward to Dresden to perform at St. Sophia, the main Lutheran church, on the organ by Gottfried Silbermann. This earned him an admiring poem which, unfortunately, tells us nothing about what he actually played.[569] That performance took place on September 14; he may also have attended a performance of the opera *Cleofide*,

---

[567] Fröhde (1982, 17).

[568] The building was torn down in 1902. A photograph taken ca. 1885 (available online) shows the basic design unchanged, but many ornamental details had apparently been removed. These are visible in older representations, including an engraving by Krügner that shows the newly renovated structure (also online); Krügner had previously depicted the pre-renovation state (see fig. 10.1https://gdz.sub.uni-goettingen.de/id/PPN521325927?tify=%22view%22:%22export%22). Bach lived in the south wing, on the right in the photograph; the large triangular structure to the left is the rear of the St. Thomas Church.

[569] That Bach played more than once (*zu unterschiedlichen mahlen*) was reported in the same Hamburg newspaper that had recorded his two 1725 performances (BD 2:213–14 [nos. 294 and 294a]).

premiered the previous day by Hasse, recently appointed Capellmeister.[570] It is often stated that Wilhelm Friedemann joined his father on this occasion, but that appears to be a conjecture, based perhaps on Forkel's report that Sebastian would often ask his son, "shall we not go back to hear those nice Dresden tunes again?"[571]

Forkel, who could have got the story only from Friedemann, presents this as a slighting reference to trivial popular music, yet on the previous page he lists Hasse among contemporaries whom Sebastian admired.[572] Bach indeed seems to have been deliberately imitating Hasse's style during these years—or rather incorporating it alongside others in a style of his own that was only superficially *galant*. Particularly reminiscent of Hasse is the last aria in Cantata 112, composed a few months *before* this trip to Dresden. That Bach could now be compared to Orpheus by an anonymous poet shows that not all the attention at Dresden was focused on Hasse's opera, or on the latter's wife Faustina Bordone, who sang the title role. One imagines that Bach, a fellow celebrity theoretically equal in rank to Hasse, would have met the latter during this or another visit. At least one of the little pieces in Anna Magdalena's second keyboard book is from a sonata by Hasse, perhaps based on a complete copy that Sebastian picked up in the capital city.[573] Yet despite being paid by the elector far more than Bach received at Leipzig, Hasse and Faustina spent most of their time in Austria and Italy; only three of their periods in Dresden corresponded with one of Bach's known visits.[574]

A year later, during September 1732, Sebastian traveled with Anna Magdalena to Kassel, a good 140 miles due west.[575] They had buried their seventeen-month-old daughter Christiana Dorothea in August; the future composer Johann Christoph Friedrich Bach had been born two months earlier. The fact that Magdalena went on the trip with Sebastian suggests that they performed together, although the offical purpose of this trip was for him to examine the newly renovated organ at the "Great" church of St. Martin. According to a manuscript annotation of uncertain authority, one of the pieces that Bach performed was the "Dorian" prelude and fugue.[576] The

---

[570] Hasse had been appointed the previous year but arrived at Dresden only in July 1731.

[571] "wollen wir nicht die schönen Dresdener Liederchen einmahl wieder hören?" Forkel (1802, 48); in NBR, 461. How often Sebastian actually traveled to Dresden is unknown; seven visits are documented, including the one in 1717 for the contest with Marchand.

[572] *That* information, which includes Hasse alongside Handel, Telemann, and other older and younger contemporaries, came from a letter of C. P. E. Bach (BD 3:289 [no. 803]; NBR, 400 [no. 395]).

[573] This is the polonaise in G, BWV Anh. 130. The copy by Anna Magdalena is not precisely dated.

[574] Apart from September 1731, these occurred in May 1738 and November 1741.

[575] Bach's fee of 76 Taler and the even more generous outlay for his and Magdalena's accommodations are recorded in BD 2:228 (no. 318); NBR, 155–56 (no. 158).

[576] "played by S. Bach in the test of the great organ at Kassel" (*bey der Probe der großen Orgel in Cassel von S. Bach gespielt*). This information, in a manuscript copy now at New Haven (Yale

fugue would have made powerful use of a sub-contrabass pedal register, which, if still present, would have reminded Sebastian of the organ at St. Catherine's in Hamburg.[577] Bach on this occasion was said to have played on the pedals "as if his feet had wings." This could not have been unusual for him, but it so impressed the young Prince Friedrich of Hesse-Kassel, son of the regent Wilhelm, that he presented the composer with a precious ring from his own finger.[578] The prince, then twelve years old, was the same Friedrich who would later rent out Hessian troops to George III to finance his lavish court spending.

Although Kassel has no other Bach connection, the journey there is likely to have taken Sebastian and Magdalena through several towns where family members lived or had worked. Mühlhausen would have been a logical stopping point, as the renovation of the Kassel organ had been completed by the son-in-law of the recently deceased Mühlhausen maker Wender. There is, however, no record of a visit there until three years later, when Sebastian traveled with his son Bernhard for his audition as organist at the main city church of St. Mary's.

The *Missa* (p. 264, following the paragraph break, "his appointment the next day"

In the dedicatory letter accompanying the *Missa*, Bach requests the elector's "most mighty protection," a common formula which here, however, has real significance. For Bach first complains of "one insult [*Bekränckung*] after another" and of being denied fees due to him in his present office. Only then does he promise "unflagging zeal in the composition of music for the church as well as for the orchestra, dedicating all my strength to your service." Exactly what he meant by *Orchestre* has been debated; his syntax suggests that he was thinking of both "the church" and "the orchestra" not as venues or ensembles but as *occasions* for performance, much like the religious and civic ceremonies for which he had composed music for the Collegium.[579] Hence he was offering to write precisely the sort of music that he had already been producing at Cöthen and Leipzig, especially for noble birthdays and visits.[580] In return he asks not for a

---

University, LM 4839/5), was added to the title apparently by the original copyist Michael Gotthard Fischer; both he and the subsequent owner J. C. H. Rinck studied with Kittel, one of Bach's last pupils.

[577] The specifications of the renovated organ are not known, but the instrument had previously possessed a 32-foot pedal principal (Wolff and Zepf 2008, 40).

[578] BD 2:410 (no. 522), trans. in NBR, 334–35 (no. 338). Wilhelm ruled for his older brother Friedrich, who had married the queen of Sweden and was now king there (this explains the name of the inn where the Bachs stayed, "City of Stockholm"; see BD 2:228 [commentary to no 318]).

[579] "in Componirung der Kirchen Musique sowohl als zum Orchestre" (BD 1:74 [no. 27]; NBR, 158 [no. 162]). Oleskiewicz (2007) shows that the term *Orchestre* as used in Dresden documents could include "dancers and other personnel" as well as instrumentalists, although it was gradually taking on its modern meaning.

[580] As suggested by Rifkin (1986, 567).

working position at Dresden but for a document informing the local authorities of his appointment to the court *Capelle*—that is, one under the personal protection of the monarch.[581]

As with a later royal submission—the *Musical Offering* of 1747—there is no evidence that Bach's *Missa* was ever performed, nor that he expected it to be.[582] He had to wait more than three years to receive his appointment.[583] It has been supposed that the Dresden court withheld giving Bach even an honorary title while he held one from the cadet line at Weissenfels. Duke Christian, however, died on June 28, 1736, and less than a month later Bach resubmitted his request, receiving in turn a decree naming him court composer. This was dated November 19, and less than two weeks later Bach was in Dresden, performing on the new organ by Gottfried Silbermann at the Frauenkirche (Church of Our Lady). His performance was not the formal organ test or dedication, which had taken place a week earlier, but it was surely understood as a public demonstration of both the organ and the organist, whose recent appointment was mentioned in the newspaper report.[584] For such an event one would imagine that Bach prepared new tokens of his musical accomplishment; did they include some of the organ pieces that he would publish three years later in the third volume of the *Clavierübung?* Like the *Musical Offering*, these combine a *galant* surface with astounding compositional virtuosity.

The report of Bach's recital mentioned the presence in the audience of the Russian ambassador, Herrmann Carl von Keyserlingk. It was Keyserlingk, moreover, who delivered the formal notice of Bach's appointment to the composer.[585] Keyserlingk was a native of Courland, like the reigning empress Anna.[586] He must previously have been in touch with the Bach family,

---

[581] "ein Praedicat von Dero Hoff-Capelle . . . und deswegen zu Ertheilung eines Decrets, gehörigen Orths."

[582] Speculation about possible performances includes that of Schering (1936), arguing for a performance at St. Nicholas's during the new elector's first visit to Leipzig, and Wolff (2000, 368), asserting one at Dresden. Although Wollny (2016, 76–77) has revived Schering's idea, it remains without documentary support, and it is difficult to refute Rifkin's (1988, 792–96) arguments against a Dresden performance using the extant manuscript parts.

[583] His letter was stamped "received" on Aug. 19, and although that was destroyed in World War II, the accompanying manuscript performing parts remain to this day in the Dresden state library.

[584] BD 2:279 (no. 389); NBR, 188 (no. 191). The report also identifies Bach as Capellmeister at Weissenfels, suggesting that he was recognized as such by Christian's successor Johann Adolf II (one of the Saxon commanders during the recently concluded war). Bach continued to serve him, traveling to Weissenfels again in 1739 (BD 2:373 [no. 462]) and also probably providing at least the four chorale cantatas mentioned previously.

[585] As indicated in the surviving archival copy of the document, in BD 2:278–79 (no. 388), trans. in NBR, 188 (no. 190). Whether this took place in Leipzig or in Dresden is unknown; the original is lost.

[586] Now part of Latvia, Courland (Kurland, Curland) at the time was officially a Polish dependency, but it would be absorbed into Russia after the death of the last duke (Peter von

probably through Friedemann, who was now in his fourth year as organist at St. Sophia. The low pay which Friedemann received in that position would have forced him to find additional patronage; Keyserlingk was a likely source, and he must also have supported Sebastian's successful resubmission of his petition to be named court composer. He would continue to be a friend of the family as the unofficial dedicatee of the Goldberg Variations, and in 1748 he became a godfather of Johann Sebastian Bach the Younger, Emanuel's second son.[587]

By the time Sebastian received his court title, he had completed at least five further secular cantatas celebrating the ruling family, most of them with librettos by Picander. The first of these probably was already composed when Bach sent (or delivered himself) the original petition; the Collegium performed it less than a week later, on August 3, 1733, in Zimmermann's garden.[588] The four homage cantatas of the next thirteen months were presented during a time of active resistance in Poland. The rival king Stanisław Leszczyński, father-in-law of Louis XV of France, was elected at Warsaw in September 1733 and expelled from Danzig only the following June. This gave special meaning to works such as Cantata 213, for the birthday of the elector's son, and Cantata 214, for the queen. The former praises the eleven-year-old boy as a future Hercules; the latter gives its first aria to Bellona, goddess of war (even if she is accompanied by two flutes).

The "Calov Bible" (p. 265, after the first full paragraph, "the royal author of the psalms")

When it first came to the attention of scholars in 1969, the Calov Bible was celebrated as conclusive evidence for Bach's serious interest in and knowledge of theology. Yet Calov's commentary is untouched by the more "enlightened," philological approaches to bible reading that were being pioneered—without departing from Lutheran orthodoxy—by Bach's younger colleagues. Among these was J. A. Ernesti, conrector at the St. Thomas School since 1731 and from 1734 onward Bach's direct superior as rector.[589] We know nothing of Bach's discussions, if any, with his more learned colleagues at the school on such matters as Latin etymology or biblical hermeneutics—specialties, respectively, of the successive rectors Gesner and J. A. Ernesti. Their more modern type of scholarship contrasts sharply with that evidently admired by Bach. He reveals some of the enthusiasm of an amateur, as he seizes upon concrete references to music and musicians in scripture and in Calov's commentaries, finding justification for his own status and opinions.

Biron). C. P. E. Bach's W. 43 concertos are dedicated to the latter, who like other members of the region's German aristocracy was a notable patron of music.

[587] In addition, Friedemann dedicated a reprint of his second published sonata (F. 5 in E-flat) to Keyserlingk in 1763.

[588] As announced four days earlier (BD 2:239 [no. 334]); the music (BWV Anh. 12) is lost.

[589] Although Ernesti did shift the curriculum away from music, Leaver (2017, 186) shows that he was not anti-orthodox or a full-fledged rationalist.

An echo of Bach's annotations in the Calov bible can nevertheless be seen in a recently unearthed document that seems to record the initial response of the St. Thomas faculty to the restrictions on their prerogatives made in the 1723 school regulations.[590] The document alludes to the bible passages that Bach underlined before continuing with justifications based on more recent history for the maintenance of a high standard of musical training and practice. One gains the impression that the cantor's colleagues, while aware of his idealistic view of his position, based on scripture, saw it necessary to supplement this with arguments based on recent history, especially the Lutheran tradition that made music central to religious practice.

We know of no new sacred music by Bach from this immediate period. Instead, Bach may already have been turning his creative energies toward revision and "perfection" of existing works. Contemplating the orderly structure of music in the ancient Temple—which Bach admired, to judge from highlighted passages in the Calov Bible—might have reinforced his own tendencies toward system and consolidation. It could also have provided some solace or relief in the face of adverse developments that soon arose in Bach's life, both at home and professionally.

Bernhard Bach (p. 268, following the first paragraph break, "ostensibly beginning university studies at Jena")

In returning to Mühlhausen with his third son, Sebastian took control at a crucial moment in the life of one of his children, as he had done for Friedemann. Perhaps this eased Bernhard's path, but it could hardly have freed him from any sense of dependency. It must have been a little unusual for a father to show up at his grown sons' auditions. Would this have helped their chances? made them more or less nervous? On these occasions Sebastian looks like a modern "helicopter parent," at least with regard to two of his three oldest sons, whose self-assurance might already have been threatened by growing up in a household headed by such an over-achieving father. Yet Bach may have thought he was doing only what a master teacher was expected to do for any capable student. When in 1743 his pupil Doles found himself in a bind between two potential employers, Sebastian (perhaps remembering his own indecision with respect to the Halle position) solved the dilemma by writing two unusually long and detailed letters that recommended an alternative candidate.[591]

Friedemann, at least, seems to have had difficulty dealing with people from early in life, requiring the sort of hand-holding that his father could provide. The historian Stählin, who knew the older Bach sons during his own studies in Leipzig, remembered Friedemann as "elegant and a little affected," suggesting a certain self-regard or standoffishness. By contrast, Emanuel was "natural, profound, thoughtful, yet also amusing in company." Stählin says nothing specific about Bernhard, whom, however, he calls "windy." This referred to his flute playing but could

---

[590] Given in full in Maul (2018, 168–71).

[591] The letters, in BD 5:269–71 (nos. A 45c–d), were first reported by Langusch (2007). They went to the Prussian garrison town of Salzwedel, where Bach's pupil Doles had auditioned only to accept a better job closer to home; Bach recommended in his place another student, Gottlob Friedrich Türsch.

also have been a pun referring to vanity or thoughtlessness.[592] It was Emanuel who charmed Stählin "on a nearly daily basis by their mutual friendship and conversation."[593] That Emanuel was also the one who eventually traded a Saxon organ loft for an entrepreneurial career in Prussia suggests that, of Maria Barbara's three sons, only he achieved real autonomy at an early age.

In Bernhard's case, a constant parental presence might have been even more necessary than with Friedemann. After leaving home, his career took a downhill slide, as he acquired debts that he could not pay off. After just nineteen months he left Mühlhausen for Sangerhausen—where Sebastian had won his first organ audition but not the position. Again Sebastian sent letters ahead of Bernhard,[594] and again he traveled with his son for the audition, also passing through Weissensee to inspect the organ there, as he had done a year and a half earlier.[595]

Perhaps there was nothing out of the ordinary in the fact that the mayor (*Bürgermeister*) of Sangerhausen, to whom Sebastian wrote, found it advisable to request two testimonials attesting to Bernhard's character from his counterpart in Mühlhausen.[596] Both, apparently, were favorable, although this might merely reflect the fact that in February 1737 Bernhard had sent a proper letter of resignation to the Mühlhausen authorities. Yet the real purpose of Bernhard's resignation letter was to request reimbursement for costs incurred two years earlier, when he had auditioned there.[597] Clearly he needed money, and although Sebastian made good the debts racked up in Mühlhausen, he refused to do so after Bernhard disappeared from Sangerhausen in spring 1738.[598]

---

[592] As Kulukundis points out (2016, 261). Stählin mentions having played flute duets with Bernhard.

[593] "Je suis charmé du celebre Emanuel Bach de notre mutuelle amitié et conversation presque journaliere à Leipsig" (BD 5:235 [no. C 895b]).

[594] BD 1:91–94 (nos. 37–38); NBR, 186–87 (nos. 188–89).

[595] Bach mentioned visiting Sangerhausen in his letter to Anna Margarete Klemm (BD 1:109 [no. 43]; NBR, 201 [no. 204]). The organ tests at Weissensee, which took place on June 22, 1735, and December 16, 1737, are recorded in local archival documents (BD 5:155 [no. B 365a] and 5:158–59 [nos. B 425a, B 427a]).

[596] One of these letters survives (BD 2:284 [no. 396]).

[597] Wollny (1996, 20–21) reproduces the letter, whose content is summarized by Kulukundis (2016, 262).

[598] Sebastian wrote separately to the mayor of Sangerhausen and to the latter's wife (BD 1:107–10 [nos. 42–43], trans. in NBR, 200–202 [nos. 203–4]), explaining to the first that he has covered his son's debts in Mühlhausen and to both that he cannot do the same for Sangerhausen without Bernhard's acknowledging the debts himself, either in writing or in person—the latter being impossible as Sebastian has not seen him since their joint visit.

The letter which Bach now sent to the mayor of Sangerhausen paints a picture of parental anguish not free of anger. Bach describes himself as "bearing my cross in patience," his son as "wayward," Bernhard's conduct "evil."[599] Abandoning his son to divine mercy, Sebastian seems to accept no responsibility for how Bernhard turned out, although this might have been a necessary position to take in a letter whose purpose is to repudiate any liability for his son's debts. Whatever Sebastian's feelings, they would have grown deeper and more complicated when news reached Leipzig of Bernhard's death in spring 1739. He had gone to Jena, enrolling as a law student in the university there, but after just four months some illness took his life. How he paid his matriculation fee or other expenses is unknown, nor is there any word as to whether he sought out Johann Nicolaus Bach, the composer and instrument maker who been organist there since 1694 and was now the senior member of the family. It is hard to believe, however, that Bernhard's presence would have escaped notice of his older cousin, from whom Sebastian must have eventually learned of his son's death.[600]

Controversies and "insults" (tables) (p. 268, following the first complete paragraph, "a period of about two years")

[599] "so muß mein Creutz in Geduld tragen, meinen ungerathenen Sohn aber lediglich Göttlicher Barmhertzigkeit überlaßen . . . werden die üble Aufführung meines Kindes nicht mir imputiren" (BD 1:107 [no. 42]).

[600] Walther, in a hand-written update to his personal copy of the *Lexicon* (1729, 64), attributed Bernhard's death to a "hitziger Fieber" (high temperature, BD 2:231 [no. 323]). The source of the information is unknown but must have been a mutual acquaintance, perhaps Johann Nicolaus Bach.

Table S12.1. The "Battle of the Prefects," the Scheibe controversy, and the Collegium Musicum, 1734–39

Events relating to the "Battle of the Prefects" are shown in normal type; those relating to Scheibe are in italics; and entries regarding the Collegium are underlined.

1734

Nov. 21	Johann August Ernesti installed as rector of the St. Thomas School.

1736

around June 15	Bach names J. G. Krause as head prefect.
July 10	Bach attempts to replace Krause but is overruled by Ernesti.
Aug. 12–19	Bach writes four successive protests to the city council, complaining of Krause's bad character and inability to beat time properly.
Aug. 17	Ernesti replies to Bach's third complaint, accusing him of being untruthful.

1737

Feb. 6	The city council decides in Ernesti's favor.
Feb. 12	Bach appeals to the church consistory, repeating complaints previously made to the city council.
Feb. 13	The consistory responds by asking the council to look into the matter.
May 14	*Scheibe publishes his first (brief) "letter from a capable traveling musician," criticizing Bach and his music in general terms.*
Summer?	Bach suspends his directorship of the Collegium Musicum.
Aug. 21	Bach complains again to the consistory; again the consistory refers the matter to the council, which takes no action.
Oct. 18	Bach appeals to the elector.
Dec. 17	The elector leaves the decision in the hands of the council.

1738

early January	*Birnbaum replies (at length) to Scheibe on behalf of Bach.*
Feb. 18	*Scheibe responds to Birnbaum about the use of the word* Musikant.
March	*Scheibe writes a longer general response to Birnbaum.*

1739

March	*Birnbaum publishes another defense of Bach, later reprinted by Scheibe with extensive annotations (1745).*
March 27	*Performance of Bach's St. John Passion (?) at St. Nicholas's cancelled; Scheibe's passion oratorio performed at the New Church by Gerlach.*
April 2	*Scheibe publishes a satire of Bach.*
Oct. 2	Bach returns to the Collegium Musicum, continuing to at least Aug. 3, 1740.

Table S12.2. Documents relating to the "Battle of the Prefects"

date	author	original document	English translation
Aug. 12, 1736	Bach	BD 1:82–83 (no. 32)	NBR, 172–73 (no. 181)
Aug. 13, 1736	Bach	BD 1:85–86 (no. 33)	NBR, 173–75 (no. 182)
Aug. 15, 1736	Bach	BD 1:87–88 (no. 34)	NBR, 175–76 (no. 183)
Aug. 17, 1736	Ernesti	BD 2:268–73 (no. 382)	NBR, 176–82 (no. 184)
Aug. 19, 1736	Bach	BD 1:90–92 (no. 35)	NBR, 182–83 (no. 185)
Sept. 13, 1736	Ernesti	BD 2:274–76 (no. 383)	NBR, 183–85 (no. 186)
Sept. 27, 1736	Bach (lost)	BD 1:91 (no. 36)	
Feb. 6, 1737	council	BD 1:99–100	NBR, 189–90 (no. 192)
Feb. 12, 1737	Bach	BD 1:95–97 (no. 39)	NBR, 190–91 (no. 193)
Feb. 13, 1737	consistory	BD 2:282 (no. 394)	
April 6–10, 1737	council	BD 2:285 (no. 398)	
Aug. 21, 1737	Bach	BD 1:97–100 (no. 40)	NBR, 192–93 (no 194)
Aug. 28, 1737	consistory	BD 2:288–89 (no. 401)	
Oct. 4, 1737	council	BD 2:290 (no. 403)	
Oct. 18, 1737	Bach	BD 1:101–6 (no. 41)	NBR, 194–95 (no. 195)
Dec. 17, 1737	elector	BD 2: (no. 406)	NBR, 195–96 (no 196)

The "Battle of the Prefects" (p. 269, following the one complete paragraph, "in favor of Ernesti")

The controversy had consequences for both present and future students at the school, one of whom recalled that from then onward the cantor and rector were always at odds: Bach hated the students who devoted themselves to the humanities, and if Ernesti came across a student practicing an instrument, he would ask the latter "Do you want to become a beer fiddler," that is, an ignorant busker.[601] Their differences were not only over matters of principle and status; money was also involved, as Ernesti and Steiglitz evidently now solicited donations for funds that excluded the cantor and musically active students. Meanwhile Ernesti was excused from certain duties, which could explain why Bach felt justified in skipping out on some of those assigned to him.[602] One likely result of these developments was to damage the reputation of the school as a musical training center. After Bach's death, Quantz, in his famous flute treatise, would criticize unmusical school directors, clearly alluding to Ernesti.[603] Leipzig, in fact, may

[601] Johann Friedrich Köhler, in BD 3:314 (no. 820), trans. in NBR, 172 (no. 180). Köhler's manuscript collection of notes concerning the history of the school, begun in 1775, seems to derive mainly from the Obituary and other printed sources, insofar as Bach is concerned, but a long paragraph about his relationship to Ernesti gives the impression of coming from firsthand knowledge.

[602] Maul (2017, 50–51) details the unequal distribution of duties and new legacy monies.

have come to be viewed as a city of philistines, for Mizler lamented that there, "where the Muses once set their seat, there is hardly a connoisseur or lover of true music."[604]

Bach must have been relieved to receive his court title during fall 1736, in the midst of the conflict. But if he had expected it to give him more sway in the matter, he was disappointed. He comes off looking poorly in this matter, waffling in his choice of first prefect and involving the students in the dispute between a youthful, idealistic new rector and a proud older subordinate who had not previously been held accountable to anyone. The self-righteousness that might be seen in some of his entries in the Calov Bible comes to the fore in his ill-conceived appeals to the consistory and then to the electoral court. Neither of the latter could have wished to involve themselves in a petty matter that must have seemed to be about little more than Bach's wounded pride. Ernesti could appeal to a perception of Bach as puffed-up and venal, at one point accusing him of thinking it "beneath his dignity" to direct music for wedding services that required only chorales—that is, not earning Bach an extra fee for new music.[605] The students favored by Ernesti probably did lack the musical capability that Bach looked for in those performing his compositions. But Bach could not win this "battle," which set him against some of the most powerful men in Leipzig. He must have understood this after his appeals to the consistory and the elector led nowhere (so far as we know).

This may look like a tempest in a teapot, and whether it amounted to much more than petty institutional politics may be doubted, even if it involved something more than the selection of a boy for a largely honorary position. Musically talented boys continued to come to the School, and even Ernesti acknowledged the necessity of their receiving some basic musical training. Bach's defeat in this "battle" might have been a reason for his subsequent failure to create new church cantatas. Yet he had already turned away from writing such compositions, and as the actual degree of participation in them by the boys is uncertain, the direct effect on Bach's

---

[603] As pointed out by Maul (2017, 52–53), although his supposition that the reference stems from J. F. Agricola is open to question. Agricola might have played a role in preparing his teacher's work for publication, as he did that of Tosi (1723) and Adlung (1768). But to call him Quantz's "probable ghost writer" is to exaggerate the "working out" (*Ausarbeitung*) that the philosopher J. A. Eberhard (1800, cols. 872–73) attributed to Agricola. Eberhard cites this as an example of the same literary "dressing up" (*Einkleidung*) that Sulzer carried out on behalf of Schulz and Kirnberger. Quantz could have learned of the situation at Leipzig from many others besides Agricola, including Emanuel and Sebastian Bach.

[604] "Nur Schade, daß an einem so berühmten Orte, da die Musen ihren Sitz aufgeschlagen haben, gleichwol so gar wenig Kenner und Liebhaber einer wahren Musik sind" (Mizler 1738–47, 3/3: 532). This immediately follows the reference to Johann Schneider, cited below, as the best player of preludes (*Vorspiele*) at Leipzig, apart from his teacher Bach.

[605] "es ihm unanständig sey," BD 2:273 (no. 382), trans. in NBR, 181 (no. 184). Bach was entitled to a fee for every marriage by a Leipzig citizen, regardless of where it took place and whether or not Bach himself was present. He had successfully defended this prerogative just three years earlier, after appealing to the consistory (BD 1:77–78 [no. 29], trans. in NBR, 160–61 [no. 164]). His success on that occasion might have led him to attempt a similar appeal in 1737.

creative output is also uncertain. It might have been negligible—yet anyone who has been unjustly treated by an employer understands how deep and genuine could be the psychological wounds that arose from living and working in a hostile environment, and from being subjected to demeaning treatment by uncomprehending superiors.

Background on Scheibe (p. 270, following the end of the printed page, "'for they strive against nature'")

Scheibe had attended the St. Nicholas School and the university at Leipzig, and in 1731 Bach had written a short recommendation for him, praising his capacities as keyboard player, violinist, and composer.[606] Scheibe would go on to become royal Danish Capellmeister, composing vocal and instrumental works in a style inspired by Graun and Hasse, the two composers whose music was *not* disparaged by his fictional letter writer. At the time the latter was published, however, Scheibe was free-lancing in Hamburg, having left Leipzig the year before. Bach would have been one of the judges who favored his own pupil Johann Schneider over Scheibe in 1729, when auditions were held to fill the position of organist at the church of St. Nicholas.[607] Alongside Bach and the other musicians pilloried by Scheibe eight years later were the three next most prominent Leipzig organists, Schneider among them.

Birnbaum claimed that Scheibe had failed the 1729 audition because of his inability to perform a proper (*regelmäßig*) fugue; Scheibe denied this.[608] Clearly, Scheibe had a personal axe (or axes) to grind. Yet he could justify his views as deriving from the rationalist philosophy of the arts then being developed by Gottsched at the university.[609] Although Sebastian Bach might have given him a failing grade as a contrapuntist, Emanuel would later exchange letters and publications with him, perhaps privately sharing some of Scheibe's critical views of his father's music.[610] Scheibe actually treated Sebastian with greater respect than some of the other musicians criticized in the letter, whom he attacked mercilessly.[611] In later issues of the *Critischer Musicus* he praised Bach's keyboard music, especially the Italian Concerto (published

[606] This is dated April 4, 1731, less than two weeks after the first performance of Bach's St. Mark Passion (BD 1:136–37 [no. 68]; NBR, 153 [no. 153]).

[607] Mizler named Schneider as Bach's pupil in his *Musikalische Bibliothek* (BD 2:445 [no. 565]).

[608] Birnbaum: BD 2:344 (no. 441); Scheibe: BD 2:365 (no. 446). It is unclear whether by *ausführen* Birnbaum referred to an improvised or a written fugue.

[609] Scheibe based his aesthetics on Gottsched's (see Birke 1966), modeling his own publication, even its title, on the latter's most famous book (*Versuch über einer critischen Dichtkunst*).

[610] Emanuel's letters to Scheibe do not survive, but they are mentioned in his correspondence from the 1770s with the poet Gerstenberg; see letters 45, 45a, and 58 in Clark (1997).

[611] As Maul (2013, 134) points out.

in 1735. When in 1745 he published a revised edition of the *Critischer Musicus*, he claimed that his portrait of Bach was meant to be more complimentary than adverse.[612]

The Scheibe controversy and the Collegium (p. 272, following the paragraph break, "learning and connoisseurship in the arts generally")

Birnbaum's points are not all semantic. He argues that the French composers Grigny and Dumage also wrote out all their ornaments, although this is a little misleading.[613] The French tradition was to notate symbols that stood for simple formulaic ornaments such as trills, but Bach also wrote out in notes the florid embellishments that were added improvisatorily by performers in the Italian Baroque style. On another matter, Scheibe saw Bach's use of dissonance and counterpoint as obscuring the expressive significance of his music, constituting empty compositional display. Birnbaum, in response, cites precedents for Bach's contrapuntal style, mentioning the contrapuntal music of Palestrina and Lotti—whose works Bach was studying and performing around this time.[614] He also replies that dissonance can express "various emotions, especially somber ones," claiming that in this Bach accurately imitates nature—imitation of nature being the aim of the arts according to Gottsched and his followers, including Scheibe. Yet Scheibe follows current fashion in accepting only simple homophonic music, dominated by a single melody, as "natural." On this point Birnbaum's reply begs the question, never explaining how any sort of music could be "natural."[615]

Scheibe at first responded only by insisting that his use of the word *Musicant* was entirely proper, not an insult.[616] This led Mizler to declare that henceforth he would refer to Scheibe as a *critischer Musicant*, as indeed he did in subsequent installments of his *Musikalische Bibliothek*.[617] In 1739 Birnbaum published a second, much longer "Defense of Bach Against Scheibe's Attacks," which Scheibe eventually reprinted, with his own replies added in the form of lengthy footnotes.[618] Scheibe's first response to this "Defense," however, had been to publish

---

[612] "vielmeher rühmlich, als nachtheilig." This appears in the foreword of the new edition, excerpted in BD 2:415 (no. 530).

[613] Bach's autograph manuscript copy of Grigny's *Premier livre d'orgue* (Paris, 1699) survives in Frankfurt, Universitätsbibliothek, Mus. Hs. 1538. Presumably he also owned a copy of Dumage's publication of the same title (Paris, 1708).

[614] As Wolff (2000, 438) notes.

[615] This is one of the observations made by Buelow (1974–75) in a not unreasonable "defence of Scheibe."

[616] Scheibe (1738, 203–4), only partially excerpted in BD 2:309 (no. 413), translated more fully in NBR, 348-49 (no. 345).

[617] Mizler 1738–47, 1/6:71–73; this is translated in NBR, 349–50 (no. 346), with an incorrect reference to BD 2:322 (no. 420), which in fact is an unrelated passage.

[618] No original printed copy survives of Burnbaum's *Verteidigung Bachs gegen Scheibes Angriffe*, which bore a dedication to Bach dated March 1739. It is known only from Scheibe's

another fictional letter, this time signed "Cornelius." The latter offers satirically excessive praise of a conceited composer of contrapuntal "masterpieces."[619]

Whether or not Bach felt personally wounded or betrayed by these attacks from (probably) a former student, he would have recognized the latter as the same sort of person who was making his life difficult within the St. Thomas School: a youthful scholar, with university training in current rationalist thought, who had no respect for or true understanding of the type of learning that Bach's music epitomized. He must have been cheered not only by Birnbaum's support but that of Mizler, whose *Musicalische Bibliothek*, more learned and wider-ranging than Scheibe's *Critischer Musicus*, demonstrated by example that music was indeed "a part of the discipline of philosophy," that is, a science, as Mizler had argued in his dissertation.[620] Mizler's views on this subject must have reflected not only his studies in theology at the university with Gesner and Gottsched but his experience as an amateur performing with the Collegium Musicum.

Gottsched did not take a public stance on the matter, but he may not have been entirely pleased by Scheibe's appropriation of some of his words in the *Critischer Musicus.* A review of the latter by Gottsched's wife, although explicitly choosing not to take sides in the Scheibe-Birnbaum controversy, seems to go out of its way to praise Bach (and Weiss) alongside Handel, Telemann, Hasse, and Graun.[621] Sebastian shared the common favorable view of those last four composers—at least according to Emanuel Bach, nearly forty years later.[622] But he might have been bemused by Scheibe's praise for Graun's "politeness" (*Höflichkeit*)—whether this was meant to describe the latter's music or his personality—and for Hasse's "inventions," which in Scheibe's view accorded closely with the texts that he set to music.[623]

In fact both younger composers were tending away from the concrete type of word-tone relationship ("text painting") that remains so prominent in Bach's music. Their preference, at least in their mature works, was for a more generalized approach to musical expression.

---

annotated reprint, published as an appendix to the second edition of his *Critischer Musicus* (1745); excerpts (only) in BD 2:340–60 (no. 441).

[619] BD 2:360–62 (no. 442). Maul (2013, 136) interprets "Cornelius's" letter as a parody of Gesner's praise of Bach, who in Scheibe's version twice calls himself "the greatest citharist and greatest composer in the world." The *cithara* was a type of lyre, understood as the ancient equivalent of a modern bowed or, in this case, keyboard stringed instrument.

[620] *Dissertatio quod musica ars sit pars eruditionis philosophicae* (Leipzig, 1734).

[621] As pointed out by Maul (2013, 138). The review, which Scheibe had requested (see Maul 2010, 173–76), was published in 1740 in Gottsched's *Beyträge zur Critischen Historie der Deutschen Sprache*. The Gottscheds must have agreed to remain silent about Scheibe's criticism of three volumes of songs published by Mizler, one of them dedicated to L. A. V. Gottsched.

[622] As he wrote to Forkel, in BD 3:289 (no. 803); NBR, 400 (no. 395).

[623] "Seine Erfindungen stimmen mit den Worten überein." Both quotations are from the sixth issue of Scheibe's *Critischer Musicus*, singled out by Maul (2013, 129 and 133).

Elsewhere Scheibe compared Bach's church cantatas unfavorably to those of Telemann and Graun; Bach's, he argued, were "always more artificial and difficult."[624] This constituted one of the first instances of what would become a cliché, in which Bach was compared unfavorably to another composer—more often Handel—whose expressivity was not hindered by counterpoint and other supposed obscurities. An anonymous "Comparison of Bach and Handel," often attributed to Emanuel Bach, was a response to this charge, which still rankled forty years after Scheibe's first published critique.[625]

Scheibe might merely have been putting into print what was commonly said by like-minded thinkers, including the new rector of the St. Thomas School. Certainly Scheibe's critique could be considered another salvo in the "battle of the prefects." For it might have justified putting a limit on the amount of time and energy required of any student forced to perform Bach's difficult music. The repeated assertion that Bach's music was old-fashioned and inexpressive, concerned chiefly with complex technical craftsmanship, contributed to a false perception still sometimes shared today. To be sure, Bach's music *is* difficult and complex. But to attack his compositions on that basis was to attack the serious, intensive cultivation of music that Bach and his adherents understood as service to God and one's neighbor. His critics considered it a self-aggrandizing waste of time to perform such music. Even if Bach was not conceited or vain about his virtuosity, he might have appeared that way to younger contemporaries, especially those whose abilities were not rated very highly by the older musician.

At least through spring 1736, Bach had remained engaged as a church musician, to the extent that he performed a revised version of the great St. Matthew Passion on March 30. That October he presented the last and arguably the most beautiful of his homage cantatas for the ruling house, BWV 206.[626] But no new sacred works are known from 1736 or 1737, with the possible exception of the anomalous motet BWV 118 and the wedding cantata BWV 197. The Easter and Ascension oratorios probably followed in 1738, but Bach was essentially finished as a composer of church cantatas, apart from parodies and revisions. What might be considered his last such work, BWV 30 for St. John's Day 1738, is a reworking of a homage cantata from the previous September, composed for a local landholder (like the Peasant Cantata five years later). Both versions of Cantata 30 are almost aggressively *galant*, replete with fashionable "alla zoppa" and "Lombardic" rhythms and entirely avoiding imitative counterpoint. One aria even includes a written-out cadenza at the end of the B section, a common element of opera seria but otherwise unknown in Bach's music.

Could Bach have performed such a piece as a response to Scheibe? If so, was it to prove to the public that (as Mizler claimed) he was capable of composing in the *galant* style? Or was he

---

[624] "allemahl künstlicher und mühsamer," from remarks published by Mattheson, in BD 2:307 (no. 411).

[625] BD 3:437–44 (no. 927), trans. in NBR, 401–9 (no. 396).

[626] Actually this work appears to have been started in fall 1734, then set aside for BWV 215 (one of the models of the Christmas Oratorio) when Bach discovered that the elector would be present for the performance during the St. Michael's Fair (see NBA, vol. 1/36, KB, pp. 166–68).

addressing more specifically the students and others who might have participated in the performance, trying to win back his place as head of the Collegium? It could be that, even before 1737, Bach was encountering resistance from members of the Collegium who shared Scheibe's views of his music. Perhaps that this is why he stepped down from its leadership in favor of Gerlach, organist at the New Church, for two years. Yet Scheibe must have stirred up animosity toward others beside Bach. He had expressed contempt for Gerlach as well as Schneider, organist at St. Nicholas's. However prejudiced he might have been, he could not have entirely fabricated his report that Gerlach and Schneider were enemies, routinely slandering one another. Gerlach must have been distressed by Scheibe's description of him as a plagiarist, "too inept" to compose is own music. Yet he and Schneider might also have been taken aback by Birnbaum's failure to defend them when he took up his pen to justify Bach.

It is odd that it was Gerlach who, despite his alleged failings, took over the Collegium for about two years, beginning in summer or fall 1737.[627] It is even odder that, two years later, he had apparently made peace with Scheibe, leading performances of compositions by the latter at the New Church.[628] Among these was a passion oratorio given on Good Friday 1739—the very day on which Bach, for reasons unknown, was prevented by the Leipzig authorities from performing a passion at St. Nicholas's. What Bach wound up performing that day is unknown—certainly not one of his own great passions, for when informed of the decision by a city official ten days earlier, he replied that he had never had to seek permission previously; besides, performing passions was "only a burden," and he "got nothing out of it."[629]
It could be that the authorities objected to the sheer length of one of Bach's works, or to the time and, perhaps, money required for rehearsing it, especially if a significant number of students and city musicians were involved. Possibly, too, Gerlach had already made arrangements to have members of the Collegium perform a simpler and more up-to-date "poetic passion" at the New Church. That would have added to Bach's difficulties in preparing for his own passion performance, at a time when he was no longer directing the Collegium as such. Also during March 1739, however, Birnbaum published his second, longer defense of Bach. It is hard to believe that this was sufficient to turn opinions back in Bach's favor. Yet within six months Bach was again directing the Collegium, leading music for the royal birthday during the Michaelmas

[627] Bach is no longer mentioned in the announcement of the Collegium's performance for the ruler's name day (Aug. 3); Gerlach is named explicitly in relation to the performance for the royal birthday two months later. See Neumann (1960, 6–7 and 17).

[628] Maul (2013, 140–41) proves the performance of Scheibe's works by Gerlach; could Scheibe's earlier criticism of Gerlach therefore have been over the latter's unauthorized use of Scheibe's music? Jerold (2011, 39), arguing that Walther's identification of Gerlach was incorrect, supposes that an eighteenth-century composer, like a modern one, would have been glad for any performances.

[629] The order to shut down Bach's passion performance had come from the city council; see BD 2:338–39 (no. 439), trans. in NBR, 204 (no. 208).

fair on October 2.[630] With his return to the Collegium Bach appears to have got back on his feet, if he had ever really been off them. During the same autumn fair he announced the publication of part 3 of the *Clavierübung*.[631] This followed a trip (perhaps in September) to Altenburg, thirty miles to the south, to play the organ in the court chapel.[632]

Even when not officially serving as a collegium director, Bach continued to perform publicly with students from the university. One such occasion even competed directly with a performance by what had been his own Collegium, now under Gerlach's direction.[633] The work performed on that occasion, perhaps not coincidentally, was the one whose *galant* style was praised by Mizler, and for at least a year or two Bach seems to have resumed his previous activity. But in 1741 Zimmermann died. Concerts continued to take place in his garden and coffeehouse, the latter now owned by Enoch Richter. The organization once led by Bach, however, soon faced competition from a third concert presenter organized on somewhat different principles. The "Grosses Concert" was offering performances by 1743; Bach was not among the founders or participants.[634]

These "great concerts," which Gerlach took over in 1746, were supported by annual subscription, sixteen contributors facilitating performances whose audiences, like those of the collegia, could number into the hundreds.[635] The performers continued to be a mix of students, amateur music-lovers, and the occasional hired ringer, but wealthy Leipzig citizens were now emulating the practice of Prussian and Saxon royalty of offering concerts as a public service. The repertory, which included passion oratorios, appears to have been similar to that of performances which Telemann had been leading at Hamburg for some time and which Handel was now giving at London. There is evidence that at least one concerto by C. P. E. Bach was in the repertory, but Sebastian and his music seem to have been left "out of the loop."[636]

---

[630] The work performed is unidentified; that this was Bach's first performance as the returning director is clear from a letter of Elias Bach (BD 2:369–70 [no. 455]; NBR, 204–5 [no. 210]) asa well as a newspaper announcement (BD 2:371 [no. 457]).

[631] On Sept. 30, 1739 (BD 2:370 [no 456]).

[632] BD 2:368 (no. 453).

[633] This was on April 27, 1738, when Bach performed the lost BWV Anh. 13 to celebrate the marriage of Saxon Princess Maria Amalie; the title page mentions the participation of university students (BD 2:326 [no. 424]). On the same evening Gerlach led a performance by what had been the "Bachsche" Collegium Musicum (Neumann 1960, 11 and 17–18).

[634] As noted by Glöckner (2008a, 83). Görner, meanwhile, had "invaded" (*eingedrungen*) the still-functioning Zimmermann garden with his own collegium, for the royal name day performance in 1745 (Neumann 1960, 10).

[635] Annual subscriptions cost 20 Taler. Information on the concerts is from the city chronicle kept by Johann Salomon Riemer, as given by Wustmann (1889–95, 1:425).

[636]

By 1744 the "Bachische" Collegium had passed under the direction of Gerlach. He seems, however, to have become increasingly involved with the Grosses Concert during the next few years, leaving the Collegium in 1747 to Bach's pupil Johann Trier. But Bach, even if he was no longer leading the Collegium after 1741, is unlikely to have stopped performing—if not in public venues, then privately. During the 1740s years he continued to copy music by other composers, including concertos by both Friedemann and Emanuel, surely for practical use.[637] Also from the 1740s is an arrangement of a lute suite by Weiss—showing that Bach continued to explore recent music, experimenting with novel types of instrumental setting.[638]

Yet there are signs that after 1740 Bach grew increasingly detached from many of his previous activities. Besides leaving the Collegium, he seems to have withdrawn further from some of his cantorial duties. At home he relied increasingly on students and relatives to provide various types of assistance. The most notable of these was Johann Elias, who served somewhat like what we would call a personal assistant during 1737–43, writing letters and tutoring the children while (from 1739) studying theology as a university student.[639] To engage a tutor or secretary in this manner was common among the wealthy, but Elias was a family member, his status somewhere between that of an apprentice and a professional.

This may also have been true of another student to whom Bach delegated many of his duties as director of church music during the mid-1740s. Gottfried Benjamin Fleckeisen, a pupil in the St. Thomas School and subsequently at the university, later claimed to have "performed and directed the music at the principal churches, St. Thomas and St. Nicholas, in place of the Capellmeister

---

As Williams (2016, 500) suggests. Among the sources of Emanuel's G-minor concerto for harpsichord and strings (W. 6) is a manuscript copy by F. A. Cichorius, a student at the university and cellist in the Großes Concert during the later 1740s; see *Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach: The Complete Works*, 9/2:199.

[637] These were Friedemann's Concerto in F (F. 10) for two harpsichords without strings (manuscript parts by J. S. Bach in Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. Bach St 176), copied around 1742, and Emanuel's Concerto in A minor (W. 1) for harpsichord and strings (cembalo, violin, and viola parts by J. S. Bach in Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellonska, Mus. ms. Bach St 495). Performances of either piece are not documented; only around 1760 did Emanuel finish his father's incomplete copy of the viola part.

[638] The arrangement (BWV 1025) is for violin and harpsichord; see K. E. Schröder (1995). Bach started the copy of the keyboard part (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus ms. Bach P 226/8), which was completed by an unidentified hand.

[639] Elias's drafts of letters written on behalf of Sebastian (and Magdalena) are edited in Odruch and Wollny (2000), which includes biographical information provided by Hans-Joachim Schulze (pp. 17–19). Prior to Elias's arrival some of his functions were served by Bernhard Dieterich Ludewig, before that perhaps by Magdalena's nephew C. F. Meißner (concerning whom see Wollny 2016, 80–81).

for two whole years."[640] What he performed and directed is uncertain, nor is there any indication whether Fleckeisen was engaged in this role by Bach himself or was imposed on the latter by Ernesti and Stieglitz.

This was not an isolated incident, for in 1749 Bach wrote a testimonial for another former student who, while serving as first prefect, "conducted not only the motets but also, in my absence, the entire church music."[641] It seems, moreover, that during the 1740s Bach was providing his own church music only for a limited number of occasions. That he nevertheless continued to perform some of his existing church works is evident from new parts and revisions made for them. Not every new manuscript part was necessarily for his own performances, but few if any extant autograph parts prepared in the 1740s were for rental or sale and use in performances elsewhere.[642] Bach also continued to travel, and although the number of trips may have decreased, he was spending longer periods away from Leipzig, to judge from his two known journeys to Berlin as well as a five-week absence in 1744 that might have seen him there as well.[643] The last known performance of his largest work, the St. Matthew Passion, took place probably on Good Friday 1742.[644] Two months later Magdalena executed a power of attorney (*Vollmacht*) on his behalf for unknown reasons, perhaps in connection with an otherwise unrecorded trip.[645]

Bach's 1741 trip to Berlin (p. 273, following the first sentence in the first full paragraph, "Bach had traveled to Berlin during the Cöthen years; he made a return visit in 1741, presumably in connection with his son Emanuel's appointment as a royal Prussian chamber musician.")

The alliance between Saxony and Prussia that kept them on the same side in the War of the Polish Succession had ended by the time of the next major war, that of the Austrian Succession. When Maria Theresa succeeded her father, emperor Charles VI, as archduchess of Austria in 1740, it gave another newly crowned monarch, Frederick II of Prussia, a pretext for seizing

---

[640] This statement, made in the course of applying for a provincial cantorship, was uncovered by Maul (2017, 41).

[641] For Johann Jathanael Bammler, first reported by Wollny (1997, 38–40), trans. in NBR, 239–40 [no. 264]).

[642] For example, Rifkin (2008) dates late revisions in Cantatas 68 and 76 to 1741 or 1742, and revised parts (in Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, St 54/4) for BWV 82 are from as late as 1746–47; the last revisions to the St. John Passion were not made until spring 1749 or even 1750.

[643] The five-week trip, mentioned in Bach's letter of May 16, 1744 (BD 5:271 [no. A 45d]), lasted from about March 29 to May 13, 1744.

[644] Kobayashi (1988, 50, 52). The last known performance of the St. Mark Passion took place in 1744 (Schabalina 2009, 30–36 and 45–48), that of the St. John Passion as late as 1749 or even 1750 (Wollny 1997, 42).

[645] BD 1:179 (no. 93). It was witnessed by her brother-in-law, a trumpeter visiting from Weissenfels.

Silesia. He had a tenuous claim on the region, which lies between Poland and Saxony, and during the last month of 1745 Prussian troops occupied not only Dresden but Leipzig. Although Bach lamented this three years later, in a letter to Elias, the event could not have been too onerous for him.[646] Life at Leipzig probably continued more or less normally; Frederick, occupying Dresden, famously attended performances of Hasse's operas.

The Lutheran inhabitants of Leipzig cannot have been entirely unsympathetic to the occupying forces, whose officers would have been under orders to treat them decently. Few of the latter, as yet, are likely to have been emulating the king's love of music, but Bach might have been required to entertain if not also house members of the occupying force. When Prussian troops again occupied Leipzig after Bach's death, during the Seven Years' War, King Frederick himself took up winter quarters there in 1760–61, and Breitkopf published one of the king's symphonies as well as music by other Prussian court composers. It is possible that he had had some contact with the commander of the Prussian troops, Prince Leopold of Anhalt-Dessau (known as "the Old Dessauer"), during his days at Cöthen. This Leopold is not known to have been a patron of music, but the king whom he served assuredly was, and in 1745 some of his officers might have known that Emanuel Bach had been serving Frederick for more than four years in the Prussian capital.

Sebastian had already visited Berlin in August 1741, shortly after Emanuel received his official appointment as a royal chamber musician.[647] It is possible that Sebastian visited Berlin again in 1744 to be present at Emanuel's wedding.[648] More certain is that the 1741 visit had something to do with the wedding there of Georg Ernst Stahl, son of the royal Prussian physician and chemist of the same name. This took place in September, celebrated by a parody of Bach's homage cantata BWV 210a.[649] Sebastian, however, left the performance to Emanuel Bach and J. F. Agricola, for he was back in Leipzig before the end of August to direct, as usual, the annual council election cantata. He may have cut his visit short after receiving letters informing him that Magdalena had suffered an illness of some sort. She was, in fact, pregnant with their last child,

---

[646] Bach mentions to Elias that his first grandson was born "about the time that we had, alas, the Prussian invasion," BD 1:118 (no. 49), trans. in NBR, 234 (no. 257).

[647] Emanuel's work for Frederick prior to summer 1741 was as a freelancer, not a regular member of the *Capelle*; see Oleskiewicz (2007a, 260). He was one of two royal keyboard players, sharing duties with Christoph Schaffrath (neither was "first" harpsichordist).

[648] Emanuel married the daughter of a Berlin wine merchant in early 1744; the exact date is unknown.

[649] As shown by Maul (2001, 15–20). The work was originally composed in 1729 for Duke Christian of Weissenfels, subsequently updated twice to honor Count Joachim Friedrich von Flemming (royal governor of Leipzig) and then an unidentified dedicatee.

Regina Susanna, and although she soon recovered, she cancelled an engagement at Weissenfels—indicating her and Sebastian's continuing connection with that court.[650]

Sebastian is not known to have had any contact with the Prussian ruling family during this period. Christian Ludwig, dedicatee of the Brandenburg Concertos, had died in 1734 without heirs. But at a time when the name of every traveler crossing a border was reported to relevant authorities, King Frederick must have known that a royal Saxon court composer—father of his just-appointed harpsichordist—had entered his capital. He could easily have sent his chamberlain Fredersdorff to pick up a score of the composer's E-major flute sonata BWV 1035. This, at any rate, is the implication of titles in two manuscript copies of the piece, whose difficulty would have been a tribute to the king and to the flutes that Quantz made for him.[651]

The fact that Sebastian held a titular court appointment at Dresden has led to the suggestion that, when he traveled again to Prussia in May 1747, he did so as an unofficial representative of the Saxon court.[652] It is also possible that Count Keyserlingk, now temporarily posted to Berlin, arranged invitations for both Sebastian and Friedemann, if the latter indeed traveled with his father.[653] Yet King Frederick, having recently defeated the Saxons and forced their Capellmeister to perform for him, is unlikely to have cared about Sebastian's formal status. Rather he would have been genuinely curious about the musical abilities of a man about whom he could have heard much from Quantz or Emanuel Bach. The Saxon court, on the other hand, could not have been pleased by the glowing accounts that soon appeared in newspapers across northern Europe, reporting Bach's visit to their arch-enemy in the recently settled conflict. Royal displeasure at Dresden might even have been one reason for the pressure exerted by the Saxon minister Brühl to have his own nominee named to succeed Bach as cantor, while Sebastian was still alive.

Harrer (p. 279, following the paragraph break, "a formal document assuring him of his future appointment")

There is no question that Harrer was qualified, having studied law at the Leipzig university in the early 1720s and then music in Italy. But his conventionally Italianate music, heavily influenced by that of Hasse, marked a turn away from everything that Sebastian represented. Ironically, a

---

[650] Elias wrote to Sebastian in Berlin on Aug. 5 and again on Aug. 9 (BD 2:391–92 [nos. 489–90]). His draft of Magdalena's letter to Weissenfels from the following month is in BD 2:394 (no. 493), trans. in NBR, 213–14 (no. 224).

[651] As Oleskiewicz (1999) argues was also true of the trio sonata included in the Musical Offering, dedicated to the king. BWV 1035 is preserved only in nineteenth-century manuscript copies; the two mentioning Fredersdorff are Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. mss. Bach P 621 and 622.

[652] Wolff (2000, 426) suggests that Bach "had gone to Berlin as a true ambassador of peace."

[653] As reported by Forkel (1802, 9)—whose only source might have been the unreliable Friedemann himself, as there is no earlier mention of his presence in any known record.

Missa that Harrer performed during his Leipzig years includes a prominent statement of the B-A-C-H motive in its opening phrase.[654]

Brühl's order and Harrer's subsequent concert performance of a cantata at Leipzig on June 8 have been interpreted as signs that Sebastian had suffered a debilitating injury or illness of some kind, even a stroke.[655] Indeed, a sharp decline in the quality of Bach's handwriting around this time suggests some sort of physical or at least visual impairment. But the practice of giving pre-emptive auditions was not unheard of, and any offense given by this one would have been ameliorated by the fact that it took place in one of the city's concert venues (the "Three Swans"), not a church.

Sebastian himself had been called to perform at Gotha while the previous Capellmeister Witt was still alive, if ailing. Emanuel Bach would receive a comparable sort of "pre-audition" at Hamburg in 1756, although he would not actually succeed Telemann there for another twelve years.[656] Harrer was not the only one interested in succeeding Bach. Friedemann was probably in Leipzig on November 30 for a performance of his cantata for the first Sunday in Advent. Emanuel is thought to have visited a few months later, performing the Magnificat that he had composed at Berlin the previous year.[657] It appears that only Emanuel formally applied for the position, although both brothers must have understood that they had little chance of actually getting it.[658] As it turned out, Harrer would survive Sebastian by only five years, and although Emanuel would then apply again, the position would be won by another Bach pupil, Johann Friedrich Doles.[659]

---

[654] Presumably this was a coincidence, but it is unmistakeably present in the soprano part, mm. 3–4, transposed to A; see the edition by Ulrike Kollmar (Leipzig: Hoffmeister, 2008). She describes (p. vii) Harrer's manuscript performing parts for the work, originally composed in 1735 during studies with Zelenka, as being on paper which he used at Leipzig.

[655] Wolff (2000, 444) notes that a receipt of May 6, 1749, is in Friedrich's hand, apart from the signature (BD 3:633 [no. 142a]; NBR, 239 [no. 262]). This, however, could be an indication of visual problems rather than a general "health crisis." The performance and its venue were reported in Riemer's chronicle (BD 2:457 [no. 584], trans. in NBR, 240 [no. 266]).

[656] It is uncertain whether Emanuel was actually present in Hamburg for the performance of his Easter cantata W. 244; see Wollny (2010a, 93).

[657] Sebastian's heading *Violoncello e Bassono* atop one manuscript part (in Kraków, Biblioteka Jagiellonska, Mus.ms. Bach St 172) attests to the Leipzig performance of F. 80. For a performance of W. 215 in February or March 1750, see Wollny (2011, 44–45).

[658] That Emanuel "presented himself" (*sich angegeben*), as did the Bach pupils Trier and J. L. Krebs, among others, was recorded in city council minutes of July 29, 1750 (BD 2:478 [no. 614]; NBR, 245 [no. 274a]).

[659] Kollmar (2006, 104–11) considers why Brühl and at least certain members of the Leipzig council seemed so eager to establish a place there for Harrer, but in the end she finds no distinct explanation.

Bach appears to have responded to Harrer's audition by organizing a repeat of the "Contest" cantata BWV 201. A few lines of its libretto were changed to cast opprobrium upon Brühl and his protégé, at least for those who could understand the rather obscure references.[660] Did Bach now, at the end of his career, regret his decision to seek his fortune "in a republic," as Telemann had put it? If so, he would have been especially pleased to send his second youngest son, Friedrich, to a court appointment at the end of 1749. Not yet eighteen, Friedrich had been assisting his father in the preparation of music manuscripts, probably including revisions of the *Art of Fugue*. Now, perhaps through the mediation of C. P. E. Bach, Friedrich traveled to Bückeburg 175 miles to the west, joining the court of Count Wilhelm of Schaumburg-Lippe (a Prussian ally). Bach's last surviving letter is a note of thanks dated Dec. 27, 1749, to the count, whose successors Friedrich would serve loyally until his death in 1795.[661]

---

[660] As explained by Ambrose (2006, entry for BWV 201). The performance is documented by a manuscript copy of the libretto in the hands of J. C. and J. C. F. Bach, dated 1749 (facsimile in NBA 1/11, KB, pp. 225–29). The present interpretation follows Fröde (1984, 55–57); it was previously thought that the performance was aimed at the anti-musical views of the Freiberg rector Johann Gottlieb Biedermann (see BD 2:461–62 [no. 592], trans. in NBR, 241–42 [no. 268]).

[661] BD 1:123 (no. 54); NBR, 241 (no. 267); the extant letter is not in Bach's hand. Fragments of at least two further letters, quoted in connection with a polemical exchange over the proper place of music in education, appear in BD 1:124–26 (no. 55), trans. in NBR, 241–42 (no. 268). In 1751 Emanuel dedicated his *Zwey Trio* (W. 161) to the count, who surely heard Friedrich in performances of his half-brother's two trio sonatas.

Chapter 13

"Instructive" ensemble compositions from the Bach circle (p. 291, following the one complete paragraph, "for student use during the 1740s")

According to their nineteenth-century editor Griepenkerl, Sebastian created the two three-harpsichord concertos (BWV 1063 and 1064) in order to "strengthen all varieties of performance" in his two oldest sons.[662] Indeed, who else would have performed these or the quadruple-harpsichord concerto (BWV 1065)? Even music for just two keyboard instruments had been quite rare prior to Bach, although Couperin had raised the possibility of performing trio sonatas as keyboard duos.[663] That such music became a specialty of the Bach household is clear from its cultivation by the sons as well as the father.[664] Few things are more instructive or more delightful even for professionals than to perform alongside others in a Bach concerto. If one of the keyboard players was Bach himself, one can imagine how much more a student might have learned from the experience.

Although the six multiple-keyboard concertos all include strings in their most familiar versions, one of them (BWV 1061) originated as a duet for two instruments alone. That this was originally envisioned as a "clavier" work for study rather than a concerto for public display is suggested by the fact that Bach confined the range of both instruments to four octaves,[665] as also in the Well-Tempered Clavier—which would facilitate use at home on two clavichords. This brilliant work concludes with a complex fugue, unique in Bach's concerto fugues for its double exposition, the two soloists each introducing the subject alone, in three parts, before joining together in a third. Another contrapuntal duo, somewhat more explicitly pedagogical, is Sebastian's arrangement for two keyboards of the three-voice mirror fugue (Contrapunctus 13) from his most transcendentally instructive work, the *Art of Fugue*. Here, as in the solo concertos with strings, Bach supplements the original counterpoint, in this case by adding a single (non-invertible) part.[666] The string parts eventually added to BWV 1061a, on the other hand, might have been the work of a student, possibly Friedemann, for a performance with his own pupil F. W. Rust.[667]

662

"der Vater seinen beiden ältesten Söhnen, W. Friedemann und C. Ph. Emanuel Bach, Gelegenheit verschaffen wollte, sich in allen Arten des Vortrags auszubilden." Preface to his edition of BWV 1063 (Leipzig: Peters, ca. 1846, quoted in NBA, vol. 7/6, KB, p. 26). Griepenkerl was a pupil of Forkel.

663 In the preface to his *Apothéose de Lully* (Paris, 1725).

664 In addition to the double-keyboard concertos F. 10, F. 46, W. 46, and W. 47, there are the duetti W. 115, arranged by C. P. E. Bach from four little solo pieces, as well as two "sonatinas" W. 109 and 110 (really divertimentos for soloists and orchestra). Christian's four duets (one for two instruments, the other for four hands at one) were models for those later written by Mozart.

665 As observed by Dürr (1978).

666 The four-part mirror fugue (Contrapunctus 12) from the *Art of Fugue* might also have been performed by two players, as it is the one movement that cannot be executed as written by a

Several other miscellaneous works whose attribution to Bach has always been doubtful may also have been products of his teaching. Two flute sonatas with obbligato keyboard, BWV 1020 and 1031, are so similar to one another and to a trio sonata by Quantz (QV 2:18) that they could well have originated as composition exercises modeled on the latter.[668] The sonata in G for violin and continuo, BWV 1021, is assuredly by Bach, but, remarkably, a trio sonata in the same key has the same bass line. The trio sonata work (BWV 1038) has been plausibly explained as the product of a joint exercise by Sebastian and Emanuel; the latter may then have been responsible for a subsequent arrangement of the same piece for obbligato keyboard and violin.[669]

If so, then BWV 1038 can be added to the list of collaborations between Bach and his pupils. Among these one might also include some of the music performed during Leipzig church services, particularly during the 1740s. In addition to the cantata by Friedemann performed in 1749 (F. 80), we know of two cantatas by Johann Gottlieb Goldberg, at least one of which was performed at Leipzig in the mid-1740s from parts copied by Sebastian, among others.[670] Collaboration in another sense is suggested by arrangements that survive only in manuscript copies by students. Whether Bach himself produced the C-major version of the organ "toccata" BWV 566 has been doubted, but the existence of an early copy by J. T. Krebs suggests that this version was at least authorized by the composer.[671] Less certain are other arrangements, such as the five-movement version in B-flat of the organ praeludium BWV 545 and the "Triple" Concerto BWV 1044. Either of these might be the work of pupils, the former by one who was not particularly capable, the latter by one of considerable ingenuity.[672]

---

single performer. Here, however, as each player could take two of the existing parts, there was no need for Bach to create a new duo version.

[667] On this possibility, see Schulenberg (2010, 88).

[668] The style of both pieces makes them unlikely to be by either Sebastian or Quantz himself (as suggested by Swack 1995). See Oleskiewicz (1998, 202–6) on the authorship of BWV 1031 and the use of its somewhat rare tonality (E-flat) on the Baroque flute.

[669] The obbligato-keyboard version, in F, was formerly attributed to Sebastian as BWV 1022. See Hofmann (2004) and his reconstruction of a postulated earlier version for violin, viola, and continuo (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf und Härtel, 2008).

[670] Sebastian's hand is found among performing parts for the cantata *Durch die herzliche Barmherzigkeit* (in Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. 7918); the paper used for the manuscript sources of both this work and the cantata *Hilf, Herr* (Ps. 12) was the same used for late works by J. S. Bach. See the edition by Alfred Dürr in *Das Erbe deutscher Musik*, series 1, vol. 35 (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1957), especially the second page of the "Vorwort" (unpaginated).

[671] As first suggested by Dietrich Kilian in NBA, vol. 4/5–6, KB, p. 302); see the edition by the present author (2013–14, 1:126).

[672] For informed speculation on the origin of BWV 545b, see Williams (2003, 105–7). That BWV 1044 was most likely the work of W. F. Bach, expanding upon BWV 894 and 527/2, was

Bach's late works and collections (p. 292, following the one complete paragraph, "examples of profoundly expressive text setting")

Table S13.1 lists this repertory; it overlaps with earlier lists, but its purpose is to demonstrate the breadth of Bach's musical thought as he summed up his own achievement in the collections assembled or revised during his last two decades.

Table S13.1. Collections and exemplary compositions, ca. 1730–1750

<u>Unpublished collections for keyboard instruments (alone and in ensembles)</u>
- Little preludes: BWV 933–38
- Well-Tempered Clavier, part 2 (WTC2): BWV 870–93
- Advent and Christmas chorales: BWV 696–99, 701, 703–4
- "Great 18" chorales: BWV 651–68
- Organ praeludia: BWV 537 (fantasia and fugue), 543–48, 562 (fantasia and fugue)
- Concertos: BWV 1052–57 (and others?)

<u>Self-publications</u>
- *Clavierübung*, parts 1–3 (1726–39), and Goldberg Variations (1741): BWV 825–30; BWV 831 and 971; BWV 952, 669–89, and 802–5; and BWV 988
- Canonic Variations (ca. 1747–48): BWV 769
- Musical Offering (1747): BWV 1079
- "Schübler" chorales (ca. 1748): BWV 645–50
- Art of Fugue (published 1751, 1752): BWV 1080

<u>Anthologized publication</u>
- Chorale settings from Schemelli's Songbook (1736): BWV 439–507

<u>Unpublished vocal works</u>
- Four-part chorale settings: BWV 253–438 (and others)
- Cantatas for various occasions: BWV 29, 69, 120 (for council elections); 97, 100, 117, 192 (chorale cantatas *per omnes versus*); 191, 195, 197
- Passions and oratorios: BWV 11, 244–49, also arrangements and pastiches (BWV 1083, etc.)
- Masses, Magnificat, and other Latin works: BWV 232–43, also arrangements (BWV Anh. 24–26, 30, 167–68, etc.)

Not every late work was necessarily an "exemplary" composition. The inclusion of a few late sacred cantatas in table S13.1 might be questioned; while excluding the Coffee and Peasant cantatas, it counts the wedding cantata BWV 195 and the council election cantata BWV 69, for which Bach drew up revised scores around 1748. Both works open with unusually expansive fugal settings of psalm verses, suggesting that these, like the unique BWV 191, could have been meant to serve as exemplary examples of vocal music. BWV 191, comprising three extracts from

---

argued in the present author's "The Triple Concerto and Its Models," a presentation for the American Bach Society meeting at Yale University on April 28, 2018.

the Gloria of the B-Minor *Missa*, is usually described as a cantata, but like the Magnificat it has a Latin text and calls for five voices, making it distinct from Bach's regular liturgical works.[673]

Within the sphere of instrumental (especially keyboard) music, the list includes not only great works such as WTC2 but smaller ones that could have served as preliminary essays in related genres. Thus the little *manualiter* chorale settings for Advent and Christmas are miniature versions of those in the "Great Eighteen." Not every smaller work was a precursor of a larger one in the chronological sense; the little preludes and fughettas BWV 870a and 899–902, however, were early versions of movements incorporated into WTC2. The *manualiter* pieces in part 3 of the *Clavierübung* could, at least pedagogically, serve as precursors to the *pedaliter* ones. Among the potential additions to table S13.1 are a number of miscellaneous trio movements for organ which might have preceded the organ sonatas.[674] Yet the trios, although possibly assembled only during the later 1720s for use in teaching, remain close in style to Bach's repertory from Weimar and Cöthen (on which they draw), and they do not seem to have been gathered together or revised subsequently.

Printed collections

In earlier years Bach had made manuscript copies of printed works by famous contemporaries as well as musicians of the past, including Palestrina and Frescobaldi. He must long have wished to add his own contributions to this repertory. He published nothing while at Cöthen, unlike his predecessor as Capellmeister there.[675] But after coming to Leipzig he issued no fewer than seven volumes, beginning with one that appeared in installments from 1726 to 1730; an eighth publication came out posthumously in 1751. Only one of these bears a dedication, implying that Bach produced these without external financial support.[676] The exception was the *Musical Offering*, but its dedication to King Frederick II of Prussia reflected the unusual circumstances of the work's origin, not (so far as is known) any royal subsidy for engraving and printing. In eschewing any conventional dedications, Bach departed from the practice of his older contemporaries, including Couperin in France and Kuhnau and Graupner in Germany. Telemann, however, after dedicating his first publication to Prince Johann Ernst of Weimar, was now regularly issuing collections of cantatas and chamber music at Hamburg on his own. In these he

---

673 Rathey (2013) links it to a Latin oration in the university church on Christmas Day 1742—not 1745, as previously argued by G. Butler (1992); further on the oration in Leaver (2013).

674 These are discussed by Stauffer (2016).

675 Stricker's Opus 1 was dedicated to Prince Leopold; the dedication is dated October 1715, a month before the end of the regency; does this suggest that the publication signaled the prince's coming of age? financing by the regent (his mother)? Was it understood that Bach could not expect similar support for the more costly type of publication he might have envisioned?

676 A special dedication copy of the First Partita was accompanied by the hand-written copy of a poem dedicated to the newborn son of Prince Leopold of Cöthen (in BD 1:223 [no. 155], trans. in NBR, 129–30 [no. 128]), but as the poem was not published it probably does not imply financial backing.

addresses his dedictions or prefaces as an equal to the "gracious reader" (*geneigte Leser*),[677] avoiding the customary obsequies to a wealthy aristocrat or powerful magnate.

Only once, again in the *Musical Offering*, did Bach include a verbal introduction in one of his own publications. Otherwise the only declaration of purpose appears on the title page. Bach's reluctance to commit himself verbally probably had something to do with this. As engraving was expensive and he was usually his own publisher, a desire to reduce costs by having to pay for one less printed sheet may also have been a consideration.

Nevertheless, by handling all aspects of publication—including financing—Bach could ensure that these volumes, each exceptional in organization and content, reflected his plans. Like his unprinted collections, these were meticulously thought out, never simply following convention. Bach had as good an idea as anyone of the diversity of previously published keyboard music; he added to the repertory in a deliberate manner. Had he enjoyed the type of financial backing that Lully and Lalande had in France, or (to a lesser degree) Handel in England, he might also have published scores of his vocal works.[678] This, however, was nearly impossible in Germany and unthinkable for Bach, given the size and complexity of his compositions. Before 1750 Telemann was able to issue at least three annual cycles of cantatas, as well as a passion, but these appeared in reduced scores. For Bach, a diverse array of published keyboard pieces would have to serve as samples of his compositional accomplishment.

Anyone contemplating publication of music during Bach's lifetime needed to be acquainted with the process of transforming a manuscript into a printed work. For notes as for words, typesetting had been the original form of music printing in the years just after 1500. But by the late Baroque, notation had grown so complex that it was more efficiently printed through engraving, or more properly etching. Only during the decade after Bach's death did Breitkopf of Leipzig perfect a form of musical typography adequate for printing eighteenth-century keyboard scores. Sebastian's sons, especially Emanuel, would profit from this, but Sebastian could follow only the same laborious music-printing process used by Kuhnau, Couperin, and other older composers.[679] This began with a finely written manuscript which was then reproduced in facsimile. Through a process resembling that used for the production of fine art prints, each page of the handwritten original was traced or copied backwards onto a metal plate. This was then etched with acid to yield a mirror image of the manuscript. The plates were then inked and placed in a press, one sheet being printed at a time. The copper plates used for this sort of printing were relatively soft;

---

[677] As in the *Getreuer Musik-Meister* of 1728–29.

[678] Bach might have seen the sumptuous collected editions of Lully's operas and Lalande's motets, issued under royal patronage and preserved to this day in archives that originated as private aristocratic collections. During Bach's lifetime Handel issued the oratorio *Alexander's Feast* by subscription (see Burrows 2012, 248), but full-score editions of other works would not follow until after 1750.

[679] Today one usually speaks of this music as having been "engraved," but the term is more properly applied to a method of physically preparing the plates that was used by Telemann and later composers and publishers, but not by Bach.

small corrections or alterations could be made with engraving tools, but the plates wore and broke easily, and no more than a few hundred impressions could be made of each.[680]

Bach clearly understood the process and designed his publications accordingly. To avoid having to make a large initial investment in copper or payments to an engraver, he began by issuing the six harpsichord partitas one at a time. These were timed to come out during the Leipzig fairs, when visitors to the city could buy printed copies from Bach himself; publication was announced in the local papers, beginning in November 1726 for the First Partita.[681] Where the engraving and printing were done is uncertain, but Bach must have kept the finished plates at home, re-using them to produce a collective volume of all six Partitas in 1731. Emanuel Bach also produced a little one-page printed minuet in that year, engraving it himself.[682] This suggests that at least some of the preparation of the plates—including many alterations of details undertaken for the collective edition—was carried out within the Bach household. The process continued even after printing, for many printed copies contain handwritten alterations that reflect further corrections or small revisions made or authorized by Bach.[683]

These details of production may seem irrelevant to the music or the creative process, but they shaped the way a composer would have gone about planning both individual pieces and the set as a whole. For instance, the sizes of compositions and of entire volumes, measured in pages, could not exceed what the composer was prepared to pay for etching and printing. Not surprisingly, Bach's first venture into music publishing was somewhat tentative, limited to a single keyboard suite. Yet its title page indicated his intention of continuing the series, and by the time the first partita was being sold (during the New Year's fair of 1727), he probably had already composed at least two of the five that were to follow.[684]

---

[680] The process is explained in detail by Koprowski (1975), summarized by G. Butler (2008, 120n. 3). Although the results were, in principle, facsimiles of the manuscripts provided by the composer to the engravers, individual hands among the latter can be identified through certain details; this has allowed Butler to identify most of Bach's engravers.

[681] BD 2:160–61 (no. 214), trans. in NBR, 129 (no. 127). Notices of subsequent installments appeared in 1727 for Partitas 2 and 3 (BD 2:169 [no. 224]) and in 1730 for Partita 5 (BD 2:202 [no. 276]). Dates of the actual publications appeared on their respective title pages, including that of the collective edition, which appeared in 1731 (given in BD 1:224–32 [nos. 156, 159–60, 162, and 164–65]).

[682] With help from his father's pupil Ziegler, according to G. Butler (1986, 12–15).

[683] The presence of these handwritten ink entries has led to the designation of certain examplars of the printed editions as Bach's "personal copies" (*Handexemplaren*), but the identification of the latter remains uncertain.

[684] These are Partitas nos. 3 and 6, whose early versions appear in Magdalena's second keyboard book.

The precise number of pieces might not yet have been determined, but the title was set: *Clavier-Übung* (Keyboard Practice), the same modest title that Kuhnau had used for two volumes of keyboard music published at Leipzig some four decades earlier.[685] Much like Kuhnau's, Bach's full title committed him to issuing suites "consisting of preludes, allemandes, courantes, sarabandes, gigues, minuets, and other galantries [*Galanterien*]"—that is, pieces in fashionable or *galant* style as understood at the time. Subsequent volumes, issued in 1735 and 1739, consisted, respectively, of two large works for double-manual harpsichord and a huge collection of pieces for organ, both with and without pedals. These were followed in 1741 by the Goldberg Variations, which today are regarded as a fourth volume in the series, although not explicitly designated as such. Bach subsequently issued two further publications for organ, but these were clearly not part of the series.

Unpublished collections for keyboard (alone and in ensembles)

Most of the keyboard works listed above in table S13.1 have already been discussed in chapters 7 and 9. Among the newer ones, the six preludes BWV 933–38, all in binary form, look like more *galant* versions of the pieces that Bach had included in the little keyboard books for Friedemann and Magdalena. Like the seven *manualiter* fughettas on chorales for Advent and Christmas, they are of uncertain date, being preserved only in late copies. Yet there is little reason to question Bach's authorship or their status as a set.

The little Advent and Christmas chorales, once thought to be early compositions, reveal the same counterintuitive counterpoint and the apparent interest in modal melodies seen in the larger chorale settings in the *Clavierübung*.[686]Six of these pieces, four in three parts and two in four parts, are fughettas based on the opening phrases of their respective chorale melodies. A seventh, BWV 701, is better described as a fantasia, combining the first phrase of "Vom Himmel hoch" with the second phrase, then with the third. What sets these pieces apart from earlier chorale settings, and even from the clavier fugues of WTC2, is their modal character. Five of the seven avoid conventional tonal modulations, or they conclude unexpectedly on what sounds like a dominant chord. In addition, the chorale subjects are treated in dense strettos and invertible counterpoint. Although always fluent, this leads to unexpected passing dissonances and sometimes strange doublings, as when BWV 701 combines all three of its chorale phrases in a passage that ties up the hands in a way rarely found even in Bach's earlier contrapuntal keyboard music (ex. S13.1).

It is frustrating that we cannot form an accurate picture of when Bach worked on these and other late compositions or how they relate to his revisions of older music. Although his biggest organ

---

685

Kuhnau's *Neue Clavier-Übung* comprised fourteen suites (called *Partien*) and a sonata issued in 1689–92; a second edition of both volumes appeared in 1695.

686 Williams's (1975) argument for a late date is convincing, less so Dirksen's (2002) for adding BWV 702 to the set. Although the latter extends the series to New Year's Day (hence its inclusion in a Brussels copy of a Breitkopf manuscript; contents listed by Dirksen 2002, 158), it suffers from weaknesses enumerated by Williams (2003, 442).

praeludia, like many of his organ chorales, were now several decades old, he continued to write new ones even while performing old ones (as at Kassel) and, apparently, gathering six of them into a set (BWV 543–48). Two of the latter go back to Weimar, but at least three of the four others probably originated at Leipzig.[687]

Two of these, in E minor and B minor (BWV 548 and 544), are characterized by the audacious character of their melodic material and by certain concerto-like features, including extended "solo" episodes without pedal.[688] The Weimar organ praeludia had already incorporated elements of Italian concerto style, but these newer pieces probably reflected newer types of concertos, including those of German composers such as Fasch and J. G. Graun, as opposed to Vivaldi. They also may have been inspired by what has been described as the more "chamber-music" quality of newer German organs, including those at Leipzig as these underwent renovation under Bach's eyes.[689]

The B-minor prelude opens like an embellished slow movement in siciliana style—a *galant* take on the old idea of beginning with passagework for manuals alone, the pedals eventually entering with a punctuated pedal point (ex. S13.2). The idea of subsequently treating this opening as a ritornello, which alternates with a fugal "solo" passage, goes back to the preludes of the English Suites—which, however, sound utterly different. The E-minor piece is best known for its fugue subject, whose expanding intervals have given it the nickname "Wedge" (ex. S13.3a). The general harmonic shape of this recalls that of another E-minor fugue, in the gigue of the Sixth Partita (ex. S13.3b). The latter, composed around 1725, was an austere contrapuntal exercise inspired by Froberger's gigues in a persistent dotted rhythm. This, however, is a grand ternary form, like several of the fugues for violin and lute, its B section incorporating brilliant episodes in up-to-date concerto style.
Another late organ work, the C-major praeludium (BWV 547), is less spectacular but even more refined and mature in style. Its prelude, despite opening like an easy-going siciliana, shares some of the motivic material and some of the brilliance of the D-major prelude from WTC2, with which it must be roughly contemporary (ex. S13.4). The fugue complements the relatively early "Dorian" one as a late example of "demonstration counterpoint" for organ; its seventy-two measures are divided into three roughly equal sections, the first developing the subject in stretto,

---

[687] Tatlow (2015, 360–63) discusses BWV 543–48 as a collection, although the earliest source grouping them together (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Amalienbibliothek ms. 60) is a *Konvolut* (collective manuscript) of uniform copies in the same hand. Tatlow dates the latter to "the late 1740s," but they more likely originated in the 1750s, commissioned by Kirnberger for the library of Princess Anna Amalie and possibly based on lost autographs in the possession of C. P. E. Bach (see the entry in *Bach-Digital:* https://www.bach-digital.de/receive/BachDigitalSource_source_00025335).

[688] Both survive in autograph manuscripts from around 1727–32, although neither is a first draft; both also were copied by Kellner, who even finished the autograph manuscript begun by Bach (in Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. Bach P 274).

[689] Stauffer (2010, 124–26) identifies relevant stylistic features of these works; Lynn L. E. Butler (2010) argues for corresponding changes in organs at Leipzig during Bach's time there.

the second introducing the inversion, and the third using both forms of the subject in augmentation. The latter occurs in the pedals, which are used only in the final third of the piece.

This design has a parallel in the C-minor fugue of WTC2, which likewise introduces its lowest part only in the final third of the piece, where it states the augmented form of the subject. There is also a parallel with the fughetta on "Allein Gott" in the *Clavierübung*, whose oddly perky subject resembles the unassuming theme of the present fugue (ex. S13.5a). Also recalling the *Clavierübung* is the learned, slightly abstract character of the fugue, which at one point makes a stunning chromatic modulation from D minor through E minor to F minor, via a strange augmented chord (ex. S13.5b, second part).

Two fantasias with fugues, both in C minor, must also date from around this time. Both are problematical, although for different reasons. The use of the title *fantasia* for the first movement probably reflects the presence in each of a sustained pedal point at the beginning; its iterations on different notes articulate the tonal design of each piece, as in earlier pedal pieces going back to Frescobaldi and Pachelbel. Both fantasias, moreover, open with fugal imitation in the upper voices, although their styles are very different. BWV 537 alludes to the popular siciliana rhythm, whereas BWV 562 sounds more French, with its numerous ornaments.

Problems arise in the fugues. That of BWV 537 is a through-composed ternary form whose final section recapitulates the initial exposition but then seems to stop short, after a too-brief, stylistically anomalous closing phrase. It is as if the copyist, J. L. Krebs, composed the last four measures himself after finding no suitable ending in the lost autograph manuscript. It is possible that Bach never quite finished the fugue, or perhaps Krebs, misunderstanding something in the autograph, should have extended the recapitulation to include not just mm. 5–23 but also mm. 24–56. This, with a slight adjustment of the existing m. 57, would at least make the second A section comparable in length to the first, although it would not solve the problem of the last four measures.

The fugue of BWV 562 presents a more serious challenge, as it survives as only a short fragment. The existing autograph manuscript consists of only a single folded sheet (bifolio) written on both sides. This was enough to include the fantasia together with the first twenty-seven and a half bars of the fugue, but the rest of the latter, if it ever existed, is gone. This is exceedingly frustrating, as the piece would likely have been Bach's very last organ fugue, and we have barely more than the opening exposition.[690] This fugue must have been intended as a demonstration of contrapuntal devices, to judge from the simplicity of the subject and its suitability for stretto and inversion. The fragmentary state of this movement recalls a third late fantasia and fugue in C minor, BWV 906. Here Bach broke off his copy of the fugue in the middle of a page, after a promising start. The small amount of music that Bach actually left for

---

[690] The fantasia (in Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. Bach P 490) was copied by 1745 from a somewhat earlier composing score; Bach added the fugue as late as November 1748 (Kobayashi 1988, 59). The fantasia may originally have been composed to go with the fugue of BWV 546, with which it is paired in a later copy; the surviving autograph of BWV 562 might have been part of an effort to complete a second set of six organ praeludia.

both fugues has not deterred speculators from completing them. Too much is missing, however, to call these reconstructions; really they are new compositions based on Bach's material.[691]

The largest of Bach's unpublished late collections were WTC2 and the six completed concertos for harpsichord and strings. The first of these was never quite completed; the so-called autograph manuscript is actually a set of twenty-four separate copies, each containing one prelude and fugue; most are in Bach's hand, a few in Magdalena's.[692] Their purpose is uncertain, for they do not always contain the latest revised version. This (in some cases) is found elsewhere, notably in a copy made by Altnickol.[693] From this we can infer that Bach found it impossible to keep up with his own irrepressible urge to revise and improve his music. Even with the aid of assistants, he was never able to bring all his most treasured compositions to the ideal state that he envisioned.

The six concertos are preserved in two distinct manuscripts prepared at different times (now joined together), alongside a fragment of a seventh concerto. This suggests a plan, quickly abandoned, to expand the set further, while raising some question as to whether any of the keyboard concertos—including those with multiple soloists (considered above)—indeed constitute an integral set.[694] The concertos are traditionally associated with the Collegium, yet the fair copy score dates from the period when Bach was not directing the ensemble (1737–39).[695] By then Bach could already have performed the solo parts of the concertos for one harpsichord, playing from the lost original scores and improvisatorily adapting parts originally written for solo violin or oboe. The new scores, like those of other revised keyboard works, would have finalized decisions made in performances over the years; they also would have tweaked measure counts to produce "proportional parallelisms," if the theory of the latter is correct.

***Clavierübung,* part 1** (p. 293, following the second complete paragraph, "what 'keyboard practice' (*Clavierübung*) might be")

---

[691] For discussion of BWV 906, including a "completion," see Schulenberg (2006, 154–58). For BWV 562, whose fugue has attracted less attention, the author has offered a version online, but Williams (2003, 148), noting the short-windedness of the subject and countersubject, wonders whether the fugue "was ever taken very much farther."

[692] London, British Library, Add. ms. 35021. Three preludes and fugues are missing from this set; further discussion in Schulenberg (2006, 241–43). Rifkin (2008, 209–11) narrows the dating of the last entries to spring 1742.

[693] Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. Bach P 430, containing some autograph corrections; it is dated 1744. A second manuscript by Altnickol, P 402, is dated 1755; both were copied from the same lost autograph manuscript.

[694] Tatlow (2015, 364–66) finds "proportional parallelisms" within the groups of concertos BWV 1052–55, 1058 + 1060–62, and 1063–64, but none of these are reinforced by source evidence.

[695] As noted by Schulze (1981, 12f., cited by Dadelsen 1986, 74).

The idea of including different types of opening movements could have come from the suites published by Mattheson in 1714, but Bach's are far longer and more diverse. But Bach extends the concept of diversity to the other movements as well. Among the allemandes, only those of the third and sixth partitas closely resemble one another, possibly because these were the first to be written, before Bach had achieved his final conception of the collection (even so, the allemande of the Third Partita is distinguished by its unconventional pickup of a full beat).

Needless to say, this diversity was possible only by swerving away from the traditional or conventional types of each movement. Even the unique "Rondeaux" of Partita 2, Bach's only keyboard piece to use that French title, is Italianate in its virtuoso style. Unlike most French rondeaux, it varies the restatements of the main theme, which are written out. Even farther from any traditional type is the sinfonia that opens Partita no. 2, consisting of a few introductory chords followed by a lyrical andante and a fugue. Both of the latter are in just two parts, although the ornate melodic writing of the andante and the vigorous subject of the fugue imply a harmonically saturated texture. The closing movement of the same partita is called a Capriccio; the term alludes to the austere contrapuntal capricci of Froberger, but although fugal this is an utterly different type of piece, even more exuberantly outgoing than the Rondeaux. Yet Bach treats even the leaping tenths of the subject in a strictly motivic manner, developing them sequentially in a recurring episode that falls symmetrically within each half (ex. S13.6).

Froberger must also have been on Bach's mind in the concluding movement of the collection (as published). Here Bach abandons the compound meter that characterizes nearly all eighteenth-century gigues, returning, as in the First French Suite, to the pervasive dotted rhythm of certain seventeenth-century examples, especially many of Froberger's (the subject was illustrated in ex. S13.3b). That Bach ended the collection with this archaic movement signified his allegiance to the Froberger tradition while also offering a climactic demonstration of strict counterpoint.[696]

Up-to-date contemporaries would have recognized, alongside the echoes of Froberger, Kuhnau, and Mattheson, parallels with recent publications by Rameau and Handel. It has been suggested that Bach might have felt himself to be in competition with his best contemporaries, while also "misreading" their work.[697] Echoes of contemporaries grow fainter, however, as Bach continued the series of "Keyboard Practice."

---

[696] The gigue was the last movement in a posthumously published edition that Bach is likely to have known; published at Amsterdam by Roger in 1698, it was re-issued by Mortier ca. 1709. Bach originally notated the gigue of Partita 6 in the same manner as Froberger's (in Magdalena's 1725 keyboard book), but the note values were doubled in the publication. There is no reason to think that this notation was meant to be "tripletized" (see Schulenberg 2006, 344–45).

[697] Williams (2003a), referring to Harold Bloom's theory of literary influence, noted such things as Rameau's *batteries* (hocket-like passages for alternating hands) and the hand-crossings in the gigue of Partita no. 1. The allemande of the same partita seems to respond to the corresponding movement in Handel's E-major suite, no. 5 of the eight "Great Suites" published in 1720 but actually a very early work.

***Clavierübung,* part 2** (p. 294, following the first paragraph break, “such composers as Pisendel and Gottleib Graun)

Of course this did not rule out Bachian counterpoint, and the last movement of the concerto includes extensive passages in which the *left* hand has the main part, playing a bouncing *forte* line against a quieter but more lively accompaniment in the right hand (ex. S13.7).[698] Florid melodic embellishment, another Bachian specialty, comes to the fore in both the andante of the concerto and the sarabande of the overture. The latter movement may be exceeded in expressive intensity only by the corresponding dance of the Sixth Partita.[699]

That Bach would have followed up the six partitas with a separate, second “part” (*Teil*) of the *Clavierübung* was not preordained. Nor is it known why publication of the latter was delayed, especially as at least one of the compositions (the overture) probably was already composed, and Bach does not seem to have been particularly busy after 1730. It has been suggested that Bach might have considered publishing instead the organ sonatas as the second part of the series.[700] At 55 pages in length (including title page), however, the sonatas would have added up to something much larger than what he actually issued in 1735. That volume, on the other hand, was somewhat smaller than either the Partitas or the collection of organ music that Bach eventually published as the third volume in 1739. Possibly the six sonatas seemed too homogeneous and too difficult to appeal to potential buyers, or to serve as samples of Bach’s music. They evidently did not circulate widely; no complete manuscript copies by Bach’s pupils are known, unlike his other collections of keyboard compositions.

***Clavierübung,* part 3** (p. 295, following the first full paragraph, “similar subjects occur in earlier pieces”)

Despite the presence of *galant* melodic elements in some movements (which might have pleased Scheibe’s adherents), this third collection for “keyboard practice” is by no means as distinctly fashionable or immediately accessible in style as several vocal works from the same period (such as Cantata 30). Potential purchasers, moreover, might have balked not only at its size—78 printed pages, four more than part 1—but its extraordinary difficulty, which is both conceptual as well as purely technical.

The basic compositional techniques are traditional, but the style is an original and sometimes quite challenging combination of archaic with *galant* elements. Superficial aspects of the latter include flowing triplets, expressive appoggiaturas, and so-called Lombardic rhythms (reverse dotting). Yet these coexist, sometimes in the same piece, with chromatic melodic lines and quasi-

---

[698] There is little justification for the editorial “p” inserted in the left hand at m. 127 in NBA, vol. 5/2.

[699] On Bach’s revision of the E-minor sarabande, see Schulenberg (2006, 342).

[700] Williams (2003, 2) noted that the autograph of the sonatas, which somewhat resembles a fair copy prepared for a printer, was made around 1730. Tatlow (2015, 178) offers “numerical evidence that Bach designed the [first] two parts of the *Clavier Übung* as a unit.”

modal modulating schemes. Even in movements that fall into conventional ritornello designs, the easy sequences and transparent texture characteristic of the Italian concerto or sonata style tend to be replaced by asymmetrical phrasing and angular part-writing that falls in unfamiliar ways between the hands or feet.

The first four chorales represent a Lutheran organ mass—that is, settings of chant melodies for the Kyrie and Gloria, in Lutheran versions.[701] These pieces reflect Bach's familiarity with French organ masses, in which the chants for various sections of the mass are elaborated in solemn contrapuntal settings in as many as six parts, with pedal. There follow six "catechism" chorales which have been interpreted as corresponding to elements of a Vespers service.[702]

Preceding all of this is the Praeludium, whose first section, with a dotted rhythm that makes one think of a French overture, actually functions as a ritornello, alternating twice with episodes that take the form of a fugue first in three parts, then in four (ex. S13.8). In the key of E-flat—unusual at the time for organ music—the prelude coordinates tonally with the three movements of the *pedaliter* Kyrie that opens the *Missa* portion of the volume, also notated with a signature of three flats. Yet this Kyrie—based on a chorale melody that Bach also set in a four-voice harmonization (BWV 371)—is actually in the Phrygian mode, and Bach treats it as ending on the dominant of C minor.

All three movements of the Kyrie therefore reveal the modal ambivalence or "indecisiveness" that has been observed in certain examples of Renaissance music.[703] Here, however, one observes an ambivalence between modality and tonality themselves: two fundamentally different types of musical structure. Only toward the end of each movement is the ambivalence resolved, in favor of a quasi-modal ending on the dominant in the two Kyries, a tonal ending in C minor in the Christe.[704] The three *manualiter* Kyrie settings function similarly, but a minor third lower, notated without a key signature.

Of the seven chorale melodies treated in the remainder of the volume, only "Allein Gott" and "Jesus Christus unser Heiland"—the first and last—are unambiguously tonal, notated with their expected key signatures and ending (not always immediately) after a conventional full cadence. The absence elsewhere of an unambiguous tonality is not the only thing that lends these compositions a mysterious, perhaps spiritual, quality. Most of the "catechism" hymn settings with pedals fall into ritornello designs familiar from Bach's "Great 18" and other large organ chorales. The *manualiter* versions of almost all the chorale melodies, however, are fughettas,

---

[701] One of these melodies, "Allein Gott" (the German Gloria), receives an extra setting (BWV 675), also *manualiter*, which immediately follows the three manuals-only Kyrie movements.

[702] As demonstrated by Leaver (2010, 152–54), on which this discussion is based.

[703] See Schulenberg (1986, 320–21), referring to earlier writings by Harold S. Powers and Carl Dahlhaus.

[704] The so-called "Picardy third" at the end of the Christe does not negate the *minor* character of its tonality as a whole.

often bringing their subjects in on beats or intervals where one does not expect them. In this respect they go beyond the little chorale fughettas for Advent and Christmas.

For instance, the last of the *manualiter* Kyrie settings is based on a subject that paraphrases a chorale melody in the Phrygian mode. Bach places the initial fugal entries on b′ and f′-sharp (ex. S13.9). This is quite irregular from either a modal or a tonal point of view, and the doubling of the note B at the tenor entry would never occur in a normal tonal composition because it leaves the chord (b/g′/b′) incomplete, weakening the sense of tonality. Presumably the chord is a first-inversion G-major triad, but any sense that G major has been tonicized is contradicted by the B-flat in the next measure, and within two more measures Bach has tonicized A minor. Despite the uncertainty as to how the music might be analyzed, it never gives the impression of being confused or aimless. Nevertheless, the tonal and modal ambivalence must have been intentional (although Bach could not have expressed it that way), lending a sense of mystery to a movement dedicated to the Holy Spirit.

The three larger Kyrie movements with pedals are abstruse cantus firmus settings in four and finally in five parts. At first they seem utterly incohate, but they are shaped by a gradual if very subtle increase in motion. The process continues up to the concluding passage of the second Kyrie, which, as a climactic gesture, juxtaposes chromatic scales in the upper voices against the final phrase of the chorale melody in the pedals (ex. S13.10).

These three movements were probably meant to emulate cantus firmus settings by Frescobaldi and "some old and good Frenchmen," as C. P. E. Bach called them.[705] The shorter *manualiter* settings that follow remain vaguely archaic in style, as noted previously, but the "catechism" chorales on the whole receive more up-to-date types of setting. The *manualiter* settings among these must have been intended to give less advanced players an opportunity to study the types of organ chorales that Bach usually composed with pedals. Hence, in addition to the fughettas already mentioned, they include rare *manualiter* examples of both the "*Orgelbüchlein*" type of chorale prelude (on "Vater unser") and a cantus-firmus fantasia in ritornello form (the first of the three "Allein Gott" settings).

Players were also given examples of the old-fashioned chorale motet, represented by the two settings of "Aus tiefer Not," the first in six parts with double pedal. Despite the massive sonority of the latter, these are among Bach's most austere compositions, seemingly aiming at a neutral expressive effect, like some of his very earliest chorale settings in the Pachelbel tradition. Contrasting with this is the exuberant, gigue-like *manualiter* fughetta on the "Ten Commandments" chorale—which really does bring in its subject ten times—as well as the intensely expressive *pedaliter* "Vater unser." The latter frames the phrases of the chorale melody with a slow fugal ritornello, replete with *galant* melodic embellishments and chromatic voice leading.

Whether these two or any other settings were meant to express emotions particular to their chorales may be doubted, for another of Bach's intentions seems to have been to juxtapose

[705] "einige alte gute französische [Komponisten]," perhaps including Gigault and Couperin, in his letter of Jan. 13, 1775, in BD 3:288 (no. 803); NBR, 398 (no. 395).

utterly different settings of the same melody. Bach's pupil Ziegler claimed that he was taught to play chorales "according to the affect of the words."[706] Yet the lengthy and complicated *pedaliter* "Vater unser" is followed by the straightforward little setting for manuals only. The final *pedaliter* chorale is a virtuoso trio on "Jesus Christus, unser Heiland," with a violinistic leaping subject; its *manualiter* complement is a four-part fugue as complex and chromatic as any in the Art of Fugue (which could have been already drafted when this was published). In the unique *pedaliter* setting of "Wir glauben all'," the hands play a three-part permutation fugue as the feet enter six times with an ostinato bass line in different keys (a design possibly suggested by the *Ricercar con obligo del basso* from Frescobaldi's *Fiori musicali*). This is followed by an equally unique but wholly different *manualiter* setting in dotted rhythm, recalling the gigue from the First French Suite.

Clearly, the Baroque cliché that the emotions can be codified and then represented through chorale melodies, organ registrations, or some other simple symbol system was of limited validity. A clever commentator could always find some plausible explanation of how some music represents an appropriate affect. The virtuoso *pedaliter* setting of "Jesus Christus unser Heiland" (BWV 688) might represent "life-strengthening beliefs," the anger of the Father deflected by Jesus," or "victory over the cross."[707] Yet none of these accounts for the piece's many quirky passing dissonances (see ex. S13.11 below) or its sheer wittiness. Nor could any of these explanations apply to the four-part fugal setting for manuals only, which is acerbic even by the standards of the most austere pieces in the Art of Fugue.

The "searching" or ricercar-like character of such a piece, or even of the little Advent fughettas, recalls Bach's earliest chorale settings, especially those which explore the canonic possibilities of their melodies. But there is a new flexibility in these late works, evident in both the tolerance for irregular passing dissonances and the incorporation of *galant* melodic details in the counterpoint. Those same features make the music even harder to play than most of Bach's, for the sequences and other "note-patterns" that one has come to expect occur less frequently. Where such things do appear, they may incorporate unprepared or passing dissonances where one does not expect them, as at the points marked by asterisks in example S13.11. The invertibility of the counterpoint, moreover, means that both hands (and sometimes the feet) are forced through the same unfamiliar patterns, as in the second half of the example.

Similar writing, although free of any chorale paraphrases or cantus firmi, characterizes the four duets near the end of the volume. These superficially resemble Bach's inventions and the *bicinia* (two-part pieces) of the sixteenth century. They are, however, full-size pieces, perhaps conceived originally for practice by organists unable to play a *pedaliter* trio. The closest parallel outside the *Clavierübung* is the prelude in A minor from WTC2, likely composed during the same period. The latter, although distinct from the duets in its binary form, is equally obsessed with the

---

[706] "nach dem Affect der Wortte [*sic*]," from a letter of application by Johann Gotthilf Ziegler for the Halle organ position won by W. F. Bach, dated Feb. 1, 1746, BD 2:423 (no. 542); NBR, 336 (no. 340).

[707] Williams (2003, 426), skeptically quoting Spitta, Chailley, and Leaver.

symmetrical distribution of unusual, often chromatic, melodic ideas between two absolutely equal voices.

Two of the duets, no. 2 in F and no. 4 in A minor, begin like fugues. Yet they differ from ordinary fugues in the relatively small number of full statements of their subjects, which instead are used as sources of motivic material. The F-major duet is in da capo form, introducing a new chromatic idea in the B section (it is not, however, ever combined with the main subject). The A-minor duet, like the fantasia in the same key from the Third Partita, repeats its entire opening section, with the two parts exchanged, before proceeding to further development and then to something resembling a recapitulation.[708]

The G-major duet (no. 3) might have been the first composed, as it most closely resembles a conventional keyboard piece. For instance, the first statement of the subject is accompanied by a bass line whose arpeggiation is never heard again.[709]This relatively conventional way of starting an otherwise fugal piece has a parallel of sorts at the recapitulation. There the return of the subject in the tonic, originally stated in imitation by the two upper voices in turn, is now divided between the two voices—a device common in *galant* trios of the period (exx. S13.12, S13.13).[710]

This device is conversational, and it reflects one of the most highly valued elements of eighteenth-century conversation: wit. Clever, witty conversationality is evident throughout these duets despite, or sometimes because of, their chromatic element. This is evident from the start of no. 1, where the quasi-ostinato bass line turns out to be a countersubject, shared equally with the upper part; the rare intervals of diminished and augmented octaves appear in both voices (ex. S13.14).

Among the antecedents for the volume's closing fugue is a praeludium by Buxtehude which, like Bach's fugue, has a central *manualiter* section. The melody is generic enough to be found in a siciliana version in an aria from the "Keiser" passion which Bach had performed in 1726, in the same key of E-flat.[711]But Buxtehude's subject also recurs quite closely in a fugue by Hurlebusch published just four years earlier. Bach was a sales agent for Hurlebusch's publication during

---

708

Restatements of opening material in the tonic begin at m. 69 in BWV 805, m. 97 in BWV 827/1.

709 This recalls the opening of the G-major trio sonata (BWV 1039), arranged perhaps around this time for viola da gamba and harpsichord (BWV 1027).

710 Bach does something comparable in the B-minor sonata for flute and keyboard, at the recapitulation in the opening Andante (mm. 80ff.).

711 This is no. 24, "Seht, Menschenkinder," sung after Jesus's death on the cross, once by soprano and then in a second stanza by tenor.

1735 and 1736. Yet the subject did not necessarily travel from Hurlebusch to Bach; Hurlebusch, like Bach, could have known Buxtehude's piece from his early days in Hamburg (ex. S13.15).[712]

Bach's composition shares points with many earlier fugues, surpassing them by virtue of its five-part *pedaliter* scoring. Like the E-major fugue of WTC2, it begins in *stile antico*, with a conventional subject that is soon developed in stretto (m. 21). In the two subsequent sections, the theme, transformed rhythmically, combines with livelier second and third subjects. This is reminiscent of the gigues from the Fourth and Fifth partitas, which introduce new subjects after the double bar. The ending recalls the prelude in E-flat from WTC1, whose conclusion, with stretto entries of the old-fashioned theme soaring above animated "modern" passagework, looks like a preliminary exercise for the last stretto exposition of this work (ex. S13.16).

***Clavierübung* [part 4]** (p. 296, following the second full paragraph, "the conventions of ordinary harpsichord music"

Given his apparent distaste for variation form, essentially absent from his keyboard music since his Weimar days, Bach must have had special reasons for turning to it in what would be his last composition specifically for the harpsichord. He surely knew of earlier variation sets, some of great length, that demonstrated how a simple melody or bass line could be the basis for almost any sort of composition. These incorporated dance movements as well as exercises in imitative chromatic counterpoint; examples by Froberger and Poglietti as well as an early set bearing a doubtful attribution to Bach himself (BWV 990) come to mind. More recent, although less varied in content, were printed examples by Handel and Rameau.

Yet variation in a broader sense had not been so foreign to Bach's later compositions. Many chorale works, including the late cantatas *per omnes versus*, were in a sense sets of variations. Conversely, the recurring bass line of the Goldberg set was a sort of cantus firmus, to which the addition of canons and other contrapuntal devices was a traditional exercise. The latter conception of variation was the basis of a little set of pieces not included in table S13.1 (above): the "Various Canons on the first eight fundamental notes of the preceding aria," that is, the bass line of the Goldbergs.[713]Here, on the blank last page of his personal copy of the printed Goldberg Variations, Bach wrote out fourteen increasingly sophisticated little canons in puzzle notation. These are constructed over the bass notes from the first phrase of the aria (ex. S13.17). These canons might have been envisioned for future use in friends' albums. Bach copied one of them (no. 11) into the *Stammbuch* of a Leipzig theology student in 1748.[714] Another (no. 13, also known as BWV 1076) recurs in the Haussmann portrait, and a manuscript copy was distributed to the membership as Bach's first gift to Mizler's society.

---

[712] As Williams (2003, 139) points out. For the advertisement of Hurlebusch's *Composizioni musicali*, see BD 2:262–63 (no. 373). The hymn tune attributed to William Croft (organist at St. Anne's, London) was first published in 1708.

[713] *Verscheidene Canones über die ersteren acht Fundamental-Noten vorheriger Aria von J. S. Bach"* (from Bach's autograph in in Paris, Bibliothèque National, ms. 17669).

[714] For Johann Gottlieb Fulde; see Wolff (1976, 233); this version of the canon is numbered separately as BWV 1077.

These little canons are incidental to the Goldberg Variations proper, whose monumentality is amplified by the symmetrical construction even of the delicate duet variations, which usually invert both the motivic material and the counterpoint after the double bar. The rigorous symmetry not only of individual movements but of the recurring threefold grouping of movements is broken in the final duet (no. 29), a stupendous take-off on the *batteries* which Rameau had described in the preface to his *Pièces de clavecin* of 1724 (ex. S13.18). The final variation is a quodlibet, quoting one of the same folk tunes worked into the Peasant Cantata (composed around the same time).[715] Yet the work continues with an *Aria da capo*, yielding a total of thirty-two movements—one for each measure in the aria not counting repeats.

Those who immerse themselves in the music—as one must, in order to learn to play it—eventually forget the strangeness of many details. Yet the three variations in the minor mode, in particular, incorporate dissonant, chromatic progressions which elsewhere might be considered awkward or even incompetent. Such writing could be understood as expressive. Yet it also must reflect a fascination in chromaticism or counter-intuitive melodic writing for its own sake, as in earlier works such as Froberger's variations on the tune known as "the Mayerin" (ex. S13.19). Even the twenty-fifth variation, which constitutes the expressive climax of the entire work, also demonstrates abstract compositional virtuosity as it modulates as remotely as E-flat minor, then quickly moves to a "subdominant recapitulation" in C minor (ex. S13.20).

The Canonic Variations (p. 296, following the end of the page, "chorale settings, especially those for Christmas")

Bach had been writing little dedicatory canons since at least 1713, when he is presumed to have copied one into the album (*Stammbuch*) of an unidentified friend.[716] Most of these little canons, including one sent as an initial offering to Mizler's group BWV 1076), are of limited intrinsic interest, constituting something like the musical equivalent of a crossword puzzle. On the other hand, the five variations on "Vom Himmel hoch," like the canonic variations of the Goldberg set, are genuine pieces of music, even surpassing the Goldberg canons as an ingenious demonstration of the strictest of all contrapuntal devices.

Discussion of the Canonic Variations has focused on the unanswerable question of whether either extant version gives the variations in the order in which Bach intended them to be played. Yet there is no certainty that there *was* an intended performance order, any more than for another canonic work, the Musical Offering. The version that was engraved and printed by Bach's former pupil Balthasar Schmidt, probably during 1747, gave the five movements in "puzzle" format. The incomplete notation left it up to the reader to realize the canonic part, saving paper but forcing players to write out their realizations—as Bach himself did in the version that survives in his own autograph fair copy (known as BWV 769a). The autograph version also puts

---

[715] "Ich bin so lang nicht bei dir g'west," the opening tune of the quodlibet, seems to have another phrase of the same tune, quoted at the end of the first recitative in the Peasant Cantata.

[716] Bach's autograph manuscript for the canon BWV 1073 gives the date (Aug. 2, 1713) but not the name of the dedicatee; see BD 1:213 (no. 147); NBR, 65–66 (no. 45).

the longest and most elaborate of the five variations in third place, not last as in the printed copies.

Only in the fifth variation (that is, the last one as printed) is the chorale melody itself treated in canon. This becomes possible when the melody is manipulated in various rhythmic and melodic ways. That Bach had this printed last as the culmination of the set seems clear, as it actually comprises two distinct variations, employing four different sorts of canonic imitation. This fifth variation ends with what is labeled as a stretto, actually a simultaneous statement of all four phrases of the melody. In other variations the hymn tune serves as a cantus firmus, also supplying motivic material for the two canonic parts. In variation 3, however, the canon itself becomes accompaniment, in a way that recalls the climactic variation 25 of the Goldberg set (ex. S13.21; cf. ex. S13.20).

Whether even an astute listener finds the variations entirely successful as music might be doubted, despite the intense interest its history has engendered. Williams described the canonic technique as producing "melodies and progressions not only otherwise unheard but strangely rapt and intense."[717] Yet this remains austere music whose appreciation can barely begin without some acquaintance with its score. Stravinsky managed to make it sound enticingly like his own neoclassic music; he arranged it for chorus and orchestra, adding a significant overlay of new material.[718]

The Schübler chorales (p. 297, following the first paragraph, "a chorale movement from one of the cantatas")

Like the Canonic Variations, the Schübler chorales are discussed at least as much for their origin as for their intrinsic musical content (see table S13.2). The chief questions are why the arrangements were made and whether Bach carried them out or merely authorized them—for neither are they particularly idiomatic for the player, nor do they improve on or embellish the originals in ways that we would expect, based on Bach's other keyboard arrangements. Admittedly none of the latter are derived from vocal music, unless one counts two very doubtful examples.[719] Yet it is hard to see these selections as particularly compelling examples of their genres, with the possible exception of the movement that opened the set, from the now-popular Cantata 140. Superficially, however, these pieces reveal a generally lively and accessible style, and they survive in a personal copy (*Handexemplar*) that contains many handwritten corrections, made necessary by the faulty character of Schübler's edition.

Table S13.2. The Schübler chorales

[717] 2003, 518.

[718] Straus (1986, 319–24) describes Stravinsky's version as a "recomposition," citing Milton Babbitt on its relationship to the serial music that Stravinsky was composing at the time (1956).

[719] BWV 584, arranged from the aria BWV 166/2, and BWV 131a, based on the choral fugue "Und er wird Israel erlösen" from the very early Cantata 131. Both are probably posthumous adaptations.

BWV	melodykey	source work/movement (date)		type
645	Wachet auf	Eb	BWV 140/4 (1731)	solo chorale
646	Wo soll ich fliehen hin	e	none known	chorale trio
647	Wer nur den lieben Gott	c	BWV 93/4 (1724)	chorale aria (duet)
648	Meine Seele erhebt den Herren	d	BWV 10/5 (1724)	duet with chorale cantus firmus
649	Ach bleib bei uns	Bb	BWV 6/3 (1725)	solo chorale
650	Kommst du nun, Jesu	G	BWV 137/2 (1725)	solo chorale

It remains uncertain whether these arrangements should be regarded as companion pieces to the Canonic Variations and other exemplary works of Bach's late years.[720] It is likely that Bach at least selected the six movements for arrangement and publication, and it is possible that he composed the second one anew, leaving the transcriptions of the others to an assistant (perhaps Schübler himself). The second piece differs from the others in its trio texture, and this as well as its actual content recall Bach's earlier setting of the same chorale melody.[721] Each of the remaining settings originated as either solo chorales or chorale arias, the three or four parts of the original compositions being easily adaptable to the organ, or so it would seem, although it is not in fact easy to find suitable movements in the known cantatas.[722] Bach presumably determined the order, placing the two quartet movements at the center.[723]

Those purchasing the set could not have known of the vocal origins of all or most of the pieces unless they remembered hearing them at Leipzig. Given the cultivation of thin textures in the *galant* style, few would have objected to the occasional emptiness that arises as a result of the unrealized bass lines, originally for continuo. A colorful organ registration would have helped make the texture seem complete, although it is an open question whether organists would have played music such as this more often in public, that is, at church, than at home on pedal clavichords, such as the one that Bach must have owned by this time.[724]

The Musical Offering (table) (p. 299, following the first paragraph break, "Bach's original improvisation on the royal theme")

---

[720] Potential justifications for doing so are given by Williams (2003, 322) and Tatlow (2015, 217–23).

[721] BWV 694, probably a Weimar work; it is preserved in a copy from around 1760 by J. L. Krebs (Brussels, Bibliothèque Royal, ms. II 3919 (Fétis 2026 [II]), fascicle 7).

[722] As shown by Williams (203, 322–23).

[723] As noted by Werner Breig in the introduction to his edition, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

[724] Bach's pedal clavichord was included in his estate as "three claviers with pedal"; see Speerstra (2004, 25–26).

Table S13.3 presents an overview of the work's contents:

Table S13.3. The Musical Offering

BWV	NBA	title
		Musicalisches Opfer Sr. Königlichen Majestät in Preußen etc. allerunterthänigst gewidmet von Johann Sebastian Bach *(Musical Offering dedicated most respectfully to His Royal Highness in Prussia, etc., by Johann Sebastian Bach)*
1	1	Ricercar [a 3] *(Ricercar in three parts)*
	6	Canon perpetuus super Thema Regium *(Perpetual canon on the royal theme)*
3	3	Sonata sopra il Soggetto Reale *(Sonata on the royal theme)*
4h	7	Canon perpetuus *(Perpetual canon)*
		Regis Iussu Cantio Et Reliqua Canonica Arte Resoluta *(A composition at the King's command, with other matter written in canonic style)*
2	2	Ricercar à 6 *(Ricercar in six parts)*
4i	8a	Canon à 2 Quaerendo invenietis *(Canon in two parts, by seeking you will find)*
4j	8b	Canon à 4 *(Canon in four parts)*
		Canones diversi super Thema Regium *(Various canons on the royal theme)**
4a	4a	Canon 1 a 2 *[crab canon in two parts]*
4b	4b	2. a 2 Violini in Unisono *(for two violins at the unison)*
4c	4c	3. a 2 per Motum contrarium *(by inversion)*
	4d	4. a 2 per Augmentationem, contrario Motu *(in augmentation, by inversion)*
4e	4e	5. a 2 per Tonos *(modulating by steps)*
4f	5	Fuga canonica in Epidiapente *(Canonic fugue at the fifth above)*

The individual items are grouped as in the original publication, but the ordering of the groups as shown is arbitrary. BWV numbers are those of subentries under BWV 1079 in the 1985 edition of the Schmieder catalog; NBA numbers are from the edition by Christoph Wolff (NBA, vol. 8/1, 1994).

*In the presentation copy this includes an additional handwritten title page: *Thematis regii elaborationes canonicae* (Canonic elaborations of the royal theme).

The Musical Offering (p. 300, following the first paragraph break, "a vaguely similar fugue subject")

It is impossible to say how seriously the king, or even Bach, took the contrived Latin acrostic based on the word *ricercar* (used as a title for the six-part fugue and two canons printed at the bottom of its last page). Certainly, however, as in the *Clavierübung* there is an element here of serious play, which the composer must have expected the king to appreciate. Anything dedicated to a king, especially this one, was also in a sense dedicated to his court musicians, who might be

expected to have to perform it with their employer. We know, too, that Sebastian sent many copies to friends, among whom must have been members of the Prussian *Capelle*, including Quantz and his own son Emanuel.[725] Other Prussian court ensembles, such as that of the king's brother Heinrich (which was led by Kirnberger), would also have played these pieces.[726]

Professional musicians would have read through the trio sonata and sought solutions for the canons, even if the king did not.[727] The dedication copy (on special paper) that Bach sent to Berlin eventually went to the collection of the king's sister, which was overseen by Kirnberger. But as late as 1774 Frederick himself remembered the theme which he had given to Bach—although he also remembered Bach's improvising fugues in four, five, and eight parts, which even if possible is not what other sources recorded.[728]

Quantz must have been thinking about the work as he wrote his book on flute playing during the next few years, for he took care to explain the special fingerings needed for playing certain difficult trills in the sonata; these are found in few other flute works of the period.[729] Neither the sonata nor the Canon perpetuus, the only other movement that specifies the flute, requires the special two-keyed type of instrument that Quantz made for the king. Yet both works, like Bach's E-major flute sonata, were most likely written with Quantz's flutes in mind. Bach probably also assumed performance at the low pitch that was still favored not only at Berlin but, probably, elsewhere in Germany for private chamber music.[730] It is less likely that the two ricercars were composed specifically for the fortepiano, as is often claimed, for such instruments were still very rare in Germany. Nor can it be assumed that the three-part ricercar preserves aspects of Bach's first improvisation on the king's theme, played on the new palace piano, for there is nothing in the music to demand a dynamic instrument. The small, quiet Florentine-style pianos made by Silbermann were prized above all for accompaniment; such instruments would have been most

---

[725] Sebastian wrote on Oct. 6, 1748 to Elias that only one hundred copies had been printed, most of them "distributed *gratis* to good friends" (*die meister an gute Freünde gratis verthan worden*, BD 1:117 [no. 49], trans. in NBR, 234 [no. 257]).

[726] On Prince Henry's *Capelle*, see Oleskiewicz (2011, 109–10). Kirnberger published a realization of the figured bass for the third movement as an illustration in his *Grundsätze des Generalbasses* (Berlin, 1781; edited in NBA, vol. 8/1). This is one of several sources showing that the work was long studied, if only as a challenging exercise in keyboard harmony.

[727] Hard evidence for this is limited to a set of two parts for harpsichord and violin—a realization of the Fuga canonica written out by Emanuel shortly after the work's publication, to judge from the handwriting (in Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. Bach P 218).

[728] Frederick sang the theme to the diplomat Van Swieten, according to the latter's report of July 26, 1774, in BD 3:276 (no. 790), trans. in NBR, 366–67 (no. 360).

[729] As noted by Oleskiewicz (1999, 101–2).

[730] The use of low chamber pitch "for the sake of flutes" (*um der Flöten willen*) may well have applied at Leipzig as well, to judge from a comment made by Adlung (1758, 570).

useful not in the ricercars but in the sonata, where delicate chord playing is implied especially in the *piano* passages of the slow third movement.[731]

Bach's two ricercars form a complementary pair. The one in three voices is sometimes described as improvisatory and thus, again, representing what Bach actually played in his initial appearance at Potsdam. But it is no more (or less) improvisatory than some of the freer fugues of the WTC, such as the one in D minor from book 2—which is based on a somewhat comparable subject, and which Bach actually quotes in one passage (m. 128). This ricercar includes several lively episodes, and it also alludes briefly to the *galant* "sigh" figures heard more prominently in the sonata (ex. S13.22).

In these things the three-part ricercar contrasts radically with the one in six parts. The latter, like the six-part setting of "Aus tiefer Not" from the *Clavierübung*, is a densely textured exercise in archaic style. It is made even more challenging by the absence of pedals, which imposed stiff restrictions on the type of voice leading that could be managed by two hands alone. But although it was printed in open score—simplifying the engraver's task—the six-part ricercar was clearly meant for solo keyboard, without pedals, as is shown by an early version which survives in Bach's hand, notated on just two staves.[732] The texture thins out for substantial portions of the piece, after the initial build-up to massive six-part polyphony during the first exposition. Indeed, the movement as a whole is centered around a much lighter, livelier passage that presents, first, the subject, then an episode, both in trio-sonata style (mm. 66–72).

The Musical Offering: Sonata and canons (p. 300, following the first full paragraph, "contrasting form and character")

Both slow movements gain an elegiac character from early references to the subdominant. This was a favorite device of Emanuel Bach, whose "Prussian" and "Württemberg" sonatas, published in 1742 and 1744, must have been known to Sebastian.[733]Those keyboard sonatas might even have provided a few suggestions for the Musical Offering, as in the inclusion of a "drum" bass in the opening Largo. Common at Berlin even in slow movements, the repeated notes are ameliorated by the addition of slurs—indications for bow vibrato, as called for in other works, such as Cantata 82. That Bach assumed the participation of a good cellist is clear from the fact that the bass line is as expressive as the upper parts, as in many of Quantz's sonatas. This is true

[731] Dynamic markings appear only in the flute and violin parts, however.

[732] This version (in Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. Bach P 226/1) differs from the published one only in details; could the manuscript have been begun with the intention of serving as Bach's offering to Mizler's society for 1747? Milka (2017, 228–29) argues similarly for the other late fugue that survives in an autograph keyboard score, the *Fuga a 3 soggetti* from the Art of Fugue.

[733] The nicknames for these sets of sonatas, each comprising a half dozen, derive from their dedications to King Frederick and an allied duke, respectively.

above all in the third movement, where all three lines share the slurred opening motive and ensuing "sigh" figures (ex. S13.23).[734]

The two slow movements of the sonata are the only components of the Musical Offering that do not include the royal theme. It is, however, used as a subject in both allegros, which are fugues of very different types. If the king did play through the sonata, he might at first have wondered when he would hear his theme, for it remains absent until the second exposition of the second movement. There it finally appears in the bass, not unlike the late entry of a chorale melody as a cantus firmus in several organ works.[735]Not until the altered "da capo" of this ternary-form movement does the flute get to play the royal theme, now revealed as the principal counter-subject, soaring above the fugue's main theme (ex. S13.24).

Bach might have treated the subject in a similar way when he first improvised on the king's theme, employing something like cantus firmus technique, as developed through long practice in playing organ chorales. The closing allegro, however, transforms the theme into an *empfindsam* melody, interpolating rests (or sighs) into its chromatic second half (ex. S13.25). Despite this halting subject, the movement, which employs the meter of a gigue, generates extraordinary intensity in the build-ups to its three principal cadences (at mm. 38, 69, and the end at m. 113). Requiring exceptional virtuosity from all four players, this might be the most difficult chamber music Bach ever wrote, from the point of view of the ensemble as a whole. As such it signified his respect for the musicality of the king, even if the latter found the music more involuted than he would have preferred.

The king may not have had time to contemplate the canons very deeply, if at all. Fugue and canon were, however, serious pastimes for many of his subjects. Among these was Marpurg, whose two-volume book on imitative counterpoint was published during 1753–54, shortly after he helped bring out the posthumous Art of Fugue. Bach clearly had an audience of musical intellectuals in mind as he attached learned Latin titles to the little puzzle canons of the Musical Offering. He must have understood that the rubrics were more teasing than genuinely descriptive, only adding to the challenge of puzzling out the realizations of the ten canons (see table S13.4). The canons range from relatively simple examples, not much more elaborate than those written into friends' albums (*Stammbücher*), to longer ones that constitute genuine self-contained compositions, like the canons in the Art of Fugue and the Canonic Variations.

---

[734] The best of the court cellists was probably Ignaz Mara, but at the time of Bach's visit the *basso* in Frederick's private concerts was played by Johann Georg Speer and the gambist Christian Ludwig Hesse in alternation; Franz Benda was the principal violinist (Oleskiewicz 2011, 98).

[735] E.g., the trio on "Herr Jesu Christ, dich zu uns wend'" (BWV 655) from the "Great 18," last worked on by Bach perhaps around 1742.

Table S13.4. The canons in the Musical Offering (bold type signifies canonic treatment of the royal theme)

Title	Location within original print	Comment
Canon perpetuus super Thema Regium	Follows 3-part ricercar	In three parts: two-part canon at the octave in outer parts, royal theme as cantus firmus in middle part
Canon perpetuus	Follows sonata (in parts)	In three parts: flute and violin in two-part canon by contrary motion, over free figured bass
Quaerendo invenietis	Follows 6-part ricercar	This rubric appears next to the title “Canon a 2” but seems meant to apply to both pieces.
Canon a 2 (two-part canon)		At least two workable solutions
Canon a 4 (four-part canon)		All four parts in imitation at the unison or octave
Canones diversi super Thema Regium	On a separate sheet	
1. Canon a 2 cancrizans		A version of the royal theme played backwards and forwards simultaneously
2. Canon a 2 Violini in unisono		In three parts: canon at the unison for two violins, over a bass comprised of the royal theme
3. Canon a 2 per Motum contrarium		In three parts: royal theme in the upper voice above two-part canon by inversion
4. Canon a 2 per Augmentationem, contrario Motu		In three parts: embellished version of royal theme in middle part, upper voice imitating the lower in inversion and double note values
5. Canon a 2 per Tonos		In three parts: royal theme in upper part, repeated successively one whole step higher; canon at the fifth in lower parts
Fuga canonica in Epidiapente	Follows the *Canones diversi*	Trio movement: two upper parts in canon at the fifth over free bass; royal theme as fugue subject (upper parts only)

All but one of these are, despite their varying titles, perpetual canons. Hence they lack a final cadence, instead cycling endlessly (or until the performers give up). Like the smaller canons traditionally written into personal albums, they are sophisticated contrapuntal entertainments, not concert pieces meant for an audience. Modern performers need to decide not only the instrumentation of each piece but how to end them; not every item has a satisfactory stopping point.[736]

Five of these pieces offer canonic treatment of the royal theme itself, suitably varied or altered. In five others the theme serves as a cantus firmus or counterpoint to a canon in two other parts. Bach specified instrumentation for only two items: the second of the "Diverse Canons," which is for two violins plus an unspecified bass instrument; and the "Perpetual Canon," whose three parts were printed at the ends of the flute, violin, and continuo parts of the sonata. This reflects the fact that the Perpetual Canon is one of the longer and more substantial of the canons, although only the Fuga canonica is an entirely self-contained composition, with a notated final cadence. Emanuel Bach's instrumentation of the latter for violin and obbligato harpsichord might reflect his father's practice; it more surely reflects the Berlin tradition of playing "trios" as duets with obbligato keyboard. The canon "per tonos" is also relatively lengthy, if only by virtue of its unique rubric, which requires the performers to repeat it at successively higher scale degrees. It therefore modulates upwards by whole step with each repetition, recalling the aria "Unter seinem Purpursaum" from the Cöthen serenata BWV 173a.[737]

However arcane their compositional technique, even these little pieces reflect Bach's accustomed aspirations toward both expression and variety. Their pervasive chromaticism, dictated by the theme, might have been only symbolic of expressive intent. Yet the written-out melodic embellishment of both the theme and its added counterpoints employs Bach's usual vocabularly of expressive figures; none of the canons adopts the simpler, archaic style of the six-part ricercar. They range instead from the trio-sonata manner of the Fuga canonica to something like the dotted section of a French overture in the Canon by augmentation and contrary motion.

The Art of Fugue (p. 304, following the first paragraph break, "two of his most intricate and overwhelming compositions")

Bach left no title in his own hand for the work as a whole, and the few headings for individual movements in his manuscript do not always correspond with those in the work as printed. One might suppose that, during ten years or more of labor on the Art of Fugue, Bach would have made his thoughts about such things known to those around him. Yet the work as printed in 1751 shows signs of misunderstanding or at least improvisation, as in the substitution of a chorale motet (BWV 668a) for the end of the incomplete "Fugue with three subjects."[738] The general

---

[736] In recordings, a fadeout might be more authentic, in the sense of conveying the "perpetual" character of these little works.

[737] As the serenade was performed in honor of Prince Leopold, Bach might have remembered the device as something appropriate for a musical offering to a ruler.

[738] That the chorale setting compensated for the incompleteness of the fugue is explicit in the brief prefatory notice presumably placed by Emanuel in the 1751 edition and in the longer

title, added in the manuscript by Friedrich Bach, is probably Sebastian's, but it was given differently in the first edition, which changed the Latin *fuga* to German *Fuge*.

Either form of the word could have signified not the individual compositions that we call fugues but contrapuntal imitation in the abstract, as a compositional principle or device. The collection employs two distinct types of imitation in two types of pieces; in the printed edition these are called "contrapuncti" and "canons," respectively. Marpurg would make a similar distinction when he published his "treatise on fugue" (*Abhandlung von der Fuge*) in 1753–54, dividing it into two volumes, the first on fugue proper, the latter on canon. Bach's *contrapuncti* correspond, in general, to what we call fugues, but several of them differ from conventional fugues by combining the theme with itself in one way or another, right from the start. The canons also differ from typical examples of the time not only by being much longer but—in the printed versions—by following schemes that could not be represented by the traditional puzzle notation. Their scores therefore had to be given in full. On the other hand, the canons lack the free bass lines or cantus firmi present in most of the other canons in Bach's late works. For this reason they are readily playable as duets on a keyboard instrument.

Whatever its intended plan, the Art of Fugue is in principle cumulative. It starts with four "simple" contrapuncti—that is, pieces using a single form of the subject, either upright (nos. 1–2) or inverted (nos. 3–4), sometimes with a regular countersubject (ex. S13.26). The two forms of the subject are combined in stretto at the beginning of each of the next three pieces. Of these, no. 6 also adds entries in diminution (half note values); no. 7 adds entries in augmentation (double values). At times in the latter, one hears the subject simultaneously at three different tempos, both upright and inverted (ex. S13.27).

Further wrinkles appear in contrapuncti 9 and 10. Both are double fugues, combining the theme with new subjects, in double counterpoint at the twelfth and the tenth, respectively. The same intervals of inversion are the basis of the last two canons (as printed).[739]Contrapuncti 8 and 11 are triple fugues; they use the same three subjects, the last of which incorporates the BACH motive (ex. S13.28). The most advanced writing, in principle, occurs in contrapuncti 12 and 13. These are mirror fugues in four and three voices, respectively, playable both rightside-up and upside-down. But the emotional and compositional climax of the set probably occurs in Contrapunctus 11, more specifically at a point near the end where all three subjects are first combined—or possibly a bit later, when the upright and inverted forms of the subject appear simultaneously (ex. S13.29).

---

introduction by Marpurg added in 1752. Milka (2017, 147–58) asserts that Emanuel must have been better informed about his father's intentions than is usually supposed. During the period in question, however, Emanuel was not only writing volume 1 of his *Essay* (1753) but traveling and doubtless dealing with matters relating to the settlement of his father's estate. It cannot be assumed that he was in a position in effect to carry out, in effect, a critical edition of Sebastian's last work.

[739] These canons are absent from the manuscript version. It is generally assumed that the Augmentation Canon, which comes first in the printed edition, was actually meant to go last.

As in other examples of “demonstration counterpoint,” such as the fugue in B-flat minor from WTC2, the increase in contrapuntal sophistication corresponds with an increase in expressive intensity. Here, however, the process takes place over the set as a whole, as well as within individual movements. The first few contrapuncti are in a relatively conventional *stile antico*, echoing the archaic vocal works that Bach had been copying out and performing during the mid-1730s (see table S13.8 below). But Contrapunctus 4—added for the printed edition—is longer and more flowing, also modulating farther and more dramatically than the first three. With no. 6, Bach introduces the *stile francese*, by which he meant the dotted rhythm of a French overture.[740]

Both affective and contrapuntal intensity reach a climax in the two triple fugues, particularly as the chromatic BACH subject leads both into increasingly remote keys (such as E minor in ex. S13.29a). From here the music grows dark, even murky, with the four-part mirror fugue (Contrapunctus 12), a somewhat contrived exercise in archaic style. One might have expected as much, given the piece’s challenging compositional scheme. Yet the three-part mirror fugue that follows is in the style of a virtuoso gigue. It is virtually unplayable by a single performer, however, and Bach therefore arranged both versions—upright and inverted—for two players at two “claviers” (*Clav.*). The latter might have meant either harpsichords or clavichords. This piece is the climax of the work from the point of view of keyboard display, although the first double fugue (no. 9), with its dashing first subject, certainly comes close.

The BACH theme returns as the last of three subjects in the extant portion of the incomplete fugue. Since the nineteenth century, it has been assumed that the fragment was to continue to a final section, in which the three subjects are combined with the main theme of the work as a whole. Many attempts have been made to complete the fugue, some frankly departing from Bach’s style or what we know of his intentions, others attempting to remain within certain parameters, such as a stipulated length. One commentator has retracted his own previously proposed reconstruction of the movement’s structure, finding the necessary rhythmic alteration of the main theme “forced and unnatural” (see ex. S13.30b).[741]Other parts of the Art of Fugue, however, are not entirely free of “forced and unnatural” melodic writing. In any case, a different rhythmic modification of the theme easily eliminates the need for an awkward syncopation (ex. S13.30a).

***Lieder:* chorales and songs** (p. 305, following the first paragraph break, “the melodies are his own”)

The four-part chorale harmonizations

740

Bach had already written a fugue in this style; that was the D-major fugue of WTC1, a much shorter and simpler piece.

741 G. Butler (2008, 116–20), retracting his own earlier finding (1983, 54) that the fugue should have occupied pages 45–50 of the first edition; the latter was the basis of the reconstruction in Schulenberg (2006, 425–27). Tatlow (2015, 252) finds reasons for keeping close to the 279-bar length originally proposed by Butler.

At a time when most notated hymnals, such as those edited by Graupner and Telemann, gave only simple two-part harmonizations, Bach could not have anticipated publishing the several hundred four-part settings included in his cantatas. Today these are considered “simple,” and modern church hymnals of all denominations typically include at least a handful of “Bach chorales” alongside four-part settings of other tunes. But even the simple or cantional chorale settings included in Baroque cantatas were examples of “figural” music, and hymn books containing this type of arrangement did not become routine before the nineteenth century. The relatively few eighteenth-century examples with four-part harmonizations were probably intended for study or domestic use, not worship.[742]

The posthumous edition of Sebastian’s four-part chorale settings by Emanuel Bach and Kirnberger was thus something of an innovation. It was also the first project to publish any of his mature vocal music, but it was incomplete, as it omitted the texts, thereby misleading generations of students as to the original significance of these harmonizations. Emanuel Bach and Kirnberger, while rightly admiring Sebastian’s ingenious and expressive four-part harmony, seem not to have considered publishing the settings in anything like the format used for the *Melodien* of Sebastian’s successor Doles. In 1758, he issued settings of sacred poems by the Leipzig poet Gellert; these appeared simultaneously in four-part vocal arrangements and in the more customary format as lieder for solo voice and keyboard.[743] Included with the music for each song was the poem, comprising multiple stanzas.

The much larger number of “Bach chorales,” with their many stanzas, made it impractical to include the texts together with his harmonizations. When the latter finally came out, first in an incomplete edition of two hundred settings, then in the better-known one containing 371 chorales, the editors were focused on the “harmony,” by which they actually meant something closer to what we call counterpoint. The must have assumed that readers knew the poems or could consult them in other hymnals.[744]

Yet most of these settings were taken from cantatas or other larger works, where they had been made for specific stanzas of the chorale poems. The roughly one hundred settings that cannot be traced to other extant works are often assumed to have been taken from lost compositions, as indeed seems true for a number of settings can be fitted with texts from the lost St. Mark Passion and some of Picander’s cantata librettos. Most editions nevertheless show these arrangements as Emanuel Bach did, without the words. This obscures the possibility that Bach’s harmony (especially the use of dissonances) and modulations might reflect specific images or ideas in the

---

[742] See Dirst (2012, 41–44).

[743] Emanuel would have been familiar with this edition, having published his own collection of Gellert-Lieder (W. 194) in the same year.

[744] The brief foreword by Emanuel Bach that introduced the first edition (2 vols., Berlin: Birnstiel, 1765–69) envisions the player reading the score at the organ or clavichord and does not mention the words. It was reprinted with no essential change, except to acknowledge the assistance of Kirnberger, in the second edition (4 vols., Leipzig: Breitkopf, 1784–87).

texts. As a result, the expression “Bach chorale” suggests for many an abstract harmonization of purely theoretical interest.[745]

By his last decade, Bach must have written out hundreds of four-part chorale harmonizations. Although most probably originated as movements in church pieces, some were likely written independently or for use at the keyboard. Indeed, Emanuel’s view of these settings as useful above all for the study of “harmony” might go back to his father, who perhaps neglected to explain how his often ingenious and expressive polyphony was ultimately inspired by the words. Recognized ever since as models of voice leading and harmony, the arrangements were already being copied into manuscript collections by Sebastian’s pupils, decades before their publication. This suggests that he kept his own anthology for instruction.[746]

These settings still play a role in traditional approaches to the teaching of harmony. Since the nineteenth century, however, they have tended to be analyzed in terms of chord functions, following theories that derive ultimately from Rameau. Yet Emanuel declared his father’s views to be “anti-Ramellian.”[747] The implication was that Sebastian rejected the idea that chords should be understood according to a fundamental bass that exists only as a theoretical or analytical construct. It may be that Emanuel was projecting his own ideas onto his father. Yet anyone who understands a chorale harmonization in terms of roots and chord progressions, as opposed to voice leading and figured bass realization, is unlikely to be able to harmonize a melody in the style of Bach.

Sacred and secular songs (lieder)

As fundamental as chorale harmonizations were for Bach throughout his career, original songs or lieder by him are found in just one or possibly two publications. The more important of these, known as Schemelli’s Songbook (*Musicalisches Gesang-Buch*), was a hymnbook for the Lutheran congregations of the dioceses of Naumburg-Zeitz, compiled by Georg Christian Schemelli. A former student at the St. Thomas School, he was cantor in Magdalena’s home town of Zeitz. His son Christian Friedrich attended the St. Thomas School during 1731–34 and eventually succeeded him at Zeitz. Many composers of the period, including Telemann and Graupner (and later Quantz and Emanuel Bach), contributed to hymnbooks. Why Sebastian did

[745] Although the NBA gives these arrangements without texts, the latter have been restored in some editions, notably that of Bernhard Friedrich Richter (Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, ca. 1912, numerous reprints).

[746] Copies survive by Johann Ludwig Dietel and Christian Friedrich Penzel, both students in the St. Thomas School who went on to become provincial cantors. Dietel’s collection of 149 settings, copied around 1735 (Leipzig, Bach-Archiv, Peters ms. R 18), is edited in NBA, vol. 3/2.1. Penzel’s collection includes four-part versions of twelve of the Schemelli songs (discussed below); it is now at Berkeley (University of California, MS 1402).

[747] “Daß meine und meines seel. Vatters Grundsätze antirameauisch sind, können Sie laut sagen” (the closing line in Kirnberger’s *Kunst des reinen Satzes*, part 2, vol. 3 [Berlin and Königsberg: Decker und Hartung, 1779], p. 188, quoting a letter from C. P. E. Bach).

so only for a region southwest of Leipzig, rather than Leipzig itself, is explained by the fact that the Leipzig churches continued to use versions of older hymnbooks during Bach's time there. Indeed, in 1730 the introduction of new hymns was expressly forbidden by order from Dresden. This was probably in response to the controversy over the selection of hymns that had arisen a year and a half previously.[748] If this was a frustration for Bach, his only way around it was to contribute to hymnody elsewhere.

Most hymnbooks of the time still gave only texts, but during the eighteenth century it became increasingly common to print at least recently composed melodies, with figured bass. Schemelli gave music for sixty-nine of his 954 song texts, arranging to have some of the melodies "newly composed" by Bach; some of the figured basses were also "improved" by him.[749] To what degree Bach also served as "musical editor" of the entire book,[750] assigning opening pitches to hymns lacking musical notation by the addition of a letter code, must remain uncertain; Schemelli was a trained singer and cantor and was presumably capable of adding these minimal musical rubrics himself.

Only one setting is explicitly attributed to Bach. His authorship of "Vergiss mein nicht" (Forget me not) is evident in the close attention to the poem's prosody, yielding a subtly asymmetrical musical phrasing and never repeating himself musically in the three restatements of the poem's opening line. Bach's hand is also evident in the very independent bass line, although it is surprising that this lacks the precise continuo figuring present in most of the other songs with figured bass. The latter often dictates the voice leading of inner parts, as in Bach's figured basses elsewhere.

Bach's hand has also been seen in two further songs, one of which Magdalena copied (in a slightly different version) into her 1725 music book. There it immediately follows Sebastian's copy of the same melody in a four-part arrangement.[751] The other song is "So Gehst du nun," whose chromatic bass line certainly looks characteristic of Bach. Yet he seems to have performed a more satisfactory five-part version ten years before Schemelli published the much

[748] See the consistory's order of Feb. 16, 1730 (in Bitter 1865, 2:86–87, trans. in NBR, 143–44 [no. 149]) and Bach's earlier complaint of Sept. 20, 1728 (BD 1:54–55 [no. 19]; NBR, 137–38 [no. 138]). It is hard to understand how the order of 1730 could be interpreted "to indicate that Bach's view prevailed" (NBR, 139, as in the original *Bach Reader*), for clearly the consistory ruled against any discretion on the part of the cantor in hymn selection.

[749] "Die in diesem Musicalischen Gesangbuche befindlinchen Melodien, sind von . . . Bach . . . theils ganz neu componiret, theils auch von Ihm im General-Baß verbessert" (unnumbered final page of the foreword by Friedrich Schultze, dated April 24, 1736).

[750] As proposed by Leaver (2014, 29).

[751] "Dir, dir, Jehovah, will ich singen." Both manuscript settings are listed under BWV 299, the published version as BWV 452. A second hymn copied by Magdalena, "Wie wohl ist mir" (BWV 517), is also included in Schemelli's book but without music. G. Butler (1984, 246–47) identifies nine of the printed engravings as reproductions of Bach's autograph manuscript.

simpler one in two parts. This was one of the movements added for the 1726 performance of the "Keiser" passion (discussed below). Although it includes four vocal parts, at least one additional string part, needed to fill out the harmony, is missing.[752] This version of the song has an improved melody in m. 2 and also avoids the banal repetition of the latter in the penultimate phrase. From this one might surmise that at least some of the arrangements published by Schemelli were relatively old or, at any rate, had not been recently checked over by Bach.

That Bach and his contemporaries saw no significant distinction, musically or poetically, between secular and sacred songs is clear from the placement of both types side by side in the later pages of Magdalena's 1725 book. There is, moreover, little difference in style between a minuet in D minor (BWV Anh. 132) that she copied near the end of that manuscript and the little sacred song "Schaff's mit mir, Gott" (BWV 514) that she added, probably some time later, on the front side of the same page. Both are in two written parts, but the song benefits from a realization of its figured bass, as the melody lacks the broken chords which fill out the harmony in the minuet. The presence of such songs alongside simple dances bears out Emanuel's report that continuo playing was basic to Bach's teaching, introduced at an early age. The skills involved in realizing the figured bass of a song—probably while accompanying oneself at the keyboard—were the same ones expected of any organist. Not every song here or in the Schemelli book is completely figured, however, suggesting that Bach gave pupils unfigured as well as figured basses to realize.[753]

Both improvised and written song harmonization must have been part of the training for all Bach's pupils, many of whom would have gone on to jobs as church organists. As such they would have been expected above all to accompany hymns, either from memory (improvising the accompaniment) or by extemporaneously fleshing out the type of simple two-part setting found in the Schemelli and Magdalena Bach books.[754] Probably not every student advanced beyond that, but some must have gone on to study Bach's written-out chorale harmonizations.

A second, secular songbook also appeared at Leipzig in 1736. The *Singende Muse an der Pleisse* (Singing Muse on the River Pleisse) was the work of the poet Johann Sigismund Scholze, known as Sperontes. His talent was to write strophic verses that were to be sung to popular song and dance tunes; he published these parody texts in a series of volumes that continued to appear until 1745. Whether J. S. Bach had anything to do with Sperontes is uncertain, but the possibility that he contributed to or edited some of the melodies and their often elegant figured bass accompaniments cannot be entirely ruled out. He probably was not, however, the composer of

---

[752] Hans Bergmann provides a convincing reconstruction in his edition (*Reinhard Keiser: Passio secundum Marcum*, Stuttgart: Carus, 1997).

[753] That BWV 514 was used in teaching is clear from the addition of letter names for the pitches above the vocal line in Magdalena's copy.

[754] Leaver (2016) argues that a manuscript *Choralbuch* now in Rochester, containing rudimentary figured-bass settings of chorales, may have been a product of the unidentified copyist's studies with Bach or a Bach pupil. An example is transcribed by Remeš (2017, 33).

one song with a dubious attribution to “Bach.”[755] The musical style of this song is, however, close to that of the little pieces in Magdalena’s notebook; the opening phrase of another of Sperontes’ songs, “Ich bin nun wie ich bin,” recurs in an early sonata by C. P. E. Bach.[756]

The background to Bach’s passions (p. 306, following the first paragraph, “birth, resurrection, and ascension as heavenly king”)

Other composers were exploring similar types of sacred drama during the first decades of the eighteenth century. The plain narrative of the gospels could be elaborated and its lessons spelled out by the insertion of poetic reflections and chorale stanzas. Some librettos went so far as to give arias to the figures of the biblical narrative, including Jesus, Mary, and the disciples. Some also dispensed with the traditional narration, turning the entire work into a lyrical contemplation of biblical history rather than a “history” in itself. Others, including those set by Bach, kept the “voices” of the arias at the level of allegory or metaphor, identifying some of them only as the “Daughter [of] Zion” or the like. Nevertheless, the words of Jesus and others as reported in the biblical narrative were still sung by separate soloists, the narrative being borne (usually) by a tenor whose part is labeled “Evangelist” in modern scores. This followed much older traditions that went back to the medieval chanting of the gospel, which on Good Friday might be divided between several singers.

Whatever form it took, the performance of passion music on Good Friday had become one of the most important duties of a Lutheran director of church music, and Bach kept himself informed about emerging possibilities. An early example—possibly the very first—of the new “mixed” type was the so-called Keiser passion that Bach copied out and perhaps performed during the Weimar years. At some point he also got to know the famous passion libretto by the Hamburg poet (and senator) Barthold Heinrich Brockes. First published in 1712 and more widely distributed in a revised version of 1715, the latter was almost immediately set to music by Telemann. A setting by Handel soon followed, and eventually several more by other composers. At Leipzig Bach probably had access to Telemann’s setting,[757] and during the 1740s Sebastian had a copy made of Handel’s setting, having previously set many lines from Brockes’s poem in his own St. John Passion.[758] The anonymous libretto of the latter is derived in large part from

[755] “Dir zu Liebe, wertes Herze,” designated “Menuet di Bache” in a later copy (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. 38044).

[756] At the beginning of the first movement of the sonata W. 65/7 in E-flat; Magdalena’s copy (listed as BWV Anh. 129) begins on page 79 of her second little keyboard book. See NBA 3/3, KB, pp. 108–9; the songs are listed as BWV Anh. 40 and 41.

[757] Melamed (2011, 14–15).

[758] Ten years after Melamed (2008a) published a correction, one can still read in *Grove Online* that Bach made a manuscript copy of Handel’s work jointly with his sister. In fact the manuscript (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. 9002/10) was completed during the late 1740s by his assistant Johann Nathaniel Bammler (see Wollny 1997, 44).

Brockes's, although it also includes the gospel narrative that Brockes had replaced with poetic paraphrases.[759]

Although it is unlikely that Bach ever performed a complete setting of Brockes's text, he did perform Stölzel's oratorio of the same type, *Ein Lämmlein geht*. Details about the musical form in which this work was performed cannot be given, as only a printed libretto survives.[760] We do, however, have a score of an anonymous St. Luke Passion begun by Sebastian and completed by Emanuel around 1731. No librettos attest to its performance, however, and the work is so dull that only the incomplete understanding of Bach's style during the nineteenth century could have led it to be attributed to him as BWV 246. The one passage that perhaps "sounds like Bach"—a short instrumental sinfonia apparently inserted to mark the beginning of the second half—might actually have been contributed by Emanuel, although his writing at this point in the manuscript shows no clear signs of compositional corrections.[761] Why he and his father should have copied out the score of such an utterly pedestrian work is hard to understand; was it for Emanuel's instruction, exemplifying an older type of passion consisting mainly of gospel recitation, with chorales as the main interpolated element?

Even if Sebastian never have performed any of these settings in full, he did incorporate some of Handel's arias into a version of the "Keiser" passion performed at Leipzig during the 1740s.[762] These brought the latter work, which already contained many beautiful moments, more into line with Bach's own more recent passions in terms of size and dramatic flow—particulary in the final portion of the work, where five of the seven added arias were placed. Any such expansion involved inserting chorales or arias at strategic points within the narrative, much as the original librettist and composer had done with respect to the basic gospel text. The result, although in this case not an original composition, incorporated Bach's editing as well as two chorale settings that appear to be his own.[763] There is a particularly close relationship between one of the inserted Handel arias—a dialog between a soprano representing the "Daughter of Zion" and a chorus of "Believers"—and an aria in Bach's St. John Passion.[764] Although one might imagine that Bach's

[759] The libretto for Bach's St. John Passion includes twelve or thirteen "free" poetic items, eight of which come from Brockes's (see Dürr 2000, 41–48).

[760] The 1734 libretto was first reported by Schabalina (2008, 77–84).

[761] Glöckner (1977, 95–96) demonstrated that the sinfonia as well as the string accompaniment for the following recitative were new but did not consider that the "Bach" who composed them might have been the copyist Emanuel, not his father. The sinfonia, with its simple chordal accompaniment in eighths, is reminiscent of the opening aria of Emanuel's early cantata *Ich bin vergnügt mit meinem Stande*.

[762] Melamed (2006, 169) warns that firm evidence is lacking for Bach's performances of passions by other composers, apart from the "Keiser" passion (on which see Melamed 2002a).

[763] These were first inserted for a performance in 1726.

[764] "Eilt, ihr angefochtnen Seelen"; its text is a parody of the aria with the same incipit in Brockes's libretto. Several other arias have similar parody texts, but in this case there is also a

aria was influenced by Handel's, it is just as likely that he selected this aria for inclusion in the 1746 performance because it reminded him of his own dialog aria.

"Pastiche" passions made up of numbers by multiple composers have tended to be disparaged by commentators, but there is nothing inherently ineffective about them, and one might even consider their "polyphony of voices" a positive feature.[765] Evidently these passions were conceived much as operas often were during the period, assembled out of heterogeneous words and music that might have multiple authors. During the 1740s Bach may have performed not only the "Keiser"–Handel pastiche but also another such work based on a passion oratorio by Graun, with additional music by Telemann, Kuhnau, and Bach himself.[766] The inclusion of music by Graun, whose operas dominated the Berlin stage throughout the 1740s, must have made this seem a fashionable work. Yet it belongs among Graun's early compositions, making frequent use of old-fashioned word painting. The latter probably seemed entirely natural and attractive to Bach, but it was now avoided by the younger composer.[767]

Such a work could serve its liturgical function perfectly well, even though it was never meant to be a "stylistic whole."[768] Although Telemann composed an original passion for each of the forty-six years he served at Hamburg, when Emanuel succeeded him his twenty-one such works were all pastiches, incorporating some music by Sebastian but chiefly that of Telemann and younger contemporaries. Emanuel was probably following a model learned at home, although all but the first of his passions is far shorter than his father's. In this respect they resemble Telemann's passions, which tend to be only an hour or so in length. Sebastian's passions are much longer, in part because passion music at Leipzig was expected to comprise two parts, performed before and after the sermon. But Sebastian's settings also show deeper thought about what it meant to set a passion text to music; he troubles over episodes in the narrative that go by much more swiftly in other passions.

---

strong musical relationship as well between the Bach and Handel arias, even though Bach replaced the original soprano soloist with a bass, suggesting that this is the voice of Jesus rather than a "daughter of Zion."

[765] Rathey (2016a, 85ff.) uses the phrase with respect to the text of the St. John Passion, but it might also refer to the music of a heterogeneously assembled work.

[766] Graun's original oratorio (GWV B:VII:4) opens with a setting of the same chorale as Stölzel's *Ein Lämmlein trägt* and thus bears the same title. In the pastiche, the chorale is preceded by the first two movements of Telemann's cantata *Wer ist der, so von Sodom kommt* (TWV 1:1585), with the name of the city changed to Edom. Bach is thought to have inserted movements 19 and 20: the opening chorus of Cantata 127 (transposed down to E-flat) and a newly composed arioso, listed as BWV 1088.

[767] As Graun himself observed; see Schulenberg (2014, 146).

[768] As Butt (1998, 674) wrote of the "Edom" pastiche.

The new type of passion music had been established in some places for a decade or more by the time Bach arrived at Leipzig. But the two main churches there had first seen performances of the new type of passion music only in 1721, and only as part of the Good Friday Vespers service, not the main morning service. That tradition continued with Bach's passions, which did not substitute for the liturgical reading of the gospel story. The latter was instead provided through a St. John passion by Johann Walter; like other Renaissance passions, this was mainly chanted, only the "turba" choruses being sung polyphonically. At Vespers, however, Bach was apparently free to employ any of the various types of passion libretto now in use, although in 1739 this freedom evidently was withdrawn.[769]

The Saint John Passion (p. 314, after the second paragraph, "essentially the same music")

It is curious that something of the sort nevertheless occurs in five versions of the St. Matthew Passion that Emanuel performed at Hamburg from 1768 to 1788 (ex. S13.36). In these pasticcio works, Emanuel retained portions of his father's recitative and *turba* choruses while substituting music by other composers for the rest of the work, including "Gegrüsset seist du." The latter (whose composer remains unidentified) does seem to make a point of emphasizing the words *der Jüden*. This does not mean that Emanuel was more prejudiced than his father; his and Friedemann's execution of commissions from the Jewish patron and amateur musician Sara Levy suggests otherwise. Rather it strengthens the argument that Sebastian simply was not interested in expressing an attitude that was of little relevance to a community from which Jews were effectively banned during his lifetime.[770]

In addition to the *actus* structure mentioned earlier, efforts to find an underlying formal scheme have also focused on on the tonal design of the work, whose individual movements pass through a far greater number of tonalities than those of any cantata. The necessary modulations, sometimes between remotely related keys and involving chromatic or enharmonic progressions, take place in the connecting recitatives. At times, as in Cantata 121 and other works, there seem to be associations between particular theological ideas and the use of "sharp" or "flat" keys. Yet an effort to interpret the tonal design of the entire passion in terms of a single principle has failed to convince most observers.[771]

[769] As reported in a document dated just ten days before Good Friday: BD 2:338–39 (no. 439), trans. in NBR, 204 (no. 208). Why Bach was not allowed to give the planned passion in 1739 is unknown; potential reasons include disapproval of the text, unhappiness over the theatricality of oratorio-style passions, and the possibility that music which overshadowed the Vespers sermon "would hardly please the clergy" (Williams 2016, 298).

[770] Jews and other non-Christians were tolerated in Saxony only during the Leipzig fairs. On the issue of "anti-Judaism" in Bach's sacred music, see Marissen (1998) and, more specifically on Cantata 46, Marissen (2003); on Sara Levy and Emanuel Bach, see Schulenberg (2014, 208).

[771] Chafe's (1991) argument for "tonal allegory," although refined in subsequent writings, has not found widespread acceptance.

Yet another potential organizing principle can be seen in the repetition of music for different texts, including the "law" chorus, whose music is repeated a bit later for the words "Lässest du diesen los." That the purpose of the musical repetition was to articulate a so-called *Herzstück* might even be seen in the fact that the later text ("If you let this one go") no longer has anything directly to do with the "law" symbolized by the fugal texture of the chorus (ex. S13.31). Yet the chorus remains no less vivid than others that express visceral emotions, as when the priests interrogate the disciples in short phrases—although these too actually constitute a four-part fugue, the basses, then the tenors, singing the subject (ex. S13.32). Violent anger is represented when the priests and their servants scream "Crucify him" in a combination of dissonant suspensions and vigorous *figure corte* (ex. S13.33). The latter, near the center of the "heart piece," is part of a close alternation between Pilate's reluctant questioning and the crowd's angry denunciations of Jesus. Bach's setting, made more vivid by energetic free counterpoint for the instruments, is as dramatic as any operatic scene.

It is probably no coincidence that the dissonances in the "Kreuzige" chorus involve some of the same notes and intervals as the ritornello of the choral aria that opens the work (previously illustrated in ex. 13.3). Although it shares its ternary form with the choral arias that open many of Bach's secular cantatas of the later 1720s and 1730s, this movement remains closer in conception to the opening choruses of the three works originally composed for Advent 1716 and repeated during summer and fall 1723. The nearest parallel is the dramatic opening chorus of Cantata 70, which likewise sets a scene of agitation, juxtaposing sustained choral passages with rapid figuration from the ritornello (which is used in extended *Choraleinbau*).[772] Such a movement at the very beginning of an oratorio passion, still a novelty at Leipzig, would have seemed "positvely avant-garde for the Leipzig congregations" while preparing them for the unprecedentedly long and intense experience to follow.[773] Near the end of the work, the penultimate choral aria ("Ruht wohl") belongs to another type also first essayed in those late Weimar cantatas, a sort of double da-capo or rondo form. Yet its mournful if calm tone—a product of its relatively homophonic texture and elegiac melody—is entirely different from that of its formal model in Cantata 186.

---

[772] Also common to the two movements is the use of a one-line exhortatory "A" text, an archaic feature by 1723.

[773] The quote is from Williams (2016, 300).

Table S13.5. Solo ariosos and arias in BWV 245

no.	voice	incipit	key	form	instrumentation (+ b.c.)
7	A	Von den Stricken	d	ABA′	2 ob.
9	S	Ich folge dir gleichfalls	Bb	ABA′	2 fl. (unis.)
13	T	Ach, mein Sinn	f#	AB*	str.
19	B	Betrachte, meine Seele	Eb	arioso	2 va. d'am., lt.
20	T	Erwäge	c	ABA	2 va. d'am.
24	B**	Eilt, ihr angefochtnen Seelen	g	ABA′	str.
30	A	Es ist vollbracht	b	AB	gamba, str.
32	B**	Mein teurer Heiland	D	AB***	(str.)
34	T	Mein Herz!	G–C	arioso	2 fl., 2 ob., str.
35	S	Zerfliesse, mein Herze	f	ABA′	2 fl.? 2 ob. da caccia? no b.c.

*musically ABA′ with "subdominant recapitulation"
**with SAT (no. 32 also includes ripieno B)
***chorale aria with Bar-form chorale, *Stollen* coincides with "A" text of aria

---

Most of the arias, including the opening one for chorus, rely heavily on *Einbau.* This, together with the many repetitions in the rondo-like penultimate chorus, could be the basis of a criticism that the work, like a number of cantatas from Weimar and the early Leipzig years, involves excessive repetition of what are (admittedly) beautiful ritornellos. The latter are also relatively uniform in scoring, lacking the writing for solo or paired violins (as opposed to woodwinds) that is more common in the St. Matthew Passion. The placement of the arias is sometimes odd although evidently reasoned: both halves include pairs of arias separated by only brief passages of gospel recitative. These paired arias seem to signal important distinctions in how a listener is to understand the events to which they are responses.

In the first such pair of arias (nos. 7 and 9), a contemplation of sin and redemption gives way to the joy of following Jesus. Bach represents the first of these ideas with a minor-key alto aria whose dissonant, imitative writing for the oboes echoes the opening movement. There follows a much brighter aria for soprano in which two flutes, playing in unison, provide an almost unbroken moto perpetuum. This reflects more the "joyful steps" (*freudige Schritten*) than the "I follow you" (*ich folge dir*) of the text; Bach evidently chose not to repeat the idea of symbolizing "following" through contrapuntal imitation (as he had done in Cantata 12).

The second aria pair (nos. 30 and 32) comes at a much more critical moment, the alto responding to Jesus's last word on the cross and shortly afterwards the bass to his death. Bach and his anonymous librettist avoided obvious responses to these events. The text of the alto aria has an unusual form, essentially bipartite but ending with a reprise of its opening words, which echo those of Jesus: "it is accomplished" (*es ist vollbracht*). Bach sets the A section as a conventional (but beautiful) lament in B minor, with solo viola da gamba.[774]The B section, however, depicts

[774] The use of the gamba or the vaguely French style of this A section is sometimes supposed to have been a symbol of Jesus's royalty. Yet the dotted rhythm is not that of an overture, and the

the “hero from Judea” (*Held aus Juda*) as victor. This is a theme especially characteristic of the gospel of John, and here Bach shifts to triumphal musical imagery, using a D-major fanfare motive familiar from the Fifth Brandenburg Concerto. Yet the aria concludes with a restatement of its original B-minor ritornello, and at the very end the soloist joins in the final cadence to repeat the first three words (ex. S13.35).

The rejoinder to this, a few seconds later—after Jesus has, in the evangelist’s words, bowed his head and died—is a return to D major. But this takes place in a comforting aria, marked Adagio, in which the bass soloist is joined by the seven other voices. These sing a verse of the chorale that was most strongly associated with the passion: not the so-called Passion chorale (“O Haupt voll Blut und Wunden”), but one whose final stanza originally ended Cantata 182, and which has been heard not much earlier within the present work (no. 28). The 1725 version of the passion included a second chorale aria based on the same hymn, also for bass voice but entirely different in character. This aria, omitted in later years, followed no. 11 in the first half; it responded to Jesus’s torture with an outraged, virtuoso bass solo (“Himmel reiße”). The latter was accompanied by both a vigorous continuo part and the much slower-moving chorale melody, sung by the alto concertist and accompanied by two flutes.[775]

The inclusion of this chorale aria perhaps strengthened the character of the 1725 version as part of the cycle of chorale cantatas. Unlike those works, however, the passion was not based on any one hymn, and the large chorale choruses added at the beginning and end of this version were based on different chorales. These revisions, moreover, effectively exchanged the emotional character of the opening and the close. At the start of the work now stood a lyrical chorale fantasia in the major mode, replacing the harsh minor-mode choral aria of the familiar version. The work now ended with a grand chorale chorus that is solemn and rather dark in tone, as opposed to the plain but essentially consoling four-part hymn of the first and last versions. There are theological differences as well, and whereas the second version is arguably more interesting and varied musically, the first version—that is, the one to which Bach returned by the early 1730s—is truer to the gospel that it nominally represents, retaining its special focus on Jesus as a divine savior rather than a suffering human being.[776]
Although Bach called for ripienists as well as concertists in the St. John Passion, only one movement, the chorale aria “Mein teurer Heiland,” involves the two groups in a dialog, and then

---

text has not yet moved on to the triumphalism of the B section. The relatively unconventional text is not one of those taken from Brockes’s libretto.

[775] Another change in the 1725 version was the substitution of the highly operatic “Zerschmettert mich,” for “Ach, mein Sinn.” The latter is perhaps the least engaging aria in the original work, but it is harder to understand the replacement of the profound “Betrachte”–“Erwäge” pair by the rather pedestrian aria “Ach windet euch nicht so.”

[776] This is clear from the text of the chorus “Herr, unser Herrscher” (“Lord, our ruler”) that opens the familiar version, as well as in the *absence* of the closing chorale that addresses Jesus as the sacrifical lamb of God. Chafe (2014) provides exhaustive treatment of theological topics surrounding the work; for more general considerations of liturgy and drama in Bach’s passion settings, see Rathey (2016, chaps. 4–5).

only barely, as the bass soloist, accompanied by continuo, alternates with the other singers and strings. Here the bass concertist and the bass ripienist have distinct parts, although that is not so in the other dialog aria, “Eilt, ihr angefochtnen Seelen” (where the ripieno bass is silent).[777]The aria text in “Mein teurer Heiland” was probably envisioned as an asymmetrical bipartite form: the first seven lines ask questions of Jesus on the cross, whereas the last three relate his unspoken answer (he simply nods “yes”). Bach, however, divides these lines as 6 + 4; thus the final question, “Is the savior of the whole world here?” answers itself with a long melisma on “savior” (*Erlöser*). This occurs at the beginning of the second half, which is coordinated with the second half (*Abgesang*) of the chorale (see ex. 13.4).

The Saint Matthew Passion (and the Saint Mark Passion) (p. 318, following the second paragraph, “the intimacy of chamber music”)

Table S13.6 summarizes the use of paired recitative (or arioso) and aria movements in this work. Picander envisioned the great dialogue movemet “So ist mein Jesus nun gefangen” as ending the first half of the work. Bach, however, broke up the long gospel narrative that follows, interposing a simple chorale to end the first half. This was later replaced by a large chorale chorus, transferred into the St. Matthew Passion after it had been first heard as the opening movement of the 1725 version of the St. John Passion. In fact it is the presence of chorale-based arias and choruses, even more than its use of a double chorus, that distinguishes Bach’s St. Matthew Passion from the St. John Passion (except in its 1725 form). Picander, perhaps at Bach’s suggestion, specified the inclusion of a chorale stanza in the opening movement, which therefore is actually a three-way dialog (“Zion,” “Believers,” and chorale).[778]

---

[777] (Melamed 2004, 9) argues that this points to “an ensemble of ripieno singers assigned to a role independent of that of the concertists,” but except in this aria they are hardly independent. The inclusion of “Mein teurer Heiland” in the other concertist parts (soprano, alto, tenor), however, is documented only by inserts apparently made for the 1732 performance.

[778] It is unclear whether the chorale melody was sung in the original performance; it might have been merely played on the obbligato organ. The existing part for a third “soprano in ripieno” was prepared for the 1736 performance.

Table S13.6. Ariosos and arias in BWV 244

no.	voice(s)	incipit	key	form	instrumentation (+ b.c.)
1	SATB1, SATB2, S in rip.	Kommt ihr Töchter	e	(ABA′)	1: 2 fl., 2 ob., str. 2: 2 fl., 2 ob., str.
5	A1	Du lieber Heiland	b	arioso	2 fl.
6	A1	Buß und Reu*	f#	ABA	2 fl.
8	S2	Blute nur*	b	ABA	2 fl., str.
12	S1	Wiewohl mein Herz	e–C	arioso	2 ob. d’am.
13	S1	Ich will dir mein Herze schenken*	G	ABA	2 ob. d’am.
19	T1, SATB2	O Schmerz!	f–c:V	arioso**	2 rec., 2 ob. da caccia
20	T1, SATB2	Ich will bei meinem Jesum wachen*	c	ABA′	1: ob. 1 2: 2 fl., str.
22	B2	Der Heiland fällt	d–Bb	arioso	
23	B2	Gerne will ich mich bequemen*	g	ABA	vn. 1 + 2 (unis.)
27 a	SA1, SATB2	So ist mein Jesus nun gefangen	e–b	A***	1: 2 fl., 2 ob., str. (no b.c.) 2: 2 fl., 2 ob., str.
b	SATB1, SATB2		b–e	B	1: 2 fl., 2 ob., str. 2: 2 fl., 2 ob., str.
30	A1, SATB2	Ach, nun ist mein Jesus hin	b	(ABCD)	1: fl., ob., str. 2: str.
34	T2	Mein Jesus schweigt	d–a	arioso	2 ob. (gamba added)
35	T2	Geduld!	a	(ABA′)	gamba
39	A1	Erbarme dich*	b	ABA′	vn. solo, str.
42	B2	Gebt mir meinen Jesum wieder	G	(ABA′)	vn. solo, str.
48	S1	Er hat uns allen wohlgetan	e–C	arioso	2 ob. da caccia
49	S2	Aus Liebe*	a	(ABA′)	2 ob. da caccia (no b.c.)
51	A2	Erbarm es Gott!	F–g	arioso	str.
52	A2	Können Tränen	g	ABA	vn. 1 + 2 (unis.)
56	B1	Ja freilich will in uns	F–d	arioso	2 fl., gamba (lute)
57	B1	Komm, sußes Kreuz*	d	ABA′	gamba (lute)
59	A1	Ach Golgotha	Ab	arioso	2 ob. da caccia, vc.
60	A1, SATB2	Sehet, Jesus hat die Hand	Eb	(AB)	1: 2 ob. da caccia 2: 2 ob., str.
64	B1	Am Abend	g	arioso	str.
65	B1	Mache dich, mein Herze, rein*	Bb	(ABA)	2 ob. da caccia, str.
67	BTAS1, SATB2	Nun ist der Herr	Eb–c	arioso	1: str. 2: 2 fl., 2 ob., str.
68	SATB1, SATB2	Wir setzen uns*	c c	ABA	1: 2 fl., 2 ob., str. 2: 2 fl., 2 ob., str.

*later parodied in BWV 244a
**with chorale sung by SATB2
***first section of a bipartite (AB) aria
(parentheses indicate irregular or ambiguous formal dispositions)

No other hymns are cued in the printed poem, suggesting that the selection and placement of thirteen other chorale movements—including the large choral fantasia at the end of part 1—were Bach's choices. These join the twenty-eight recitatives, arias, and choruses of Picander's libretto as commentaries on the gospel text, here drawn entirely from Matthew (chapters 26–27). Reflecting the latter, the St. Matthew Passion setting distributes the "acts" differently from the St. John, the first half now being confined to the scene in the garden, with the disciples. Hence this passion places more emphasis on Jesus's human anxiety and foreboding over what is to come. In addition, Picander's dialog libretto, in which the chorus of Believers could be understood as representing the congregation, places a greater focus on the *listeners*. These are invited to participate more actively than in the St. John Passion, not only when the second chorus asks impatient questions in several dialog numbers, but when it joins the first to express belief that Jesus really was the son of God (this, however, occurs in a *turba* chorus, no. 63b).

Commentators have again found a "heart piece" *(Herzstück)* in the St. Matthew Passion, as in the St. John, comprised of *turba* choruses arranged symmetrically around a central movement in the second half. Yet, if present at all, such a segment is even less clearly delineated here than in the earlier work.[779] All three central "acts" are relatively short in the St. Matthew Passion; the one aria in the "cross" act contains none of the triumphalism expressed in the B section of "Es ist vollbracht." Hence, in part through Picander's—and perhaps Bach's—choices in the libretto, in part through the specific character of the gospel of Matthew, Bach's "great" passion focuses on the very human suffering of Jesus. Despite its grander scoring, it is therefore more moving, at least when experienced as musical theater or drama. Jesus' words are set off, moreover, by the additional accompaniment of strings, which Bach would have known from earlier oratorios, including the "Keiser" Passion. The scoring made audible the coloration visible in Bach's score, where the words of these passages were in red ink. The accompaniment also tended to make Jesus's speeches longer, their setting more contrapuntal, yet this could both mark him as divine—which is to understand the string accompaniment romantically, as a metaphoric halo—and at the same time deepen the expressiveness of his speeches, and therefore a listener's sense of his humanity.

It is true that, when Peter realizes that he has denied Jesus three times, only in the St. John Passion (no. 12c) is the report of his weeping extended into an arioso and twice repeated. This, however, emphasizes *Peter's* human weakness. It is done, moreover, through music that was composed only in 1725, for a verse interpolated for this very purpose from the gospel of Matthew (26:75)! Two years later, in the actual St. Matthew Passion, Bach set the same words in the same key (F-sharp minor) and in the same general manner, but less vividly (no. 38c).

[779] Smend (1926, 105ff.) first identified a *Herzstück* in the St. John Passion centered around the chorale "Durch dein Gefängnis" (nos. 21b–25b in the NBA). Later (1928, 29–30) he described one in the St. Matthew (nos. 45b–50b, focusing on the aria "Aus Liebe"). Chafe (most recently 2014, 125ff.) has treated the idea with varying degrees of enthusiasm.

One aria, "Geduld" (no. 35), has been identified as a possible parody.[780] Although ostensibly in a through-composed ternary form, it severely truncates its second A section, and this, together with its old-fashioned use of *Einbau*, suggests an earlier origin with a different text. Ten of the arias were subsequently re-used in the funeral music for Prince Leopold (listed as BWV 244a, although only Picander's text survives). One of these arias (no. 49) underwent a surprising twist in its new version, the opening words "Out of love" (*Aus Liebe*) being replaced by "With joy" (*Mit Freuden*). The new text continues with "let me leave this world" (*sei die Welt verlassen*); it is not exactly a celebration in the usual sense. Yet the fact that "love" could be replaced by "joy" suggests that the modern tradition of performing this aria very slowly reflects a nineteenth-century misunderstanding; the aria focuses on divine compassion, not "the passion's supposed pure tragedy."[781]Famous for its expressive flute solo, the aria is one of several from the second half of the passion that disposes its text somewhat irregularly. Its final section begins with an unusual sort of "subdominant recapitulation"; the opening words are now combined in *Einbau* with a transposed statement of the ritornello theme (ex. S13.37).

Something similar happens in the next aria but one, "Komm, sußes Kreuz" (no. 57), and again in the dialog aria no. 60 ("Sehet, Jesus hat die Hand"). In the latter, the returning music is set to new words. These, however, echo earlier ones, justifying the recapitulation of the opening melody for the final line of the poem (ex. S13.38). On the other hand, the earlier aria "Gebt mir" (no. 42) is, like "Geduld" and "Aus "Liebe," in a sort of sonata form, that is, through-composed ternary form. It nevertheless presents its entire text in the two A sections, then repeats lines 2–4 in the B section. The text repetitions emphasize the poet's indignity at Judas's betrayal, even if they reflect an origin, again, in parody.[782]

These manipulations of aria form are rarely on the minds of listeners, even if there is a correlation between the less conventional treatment of form and the deepening expressive or religious significance of the arias in the second half of the work. To single out any particular movements for discussion is almost arbitrary, for even the "simple" recitative of the gospel narrative seems more *cantabile* than in other works. Some of the pronouncements of Jesus, accompanied by the strings of the first choir, are short self-contained movements equal in stature to the ariosos, as when the first bass sings the words of institution ("This is my blood," *das ist mein Blut*, etc., at the end of no. 11). The passage is set off by the use of 6/4 meter, and the accompaniment anticipates the ritornello of the following aria (ex. S13.39).

---

[780] NBA, vol. 2/5, KB, p. 112.

[781] As argued by Melamed (2017). The original text was based on that of an aria from Picander's earlier oratorio, *Erbauliche Gedanken*, "Out of love will I bear everything" (*will ich alles dulden*). Although not suggesting great speed, neither does this text support a lugubrious *larghissimo*.

[782] As suggested by Dürr (NBA, vol. 2/5, KB, p. 112). For further examples of special formal treatment of the text, see Schulenberg (2011a).

The dialog arias, with their attached ariosos, are doubtless the ones that stand out for most listeners. The first (after the opening choral aria) comes near the middle of the first half, immediately after Jesus has admitted to being "troubled unto death" (*betrübt bis an den Tod*). These words are accompanied by bow vibrato, a traditional symbol of fear or trembling which continues to be heard in the continuo during the following arioso ("O Schmerz!," ex. S13.40). This trembling ceases, however, when the second chorus counters with a stanza of a chorale that has been heard previously (no. 3), and which will be heard again before the work is over (no. 46). This chorale ("Herzliebster Jesu") is one of several in the work whose repetitions give the impression of a meaningful restatement, although as in the St. John Passion it is impossible to identify exactly what the returning chorale melodies signify.

Surely the most stunning movement in the first half, overshadowing even the monumental opening chorus, is the bipartite aria heard immediately after Jesus has been betrayed by Judas and seized in the garden (no. 27). The grief and then anger which the two halves of Picander's text express foreshadow the ensuing violence, in which one of the disciples, attempting to protect Jesus, cuts off the ear of the priests' servant with his sword. The dialog movement, already described above, is an aria only in the sense that its madrigalian text falls into the customary two sections. The second of these, the sublime "Sinde Blitze, sind Donner," borrowed some of its musical ideas from an equally unusual aria, the final one of Cantata 127 (ex. S13.41).[783]But this movement is far more intense, anticipating the most dramatic storm music of Rameau while retaining Bach's characteristic polyphony in up to twelve nominal parts. His harmonic invention comes to the fore with a Neapolitan harmony and melodic diminished third on the key word *Verräter* (traitor) just before the end (ex. S13.42).

All this, however, is heard against what follows: Jesus counsels his disciple to sheathe his sword, and within a minute or so the harsh E minor of the choral dialog is replaced by the sweet E major of the chorale fantasia that closes the first half. This chorus is thought to have become part of the present work only in 1736. In its place originally was only a "simple" setting of another hymn, also in E major—showing that the idea of ending in that key, the parallel of the opening E minor, was part of Bach's original conception.[784] The alternation between these "sharp" keys and "flat" tonalities like C minor, in which the work ends, must also have been part of the composer's plan, although how rigorously the choices of keys represent specific emotions or even theological ideas is debatable."[785] The ritornello alone of the new chorale chorus interweaves both strands of the passion's tonal design, setting off in measure 2 toward the "sharp" domain of C-sharp minor, then dwelling on E minor (not E major) in the phrase leading to the final cadence. Although there

---

[783] In some years BWV 127 would have been the last such work heard in the Leipzig churches before Lent.

[784] Bach's four-part harmonization of "Jesum laß ich nicht von mir" is preserved in a copy of the early version (BWV 244b) by Johann Christoph Farlau, presumed to have been a pupil of Agricola (in Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Amalienbibliothek ms. 6).

[785] Chafe (1991) explained Bach's modulating schemes here and elsewhere in terms of "tonal allegory," but see the review by Butt (1993), as well as that by Williams (2015) of a more recent publication on the same subject.

is not a single flat in this enormous movement (appropriately for a hymn about the cross), it spans a range of tonalities almost as broad as that which separates the opening and closing keys of the work as a whole, that is, E minor and C minor.

The continuing use of "sharp" keys at the beginning of the second half assured a bright, penetrating sound (at least from the strings), in a series of arias that might be described as importunate if not still angry. These include the B-minor dialog aria that opens the second half, as well as the impatient-sounding "Geduld" (no. 35). Here, incidentally, the nervous dotted rhythm of the continuo part (see ex. S13.43b below) seems to contradict the admonition toward patience expressed by the tenor soloist. The series of "sharp"-key arias comes to an end after the two similarly scored but emotionally antithetical nos. 39 and 42. Both are scored with solo violin and strings, but they are assigned to different choirs and are in the remotely related keys of B minor and G major, respectively. The first, a response to Peter's denial, is a prayer for mercy ("Erbarme dich"), in the style of an embellished siciliana. In the second, a bass soloist demanding Jesus's release is (perhaps) overshadowed by a virtuoso violin part in concerto style.

From here the passion grows darker, as Jesus's trial begins. Four of the six remaining arias are in minor keys, all but "Aus Liebe" with flats in the signatures. Particularly notable is the shocking harmony that opens the arioso "Erbarm es Gott!" (no. 51). This comes after "the entire people" have accepted guilt for Jesus's execution, in a four-part fugue that constitutes one of the longest of the *turba* choruses. Now Picander's prayer for mercy is sung to a series of chromatic and enharmonic modulations. The first of these proceeds from E minor to F, via what we would call a misspelled German sixth chord (ex. S13.43a). As events move inexorably toward Jesus's death, the same progression, transposed a fourth higher, opens the following arioso-aria pair (ex. S13.43b). Originally scored for bass voice with lute, this is now usually heard in the later version with viola da gamba. Like the previous gamba aria, "Komm, süßes Kreuz" (no. 57), it juxtaposes a slow-moving, resigned vocal part against a more active instrument.The latter here has some of the character of the extraordinary allemandes from the Sixth Partita and the Sixth Cello Suite (ex. S13.44).

Dance characteristics feature prominently as well in the concluding choral aria. This is a sarabande, as is clear from thematic parallels in instrumental works (ex. S13.45). The A section is in binary form, each half heard instrumentally (as a ritornello), then repeated with the voices. The idea of closing with a choral movement in dance form went back to Cöthen, but it also balances the use of siciliana rhythm for the first movement of each half.[786] A common element among these movements is the underlying idea of a solemn movement or procession, but there is also something consoling in the relatively simple texture of this final movement, with its numerous parallel thirds and sixths. These, however, are countered by the restless chromaticism and harsh dissonances that sound against the initial pedal point.

Like "Aus Liebe," this chorus was parodied in Prince Leopold's memorial music, although its text derived from Picander's earlier passion oratorio. It is in some ways a traditional lament, returning to the chromatic descent over a rising bass heard in the work's opening chorus (ex.

---

[786] "Ach, nun ist mein Jesus hin" at the beginning of the second half (no. 30) also has similarities to sarabande, despite its notation in 3/8.

S13.46). The ritornellos of both movements, moreover, open over tonic pedal points; the ritornello theme of the first chorus becomes the bass line of the vocal entry. One need not recognize these parallelisms consciously to sense that they make the closing movement a profoundly right ending to Bach's greatest work.

The Saint Mark Passion (p. 318, following the end of the printed page, "published and recorded")

Two arias are thought to have come from cantatas (BWV 54 and 7); five movements more surely were parodies of ones used in the Funeral Ode (BWV 198), with text by Gottsched. One can only imagine what the latter thought of the use made of his poetry by the man he had sued for defamation two years earlier. Picander's printed text for this work, unlike that of the St. Matthew Passion, includes the gospel verses as well as chorale stanzas; does that mean that he selected the latter, rather than Bach?

The fact that Bach made no known attempt to preserve it in a fair-copy integral autograph score suggests that the St. Mark Passion occupied a somewhat lower rank in his mind than the two surviving ones. The greater proportion of chorales—no fewer than sixteen—to other movements could have posed an interesting compositional problem for Bach, inspiring creative settings of some of the hymns. But that same feature of Picander's libretto might have caused Bach to treat the work with relative carelessness, and this could be why it does not survive. Another reason could be that, like Emanuel's later pastiche passions, it consisted mostly of re-used music that did not need to be copied into an integrated score. This did not prevent Bach from repeating the work in 1744, apparently with two new arias inserted.[787] These would have shifted the balance of chorales and arias a little toward that seen in Bach's other passions. But just as Mark's is the shortest of the gospels, Bach might have intentionally made this work the most concise of his passion settings.

Bach's oratorios (p. 321, following the first paragraph break, "largely faultless handwriting in Bach's autograph manuscript")

Table S13.7 lists the parody models for the arias in the Christmas Oratorio. Several further movements in parts 5 and 6 have been supposed to come from a lost cantata for St. Michael's Day, known as BWV 248a.[788] Their style, however, points to another serenata as the ultimate model, possibly a work that Bach performed on Jan. 17, 1734, which has never been positively identified.[789]

---

[787] As documented by the libretto reported by Schabalina (2009, 32–34).

[788] See Glöckner (2000).

[789] Documented in BD 2:245 (no. 346). The suggestion was made by Joshua Rifkin in unpublished remarks given during a symposium at Harvard University in 2013.

Table S13.7. Arias in BWV 248 and their sources

248 no.	pt.	*	incipit	key	voice(s)	form	source** BWV	no.	incipit	key	voice(s)
1	I	1	Jauchzet, frohlocket	D	SATB	ABA	214	1	Tönet, ihr Pauken	D	SATB
4		4	Bereite dich, Zion	a	A	ABA	213	9	Ich will dich nicht hören	a	Hercules (A)
8		8	Großer Herr	D	B	ABA	214	7	Kron und Preis	D	Fama (B)
15	II	6	Frohe Hirten	e	T	AB	214	5	Fromme Musen	b	Pallas (A)
19		10	Schlafe, mein Liebster	G	A	ABA	213	3	Schlafe, mein Liebster	Bb	Wollust (S)
24	III	1	Herrscher des Himmels	D	SATB	AB	214	9	Blühet, ihr Linden	D	SATB
29		6	Herr, dein Mitleid	A	SB	ABA	213	11	Ich bin deine	F	Hercules (A), Tugend (T)
31		8	Schließe, mein Herze	b	A	ABA′	[none]				
36	IV	1	Fallt mit Danken	F	SATB	ABA′	213	1	Laßt uns sorgen	F	SATB
39		4	Flößt, mein Heiland	C	SS	AB	213	5	Treues Echo	A	Hercules (A), Echo (A)
41		6	Ich will nur dir zu Ehren	d	T	ABA	213	7	Auf meinen Flügeln	e	T
43	V	1	Ehre sei dir, Gott	A	SATB	ABA	[none]				
47		5	Erleucht auch	f#	B	ABA′	215	7	Durch die vom Eifer	b	S
51		8	Ach, wenn wird die Zeit	b	SAT	ABA′	248b?	[unidentified]			
54	VI	1	Herr, wenn die stolzen	D	SATB	ABA′	248a	1	[text unknown]		
57		4	Nur ein Wink	A	A	AB	248a	3	[text unknown]		
62		9	Nun mögt ihr stolzen	b	T	ABA′	248a	5	[text unknown]		

*number within this "part"
**BWV 248b is the hypothetical secular model for movements used in both BWV 248a and BWV 248^{VI}.

Picander is often thought to have been the poet of the Christmas Oratorio, but although he wrote the libretto for BWV 213, one of its chief models, the text of BWV 214 is anonymous.[790] Hence it is entirely possible that the parodies were by another poet, working closely with Bach to assemble the same type of heterogeneous libretto used for the passions. The need to open each part with a large choral movement, however, gave the work a distinct structure. In the one exception, part 2, the initial chorus is replaced by a sinfonia in the style of a pastorale. This movement, a slow gigue of a type traditionally associated with Christmas, represents the shepherds in the fields; a large choral movement comes later.[791] As in the St. Matthew Passion, nearly every aria is preceded by an arioso accompanied by instruments, but such movements are placed more freely, as in the cantatas. Some are followed by chorales or gospel narratives; one even interrupts or "tropes" a *turba* chorus (no. 45). This happens as the wise men arrive, seeking Jesus; here Bach, or his librettist, inserted lines meant to remind listeners that Christmas was a celebration not only of Jesus's birth but of his presence ("indwelling") in the hearts of believers, an important theme for the oratorio as a whole.[792]

The somewhat greater flexibility in the structure of the work, as compared to the great passions, has a parallel in the more *galant* style of the aria movements. The opening choral arias in five of the six "parts" are of the type that Bach had been cultivating since his first secular cantatas for Leipzig. Setting texts usually in da capo form, all but one includes brass and timpani while avoiding fugue (although individual lines are set imitatively). These are among Bach's grandest and longest movements of this type, and although three share the same meter (3/8), key (D), and instrumentation, with trumpets and drums—vestiges of the royal occasions for which they were originally composed—they are interspersed with contrasting examples: horns in F replace trumpets in D at the opening of part 4, and part 5 begins with a particularly vivacious chorus whose ritornello is in concerto style, apparently newly composed. Distinct above all is part 2, whose opening sinfonia in G includes four double reeds (two oboes d'amore and two da caccia). These represent the rustic bagpipes of the shepherds whose playing is also heard in Christmas pastorales by Corelli and Handel.[793] The main theme of this sinfonia returns in the interludes of the concluding chorale of this "part," recalling the similar procedure in the cantata for New Year's Day 1725 (BWV 41).

As in the St. Matthew Passion, there are more through-composed or "modified" settings of da capo–form texts as the work progresses, and an argument has been made that this relates to

---

[790] The text of BWV 215 was by Johann Christoph Clauder, an instructor at the Leipzig university and later Saxon official.

[791] Strinctly speaking, this "Ehre sei Gott" ("Glory to God") is a *turba* chorus, presenting the words of the angels within a section of gospel narrative and separated from the final chorale by only a few further lines of recitative. It is, however, on a scale and in a form approaching those of *dictum* choruses in other cantatas.

[792] Further on this in Rathey (2016a, 51–52), and, at greater length, Rathey (2016, 52–67).

[793] In the optional final movement of Corelli's "Christmas" Concerto (op. 6, no. 8) and in the *pifa* of Handel's *Messiah*.

something "directional" as opposed to "cyclic" in the underlying texts or topics.[794] But none of the arias aims for or achieves the profundity of the greatest ones in the passions; some probably reflected the meaning and syntax of their texts more closely in their original versions. For instance, "Frohe Hirten" (Joyful shepherds), the first aria of part 2, seems understated in its setting for flute and tenor. It makes more sense in its original version as a chaste invocation of the muses to honor the queen ("Fromme Musen"), scored for alto voice with oboe d'amore. On the other hand, the lullaby also from part 2 ("Schlafe, mein Liebster") retains much of its original text. Rescored for alto with flute and double reeds, transposed down to G, it sounds more mellow than the original in B-flat, for strings and soprano. The later version, however, lacks the irony of the original, whose B section represents the seductive beauty offered by Wollust (Vice).

It is hard to imagine any listener failing to respond to the grandeur of the final aria of part 1 ("Großer Herr"), even if the declamation is a little more awkward than in the original. But is it possible that some arias are, like their courtly originals, simply too long? The echo aria "Flößt, mein Heiland" may wear out its novelty in all but the best performances. And could anyone be blamed for growing tired of the hectoring alto who too insistently reminds the soprano and bass of Jesus's presence, in the trio from part 5? The latter is one of four movements whose original versions are lost; one of these, "Nur ein Wink," has a strangely complicated rhythm that corresponds to no standard dance. The latter must have been inspired by something in the original text, which presumably fit the music better than the present one (ex. S13.47).

Similar considerations apply to the two later oratorios. The Ascension Oratorio was originally published in the nineteenth century as "Cantata 11," reflecting its suitability for regular liturgical performance, just like the individual parts of the Christmas Oratorio, which it closely resembles. Its antecedents, however, were linked not to royalty but to buildings and people that Bach knew well.[795] The opening chorus was originally written for the rededication of the St. Thomas School building—Bach's home—in 1732. The two arias were from a wedding cantata with text by Gottsched, composed in 1725 for Peter Hohmann. He was a son of the wealthy master builder (*Baumeister*) of the same name, one of those responsible for the architectural renewal ongoing at Leipzig since the first decade of the century.[796]

The opening choral aria (in through-composed da capo form) is suitably grand. So is the newly composed chorale fantasia that concludes the work, Bach's only setting of the melody "Gott fähret auf den Himmel." It is sung in B minor, yet the movement begins and ends with ritornellos in D major—a reasonable compromise, given the need to end in a sufficiently festive manner. Yet this ambivalent tonality confirms the oratorio's somewhat ambivalent character, which

---

[794] Surely *bipartite* form can represent "temporal or kinetic directionality" (Rathey 2016, 63). That is to say that the B section moves on, in some sense, beyond the A section. But it is hard to see how that reflects a particular conception of time itself, as argued by Berger (2007); see the critique by Levin (2010).

[795] The originals are lost; they were BWV Anh. 18 and BWV Anh. 196.

[796] The elder Hohmann had died in January 1732; he was among the council members who elected Bach cantor in 1723 (BD 2:95 [no. 129]).

emerges in the first aria, a minor-key response to Jesus's departure from the disciples. This aria is the expressive climax of the work, its mournful character plausibly explained as representing longing rather than mere lamentation for Jesus.[797]The aria on which it is based was also used later for the Agnus Dei of the B-minor Mass, but words and music fit together more clearly here. This is especially clear in the melismas on *fliehen* ("fly not so soon"), echoed between voice and unison violins at the ends of both A sections (ex. S13.48).[798]

The Easter Oratorio, although the last of the three works to reach its familiar form, was the earliest in origin. Its sinfonia, arias, and final chorus were first heard as parts of the so-called Shepherds' Cantata (BWV 249a), performed for the birthday of Duke Christian of Weissenfels on February 23, 1725.[799] Five weeks later the four Greek characters of the original pastoral became Mary (the mother of James), Mary Magdalene, Peter, and John, in a parody of the Shepherds' Cantata performed on Easter Sunday.[800] As this immediately followed the second performance of the St. John Passion, it is remarkable that Bach here abandoned the traditional liturgical type of drama, built around the gospel narrative, and presented the Easter story only through verses sung by the characters themselves.

Probably in the late 1730s, however, Bach revised the work, eliminating the names. He subsequently converted the first vocal number, originally a duet, into a chorus, thus bringing the work more into conformity with the two already completed oratorios. It nevertheless still opened with a two-movement sinfonia—not entirely an innovation, as the much earlier Easter Cantatas 4 and 31 had also begun with instrumental movements. The present two movements, however, are formally and stylistically those of a concerto from the mid-1720s, with soloistic parts for the first violin, flute, oboes, and cello. The third movement continues the concerto-like pattern, employing the dance style now favored in the concluding movements of concertos. But the opening ritornello, which suggests a passepied or quick minuet, is answered by the two lower voices, eventually joined in the revised version by the remaining singers.[801]

---

[797] As argued by Rathey (2016a, 159–60).

[798] The through-composed ternary form of the two extant versions of this aria has been discussed by Wolff (1993a) and Schulenberg (2011a, 39–42).

[799] The date and occasion are recorded in Picander's reprint of the text (1727, 4); that this took place at Christian's court is implied by the title *Tafel-Music*, indicating that it was given as part of a banquet. This cantata also received a secular parody in August 1726, when it was performed as a birthday serenata for Count Joachim Friedrich von Flemming (BWV 249b), again documented only by Picander's text.

[800] On April 1. The names appear at the tops of the individual vocal parts in Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. Bach St 355/1.

[801] The notion that the three opening movements together originated as an independent sinfonia was convincingly quashed by Rifkin (1997, 74n. 57). The original soloist in the second movement was flute, subsequently replaced by the first oboe.

The work retains much of the character of its secular original version. Peter's "Sanfte soll mein Todeskammer" (Gently will my grave) is a slumber aria, a conventional operatic type, as signified by the slurred figures in the recorders and strings. As compared with another sleep aria, "Schlummert ein" from Cantata 82, this is a more direct borrowing from the stage (ex. S13.49). The gavotte-like first section of the final chorus is only slightly farther from operatic tradition, but meter and style change suddenly for a concluding fugato, reflecting the change of poetic meter for the final couplet of the text. The ascending melodic lines, symbolizing the opening of the heavens, make for a fitting end to an Easter work. Yet the original text, with its generic praise of laughter and play (*Lachen und Scherzen*), fits this music just as well; the loss of Bach's early drafts makes it impossible to know whether this was newly composed for Easter, but one suspects not (ex. S13.50).

The Easter Oratorio was one of those works for which Bach prepared new full scores in the 1730s, with further revisions to follow. Clearly, neither its dependence on parody nor the apparently secular character of its music was problematical for him. The "protracted devaluing" of such works began only in the nineteenth century, and although the oratorios for Easter and Ascension do not approach the sublime levels of the two passions, this must have been by design, not a regrettable product of the manner in which Bach adapted the music. Creating parodies could even be "quite arduous and possibly more bother than entirely fresh composition."[802] It was, moreover, an instructive lesson for Bach's students, some of whom would have performed this music both as serenatas in the coffee house and as cantatas in church. The distinction that we make today, the former being secular, the latter sacred, simply did not exist for Bach and his audiences.

Bach's use of music with Latin texts (p. 322, following the first complete paragraph, "music history as understood at the time")

Table S13.8 lists all the Latin sacred music that Bach is reasonably certain to have owned or performed, including dates of copying, publication, or compilation. Most copies of compositions by others that survive in Bach's performing materials probably incorporate his arranging or editing to some degree, even if this was limited to the assignment of parts to individual performers in his ensemble.[803] The number of items and documented performances increases with time, but this might reflect only a higher rate of survival for later sources.

---

[802] As observed by Butt (1998, 675).

[803] In a few cases Bach's practical use of a work is documented only by his alterations in a copy of the score, as when he changed the text underlay in the six masses by Bassani so that the opening words of the Gloria could be sung by all the voices instead of being chanted by a soloist. Not included in table S13.8 are settings of the Magnificat known to have been performed at Leipzig but not certainly by Bach (on these see Cammarota 1986, especially his conclusions on pp. 349ff.).

Table S13.8. Latin sacred works copied, composed, and compiled by Bach

Composer	Work	BWV	Source*	Date	Origin
Palestrina	Masses, book 1	—	O	ca. 1700	Rome, 1554, revised 1591 (ms copy later owned by Bach)
Peranda	Kyrie in C	—	P	ca. 1709	ms copy by Reineccius[804]
Anon.	*Missa* in C minor	Anh. 29	P	ca. 1714–17	unknown (a sole autograph cello part survives)
Johann Baal	Mass in A	—	A	ca. 1714–17	unknown (joint copy by Bach and Walther)
Peranda	Kyrie in A minor	—	P	1714–17	mauscript copy by Drese or Walther?[805]
Pez	*Missa* in A minor	Anh. 24	P	1715–17 (Kyrie), 1724 (Gloria)	Missa Sancti Lamberti (Augsburg, 1706)
J. S. Bach	Kyrie in F	233a	O	ca. 1715?	original
Conti	Languet anima	—	A, P	1716, 1723–24	unknown
J. S. Bach	Sanctus in C	237	A, P	June 1723?	original
J. S. Bach	Sanctus in D	238	A, P	Dec. 1723	original
J. S. Bach	Magnificat in E-flat	243a	A	July 1723	original
J. S. Bach	Sanctus in D	232^{III}	A	Dec. 1724	original (later incorporated into B-Minor Mass)
J. L. Bach	*Missa* in E minor	Anh. 166	P	ca. 1727	ms score by J. L. Bach (ca. 1710–27), owned by J. S. Bach
Durante	*Missa* in C minor	Anh. 26	A	1727–32	version of a work also found in a Prague ms
J. S. Bach	Christe in C minor	242	A	ca. 1727–32	original, insert for BWV Anh. 26 (by Durante)
Anon.	Sanctus in B-flat	Anh. 28	P	ca. 1730–40	unknown
Wilderer	*Missa* in G minor	—	A	1731	unknown
Lotti	*Missa* in G minor	—	A	ca. 1732–35	ms copy by Zelenka (as *Missa Sapientiae*)
Anon.	*Missa* in G (double	Anh. 167	A	ca. 1732–39	unknown[806]

[804] Wollny (2015, 135–35).

[805] Wollny (2015, 134), noting that Walther, in his 1708 treatise (Walther 1955, 145), quotes a passage as an example of *heterolepsis:* a Monteverdian expressive departure from the regular rules of voice leading, when a dissonance resolves in a different voice from the one expected.

[806] This work is clearly by a composer of the middle Baroque; Wollny (2015, 132) suggests Christoph Bernhard, J. P. Krieger, or David Pohle. Earlier suggestions of Lotti or J. L. Bach are stylistically implausible.

	chorus)				
J. S. Bach	*Missa* in B minor	"232a"	P	1733	mostly cantata movements
J. S. Bach	Magnificat in D	243	A	1733?	revision of BWV 243a
G. B. Bassani	*Acroama missale*	—	A	ca. 1735	Augsburg, 1709 (6 masses)
J. S. Bach	*Missa* in A	234	A, P	ca. 1738, 1743–49	cantata movements
J. S. Bach	*Missa* in G	236	A	ca. 1738–39	cantata movements
Caldara	Sanctus in D minor	239	A, P	ca. 1738–41	Gloria, *Missa Providentiae*[807]
Gasparini	Missa canonica	—	P	ca. 1740	ms copy[808]
Caldara	Magnificat	—	A	1740–42	otherwise known only in two 18th-cent. mss (one from Vienna, 1742)
J. S. Bach	Suscepit Israel	1082	A	1740–42	original, insert for Caldara, Magnificat
Anon.	*Missa* in C	Anh. 25	A	1740–42	unknown (sometimes attributed to J. L. Bach)
Anon.	Sanctus in G	240	A, P	1742	unknown
J. S. Bach	Gloria in excelsis Deo	191	A	Christmas 1742?	extracts from B-Minor Mass
Palestrina	Missa sine nomine:	—	P	ca. 1742	from Masses, book 1 (ms Kyrie and Glora[809]copy listed above)
Torri	Magnificat	Anh. 30	A, P	ca. 1742	ms copy from Walther?[810]
Palestrina	Missa Ecce sacerdos	—	P	ca. 1745	from Masses, book 1 (ms copy listed above)
J. S. Bach	Tilge, Höchster	1083	A, P	1745–46	German parody of Pergolesi, *Stabat mater*
J. S. Bach	*Missa* in F	233	S	ca. 1747–48	cantata movements
J. S. Bach	*Missa* in G minor	235	S	ca. 1747–48	cantata movements

[807] This is actually Zelenka's arrangement, made ca. 1727, according to Stockigt (2018, 65), citing a forthcoming publication by Bruno Musumeci.

[808] Wollny (2013, 134–35) suggests the possibility of a Dresden transmission through Quantz, who mentions the work in his autobiography; a copy in Berlin (which dates the work to 1705) belonged to Quantz's and Bach's pupil Agricola.

[809] Bach's performing materials include six vocal parts giving the complete mass, as well as six doubling instrumental parts ("stromenti ripieni" according to his title page) for the Kyrie and Gloria. This implies that only the latter movements were performed liturgically, although the complete mass might have been sung for study or concert purposes.

[810] Thielemann (2012, 219) identifies two manuscript concordances, one from the collection of Walther's friend Bokemeyer.

J. S. Bach	Credo in unum	1081	A	ca. 1747–48	original, insert for Bassani, Missa 5
Kerll	Sanctus in D	241	A, P	ca. 1747–48	*Missa superba* (17th cent.)
J. S. Bach	B-Minor Mass	232	A	1748–49?	mostly cantata movements

Titles describe each work as found in Bach's copy or copies; Latin *Missa* indicates a "short" or "Lutheran" mass (Kyrie-Gloria).

Dates are those of Bach's score or parts. ms = manuscript

*A = manuscript score partly or entirely in Bach's hand
P = manuscript performing parts in the hand of Bach or known copyists working for him
S = manuscript score in the hand of a Bach pupil or associated copyist
O = other (no extant source from Bach's immediate circle)

The music of Palestrina stands out as both the earliest Latin church music that Bach knew and probably the first that he acquired, while at Weimar. Bach may have arranged only two of Palestrina's masses, performing them during the 1740s. Many other works, however, were in the so-called *stile antico* ("former style"), derived—sometimes at a considerable distance—from that of the sixteenth-century master. Bach's choices suggest that he had real affection and admiration for music of a type that was in vogue in his youth, but not necessarily for that of earlier Baroque composers. Schütz, for instance, is not represented, although the list includes music by Peranda, who succeeded him as Capellmeister at Dresden.[811] Nor does Bach's repertory seem to have included any contemporary works by Dresden composers, despite the apparent interest at Leipzig in emulating the music of the Dresden court. Zelenka is represented only by one or two arrangements of music by others; Hasse, whose music Bach was reported to have admired, is absent, nor is there anything by Heinichen.[812] Perhaps copies of their sacred works were inaccessible, although Bach must have heard them on visits to the Saxon capital, perhaps also at the Catholic chapel in Leipzig. Yet he must also have had a personal relationship with Zelenka that went beyond copying portions of the masses by Lotti and Caldara that the latter owned.[813] More common among the works that Bach collected is a style that is clearly of the late seventeenth century. This is represented by several anonymous works, as well as a Sanctus from a mass by Kerll and a Magnificat by the Munich capellmeister Pietro Torri. Although he lived

---

[811] Walther nevertheless had a reasonably complete knowledge of Schütz's biography and output, to judge from the entry for the latter in his *Lexicon* (1732).

[812] The only works by Heinichen that have been associated with Bach are two of his early German cantatas (see Beißwenger 1992, 355–56). Friedemann Bach seems to have performed one of the Zelenka's Magnificats at Halle (a copy of the score by Gottlob Harrer, with a violin part in Friedemann's hand, is in Cambridge, Harvard College Library, bMS Mus 83).

[813] The scribe who made the calligraphic copy of Bach's letter of application to the elector also worked for Zelenka, according to Hans-Joachim Schulze; see the review by Rifkin (1988, 791) of Schulze's commentary for a facsimile edition of the *Missa*.

until 1737, Torri was born around 1650 and thus, like Kerll, represented a generation prior to Bach. Torri's work is in the Roman polychoral style that seems to have been imitated especially at the Habsburg court in Vienna. The same style characterizes the anonymous double-choir mass for twelve singers (BWV Anh. 167), whose enormous score also includes five-part string and double-reed choirs; Bach copied it out during the 1730s together with a pupil.[814]In this style, fugal "Amens" and other movements inspired by Palestrina alternate with declamatory choruses; the latter seem intended to project their texts clearly and efficiently, without lingering on anything for illustrative or rhetorical purposes. Indeed, the neutral expressive character of these works makes it hard to understand Bach's interest in them, although some striking chromatic passages in the *Missa* (e.g., in the Qui tollis), or a fugal chromatic setting of "Et misericordia" within Torri's otherwise routine Magnificat, might have attracted his attention (exx. S13.51, S13.52).

This was more surely one of the attractions of the E-minor *Missa* by Johann Ludwig Bach. Sebastian owned both his cousin's autograph score and parts, copied for a performance around 1727. In this work the second Kyrie has a chromatic fugue subject, which is treated concisely in both original and inverted forms; one hears echoes of it in the corresponding movement from Bach's B-Minor Mass (ex. S13.53). Even more noteworthy, however, for Sebastian upon first discovering this composition might have been the presence of Luther's German version of the Gloria as a cantus firmus in that movement (ex. S13.54). This, too, has an echo in a subsequent work of Sebastian's: the "soprano in ripieno" part that bears the chorale cantus firmus in the opening chorus of the St. Matthew Passion. Originally, however, it would have reminded Sebastian of the use of a chorale cantus firmus in his own Kyrie BWV 233a, composed during the Weimar years. Perhaps it was while copying and performing such a work that he now began contemplating the composition of a complete *Missa*, although there is no evidence of his doing so before 1733.

Some of the Latin works over which Bach labored might have proved disappointing after parts were copied and tried out. His attention to obscure contemporaries such as Wilderer and Bassani suggests that only a limited range of such music was available to him. Yet even a seemingly simplistic work like the anonymous BWV Anh. 167 can sound splendid in a good performance. Bach must, from his student days, have known the thrilling effect of polychoral music, which today is associated with Giovanni Gabrieli and late-Renaissance Venice. Bach is more likely to have connected such compositions with the imperial cities of Rome and Vienna, also Lübeck and Hamburg if he had heard music of this type by Buxtehude during his early visits there. With those experiences in mind, it should not surprise us that, late in life, he took the trouble to rework the grand but short-winded Sanctus for double chorus by Kerll, a colleague of Pachelbel's at Vienna. Bach turned this into an even grander prelude and fugue, omitting a weak setting of "Pleni sunt coeli" and moving those words to the following fugue, to which he also added two lively violin parts. This fugue was originally the "Osanna," which had used the same music as

---

[814] The project, begun during 1732–35, was not completed until 1738 or 1739 (NBA, vol. 2/9, KB, p. 59). No performing parts survive, but it is unlikely that Bach wrote out such a huge score, including four completely notated ripieno vocal parts, if performance was not envisaged for some very special occasion.

the opening Kyrie; hence in making this arrangement Bach was also studying parody technique and then applying it himself.

Some of these compositions, especially those by Bach's Italian contemporaries Caldara and Durante, must have seemed entirely up-to-date, on a par with the Handel cantata (also composed in Italy) that the Collegium presumably performed. Bach's arrangement of an oratorio by Pergolesi, although undertaken in the mid-1740s to accommodate a German parody text, falls into the same category, showing that Bach was as open to *galant* as to strictly contrapuntal Italianate sacred music. Pergolesi had died young in 1736 after composing some of the most popular stage music of the period. His *Stabat mater* is no less *galant*—tuneful and non-contrapuntal—than his now better-known comic intermezzo *La serva padrona*. At a time when scores of this type were hard to come by, and opportunities to hear such music were few and far between outside Catholic capitals, Bach must have deliberately sought them out, arranging performances for his own and his pupils' edification. Doing so could also have demonstrated that he was not averse to offering Leipzig congregations the same type of music that was being composed at Dresden by his eventual successor Harrer, among others.

In this light it makes sense that when Emanuel Bach applied for his father's position, he auditioned with a Magnificat and not a German work.[815] It is possible, too, that in cultivating music of this type Sebastian was shifting away from "homilectical" to "liturgical" church music.[816] But the tendency toward sacred music of the somewhat more neutral, less rhetorical type typical of late-Baroque Latin settings could also have reflected a trend even in orthodox Lutheranism away from the self-examining, emotionally charged piety of the seventeenth century, toward something less searching and challenging.[817] Bach might, in addition, have wished to rework compositions originally composed for specific occasions so that they were not confined to a given day in the church year. In this way he could make his best sacred music more generally usable—universal, in some sense, and of interest to future generations. When Emanuel Bach later included the Credo from the B-Minor Mass on at least one Hamburg concert program, it was as part of a concert series that also included music by Pergolesi, Handel, Salieri, and Gluck. This gave listeners "the opportunity to hear the various styles in the works of the famous composers in question," as a contemporary reviewer noted.[818] Today this sounds like a tautology,

---

[815] Emanuel's probable performance of his Magnificat at Leipzig was established by Wollny (2011, 44–46). All but one of Emanuel's early sacred works on German texts are lost; the next one would be composed in 1756, evidently for his "pre-audition" at Hamburg (see Wollny 2010a).

[816] That is, from composing pedagogic "sermons in sound" to more abstract "liturgical prayers and praises," as suggested by Leaver (2017, 190).

[817] As is evident in Emanuel Bach's later sacred works (see Schulenberg 2014, 158).

[818] The anonymous review from April 11, 1786 is reprinted in BD 3:421 (no. 911).

but at the time it was a novelty, suggested not only by the Concert of Ancient Music at London but perhaps by Sebastian's practices during the later years at Leipzig.[819]

None of the above is meant to suggest that the musical rhetoric that so strongly characterizes Bach's German works is absent from his Latin ones. These continue to emphasize significant words through melismas, to articulate texts sensibly into distinct musical clauses, and sometimes to re-purpose the original musical imagery in ingenious ways. Unlike the so-called poetic type of parody of the cantatas and other German works, in which a new libretto was written for existing music, Bach's masses employ "compositional parody," revising existing music (sometimes heavily) to fit a traditional Latin text. The "new" prose texts were typically shorter than the German verses used in the originals. Yet the music was essentially unchanged, and therefore Bach's Latin works tend to repeat their words over longer stretches, potentially allowing for stronger or more emphatic word-tone relationships than in the generally shorter and less searching Latin settings by his contemporaries. Models for Bach's masses have been sought in contemporary settings for the Dresden court chapel, but it is hard to find anything even vaguely like Bach's settings in those compositions, even ones by the highly imaginative Zelenka. Certainly Bach would have found little to imitate in the music of the Saxon Capellmeister Heinichen, whose Latin compositions rarely rise above the level of pedestrian formulas and conventional figuration.

Lutheran traditions were, in any case, somewhat distinct even for Latin works. Magnificat settings, used only on holidays, tended to be longer, falling into a greater number of sections or movements than most such works for Catholic services. All of Bach's Latin works divide into choruses and solos, but there are no recitatives, and the solo movements cannot properly be termed arias, for they are settings of Latin prose, not German verse. The musical styles that Bach employs are fundamentally the same as in the choruses and arias of a cantata, yet formal designs can be rather different. Da capo forms, for example, are less frequent, even when the parody model was in ternary form, and the binary and rondeau-like dance forms used even for some passion choruses are avoided entirely. Individual movements for solo voices tend to be somewhat shorter and more likely to run into one another without a break.

Bach's Magnificat (p. 324, following the first paragraph break, "accompanied by pizzicato bass")

A "concerted" Magnificat was particularly appropriate for the Marian feast-days of the church year, but the text was sung in some form at every Leipzig Vespers service, and Bach wrote a "simple" four-part harmonization that could have been used on ordinary Sundays; he also composed a distinctive organ fugue based on the melody.[820] The grand opening chorus with

---

[819] The printed program for C. P. E. Bach's performance is given in BD3:420 (no. 910); facsimile in NBA, vol. 2/1, KB, p. 39; further discussion in Schulenberg (1992, 14–15). Joshua Rifkin, in his edition of the B-Minor Mass (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf und Härtel, 2006), 255, describes corrections in his source "F" that point to earlier performances at Hamburg.

[820] These are BWV 324 and 733, respectively. Williams (2003, 474) finds in the organ work a "general effect" reminiscent of Contrapunctus 9 (also a double fugue) from the Art of Fugue. This might suggest a late date for BWV 733, but the relatively conventional motivic work and

which Bach opens his setting seems completely straightforward, if not even a little obvious. Yet it is hard to find an exact precedent for the combination of those elements with Bach's polychoral counterpoint, used by him for grand trumpets-and-drums choruses at least since the Weimar cantata BWV 172. By the same token, as natural as it might seem to repeat the opening music for the "Sicut erat" (As it was in the beginning), the idea does not occur as often as one might imagine in Magnificat settings.

Close examination of the movements for solo voice reveals that text and musical form do not relate to one another exactly as in an aria of the period. Numbers 8 and 9 are actually cavatinas, equivalent to the binary form of the A section (alone) of a standard aria. Numbers 2, 3, 5, and 6 all resemble through-composed da capo or sonata forms musically, while disposing their texts in other ways. Each of these represents a solution to the problem of adapting aria style to bible verses. One might imagine that some of these could be parodies of actual arias, but although that is how Bach would produce most or all of the solos in his later Latin works, there is no evidence for his doing so here.[821]

The most striking sections are surely those calling for multiple voices. All employ imitation in some way, yet they seem designed to reveal maximum variety of style and compositional technique. "Sicut locutus est" (So he spoke) is an old-fashioned permutation fugue, probably to reflect the idea "to our fathers" (*ad patres nostros*). The central "Fecit potentiam" is also a permutation fugue, but more modern in style. The first four entries of the main subject, however, are "hidden" beneath other voices until the first soprano and finally the first trumpet present the same theme more prominently. This might have been the first instance of what would become a common device in Bach's fugal choruses (cf. ex. S11.5). Only one movement, the trio "Suscepit Israel," incorporates the traditional psalm tone; it appears as a cantus firmus, originally assigned to trumpet (presumably the slide version).[822]

Bach's "short" masses and the supposed problem of parody (p. 326, following the second paragraph, "distinctly meaningful or symbolic")

The Mass in G minor, based largely on Cantata 187, is the only known instance in which Bach drew on all the arias and choruses of a single cantata (apart from chorales). But he also borrowed multiple movements from BWV 79, 102, and 179 for separate masses. Cantatas 102 and 187 were composed in close proximity during August 1726, but BWV 179 and 79 are earlier works, from the first and third annual cycles, respectively. There are no obvious common features that would explain the selection of movements from these particular cantatas, but the choruses, not surprisingly, include a variety of fugal types.

---

voice leading suggest a Weimar origin. There is no reason to think that BWV 733 is the work of its copyist J. L. Krebs (see Jones 2007–13, 1:242).

[821] Marshall (1972, 1:29–30) found no evidence of parody in the autograph score of BWV 243a, which is clearly a "non-calligraphic" first draft of the entire work.

[822] Lundberg (2011, 252) points out that the cantus firmus here takes the form used for singing it as a German chorale, in Luther's translation

These range from the *stile antico* or motet style of BWV 179/1 to the unique conglomeration of fugue with a martial ritornello in the first movement of Cantata 79. Fugue, or rather a retrospective imitative style, is also a feature of BWV 187/4, originally a *dictum* movement for bass soloist with unison violins and continuo. But exemplary counterpoint could not have been the only thing Bach sought in adapting earlier movements to the words of the mass. A beautiful two-part aria such as BWV 187/5, with an ornate oboe solo in the slow, expressive first part and a livelier B section, made for an effective Qui tollis–Quoniam setting (ex. S13.55). The latter could also be supplied by separate arias from the same work: the chromatic and tortuous BWV 102/3 was adapted together with the following aria (no. 5) from that cantata, albeit with its opening vocal line entirely rewritten (ex. S13.56).

In the Domine Deus of the A-major Mass, one of the movements whose source sork has not been identified, the three sections of the original were transparently adapted to serve the three clauses of the text, although this required writing out the repeat of the A section, in order to fit it to clause 3 (“Domine Deus, agnus Dei”). The only sure exception—that is, the only movement in any of the masses that clearly looks like an original composition—is the Confiteor from the B-Minor Mass. Yet it is striking that the latter, unlike the “short” masses, seems to have been constructed mainly out of movements from lost works; where versions of movements do survive as arias or choruses in cantatas, those too appear to have been parodies.[823]

These circumstances have made the compositional history of the B-Minor Mass difficult to reconstruct.[824]Even in the *missae*, however, Bach reworked some movements more thoroughly than in a typical “poetic” parody. To create the “Gloria in excelsis” of the Mass in G, Bach transferred the horn parts in the opening chorus of Cantata 79 to soprano and alto voices (see ex. S11.35). A ritornello thereby became a duet, and if Bach carried out similar transformations elsewhere it is hard to guess what forms the lost original versions of other movements might have taken.

Besides illustrating how existing music could be reused in sometimes surprising ways, these works demonstrate, perhaps inadvertently, that the meaning of the texts was less important than their syntax, or rather how the distinct grammars of music and language can operate independent of any specific semantic content. The clearest example of how loosely words and music could be related in these works comes with the duet “Et in unum Dominum” from the B-minor Mass, which originally included the sentence beginning “et incarnatus est” (and he was made incarnate). This sentence is repeated in the following choral movement, which Bach apparently inserted after deciding to eliminate that text from the B section of what became the preceding

---

823

This is the case for the “Gratias” and the “Patrem” of the B-Minor Mass, also known as BWV 29/2 and 171/1, respectively. For this reason the last column in table 13.1 is headed “parallel” rather than “source” works.

824 The provisional identifications of models by Häfner (1977 and 1987) have proved less persuasive than those given by Rifkin (1988) and Dürr (1992); for a handy summary, see Rifkin (2006, xviii).

movement. The latter now leads directly into the following chorus, but the duet must have parodied a lost aria or duet in Bach's usual through-composed ternary form. In both extant versions of the duet, the B section includes the words "he descended from the heavens" (*descendit de coelis*), and in the original version these words immediately follow a prominent descending arpeggio for the strings (ex. S13.58a). Although the voices actually leap up on those words, their meaning seems clearly to be "painted" by the figure in the strings.

There seems to be further text painting of a more profound sort a few measures later. The music moves suddenly into G minor, even making a shocking if momentary tonicization of E-flat major—the first appearance of these "flat" tonalities in the entire work (ex. S13.58b). The arrival on E-flat originally coincided with the first statement of the phrase "and he was made human" (*et homo factus est*).[825] One need not subscribe to the hypothesis of "tonal allegory" to agree that the change of key symbolizes the transformation described by the text. Yet Bach rejected this setting of the words. In the final version, although the vocal lines descend modestly on the word *descendit*, the association of that word with the descending arpeggio is blurred. It may be that, by this point, Bach was less interested in concrete text painting than in alluding to something more mysterious in the relationship of words to tones, or of musical to theological ideas.

The B-Minor Mass (p. 330, following the end of the printed page, "The ecstatic 'Et expecto' follows in that key")

So familiar has the B-Minor Mass become to many listeners that certain oddities resulting from its parody origins are easily overlooked. The variation in the number of voices in the choruses, from four to eight (but predominantly five), shows that Bach found it acceptable to expand the number of singers in some movements but not others.[826]Some of the ritornellos, like those of the Christe and the Benedictus, share the asymmetrical phrasing and indirect relationship to the vocal melody that characterize certain arias and solo chorales in the later cantatas. The Latin words are sometimes fitted imperfectly to the older music, the declamation occasionally forced and leaving the soloists hardly any time to breathe between phrases (ex. S13.59).[827]

---

[825] This recalls the modulation by which Bach signified the incarnation in Cantata 121, stripping away sharps in a sudden "flatward" move from B major to C major in just a few measures of recitative (see ex. S11.26).

[826] Where he retained only the original four parts, he took care to indicate whether the top line was for both or only one of the two sopranos, as noted by Rifkin (1982a, [18]).

[827] It is probably no accident that Bach found it advisable to make some changes in the bass vocal part of the "Quoniam" when he copied it from his score into the individual performance part for Dresden (see Rifkin 2006, 260–61, entries for "Basso").

The brilliance of the music, including the originality of the scoring, allows us to overlook such things. One does, not for instance, expect the passage for bass soloist within the "Et resurrexit." Whatever its original form, it manages to incorporate somewhat contrived associations of *vivos* (the living) and *mortuos* (the dead) with rising and falling melismas, respectively. To be sure, by 1748 these might have seemed old-fashioned.[828]

All three of the movements shown in example S13.59 were clearly arranged from lost arias in through-composed da capo form, but they distribute their texts differently. The "Laudamus" presents its complete text in all three sections; the "Quoniam," dividing its text into two clauses, introduces the second one in the B section and then repeats the full text in the final section. The "Et resurrexit" introduces new words in each section. On the other hand, the "Agnus Dei," although also adapted from a da capo aria, replaces the clear ternary form of the latter with a somewhat blurry binary design, eliding the division between a shortened middle section and the recapitulation.[829] It is hard to see this as a fault, however, and each of these numbers could be considered an ingenious demonstration of how to solve the problem of setting a lengthy prose text, without falling into the routine recitation of the words which is common in mass settings by lesser eighteenth-century composers.

The Kyrie, of course, presented no such problem; on the contrary, in each of its three movements a mere two words replaced what originally must have been a much longer text. Bach may have chosen their models to conform with perceived conventions. Thus the second Kyrie, evidently derived from a lost four-part *dictum* chorus originally in E minor,[830]is a relatively compact setting in Bach's version of the *stile antico*, without ritornellos or independent instrumental parts. It echoes the corresponding movement in the mass by J. L. Bach, also in E minor, which Sebastian had copied out a few years earlier (BWV Anh. 167; see ex. S13.53 above). The melodic diminished third in its subject—an intensification of the more conventional chromaticism of Ludwig Bach's subject—obviously does not have the same meaning attached to it a few years earlier in the St. Matthew Passion (compare exx. 13.7b and S13.42). Presumably a symbol of deep entreaty, it gives the movement a certain tonal instability that is not entirely resolved until the last few measures. This movement is nevertheless entirely tonal, unlike the quasi-modal Kyrie settings in the third volume of the *Clavierübung*.

The Latin Gloria begins as a series of acclamations and petitions, originally echoing those made to Roman emperors; Bach turns these into demonstrations of various compositional devices. The "Laudamus" features the florid writing for concertato violin that is so prominent in several arias of the St. Matthew Passion. Here the instrumental solo part features "glorifying" figuration that ascends to the highest note Bach is known to have written (a‴ in m. 58). This is followed by a textbook example of *stile antico* as Bach understood it: a choral fugue that he had used two years

---

[828] The passage may originally have been sung by Mars as part of a chorus of the gods in a lost Cöthen serenata, BWV Anh. 9 (see Melamed 2018, 35).

[829] As noted earlier; details in Schulenberg (2011, 39–42).

[830] Rifkin (2006, xviii); Häfner (1987, 260n. 403) lists corrections of transposing errors, which point to the original key.

earlier in a council election cantata. It is now repeated with a Latin version of the original text (*Gratias agimus*, we bring thanks).

That a composition in this style could bear any number of meanings is clear from the re-use of this music at the end of the mass as a prayer for peace (*Dona nobis pacem*).[831] It begins as a four-part fugue, like the second Kyrie but without the latter's chromaticism. It is, however, a double fugue, introducing a new theme for the second clause of the text. The two subjects tend to alternate rather than combine, but toward the end the texture expands to six real parts, as the first two trumpets enter with their own statements of the first subject.[832] Hence this fugue, too, forms a steady crescendo to a magnificent conclusion.

In the "Domine Deus"–"Qui tollis" pair, the two flutes may be most notable not for their *galant* solo line in the duet but for the coloration they add to the choral movement that follows. Bach took the latter from Cantata 46 in his first Leipzig cycle (see ex. 11.3). There it appeared in D minor, with recorders. Its adaptation here in B minor with flutes, one of Bach's most inspired inventions, might have been suggested by the atmospheric scoring of certain Italianate choruses, like the corresponding section of Lotti's G-minor mass (ex. S13.61).

To this Bach adds a third layer of rhythmic activity for the flutes—sixteenths on top of the strings' eighths and what were originally mainly quarters in the voices. The voices are somewhat more active in the mass as compared to the cantata, and more meaningfully imitative than in Lotti's composition. But what really sets Bach's setting apart is its harmony, which moves restlessly from dissonance to dissonance, with hardly a break before the concluding half cadence. In Cantata 46 the music adapted for the "Qui tollis" was originally the "prelude" section of a prelude-and-fugue chorus. Ending with a full cadence on the dominant, it now sets up the following "Qui sedes" in the same key (B minor), for alto soloist with oboe d'amore. This is followed by the bass solo "Quoniam tu solus sanctus," with its challenging horn solo and two accompanying bassoons—a unique sonority doubtless designed specifically for Dresden players. Yet, like the preceding section, this was probably a parody of a recent Leipzig composition; could Bach have originally written it for a visiting horn soloist to honor a visiting dignitary, perhaps the elector himself? Or was it intended to show that a local player, presumably Reiche, could equal anyone in the capital city?[833]

---

[831] How Bach originally used this music is unknown; his autograph score of the cantata movement (in Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. Bach P 166) was clearly copied from something else.

[832] Strings and woodwinds essentially double the voices, but trumpet 3 and timpani are independent, yielding an eight-part texture by the end.

[833] It is always noted that the aria "Cervo al bosco" in Hasse's *Cleofide*, premiered at Dresden in 1731, also features a prominent horn solo (as well as one for lute). But this does not prove that Bach was writing for the same player or that it was he who imitated Hasse's scoring, rather than the other way around.

Much has been made of the use in this and other movements of what is said to be "Polish style," that is, polonaise rhythm.[834]Supposedly a symbol of the ruler as Polish king, polonaise rhythms had actually been heard in Bach's music since at least the First Brandenburg Concerto, dedicated to a Hohenzollern. Whether the "Quoniam" is indeed a polonaise might even be questioned, as it rarely cadences on the second beat, and the recurring motive in the bassoons often shifts the distinctive *figura corte* to the third beat (ex. S13.62). Perhaps the stylistic reference was clearer in the parody model, although another aria for the king in the same style made a point of repeating the word *Sachsen* (Saxony), as if to remind the ruler where his most loyal subjects lived.[835]

By the mid-1730s polonaises were almost as common as minuets, and one can find allusions to them in almost any triple-meter movement of Bach's Mass, including the following "Cum sancto spirito" chorus. This concludes the Gloria with what appears to be a heavily reworked version of another choral aria from a lost homage cantata. The latter was doubtless in through-composed ternary form; two lively fugal expositions now constitute the B section, the second eliding into a retransition passage, such as occurs in other reworked aria forms of this type in the Mass. Both A sections end with a chromatic closing phrase that passes momentarily into the minor. With its sustained chords for the voices and arpeggios in the strings, this passage evokes the mysterious majesty of the divine. Originally, however, it might have expressed only the ostensive power of the local sovereign, using a harmonic progression that also concludes the gigue of the Fourth Partita, published in 1728 (ex. S13.63).

Bach gave the Credo a separate title page in his autograph score, reflecting the fact that it is a distinct and perhaps more mature work, even though its parody sections draw on at least one much earlier composition. The opening chorus appears to have been copied from some lost Credo introduction (or intonation) such as Bach composed in the late 1740s for one of the Bassani masses in his collection.

The brief opening movement has, in addition to its five vocal parts, two independent violins and a supporting "walking" continuo part. It is thus a seven-part fugue in *stile antico*, based on a traditional chant melody (as is the fugue in E major from WTC2). As in the Bassani mass, Bach's old-fashioned intonation is followed by a chorus in "modern" style, here a fugue previously used to open Cantata 171.[836] The Credo as a whole to some degree repeats the pattern of the *Missa*, for the choral fugue in D is followed by a duet in G ("Et in unum") and a chorus in B minor ("Et incarnatus est"); these movements recall the "Gratias," "Domine Deus," and "Qui tollis," respectively.

---

[834] Polish style in this sense is discussed comprehensively by Paczkowski (2017).

[835] "Preiset, späte Folgezeiten" from BWV 207a. Elsewhere in this cantata Bach gives the word *Sachsen* only one modest melisma, near the end of the aria "Augustens Namenstages Schimmer." It is nevertheless more prominent than the one mention of Poland (as "Samartia") in the recitative no. 8.

[836] BWV 171 was the New Year's work for (probably) 1729, but both versions derive from a lost common model that must have differed considerably. The "Et expecto" likewise comes from the lost common model for both BWV 120a and its sacred parody BWV 120.

This was not Bach's original plan, for the duet originally included the text of the "Et incarnatus." The inserted choral movement describes the incarnation in a mildly chromatic setting of unknown origin; its five-part vocal writing could not have come directly from any cantata, and the accompaniment for unison violins is reminiscent of Italian scoring, as in the anonymous Sanctus in D minor. This has led to the suggestion that the movement was adapted from the work of another composer, but it is hard to see Bach doing as much in his magnum opus. Yet the relatively simple scoring, adding only unison violins to voices and continuo, reflects Italian practice of the time, as in the Sanctus setting known as BWV 239. Bach had imitated this in another Sanctus, BWV 238, and the "Et incarnatus" demonstrates the same stylistic appropriation in a more serious style.

The "Crucifixus" likewise demonstrates stylistic borrowing, this time from French style, although this chorus was a heavily revised version of a movement from Cantata 12, one of Bach's first mature vocal works. Bach eliminated the original B section (as in the "Qui tollis"), and in place of the final orchestral realization of the ground bass, Bach gave the voices a modulating transition. Here the crucial word *sepultus* (entombed) is signified by a diminished-third chord, which Bach had reserved for climactic moments since some of his earliest compositions (ex. S13.64).[837]

In the "Confiteor," the incorporation of strict canon might have been inspired by Gasparini's *Missa canonica*, which Bach performed around 1740. Like Bach's "Confiteor" it is in an austere *stile antico* throughout, with only figured bass. There are no further parallels between the two compositions, but one can imagine Bach leading private readings of both, with five singers grouped around a clavichord or harpsichord.

The initial sections of the "Confiteor" set forth its two subjects separately and in stretto, articulated by cadences such as one might expect.[838] But as in part 3 of the *Clavierübung*, the use of a modal cantus firmus introduces a structural element independent of conventional tonality. The movement begins in F-sharp minor—a favored key in the Mass, probably because of the trinitarian symbolism of its three-sharp signature. The chant for the Lutheran Credo, however, was (as Bach knew it) in the Phrygian mode; the sentence "Confiteor . . . peccatorum" ends on the second degree of that scale, a half step above the final. The melody is therefore quite ambivalent when inserted into a tonal composition. Coordinating the movement's contrapuntal, tonal, and modal elements was a final stroke of genius in a career that saw increasingly complex manipulations of motivic ideas and modulations, carried out without the supposed benefit of later music theory.

---

[837] In modern terms this is a German sixth chord (altered IV^7) in root position; the same chord occurs in m. 5 of the very early Praeludium in C minor (BWV 921). The prominent E-flat in the present passage, turning the movement away from its tonic of E minor, hearkens back to the end of the "Et in unum" (see ex. S13.58).

[838] That is, to the dominant of F-sharp minor (m. 16), B minor (m. 32), D (m. 55), and C-sharp minor (m. 69).

Bach transposes the chant so that it can be harmonized primarily in C-sharp minor when first introduced (see the first measure of ex. S13.66). When, however, the tenor takes up the melody in augmentation, the final note of the cantus firmus is D. The movement effectively cadences on that note, shortly after the last entrances of the two main subjects (ex. S13.67). Hence the "Confiteor" as a whole has moved from F-sharp minor through B minor and C-sharp minor to a sort of D major. Yet although we have reached the tonic chord of the next and final movement of the Credo, the cadence is hardly full or perfect. A small detail here is curious: the closing passage anticipates the text heard in the following movement, although earlier in the Credo Bach eliminated a similar anticipation involving the "Et in unum Dominum" and the "Et incarnatus."

After the homage-style choral aria "Et expecto," the Sanctus follows immediately in the same key, but it is a giant prelude and fugue. The ensuing Osanna, also in D, is a demonstration of double-choral writing. The Benedictus, in B minor, offers a sharp contrast; it is known only from Bach's autograph, which does not specify the solo instrument heard alongside the tenor soloist. The instrument can be only a flute, however, and, like the Agnus Dei, this movement seems to have been cut down from what was originally a through-composed da capo aria. As beautiful as it is, it is difficult to see how exactly the *galant* triplets and "sharp" minor tonality, typically used by Bach to express longing, relate to the present text. Yet the phrasing and harmony are even more elegant and subtle than in Bach's other arias of this type.[839]

---

[839] Dürr (1992, 136), however, draws a comparison to the aria "Seele, deine Spezerieien" from the Easter Cantata BWV 249 (and its model in BWV 249a).

Chapter 14

The division of Bach's music (p. 334, following the first paragraph break, "after the death of her husband Altnickol")

More important than anything mentioned in the inventory was Bach's music, of which each son as well as the widow was entitled to a share. A monetary value could not easily be placed on manuscript scores and parts, but those for sacred cantatas were worth a great deal to a professional musician. Although only one of the musician sons (Friedemann) could have used them immediately in his current church position, all four (plus Altnickol) might have anticipated offering Sebastian's music for sale or rental, if not for use in some future employment. Like the pedal clavichord, however, Sebastian's scores and parts must have been distributed ahead of time as "gifts." Some of the surviving manuscripts carry indications showing who was to receive them, as in the presence of the nicknames "Christel" (referring to the young J. C. Bach) and "Friederich" on several. As these notes are in Magdalena's hand, they suggest that she took care to protect her own sons' inheritances from any possible encroachment by their older half-brothers.

Little is certain, however, about how the great bulk of Sebastian's music was disposed of immediately after his death. Magdalena and the four professional sons apparently divided the scores and parts of the sacred cantatas according to patterns that have been deduced from their subsequent transmission.[840] It is often lamented that Friedemann lost or sold his share, which apparently included the scores and some of the parts for the crucial cycle of chorale cantatas. But Friedrich's portion, too, is also mostly lost. Magdalena herself, who in general received one third of Sebastian's estate, kept the original parts for most of the chorale cantatas. But after receiving the customary six months' continuance of Sebastian's salary, including use of their home in the St. Thomas School, she sold her share of the music to the city, where it remains to this day in what is now the Bach Archive.

Much of Sebastian's musical legacy was eventually listed in the catalog of Emanuel's estate, published forty years later after *his* death in 1788.[841] The dispersal of Sebastian's music collection might have resulted in its complete loss, as was apparently the case with Quantz and other contemporaries whose personal libraries have never been located. But Emanuel gradually acquired some of the music originally granted to Christian and Friedemann. After his death, much of this was purchased in turn by collectors, subsequently passing to the royal library in Berlin, now the Prussian State library. There Sebastians's original scores and performing parts joined other manuscripts copied or gathered by other musicians and collectors, including Princess Amalie and her librarian Kirnberger. As a result, Berlin, which had already seen an influx of Bach students, also became a gathering point for Bach sources. When, in the nineteenth century, the heirs and pupils of *his* pupils began to edit and publish his music, they turned most frequently to the sources conveniently assembled in the Prussian capital—although there remain many further sources, sometimes equally important, in other parts of the world.

---

[840] Details summarized by Wolff (2000, 458–59).

[841] C. P. E. Bach (1790).

Family and pupils (p. 335, following the first paragraph break, “a visit to the latter in London, 1778”)

Emanuel Bach’s early works clearly derive from his father’s, as in a keyboard sonata that borrows its opening theme from the Invention in F (ex. S14.1).[842] Yet the incipient version of sonata-allegro form into which Emanuel worked that theme was borrowed from chamber sonatas by Hasse, Quantz, and other younger composers. Imitative counterpoint would play a minor role in Emanuel’s later works. This does not mean that he avoided counterpoint, but he tended to write in just two real parts: a leading melody and a subsidiary bass line. This, together with inventive, frequently chromatic, harmony and modulation, must reflect training from his father that included the addition of bass lines to melodies and the strict realization of figured bass. In his strict adherence to this tradition, which he described in detail in his famous *Essay* on playng keyboard music, he showed himself a loyal keeper of his father’s legacy. His best-known works, however, including about 150 keyboard sonatas and 50 keyboard concertos, quite purposefully veered away from Sebastian’s style in favor of a highly personal version of the *galant* style which he encountered above all at Berlin, where he had moved by 1738 after his student days.[843]

Despite being a preserver of his father’s music and defender of the latter’s posthumous reputation, in later life Emanuel may have been embarrassed by Sebastian’s old-fashioned taste in poetic texts. After becoming a director of church music, he almost never, unlike Friedemann, re-used arias or choruses from Sebastian’s cantatas in his own performances. He nevertheless safeguarded many of their scores for future generations, and his famous book on keyboard playing doubtless preserved elements of his father’s instruction even as it updated them for application in a very different style of music.

Christian Bach is often viewed as having betrayed the family tradition by leaving Germany for Italy, converting to Catholicism, and becoming a composer of Catholic church music and Italian operas. After some seven years in Italy, he continued his career in England, beginning in 1762. The development of his style has yet to be seriously traced, but it must owe something to both Sebastian’s cultivation of the *stile antico* during the 1740s and the *galant* music that Christian would then have heard at Berlin—compositions not only by Emanuel Bach but by other members of the royal *Capelle*, especially the operas of Heinrich Graun.[844] Yet before turning to opera, Christian, during his first years in Italy, mastered the strict polyphonic style of Latin church music. His Italian sacred compositions include many major works, among them three

---

[842] This sonata (W. 62/1), written at Leipzig in 1731 when the composer was just seventeen, was revised at Berlin in 1744 and finally published in 1761; the example shows the latter version. Several movements in Emanuel’s Prussian and Württemberg sonatas of 1740–44 also allude to Sebastian’s inventions and sinfonias.

[843] For further considerations of Emanuel’s early training and music, including speculation as to how and why they differed from Friedemann’s, see Schulenberg (2014, esp. chap. 2).

[844] Christian would have already known Graun’s music at Leipzig through such works as the pasticcio passion *Wer ist der, so von Edom kommt*.

settings of the Magnificat and a splendid Requiem mass.[845] These compositions sound as little like Sebastian's as they do Christian's later and better-known operas and instrumental music. Yet the impulse to compose sacred polyphony in as many as eight real parts must have been instilled through exposure to the repertory that Sebastian was performing during the 1740s. Indeed, Christian's Latin works represent a more serious cultivation of imitative polyphony than anything left by his older brothers.[846]

Christian's operas and instrumental music proved an inspiration to the young Mozart, who met him in London. After Christian's early death on New Year's Day 1782, Mozart incorporated one of his themes into a piano concerto,[847] and Christian's widow, the opera singer Cecilia Grassi, saw his last, French, opera *Amadis des Gaules* into print. The latter, published "as the composer had written it"—that is, not in the unauthorized version used for its first performances[848]—constitutes a curious parallel to Emanuel's posthumous publication of the Art of Fugue. Both publications, by surviving family members, manifested a concern for disseminating their composers' greatest accomplishments in an authentic form, an impulse that could be traced within the family to Sebastian himself.

Magdalena lived until 1760; little is known about her circumstances or activities, but they probably did not involve professional music making.[849] Bach's daughters remain ciphers. We know almost nothing about Elisabeth Juliana Friederica Altnickol, nor why her much older half-sister Catharina Dorothea never married. Presumably the latter helped raise the younger children, perhaps assisting in their early musical training. After Sebastian's death, she probably went to Halle to live with Friedemann.
Altnickol died in 1759, and his widow ("Liessgen") returned to Leipzig some time after the death of Gottfried Heinrich Bach in 1763. So did Catharina Dorothea after Friedemann's departure from Halle around 1770. The four surviving sisters eventually may have lived together; Catharina Dorothea died in 1774, and the youngest, Regina Susanna, was left alone after the deaths of Friederica and Johanna Carolina within six days of one another in 1781 (suggesting a common illness). Regina Susanna persisted until 1809, becoming the longest-living member of the immediate family. Late in life she was the recipient of charitable contributions raised by

---

[845] J. C. Bach periodically sent these compositions for approval to Giovanni Battista Martini, the leading Italian expert on counterpoint and an admirer of J. S. Bach (whose music he collected).

[846] Christian also incorporated a fugue into one of his keyboard sonatas (op. 5, no. 6)—something none of his brothers ever did.

[847] The Andante of the A-major concerto (K. 414) draws on the slow movement of Christian's overture to the pastiche *La calamita de' cuori*.

[848] Grassi's handwritten dedication inserted into one copy describes the published score as "tel que le Compositeur l'avoir d'abord Ecrit"; see Roe (2016, 162–64).

[849] Hübner (2002) traces what is known of Magdalena's financial situation, which was poor but not dire, thanks to a few limited sources of income, including alms. She also received some regular support from Emanuel.

Rochlitz and the Viennese piano maker Streicher, but no more musical activity is known from her than from any of her younger sisters.

It may be surprising that, after bringing so many children into the world, Anna Magdalena could have have known only two grandchildren, the daughters of Friederica Bach and Altnickol.[850] Her son Friedrich, who married in 1755—Lucia Elisabeth Münchhausen was a court singer, like her mother-in-law—had nine children, but only four survived childhood. The one adult son, Wilhelm Friedrich Ernst, lived until 1845, but his activity as a decidedly minor composer ceased around 1810. Although he apparently studied with both Christian and Emanuel, he seems to have taken no part in the Bach Revival, which was well underway before he reached old age. He was nevertheless the last descendent of Sebastian Bach to bear the family name, although Friedemann's daughter Friederica Sophia had an illegitimate child whose descendents eventually came to the United States.[851] Other branches of the family also saw musical activity into the nineteenth century, but after peaking with Sebastian, the production of significant musicians bearing the name Bach continued for only one or two more generations. Family traditions and practices that favored success in a court-centered musical culture evidently proved ineffective or irrelevant in a rapidly changing world.

To the names of Bach's heirs must be added his son-in-law Altnickol. He matriculated at the Leipzig university in March 1744 and was soon performing as a bass singer while also assisting as a string player and copyist.[852] In what was for him an unusually prolix recommendation, Bach also mentioned Altnickol's work as an assistant and composer. This suggests that Altnickol was one of those who substituted for Bach during the 1740s. The recommendation, written on New Year's Day 1748, helped Altnickol become organist and "schoolteacher" (*Schul-Collegen*) in the Silesian town of Niederweisa.[853] But within a few months Bach took it upon himself to "make humble application" on behalf of his pupil for the much more significant position at St.

---

[850] Knoll (2016, 286) discusses Magdalena's descendents; most of the grandchildren were born too late or were too short-lived for her to have had any meaningful personal contact with them.

[851] Wolff (2003) identifies her and her descendants and describes an unsuccessful attempt to locate her musical inheritance.

[852] So Sebastian testifed in a memo dated May 25, 1747, to the Leipzig council, probably in support of payment for Altnickol. He had been participating "mostly as vocal bass" since fall 1745 (BD 1:148–49 [no. 81], trans. in NBR, 224–25 [no. 240]).

[853] As Bach noted in a subsequent letter, BD 1:112–13 (no. 47), trans. in NBR, 231–32 (no. 253).

Wenceslaw's in Naumburg.[854] There he would preside over the magnificent organ by Hildebrandt, which had been inspected two years earlier by Bach and Silbermann.[855]

Sebastian's solicitousness in this case, similar to what he had offered his own sons, implies that Altnickol was already engaged to marry Friederica, which he would do that January. Altnickol was apparently friendly with Friedemann, who, upon leaving his position as organist at St. Sophia's in Dresden, had recommended his future brother-in-law. That application was unsuccessful, but Friedemann had made a point of mentioning Altnickol's status as a university student (*Studiosus*).[856] In fact, after his audition at Naumburg, Altnickol was reported not to be much of a teacher; he was, however, praised as a great master of music and was preferred for the job over another candidate favored by Brühl.[857] Thus his appointment could have been seen as a victory for Bach, especially after Harrer's audition at Leipzig the following summer. By then, Friederica was living in Naumburg; sadly, when her son, named Johann Sebastian, was born in October 1749, Sebastian could not be present for the christening, and the infant was buried four days later.[858]

Although Leipzig may have been growing less attractive for musicians during Bach's last decade, during that period he continued to receive not only regular pupils such as Altnickol but also short-term students and visitors. Among them must have been the theorist and critic Marpurg, who wrote of having spent time in Leipzig to "discuss certain matters pertaining to fugue" with Bach.[859] This could have been only during the 1740s, while Marpurg was preparing to write the two-volume counterpoint treatise (*Abhandlung von der Fuge*); he would publish it during 1753–54. The first volume, on fugue, was dedicated to Telemann, the second, on canon, to Friedemann and Emanuel Bach.

---

[854] With the document cited in the previous note, dated July 24, 1748. A week later, evidently having been told that Altnickol himself would have to apply, Bach wrote again, enclosing the required letter from his pupil with his own (BD 1:114–15 [no. 48], trans. in NBR, 232–33 [no. 254]).

[855] Their joint report—the last known by Bach—is dated Sept. 27, 1746 (BD 1:170–71 [no. 90]; NBR, 221–22 [no. 236]).

[856] In a note to the Dresden city council dated April 16, 1746 (BD 2:423 [no. 543]).

[857] BD 1:151 (commentary to no. 82): "er wohl in Studio kein so far großer Held seyn wird. In der Music aber ist er ein desto größerer Maître." The recommendation for Brühl's favorite, Johann Friedrich Gräbner, was dated July 27 (four days before Bach's) but supposedly arrived late, on Aug. 2. Gräbner nevertheless eventually succeed Altnickol in 1759 (BD 1:117, commentary to no. 48).

[858] According to the baptismal record (BD 2:459 [no. 587]), Bach was represented by Benjamin Gottlieb Faber. A medical student at Leipzig, he had been the recipient of the seven-part canon BWV 1078.

[859] Letter 34 (February 9, 1760) in Marpurg (1760–63), 1:266 (BD 3:144 [no. 701]; NBR, 363 [no. 357a]).

Marpurg was preceded at Leipzig by Johann Friedrich Agricola, who from 1738 to 1741 studied both at the university and with Bach. Agricola then continued his studies with Quantz at Berlin, eventually joining him and Emanuel not only as a royal musician but as author of an important treatise—or, to be more precise, translator of one and annotator of another.[860] Agricola, like both his teachers, also made numerous copies of contrapuntal works by other composers, presumably for study.[861] A more than capable composer of operas and sacred vocal music, he failed to gain Graun's title of royal Capellmeister, although he effectively succeeded the latter as the court opera composer after Graun's death in 1759. His music, which includes many substantial vocal works, has yet to be adequately evaluated, but it is clear that Agricola, more than any other Bach student, represented the ideal of a "learned" musician to which Sebastian may have aspired.

Of Bach's major students, only the composer and organist Johann Christian Kittel enjoyed a career that extended into the nineteenth century. He seems to have studied privately with Bach from 1748 until Sebastian's death, perhaps overlapping at the end with the slightly older Johann Gottfried Müthel. Both therefore have been claimed as Bach's "last pupil." Müthel proved to be the more interesting composer, leaving a small number of distinctive works that share stylistic features with those of Friedemann and Emanuel. Kittel, although younger and still a teenager when Bach died, had by that point already made manuscript copies of numerous organ works. These proved vital for passing Bach's legacy on to the nineteenth century, as Kittel made them available to his own numerous pupils. Kittel was another "learned" Bach pupil, author of a book on organ playing (first published in 1801) that is often assumed to preserve Bach's teaching. In the book, however, Kittel makes no such claim, only referring occasionally to Bach's music as providing models for composition or improvisation. By the end of his career he must, like Emanuel Bach, have evolved away from what he had learned from Sebastian, at least in the realms of musical style and keyboard technique.

Posthumous reception of Bach's music (p. 338, following the first paragraph break, "early study of Bach's music")

Late in life, Emanuel Bach, or someone close to him, confirmed that his father could write *galant* as well as contrapuntal music. Moreover, went the argument, Sebastian had been a greater organist than Handel, whose keyboard music never included substantial pedal parts.[862] To argue

---

[860] These were the *Anleitung zur Singkunst* (Berlin, 1757), an expanded version of Tosi's singing treatise of 1723, and Adlung's *Musica mechanica organoedi* (Berlin, 1768).

[861] Henzel (2003) lists works composed and copied by Agricola that are now in the collection of the Sing-Akademie zu Berlin. Oleskiewicz (2013) discusses Agricola work as a copyist of music by Handel and Bach, and Schwinger (2012) gives excerpts from a funeral ode by him that is reminiscent of Bach's BWV 198.

[862] The "Comparison" of Bach and Handel published anonymously in 1788 is often ascribed to Emanuel, as in NBR, 400. But although it shares matter with one of his letters (see Plamenac 1947), it could equally well have been written by the recipient of that letter, Johann Joachim Eschenburg.

thus, however, was to accept the underlying premiss that Sebastian's most important and original music was indeed inexpressive, good for study but pedantic in its focus on counterpoint and recondite harmony.

Handel nevertheless remained far better known than Sebastian across northern Europe, especially thanks to his frequently performed oratorios. At least until 1800, the music of Bach's sons Emanuel and Christian was better known than his own, and figures now regarded as quite minor, such as Graun and Homilius, continued to be seen as at least equally significant. Bach's keyboard music was familiar to many German organists, but his vocal works and compositions for instrumental ensemble were either forgotten or the province of a few specialist collectors (such as Martini in Italy). Beethoven, growing up in the 1770s and 1780s as the son of a German court musician, studied the Well-Tempered Clavier. Yet it seems to have been a revelation to him when, late in life, he became aware of the B-Minor Mass and other works.[863] Distinct echoes of Handel can be heard in his Consecration of the House Overture; any echoes of Bach are fainter, probably residing mainly in abstract contrapuntal or harmonic elements of Beethoven's late piano music, quartets, and *Missa solemnis*.

Since then, Bach's style and craft have influenced musicians of all persuasions, yet the choice of works for study or emulation has continued to be highly selective. Sebastian's actual compositions, moreover, have often been confused with others thought to "sound like Bach." That spurious or doubtful pieces can still prove more popular and influential than his own mature works is shown by the continuing fame of the "minuet in G" and the "toccata and fugue" in D minor.[864] One reason for their popularity is that both pieces are simple and direct, unlike more challenging music that is unquestionably by Bach. Selective listening continues to the present day, so that the small repertory of pieces for instrumental ensemble remains better known than, say, the secular cantatas. Hence, when a contemporary musician claims to be influenced by Bach, it is rarely by the organ chorales or other categories of his music. Often the claim reflects the continuing use of Bach's contrapuntal keyboard music and his four-part chorale harmonizations for the training of young musicians, now taken for granted in much of the world. Yet this became a norm only gradually, over the course of the nineteenth century. Even those chiefly instrumental works that are now so popular did not find widespread concert use until a century or more after his death.

What is known as the Bach Revival concerns chiefly the rediscovery of his vocal music, as his major keyboard works were assiduously studied in manuscript copies even before they began to appear in printed editions. Some of the most prominent musicians in nineteenth-century Germany could trace their musical ancestry back to members of the Bach family; among these were the editors Rust and Naumann, who contributed multiple volumes to the nineteenth-century

---

[863] See Lockwood (2003, 370–73).

[864] The minuet, which Anna Magdalena copied anonymously into her second little keyboard book, is the sixth movement of a suite by the Dresden organist Petzold, as Schulze (1979) discovered. (It is listed as BWV Anh. 114.) The attribution of the toccata to Bach, first seriously questioned by Williams (1981), cannot be thoroughly disproved, but it is easily explained as a mistake arising out of the work's early transmission (see Schulenberg 2011, 169–70).

collected edition. Their grandfathers were significant eighteenth-century composers, F.W. Rust having studied with both Friedemann and Emanuel.

Such men owned or had access to manuscript copies of Bach's music, at a time when much of it was still rare and unpublished. It was natural that they would be among the organizers of the project to issue a collected edition of Bach's works for the German Bach Society (Bachgesellschaft), founded in 1850. The idea of a scholarly edition of music, inspired by ongoing editions of the bible and other literary works, could be traced back to certain annotated manuscript copies by Kirnberger and other eighteenth-century pupils of Bach. Their markings show that they were aware of discrepancies between different copies of the same piece, due either to copyist error or compositional revision.

Early volumes in the BG series proved to be somewhat uncritical, and to the end it was hampered by misunderstandings about chronology and failure to identify handwriting properly. Yet the edition of the WTC by Franz Kroll, published in 1866, was a brilliant piece of scholarship that would not be improved on for almost a century and a half. By the time of its publication, the WTC was well known to musicians, but most of the vocal music remained obscure until its appearance in the series. The same was also true of some of the works for non-keyboard instruments. It is a myth, however, that the unaccompanied string works were unknown or unplayed before the twentieth century. Numerous editions of both sets came out much earlier, albeit often arranged or adapted; Schumann, a great admirer of Bach and a founder of the BG, published piano accompaniments for the violin sonatas and "partitas" in 1853.

Given the number of expert scholars and brilliant musicians who contributed to the Bach Revival, it may now seem surprising that such elementary mistakes were made as the inclusion of the spurious Cantata 15 and St. Luke Passion (BWV 246) among the vocal works, or the unlikely "toccata and fugue" BWV 565 for organ. Throughout the nineteenth century, however, very little "early music" by other composers was being similarly revived, apart from some of Handel's late oratorios. Therefore almost anything old and German could "sound like Bach." This was particularly so when music of every kind tended to be performed on the instruments currently in general use, with the same interpretive approaches taken as in music by later composers, up to and including current works of Verdi, Wagner, and Brahms. If Bach or even Graun could be played like Brahms, then either Brahms or Graun could sound like Bach.

Such practices obscured distinctions between compositions written for very different media, purposes, and places. Even today, more than a century after the first serious attempts to reconstruct Bach's instruments and performing practices, there is still contention over such fundamental questions as the nature of the vocal ensembles for which Bach composed. It may be true that how the music was meant to sound is unrecoverable, and that this does not matter, as so many people can enjoy and be moved by performances that are demonstrably not "historically accurate." But even a very weak composition can be moving or enjoyable in a good performance; at issue, rather, is whether today we have any greater understanding than those living a century or two ago of what really makes Bach's music distinct.

Appendix C: Personalia

Note: This list contains more names and for certain figures more information than the printed one. The umlauted letters ä, ö, and ü are alphabetized as if they comprised the diphthongs ae, oe, and ue, respectively. Many names have alternative spellings; this list follows the most common present-day usage.

Abel, Carl Friedrich (1723–87, gambist and composer, son of the following, friend and colleague of Johann Christian Bach.

Abel, Christian Ferdinand (ca. 1683–1737), string player, colleague of Johann Jacob and J. S. Bach.

Adlung, Jacob (1699–1762), Erfurt organist and writer on music.

Aemile Juliane of Barby-Mühlingen, Countess (1637–1706), poet and hymn writer, married Albert Anton II of Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt.

Agricola, Johann Friedrich (1720–74), composer and writer on music; pupil of Bach at Leipzig and of Quantz at Berlin, where he became court composer to King Frederick "the Great"; wrote an expanded German translation of Tosi's treatise on singing and was also an important copyist of music by Bach, Handel, and other composers.

Johann Georg Ahle (1651–1706), organist and composer at Mühlhausen, son of the following.

Johann Rudolf Ahle (1625–73), organist and composer at Mühlhausen.

Tomaso Giovanni Albinoni (1671–1751), Italian (Venetian) composer, known especially for his violin and oboe concertos, one of which Bach transcribed for solo keyboard.

Altnickol, Johann Christoph (1720–59), organist and composer, pupil of Bach, whom he assisted as singer and music copyist at Leipzig, marrying the latter's daughter Elisabeth Juliana Friderica in 1749 shortly after being appointed organist at Naumburg

Altnickol, Johann Sebastian (1749), infant son of the above, grandson of J. S. Bach.

d'Anglebert, Jean-Henri (1629–91), French composer and keyboard player; Bach probably knew his *Pièces de clavecin* (Paris, 1689).

Anna Amalie, Princess of Prussia (1723–87), sister of King Frederick "the Great," composer and collector of music, including Bach's; his pupil Kirnberger was her librarian.

Anton Günther II, Count of Schwarzburg-Sondershausen (1653–1716), ruler of Arnstadt during Bach's time there.

Augustus II, *see* Friedrich August I

Augustus III, *see* Friedrich August II

Bach (relationship to Johann Sebastian follows given names; maiden name in parentheses)

- Anna Carolina Philippina, granddaughter (1747–1804), daughter of Carl Philipp Emanuel
- Anna Magdalena (Wilcke), second wife (1701–60), court singer at Cöthen, also worked as music copyist for J. S. Bach and presumably helped train their children, including her sons Johann Christoph Friedrich and Johann Christian.
- Barbara Margaretha (Keul), stepmother (b. 1658)
- Catharina Dorothea, daughter (1731–32)
- Carl Philipp Emanuel, son (1714–88), composer, keyboard player, and writer on music, chamber musician to King Frederick "the Great," then cantor and music director at Hamburg
- Christiana Sophia Henrietta Bach, daughter (1713)
- Christian Gottlieb, son (1725–28)
- Christoph, grandfather (1613–61), court and town musician, serving at Weimar, Erfurt, and Arnstadt.
- Elisabeth Juliana Friderica, daughter (1726–81), married Sebastian's pupil Altnickol
- Friedelena Margaretha Bach, sister-in-law (1675–1729)
- Friederica Sophia, granddaughter (b. 1757), daughter of Wilhelm Friedemann; her descendants emigrated to the United States.
- Georg Christoph, paternal uncle (1642–97), composer and organist, cantor at Schweinfurt.
- Gottfried Heinrich, son (1724–63), said to have been talented, but mentally disabled.
- Heinrich, uncle (1615–92), composer, organist and court and church musician at Arnstadt.
- Johann, great uncle (1604–73), composer, organist at Erfurt.
- Johann Adam, grandson (1745–89), son of Carl Philipp Emanuel, lawyer at Berlin.
- Johann Ambrosius, father (1645–95), court and town musician at Eisenach.
- Johann August Abraham, son (1733)
- Johann Balthasar, brother (1673–91), apprenticed to his father as town musician at Eisenach.
- Johann Bernhard, nephew (1700–43), organist, succeeded his father at Ohrdruf.
- Johann Bernhard, second cousin (1676–1749), organist and court keyboard player at Eisenach, where he served alongside Telemann; a significant composer of instrumental music, some of it performed by Johann Sebastian at Leipzig.
- Johann Christian, son (1735–82), keyboard player and composer, after his father's death lived for five years with Carl Philipp Emanuel at Berlin before traveling to Italy, where he wrote sacred music and Italian operas; continued to write the latter after moving to London, where he also published many sonatas, concertos, etc., and together with C. F. Abel led a famous concert series, besides meeting and influencing the young Mozart.
- Johann Christoph, uncle (1645–93), town and court musician at Arnstadt.
- Johann Christoph, first cousin once removed (1642–1703), son of Heinrich, court organist at Arnstadt before becoming city organist and court keyboard player at Eisenach; a significant composer of motets and organ music, described by Sebastian as "profound."
- Johann Christoph, uncle (1645–93), twin brother of Sebastian's father Johann Ambrosius, court and town musician at Arnstadt.
- Johann Christoph, brother (1671–1721), organist and schoolteacher at Ohrdruf, where he took in Sebastian after their parents' death; a pupil of Pachelbel, he compiled the so-

called Möller and Andreas Bach manuscripts (the latter named for his youngest son and eventual successor)

Johann Christoph, son (1713)

Johann Christoph Friedrich, son (1732–95), chamber musician at Bückeburg, where he later served the ruling counts of Schaumburg-Lippe as Concertmeister and Capellmeister; wrote numerous sonatas, concertos, and vocal works, personally close to but never musically as original or influential as his brothers Carl Philipp Emanuel and Johann Christian.

Johann Elias, first cousin once removed (1705–55), pupil of Bach at Leipzig, tutoring the younger children and serving as personal assistant, later cantor at Schweinfurt.

Johann Ernst, first cousin (1683–1739), organst at Arnstadt, succeeding Sebastian.

Johann Friedrich Bach, second cousin (1682–1730), organist at Mühlhausen, succeeding Sebastian.

Johann Gottfried Bernhard, son (1715–39), briefly organist at Mühlhausen, then Sangerhausen; died shortly after beginning legal studies at Jena.

Johann Günther, first cousin once removed (1653–83), organist and instrument maker at Arnstadt

Johann Jacob, second cousin (1668–92), apprentice and journeyman for Bach's father.

Johann Jacob, brother (1682–1722), "oboist" (military musician), later chamber musician, for the royal Swedish court.

Johann Lorenz, first cousin once removed (1695–1773), pupil of Bach at Weimar, later organist and cantor at Lahm.

Johann Ludwig (1677–31), Meiningen Capellmeister, an important early composer of sacred cantatas, many of them performed by Sebastian at Leipzig; their relationship is uncertain, but they were presumably distant cousins.

Johann Michael, first cousin once removed (1648–94), organist at Arnstadt, later Gehren, like his brother Johann Christoph a significant composer of motets and organ music; father of Maria Barbara, Sebastian's first wife.

Johann Nicolaus, second cousin (1669–1753), composer, organist, and instrument maker at Jena.

Johann Rudolf, brother (1670).

Johann Sebastian, grandson (1748–78), son of Carl Philipp Emanuel, painter, died young at Rome.

Johanna Carolina, daughter (1737–81).

Johanna Dorothea (Vonhof), sister-in-law (1674–1745), wife of Johann Christoph, older brother of Johann Sebastian, presumably helped in bringing up the latter after his parent's death.

Johanna Judith, sister (1680–86).

Johannes Jonas, brother (1675–85).

Leopold Augustus, son (1718–19), godson of Prince Leopold of Cöthen.

Lucia Elisabeth (Münchhausen), daughter-in-law (b. ca. 1735?), court singer at Bückeburg, married Johann Christoph Friedrich.

Maria Barbara (Bach), second cousin and first wife (1684–1720), mother of Wilhelm Friedemann, Carl Philipp Emanuel, and Johann Gottfried Bernhard.

Maria Elisabeth (Lämmerhirt), mother (1644–94).

Maria Sophia, daughter (1713).

Marie Salome (later Wiegand), sister (1677–1728).
Regina Johanna, daughter (1728–33).
Veit (16th cent.), remote ancestor, said to have been a baker.
Wilhelm Friedemann, son (1710–84), composer and keyboard player, organist at Halle, then after a period of travel was briefly supported by Princess Anna Amalie at Berlin, where he died in poverty; an original if idiosyncratic writer of sonatas, concertos, and church cantatas.
Wilhelm Friedrich Ernst, grandson (1759–1845), son of Johann Christoph Friedrich, court musician and composer at Berlin.

Bach, August Wilhelm (1796–1869), organist and composer (no known relationship to J. S. Bach).

Baltzar, Thomas (1631–63), violinist and composer at Lübeck, later London.

Bammler, Johann Nathanael, pupil of Bach at Leipzig, substituted for him as director of church music late in the 1740s.

Bassani, Giovanni Battista (ca. 1650–1716) Italian composer, worked at Ferrara, later Bergamo; Bach owned copies of and probably performed several of his masses.

Becker, Carl Ferdinand (1804–77), organist and music professor, edited Bach's works.

Beethoven, Ludwig van (1770–1827), studied Bach's Well-Tempered Clavier as a boy.

Benda, Franz (František) (1709–86), Bohemian violinist and composer, studied at Dresden, later chamber musician to Frederick "the Great" at Berlin.

Benda, Georg Anton (Jiří Antonín) (1722–95), Bohemian violinist, keybard player, and composer, brother of the preceding, chamber musician to Frederick "the Great" at Berlin, later Capellmeister at Gotha.

Bernier, Nicolas (1665–1734), French composer of vocal music, including a coffee cantata.

Biber, Heinrich Ignaz Franz (von) (1644–1704), Bohemian violinist and composer, the most influential virtuoso on and writer for his instrument of his time.

Biffi, Antonio (1666–1733), Venetian singer and composer.

Birkmann, Christoph, Leipzig university student, thought to have been a librettist for and performer in some of Bach's cantatas.

Birnbaum, Johann Abraham (1702–48), instructor at the Leipzig university, defender of Bach against Scheibe.

Böhm, Georg (1661–1733), organist and composer; Bach studied (or at least knew) him at Lüneburg.
Bononcini, Giovanni, (1670–1747), Italian composer and cellist, worked at Bologna and Vienna.

Bononcini, Giovanni Maria (1642–78), Italian composer and theorist, son of the preceding, worked at Modena.

Bordoni, Faustina (1697–1781), Venetian soprano; married Hasse, performing in the title role in his *Cleofide* and other works at Dresden, Vienna, and elsewhere.

Boxberg, Christian Ludwig (1670–1729), librettist and composer, later organist at Görlitz.

Brahms, Johannes (1833–97), composer, pianist, and conductor, frequently performed Bach's music and transcribed his violin chaconne for piano (left hand only).

Brauns, Friedrich Nicolaus (1637–1718), composer, cantor at Hamburg.

Breitkopf, Bernhard Christoph (1695–1777), publisher, founder of what is now the Leipzig firm of Breitkopf und Härtel; he issued the Schemelli songbook, although music became an important part of the business only after it was taken over by his son Johann Gottlob Immanuel (1719–94), a friend and publisher of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach.

Brockes, Barthold Heinrich (1680–1747), poet and member of the Hamburg senate, author of a passion oratorio text set by Handel and Telemann (among others), portions of which were incorporated into the libretto of Bach's St. John Passion.

Brühl, Heinrich Count von (1700–1763), Saxon politican, like Bach initially a protégé of Duke Christian of Weissenfels (where he was born), later prime minister and effectively regent for Friedrich Augusts II.

Buffardin, Pierre-Gabriel (ca. 1690–1768), French flutist, teacher of Johann Jacob Bach, later of Quantz while both were chamber musicians at Dresden.

Busoni, Ferruccio (1866–1924), Italian pianist and composer who worked mainly in German-speaking Europe, editor and arranger of Bach's keyboard music.

Buttstett, Johann Heinrich (1666–1727), Erfurt organist, pupil of Pachelbel and teacher of Walther, related by marriage to Bach; author of a treatise disparaged by Mattheson.

Buxtehude, Dieterich (ca. 1637–1707), the pre-eminent composer of keyboard and vocal music of his generation in Germany, organist at Lübeck, where Bach visited and probably studied with him for several months.

Caldara, Antonio (1671–1736), Venetian composer, worked at Rome and Vienna, a prolific composer of sacred vocal music and other works.

Abraham Calovd (Calovosius) (1612–86), Lutheran theologian, professor at Wittenberg, author of numerous works including a massive bible commentary owned by Bach.
Calvisius, Seth (1556–1615), composer and theorist, cantor of the St. Thomas School, Leipzig.

Caroli, Johann Friedrich (1695–1738), town musician at Leipzig.

Charles (Carl, Carolus) VI (1685–1740), Holy Roman Emperor (from 1711).

Charles (Carl, Carolus) XII (1682–1718), King of Sweden (from 1697), hired Bach's brother Johann Jacob.

Charles III Philipp (1661–1742), Elector Palatine (from 1716).

Charlotte Marie, Princess of Saxe-Jena (1669–1703), wife (1683–90) of Duke Wilhelm Ernst of Weimar, later Bach's employer.

Chopin, Fryderyk Franciszek (1810–49), Polish pianist and composer of the Romantic period, known chiefly for his piano music, deeply influenced by Bach.

Christian, Duke of Saxe-Weissenfels (1682–1736), patron of Bach, who served him as external Capellmeister and for whom he composed several cantatas (BWV 208, 249a, 210a).

Christian Ludwig, margrave of Brandenburg (1677–1734), great-uncle of King Frederick "the Great" and nominal overlord of Schwedt, dedicatee of Bach's Brandenburg Concertos.

Christiane Eberhardine of Brandenburg-Bayreuth (1671–1727), Saxon Electress and Queen of Poland (from 1694), wife of Friedrich August I, memorialized in Bach's *Trauerode* (BWV 199).

Comenius (Komenský), Johannes Amos (1592–1670), Moravian philosopher, theologian, and educational reformer.

Compenius, Ludwig (1603–71), organ builder, responsible for instruments at Weimar, Erfurt, and elsewhere.

Conti, Francesco Bartolomeo (1681 or 1682–1732), Florentine lutenist (theorbist) and composer, worked at Vienna, where he wrote many vocal works, one of them arranged by Bach.

Contius (Cuncius), Christoph (ca. 1676–1722), organ builder, worked at Halle.

Corelli, Arcangelo (1653–1713), Italian violinist and composer, worked at Bologna, later Rome; his six sets of sonatas and concertos were arguably the most influential compositions of their type, providing models for keyboard and instrumental pieces by Bach.

Couperin, François (1668–1733), French keyboard player and composer, famed for his four books of harpsichord pieces (some of which Bach knew), although he also wrote vocal and organ music and works for instrumental ensemble.

David (fl. ca. 1010–961 BCE), King of Israel, identified in the Hebrew bible as author of many of the psalms and often represented in European images as a harpist; Bach and at least one of his sons appear to have identified themselves with him or musicians serving under him.

Dedekind, Andreas Christian (d. 1706), cantor at Eisenach during Bach's time there.

Deyling, Salomon (1677–1755), Lutheran theologian, professor and church superintendant at Leipzig during Bach's time there.

Dieskau, Carl Heinrich von (1706-–82), Saxon official and lord of Klein-Zschocher, commissioned Bach's Peasant Cantata (BWV 212); the baritone Dietrich Fischer-Dieskau (1925–2012) was a descendant.

Charles Dieupart (?after 1667–ca. 1740), French composer, known for six harpsichord suites of which Bach made a manuscript copy.

Doles, Johann Friedrich (1715–97), composer, pupil of Bach at Leipzig and his successor as cantor (after Harrer).

Drese, Adam (ca. 1620–1701), composer and string player, Capellmeister at Weimar, Jena, and finally Arnstadt.

Drese, Johann Samuel (ca. 1644–1716), Capellmeister at Weimar during Bach's time there; a cousin of the preceding.

Drese, Johann Wilhelm (1677–1745), composer, son of the preceding, whom he succeeded as Capellmeister at Weimar, apparently prompting Bach's departure.

Dumage, Pierre (1674–1751), French organist and composer; Bach may have owned music by him.

Durante, Francesco (1684–1755), prolific Italian composer especially of sacred vocal music; Bach apparently performed one of his masses, adding or arranging the Christe (BWV 242).

Durastanti, Margherita (fl. 1700–1734), Italian singer, performed works of Handel in Rome and London.

Eberlin, Daniel (1647–1715), composer and official, Capellmeister at Eisenach during Bach's time there; Telemann married his daughter Amalie Louise Juliane.

Effler, Johann (ca. 1640–1711), Bach's predecessor (and briefly colleague) as Weimar court organist.

Eichentopf, Johann Heinrich (1678–1769), woodwind instrument maker at Leipzig during Bach's time there; his products included the oboes da caccia called for in Bach's Leipzig cantatas.

Eilmar, Georg Christian (1665–1715), pastor at St. Mary's, Mühlhausen, and compiler of the libretto for Cantata 131; godfather of Catharina Dorothea and Wilhelm Friedemann Bach.

Eleonore Wilhelmine, princess of Anhalt-Cöthen (1696–1726), married Duke Ernst August of Weimar shortly before Bach's departure from the latter to serve her brother Leopold.

Emanuel Lebrecht, prince of Anhalt-Cöthen (1671–1704), father of Bach's patron Prince Leopold.

Erdmann, Georg (1682–1736), Bach's fellow student at Orhdruf and traveling companion to Lüneburg, later a diplomat in Russian service, recipient of a famous autobiographical letter from Bach.

Erlebach, Philipp Heinrich (1657–1714), composer of sacred and secular vocal music, Capellmeister at Rudolstadt; Bach's pupil J. C. Vogler initially studied with him.

Ernesti, Johann August (1707–81), philologist and theologian; as conrector, later rector, of the St. Thomas School, Leipzig, he opposed Bach's efforts to retain music as a focus of educational activity there.

Ernesti, Johann Heinrich (1652–1729), Lutheran theologian and poet, rector of the St. Thomas School, Leipzig, and professor at the university during Bach's first years there; the motet BWV 226 was written for his funeral or burial service.

Ernst Ludwig I, duke of Saxe-Meiningen (1672–1724), an early proponent of the new mixed type of sacred cantata, patron of Johann Ludwig Bach and likely author of cantata texts set by him and performed by J. S. Bach at Leipzig.

Ernst Ludwig, Landgrave of Hesse-Darmstadt (1667–1739), employed Graupner as his Capellmeister (from 1711), refusing to release him from service after his election to the Leipzig cantoriate.

Fasch, Johann Friedrich (1688–1758), composer, Capellmeister at Zerbst.

Feldhaus, Martin (1634–1720, Arnstadt burgomaster, related to Bach by marriage.

Finger, Gottfried (ca. 1660–1730), string player and composer, born probably in Moravia, worked in London, later at Berlin and Neuburg on the Danube.

Fischer, Johann Caspar Ferdinand (?1656–1746), composer, worked in Rastatt in southwest Germany; published keyboard music that Bach knew.

Fleckeisen, Gottfried Benjamin (b. 1719), pupil of Bach at Leipzig, evidently substituted for the latter as director of church music for an extended period during the 1740s.

Flemming, Count Jacob Heinrich von (1667–1728), military commander and official serving the duke-electors of Saxony; Bach's musical contest with Marchand was to have taken place at his palatial home in Dresden.

Flemming, Johann Friedrich (1665–1740), older brother of the preceding, governor of Leipzig during Bach's time there, dedicatee of at least two cantatas including BWV 210a.

Forkel, Johann Nicolaus (1749–1818), organist and writer on music, Bach's first biographer; studied and later taught at Göttingen; knew or corresponded with W. F. and C. P. E. Bach.

Franck, Salomo (1659–1725), poet and court official at Weimar, author of librettos for many of Bach's cantatas composed there.

Frederick II "the Great" (1712–86), king of Prussia (from 1740), patron of the arts and sciences and an amateur composer and flutist of professional capabilities; employer of C. P. E. Bach, Quantz, and other important musicians and dedicatee of J. S. Bach's Musical Offering.

Frescobaldi, Girolamo (1583–1643), Italian keyboard player and composer, teacher of Froberger; Bach made manuscript copies of some of his numerous toccatas and contrapuntal works.

Friedrica Henrietta, princess of Anhalt-Bernburg (1702–23), second wife of Bach's patron Prince Leopold of Anhalt-Cöthen.

Friedrich August I (1670–1733), duke of Saxony and elector of the Holy Roman Empire, king of Poland as King Augustus II; Bach performed at least three cantatas honoring him (BWV 193a and Anh. 9 and 11).

Friedrich August II, duke of Saxony and elector of the Holy Roman Empire, king of Poland as King Augustus III, son of the preceding; Bach dedicated the B-Minor Mass to him and performed several cantatas honoring him and members of his family (BWV 205a, 206, 207a, 213–15, Anh. 12).

Friedrich Wilhelm I, king in Prussia (1688–1740), father of Frederick "the Great"; his dismissal of the Berlin *Capelle* led to the removal of a number of Prussian court musicians to Cöthen, where they served under Bach.

Friedrich II, duke of Saxe-Gotha (and Saxe-Altenburg) (1676–1732), presumably heard Bach during the incapacity of the court Capellmeister Witt.

Friese (Frese), Heinrich (d. 1720), organist at St. Jacoby, Hamburg.

Froberger, Johann Jacob (1616–67), keyboard player and composer, known for keyboard music, some of which Bach must have known.

Frohne, Johann Adolph (1652–1713), theologian, superintendent of churches and pastor at Bach's church (St. Blasius) at Mühlhausen during Bach's time there, opposed to elaborate music in worship.

Fux, Johann Joseph (1660–1741), Austrian composer and writer on music, imperial Capellmeister at Vienna; Bach owned Mizler's translation of his *Gradus ad Parnassum* on counterpoint.

Georg Wilhelm, duke of Brunswick-Lüneburg (1624–1705), ruler of Lüneburg during Bach's time there, called "duke of Celle" in Bach's Obituary.

George II (1683–1760, king of Hanover and Great Britain, patron of Handel.

Gesner, Johann Matthias (1691–1761), classicist, rector of the St. Thomas School, Leipzig during Bach's time there (serving between J. H. and J. C. Ernesti).

Gerber, Ernst Ludwig (1746–1819), organist and music lexicographer, son of the following.

Gerber, Heinrich Nicolaus (1702–75), organist and court musician at Sondershausen, pupil of Bach at Leipzig, where he copied numerous music manuscripts.

Gerlach, Carl Gotthelf (1704–61), organist of the New Church, Leipzig, during Bach's time there, probably also a pupil of the latter and later director of the Collegium Musicum.

Gerstenbüttel, Joachim (1647–1721), cantor and music director at Hamburg, serving between Christoph Bernhard and Telemann.

Gesualdo, Carlo, prince of Venosa (1566–1631), composer of six books of madrigals, many of them noted for their radical chromaticism.

Geyersbach, Johann Heinrich (b. 1682), student musician at Arnstadt, involved in an incident that led to Bach's being disciplined.

Gisela Agnes of Rath (1669–1740), later countess of Nienburg, wife of Prince Emanuel Lebrecht of Anhalt-Cöthen and after his death regent for their son Leopold before Bach's time there.

Gleditsch, Johann Caspar (1719–47), Leipzig *Kunstgeiger* and oboist during Bach's time there.

Görner, Johann Gottlieb (1697–1778), composer, pupil of Kuhnau, organist at the university church, Leipzig, and director of a competing Collegium Musicum (founded by Fasch) during Bach's time there.

Goldberg, Johann Gottlieb (1727–56), keyboard player and composer, probably a pupil of J. S. or W. F. Bach, supposedly received J. S. Bach's Goldberg Variations while working for Keyserlingk at Dresden.

Gottsched, Johann Christoph (1700–1766), poetic and critic, professor at Leipzig during Bach's time there and a leading figure of the German Enlightenment, author of the texts for Bach's *Trauerode* (BWV 198) and two other cantatas (BWV Anh. 13, 196).

Gottsched, Luise Adelgunde Victorie (Kulmus) (1713–72) writer, author of stage comedies, translations, and other writings, wife of the preceding; admirer of Bach's music.

Gräser, Heinrich (17th cent.), court and town musician at Arnstadt, involved in legal proceedings against Johann Christoph Bach (Sebastian's uncle) and other family members.

Graun, Carl Heinrich (1703 or 1704–1759), Capellmeister for Frederick "the Great" at Berlin, known for operas and his oratorio *Der Tod Jesu*.

Graun, Johann Gottlieb (1702 or 1703–1771), Concertmeister for Frederick "the Great" at Berlin, known for sonatas and other instrumental works, brother of the preceding; taught violin to W. F. Bach.

Graupner, Christoph (1683–1760), composer, Capellmeister at Darmstadt; competed with Bach for the Leipzig cantoriate. His son (of the same name) made manuscript copies of several of Bach's works.

Griepenkerl, Friedrich (1782–1849), philologist and musicologist, pupil of Forkel and editor of many of Bach's keyboard works.

Grigny, Nicolas de (1672–1703), French organist and composer, known for an organ book of which Bach made a manuscript copy.

Handel, George Frideric (1685–1759), composer of operas, oratorios, and instrumental music; Bach performed at least one of his cantatas and probably knew his setting of the passion text by Brockes.

Harrer, Gottlob (1703–55), composer, Bach's successor as Leipzig cantor.

Hasse, Johann Adolf (1699–1783), prolific and influential composer of operas and sacred music, Capellmeister at Dresden, where Bach probably attended a performance of his opera *Cleofide;* later worked at Vienna.

Haussmann, Elias Gottlob (1695–1774), painter at Dresden, later Leipzig, known for his portraits of Bach and others in his circle.

Hebenstreit, Christiana Dorothea, wife of the conrector of the St. Thomas School, Leipzig; godmother of Bach's short-lived daughter Christana Dorothea.

Heidorn, Peter (17th cent.), composer, said to be a pupil of Reinken; Bach would have known organ works by him in the Möller Manuscript.

Heindorff, Ernst Dietrich, cantor at Arnstadt during Bach's time there.

Heineccius, Johann Michael (1674–1722), Halle theologian, formerly thought to have been author of the text of Bach's Cantata 63.
Heinichen, Johann David (1683–1729), composer and music theorist, Capellmeister at Dresden; Bach was advertised as sales agent for his chief theoretic work, *Der General-Bass in der Composition* (on continuo playing).

Heinrich, prince of Prussia (Friedrich Heinrich Ludwig) (1726–1802), younger brother of Frederick "the Great," employed Bach's pupil Kirnberger and other musicians.

Heinrich XI Reuss, count of Schleiz (1682–1726); Bach performed for him at least once during his Cöthen years.

Johann Joachim Heitmann (d. 1727), organist at St. Jacoby, Hamburg

Henrici, Christian Friedrich, known as Picander (1700–1764), poet, author of librettos of Bach's St. Matthew Passion, and other works, especially secular cantatas (including BWV 211–12).

Herda, Elias (1674–1728), cantor at Ohrdruf during Bach's time there, possibly advised him to travel to Lüneburg.

Herder, Johann Gottfried von (1744–1803), poet and theologian, a leading figure in of Weimar Clasicism; wrote librettos for J. C. F. Bach while a colleague of the latter at Bückeburg.

Hildebrandt, Zacharias (1688–1757), important organ builder, apprenticed to Silbermann, later worked at Leipzig during Bach's time; built lute-harpsichords for the latter as well as the organ at Naumburg "tested" by Bach and presided over by the latter's pupil and son-in-law Altnickol.

Hoffmann, Johann Christian (1683–1750), string instrument maker at Leipzig.

Hohmann von Hohenthal, Peter), Saxon court official, oldest son of the Leipzig architect and town councilor of the same name (1663–1732), dedicatee of a lost wedding cantata by Gottsched and Bach (BWV Anh. 196).

Hoppenhaupt, Johann Michael (1709–55), German sculptor, decorator of Frederick "the Great's" palaces including Sanssouci.

Hotteterre, Jacques (Martin) (1673–1763), French flute player, maker, and composer, author of a treatise on woodwind playing.

Hübner, Jacob Ernst, pupil of Bach at Leipzig, organist at Waldenburg.

Hunold, Christian Friedrich, known as Menantes (11680–1721), writer based in Halle; Bach set several librettos by him in his Cöthen secular cantatas.

Hurlebusch, Conrad Friedrich (1691–1765), keyboard player and composer, later organist at Amsterdam; visited Leipzig and presented one of his publications to Bach.

Jagemann, Adam Friedrich Wilhelm von (1695–1714), Weimar page, pupil of Bach.
Johann August, prince (*Fürst*) of Anhalt-Zerbst (1677–1742), recipient of birthday music from Bach during the latter's Cöthen years.

Johann Ernst, prince (*Fürst*) of Anhalt (d. 1586), ancestor of Bach's patron Prince Leopold.

Johann Ernst, prince (*Prinz*) of Saxe-Weimar (1696–1715), son of Duke Johann Ernst III, amateur composer; Bach arranged at least five of his concertos for solo keyboard.

Johann Ernst III, duke of Saxe-Weimar (1664–1707), father of Bach's patron Duke Johann Ernst.

Johann Georg II, duke of Saxe-Eisenach (1665–98), ruler of Eisenach at the time of Bach's birth, employer of his father and other family members.

Johann Wilhelm III, duke of Saxe-Eisenach (1666–1729), son of the preceding; employed Telemann and Johann Bernhard Bach.

Kayser, Bernhard Christian (1705–58), pupil of Bach at Cöthen and Leipzig, important copyist of his keyboard music.

Keiser, Gottfried (d. before 1732), organist, father of the following.

Keiser, Reinhard (1674–1739), composer, chiefly of operas, at Brunswick, Weissenfels, and especially Hamburg.

Kellner, Pauline (d. 1736), singer at Zeitz and elsewhere, presumed teacher of Anna Magdalena Bach.

Kerll, Johann Caspar (1627–93), keyboard player and composer, worked at Munich and Vienna, known for keyboard music and sacred works.

Keyserlingk, Herrmann Carl von (1697–1764), diplomat representing Russia at Dresden and Berlin, knew and patronized Bach and his older sons.

Kirchbach, Hans Carl von (1704–53), university student at Leipzig, commissioned Bach's *Trauerode* (BWV 198).

Kirchhoff, Gottfried (1685–1746), keyboard player and composer, organist at Halle, succeeding Handel's teacher Zachow and followed by Wilhelm Friedemann Bach.

Kirnberger, Johann Philipp (1721–83), composer and music theorist, studied with Bach at Leipzig and collected manuscripts of music by the latter and other composers for Princess Anna Amalie of Prussia.

Kittel, Johann Christian (1732–1809), keyboard player and composer, one of Bach's last pupils at Leipzig, later organist at Erfurt; an important copyist of Bach's music and author of a book on organ playing.
Kobelius, Johann Augustin (1674–1731), composer and organist, selected over J. S. Bach to serve at Sangerhausen, later Capellmeister at Weissenfels.

Köpping, Johann Christian (1704–72), pupil and copyist for Bach at Leipzig.

Kräuter, Philipp David (1690–1741), pupil and copyist for Bach at Weimar, later cantor at Augsburg.

Krause, Johann Gottlob (b. 1714?), choral prefect at Leizig; his appointment by J. A. Ernesti over Bach's objection instigated the "battle of the prefects."

Krebs, Johann Ludwig (1713–80), keyboard player and composer, pupil of Bach at Leipzig, later organist at Altenburg; son of the following.

Krebs, Johann Tobias (1690–1762), composer and organist at Buttstädt near Weimar, where he studied with Bach.

Krieger, Johann (1652–1735), keyboard player and composer, organist at Zittau; younger brother of the following.

Krieger, Johann Philipp (1649–1725), keyboard player and composer, Capellmeister at Weissenfels; an important composer of church cantatas, of which only a few survive.

Kroll, Franz (1820–77), nineteenth-century editor of Bach's Well-Tempered Clavier.

Kuhnau, Johann (1660–1722), Bach's predecessor as cantor at Leipzig and an important composer of church cantatas and keyboard music.

Kuhnau, Johann Andreas (b. 1703), nephew of the preceding, pupil and copyist for Bach at Leipzig.

Kusser, Johann Sigismund (1660–1727), composer, known today for orchestral suites but in his day for theatrical music, Capellmeister at Wolfenbüttel and Württemberg, later worked at London and Dublin.

Lämmerhirt (Brückner), Maria Catharina (d. 1721), sister-in-law of Bach's mother, married to Tobias Lämmerhirt.

Lämmerhirt, Martha, a relative of Bach's mother, married the composer Buttstett.

Lämmerhirt, Tobias (1639–1707), fur trader at Erfurt, Bach's maternal uncle.

Lairitz, Johann Georg (1647–1716), theologian, pastor and church official at Weimar during Bach's time there.

Lalande, Michel de (1657–1726), French keyboard player and composer, known for sacred vocal works written for the royal chapel and printed after his death in a collected edition.

Lange, Gottfried (1672–1748), Leipzig city council member and burgomaster, instrumental in Bach's appointment, wrote librettos for vocal works, including at least a few of Bach's cantatas.

Legrenzi, Giovanni (1626–90), composer, worked at Venice, known today for his publications of music for strings, in his own day also for operas and sacred music.

Lehms, Georg Christian (1684–1717), poet, worked at Darmstadt; published librettos for sacred cantatas by Telemann, Bach, and other composers.

Leopold I (1640–1705), Holy Roman Emperor, an important patron of music and capable amateur composer.

Leopold, prince (*Fürst*) of Anhalt-Cöthen (1694–1728), ruler of Cöthen and employer of Bach as Capellmeister, recipient of vocal works and probably concertos and other instrumental works as well.

Leopold I, prince (*Fürst*) of Anhalt-Dessau (1676–1747), best known as a commander in the Prussian military, known as "the old Dessauer."

Levy, Sara (Itzig) (1761–1854), patron of music, keyboard pupil of W. F. Bach at Berlin and great-aunt of Felix Mendelssohn; assembled a large collection of music including many instrumental works of J. S. Bach.

Lienike, Concertmeister at Merseburg, visited Cöthen during Bach's time there.

Linicke, Christian Bernhard, cellist at Berlin, later served under Bach at Cöthen.

Lipsius, Johann Christoph Samuel (b. 1695), university pupil at Leipzig and probable bass soloist in Bach's cantatas.

Locatelli, Pietro Antonio (1695–1764), Italian violinist and composer, traveled in Germany, later worked in Amsterdam.

Lohenstein, Daniel Caspar von (1635–83), poet and playwright, criticized after his death for turgidity and pomposity.

Lotti, Antonio (1666–1740), composer, worked primarily at Venice writing operas and sacred music, also briefly at Dresden.

Louis XIII, king of France (1601–43), an important patron of music and amateur composer.

Louis XIV, king of France (1638–1715), an important patron of music, in his youth an accomplished dancer.

Louis XV, king of France (1710–74).

Ludwig I, Prince (*Fürst*) of Anhalt (1579–1650).

Lübeck, Vincent (1684–1755), keyboard player and composer, organist at Hamburg; published a suite entitled *Clavierübung* in imitation of Bach.

Lully, Jean-Baptiste (1632–87), Florentine-born French composer, among the most influential figures of Baroque music, known for operas, ballets, and sacred music.

Luther, Martin (1483–1546), theologian and religious reformer, important for Bach in particular as author of numerous hymn texts (chorales) used in various ways in his church music.

Luzzaschi, Luzzasco (1545–1607), Italian (Ferrarese) organist and composer, wrote madrigals and keyboard music.

Magdalena Augusta, princess of Anhalt-Zerbst (1679–1740), married Duke Friedrich II of Saxe-Gotha.

Marcello, Alessandro (1669–1747), Italian (Venetian) composer, brother of the following; Bach transcribed an oboe concerto for keyboard.

Marcello, Benedetto (1686–1739), prolific Italian (Venetian) composer of vocal and instrumental music, also a writer; Bach transcribed one of his violin concertos for keyboard.

Marchand, Louis (1669–1732), French keyboard player and composer; Bach was to have met him in a musical contest at Dresden.

Marini, Biagio (1594–1663), Italian violinist and composer, published some of the earliest virtuoso sonatas for solo violin; worked in Germany and Austria as well as Italy.

Marpurg, Friedrich Wilhelm (1718–95), composer and writer on music, familiar with J. S. and W. F. Bach; his books include a two-volume treatise on fugue and canon.

Maria Josepha of Austria (1699–1757), electress of Saxony and queen of Poland, wife of Friedrich August II; sponsored concerts in which W. F. Bach and Goldberg, among others, apparently participated.

Mattheson, Johann (1681–1764), singer, composer, and prolific writer on music; music director (until forced to retire by deafness) at Hamburg, where he knew Handel and later must have met Bach.

Meißner, Christian Gottlob (1707–60), pupil and copyist for Bach at Leipzig, later cntor at Geithain.

Mendelssohn (-Bartholdy), Felix (1809–47), composer, pianist, and conductor, knew music of the Bach family through his great-aunt Sara Levy; a child prodigy, he directed a famous performance of Bach's St. Matthew Passion at the age of twenty.

Michael, Tobias (1592–1657), composer, Capellmeister at Sondershausen, later cantor of the St. Thomas School, Leipzig.

Mietke, Michael (d. 1719?), court harpsichord maker at Berlin, built an instrument for the Cöthen court on Bach's recommendation.

Mizler von Kolof, Lorenz Christoph (1711–78), mathematician and writer on music, a university student at Leipzig where he knew Bach, including writings on the latter's music in a periodical which he founded and edited.

Monteverdi, Claudio (1567–1643), Italian composer, one of the supreme figures in European music history, published eight books of madrigals as well as sacred works.

Moritz Wilhelm, duke of Saxe-Zeitz (1664–1718), patron of members of the Wilcke family.

Mozart, Leopold (1719–87), violinist, composer, and writer on music, author of an important treatise on violin playing; father of the following.

Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus (1756–91), composer, made ensemble arrangements of contrapuntal keyboard works of J. S. Bach.

Müller, August Friedrich (1684–1761), Leipzig university professor and rector, dedicatee of Bach's Cantata 205.

Müller, Johann Georg (early 18th cent.), organ builder, worked at Cöthen.

Muffat, Georg (1653–1704) composer of music for keyboard and for string ensemble, studied in Paris with Lully, later worked at Salzburg and Passau, transmitting Lully's style to Germany.

Muffat, Gottlieb (1690–1770), organist at Vienna and composer of keyboard music, son of the preceding.

Müthel, Johann Gottfried (1728–88), keyboard player and composer, organist at Riga; briefly a pupil of Bach.

Nagel, Sebastian (d. 1687), town musician at Gotha, one of Bach's godfathers.

Naumann, Ernst (1832–1910, composer and editor of Bach's cantatas and keyboard music, grandson of the composer Johann Gottlieb Naumann.

Neefe, Christian Gottlob (1748–98), composer and court organist at Bonn, where he taught Beethoven; assisted in preparing an early edition of Bach's Well-Tempered Clavier.

Neuber, Caroline (1697–1760), actor and producer of stage comedies performed at Leipzig.

Neumeister, Johann Gottfried (1757–1840), organ pupil of Sorge and owner and presumed copyist of a manuscript containing earlier chorale preludes, many of them attributed to Bach.

Neumeister, Erdmann (1671–1756), theologian and poet, pastor at Weissenfels, later Hamburg; influential writer on texts for church music and author of numerous cantata librettos, several set by Bach.

Newton, Isaac (1643–1727), English scientist and mathematician, formulated laws of gravitation and one of the inventors of calculus, compared to Bach by the latter's contemporaries.

Nichelmann, Christoph (1717–62), keyboard player and composer, studied with W. F. and probably J. S. Bach at Leipzig, later C. P. E. Bach's fellow court keyboard player at Berlin before publishing a controversial treatise that criticied the music of the latter.

Nicolai, Philipp (1556–1608), theologian and poet, pastor at Hamburg; author of two famous chorales each set several times by Bach (notably in Cantatas 1 and 140)

Niedt, Nicolaus (d. 1700), composer, organist at Sondershausen.

Olearius, Johann Christoph (1668–1747), theologian and musician, deacon at Arnstadt during Bach's time there, published a collection of hymns (text only); son of the following.

Olearius, Johann Gottfried (1635–1711), theologian and musician, church superintendant at Arnstadt during Bach's time there.

Pachelbel, Johann (1653–1706), keyboard player and important composer of organ music and sacred vocal works; held positions at Vienna, Eisenach, Stuttgart, and Erfurt, where he taught Bach's brother Johann Christoph.

Palestrina, Giovanni Pierluigi da (ca. 1525–1594), Italian composer, worked at Rome, published numerous collections of influential motets and masses, some of the latter copied by Bach.

Pergolesi, Giovanni Battsta (1710–36), Italian composer, known for comic operatic works performed at Naples and elsewhere; Bach performed a German parody of his *Stabat mater*.

Pesne, Antoine (1683–1757), Prussian court painter, known for portraits of King Frederick "the Great" and members of his family and court, including C. H. Graun and his first wife Anna Dorothea Schmiel (the latter shown playing a double-manual harpsichord).

Pezold, Carl Friedrich (1675–1731), instructor (*tertius*), later conrector, at St. Thomas School, Leipzig during Bach's time there.

Pezold, Christian (1677–?by 1733), Dresden organist, composer of a minuet often attributed to Bach.
Picander, *see* Christian Friedrich Henrici

Pisendel, Johann Georg (1687–1755), violinist and composer, apparently met and shared music with Bach at Weimar; eventually Concertmeister at Dresden, where he taught Quantz.

Platz, Abraham Christoph (1658–1728), city councilor and former burgomaster at Leipzig, initially opposed Bach's appointment there.

Poglietti, Alessandro (d. 1683), composer and imperial court organist at Vienna, known for his keyboard music.

Quantz, Johann Joachim (1697–1773), composer and writer on music, worked at Dresden and later Berlin, where he was teacher and court musician of King Frederick "the Great" and wrote an important treatise on flute playing.

Questenberg, Johann Adam von (1678–1752), count of Jaromerice; a wealthy Moravian aristocrat and amateur musician, he is thought to have possibly instigated or commissioned Bach's completion of the B-Minor Mass.

Rameau, Jean-Philippe (1683–1764), the leading eighteenth-century composer in France, also a prolific writer on music, known for operas and keyboard music; Bach must have known the latter, although his pupil's disparaged Rameau's theoretical ideas.

Reiche, Gottfried (1667–1734), trumpeter and town musician at Leipzig, where he probably played most of the virtuoso brass parts written there by Bach.

Reineccius, Georg Theodor (1660–1726), cantor at Weimar, godfather to Bach's daughter Maria Sophia.

Reinken (Reincken), Johann Adamszoon (?1643–1722), keyboard player and composer, organist at Hamburg, published instrumental suites arranged for keyboard by Bach, whose organ playing he praised.

Richter, Christian (1587–1667), Weimar court painter; a depiction of the court chapel is attributed to him.

Richter, Christian (1655–1722), Weimar court painter, presumably related to the former.

Richter, Christian (ca. 1625–1684), architect, regarded as the founder of the Leipzig Baroque.

Richter, Johann Moritz (1620–67), Weimar court architect; his son of the same name also worked there and at Zeitz.

Rochlitz, Friedrich (1769–1842), writer on music, pupil of Bach's student Doles.

Roger, Estienne (1665or 1666–1722), music publisher, originally French, worked in Amsterdam.

Rolle, Christian Ernst (1681–1751), organist and court musician at Cöthen during Bach's time there.

Romanus, Franz Conrad (1671–1746), disgraced former burgomaster at Leipzig during Bach's time there, father of Mariane von Ziegler.

Roth, Johann Gabriel, choir prefect at Leipzig, directed church music there during the period between Kuhnau's death and Bach's appointment.

Rust, Friedrich Wilhelm (1739–96), composer and keyboard player, studied with C. P. E. and W. F. Bach, afterward music director at Dessau.

Rust, Wilhelm 1822–96), organist at Berlin and Leipzig, chief editor of Bach's collected works and cantor of the St. Thomas school, Leipzig; grandson of the preceding.

Scarlatti, Alessandro (1660–1725), one of the most important Italian Baroque composers, especially of opera; worked at Naples and Rome, knew Handel and taught Quantz, among many others.

Scarlatti, Domenico (1685–1757), composer, son of the preceding, royal court musician at Lisbon and Madrid; known today for hundreds of one-movement keyboard sonatas, also wrote operas and sacred vocal music.

Scheibe, Johann (ca. 1680–1748), organ builder, worked at Leipzig during Bach's time there.

Scheibe, Johann Adolph (1708–76), composer and writer of music, studied at the St. Nicolaus School and then the university at Leipzig, later royal Danish Capellmeister; son of the preceding, he is known today for his serialized music journal in which he published a critique of Bach and other musicians.

Scheidt, Samuel (1587–1654), one of the leading early-Baroque German composers, known especially for a massive published set of organ works; studied with Sweelinck at Amsterdam, afterwards organist at Halle.

Schein, Johann Herrmann (1586–1630), with the preceding one of the leading early-Baroque German composers, cantor of the St. Thomas School, Leipzig.

Schelle, Johann (1648–1701), composer, student and later cantor at the St. Thomas School, Leipzig.

Georg Christian Schemelli (ca. 1676–1762), cantor at Zeitz, edited a volume of sacred songs to which Bach contributed.

Schieferdecker, Johann Christian (1679–1732), composer, worked at Weissenfels and Hamburg before succeeding Buxtehude as organist at Lübeck.

Schmid, Balthasar (1705–49), pupil of Bach at Leipzig, later music engraver and publisher; his firm (continued by his widow) issued works of J. S. and C. P. E. Bach as well as members of their circles.

Schneider, Johann (1702–88), organist at St. Nicholas, Leipzig, during and after Bach's time there; erroneously thought to have been the pupil of Bach known as Anonymous 5 (actually Kayser).

Scholze, Johann Sigismund, known as Sperontes (1705–50), poet, worked at Leipzig, where he edited a series of songbooks to which Bach may have contributed.

Schott, Georg Balthasar (1686–1736), organist of the New Church, Leipzig, and director of the Collegium Musicum there at the time of Bach's arrival, afterwards cantor at Gotha.

Schübler, Johann Georg (b. ca. 1725), pupil of Bach at Leipzig, afterward music engraver and publisher of the "Schübler" chorales (BWV 645–50).

Schubart, Johann Martin (1690–1721), pupil of Bach at Weimar, where he succeeded the latter as court organist.

Schütz, Heinrich (1585–1672), the preeminent German composer of the seventeenth century, Capellmeister at Dresden, published hundreds of sacred vocal works.

Schumann, Robert (1810–56), composer, pianist, and writer on music; admired Bach and published editions of several works, including piano accompaniments for the violin solos.

Schwanberg (Schwanenberer), Georg Heinrich Ludwig (d. 1774), Wolfenbüttel chamber musician, pupil of Bach at Leipzig and music copyist.

Schweitzer, Albert (1875–1965), French (Alsatian) musicologist, medical humanitarian, and Nobel Prize winner, author of an influential biography of Bach.

Silbermann, Gottfried (1683–1753), instrument builder active in Saxony, made organs, harpsichords, and fortepianos; Bach played and acted as sales agent for his instruments.
Smend, Friedrich (1893–1980), theologian and musicologist, influential Bach scholar and editor.

Sophia Dorothea of Hanover, Queen in Prussia (1687–1757), sister of George II and wife of King Friedrich Wilhelm I; mother of Frederick "the Great" and a significant patron of the arts and sciences.

Sorge, Georg Andreas (1703–78), composer and writer on music, organist at Lobenstein, published treatises and keyboard music, including a set of sonatinas dedicated to Bach.

Sporck, Franz Anton von (1662–1738), count of Lissa on the Elbe (Lysá nad Labem), Moravian count and patron of music; dedicatee of an oratorio libretto by Picander, later apparently borrowed (and did not return) music from Bach.
Spitta, Philipp (1841–94), German musicologist, author of the first comprehensive scholarly biography of Bach.

Stählin (-Storcksburg), Jacob von (1709–85), historian, secretary of the Russian Academy of Sciences, probably performed with the Collegium Musicum and knew the Bach sons while a university student in Leipzig.

Stahl, Georg Ernst (1713–72), court official and medical doctor at Berlin, son of the royal Prussian physician and chemist of the same name; Bach revised Cantata 210 for use at his wedding.

Stanisław Leszczyński (1677–1766), duke of Lorraine and nominal king of Poland in opposition to Augustus II and Augustus III.

Steger, Adrian (d. 1741), Leipzig city councilor and burgomaster, one of those who expressed reservations about Bach's appointment.

Stieglitz, Christian Ludwig (1677–1758), Leipzig city councilor and burgomaster (mayor), favored J. A. Ernesti in the "battle of the prefects."

Stella, Santa (*fl.* 1703–41, d. 1759), Italian singer, wife of Lotti, performing with him at Dresden.

Stölzel, Georg Heinrich (1690–1749), composer, also wrote librettos and treatises, Capellmeister at Gera; at Leipzig Bach performed an annual cycle of his church cantatas, among other works.

Strattner, Georg Christoph (ca. 1644–1704), composer, Capellmeister at Durlach and Frankfurt, later vice-Capellmeister at Weimar, where he directed the short-lived court opera.

Streicher, Nannette (1769–1833), piano maker, daughter of the Viennese maker Johann Andreas Stein; helped raise money to support Bach's oldest surviving daughter.

Stricker, Augustin Reinhard (d. after 1720), composer, chamber musician at Berlin before becoming Bach's predecessor as Capellmeister at Cöthen.

Swieten, Baron Gottfried van (1733–1803), Dutch-born diplomat based in Vienna, where he helped introduce Bach's music to Mozart; C. P. E. Bach dedicated two publications to him.

Taylor, John (1703–72), English surgeon, today regarded as a charlatan; performed unsuccessful ocular surgery on Bach and Handel.

Telemann, Georg Philipp (1681–1767), the preeminent German composer of his day, Capellmeister at Eisenach and Frankfurt, then music director at Hamburg; composed in every major genre, exerting significant influence on J. S. Bach as well as C. P. E. Bach, who was his godfather.

Terence (Publius Terentius Afer) (ca. 190–ca. 159 BCE), Roman comic playwright of north African origin; his works were studied in German schools of Bach's day.

Thayßner, Zachiaras (d. 1705), organ maker, built or worked on instruments at Leipzig, Naumburg, and Merseburg.

Thomasius, Jacob, (d. 1684), philosopher of education, rector of the St. Thomas School, Leipzig.

Thymich, Paul (1656–94), poet, studied and later taught at the St. Thomas School, Leipzig.

Torri, Pietro (ca. 1650–1737), Italian organist and composer, Capellmeister at Bayreuth, later at Munich, composer of a Magnificat performed by Bach.

Trebs, Heinrich Nicolaus (1678–1748), Weimar court organ builder; Bach was godfather to his oldest son Johann Gottfried.

Treiber, Johann Philipp (1675–1727), composer and writer on music and other subjects, active at Arnstadt during Bach's time there.

Trier, Johann (1716–1790), pupil of Bach at Leipzig, later director (the last?) of the Collegium Musicum.

Vetter, Daniel (1657 or 1658–1721), organist at St. Nicholas, Leipzig; published collections of simple keyboard chorales.

Vivaldi, Antonio (1678–1741), Italian (Venetian) composer of numerous concertos and other works, which exerted crucial influence on Bach and other German composers.

Vogler, Johann Caspar (1696–1763), keyboard player and composer, pupil of Bach at Arnstadt and Weimar, where he later served as court organist and mayor.

Vogler, Johann Gottfried, organist of the New Church, Leipzig, before Bach's time there; preceded Schott as director of the Collegium Musicum, then briefly directed the competing collegium founded by Fasch before serving as organist at Hamburg and at Darmstadt.

Voltaire (François-Marie Arouet) (1694–1778), French philosophical writer, correspondent and sometime guest of Frederick "the Great" at Berlin.

Volumier (Woulmyer), Jean-Baptiste (ca. 1670–1728), violinist and composer of Flemish origin, Concertmeister at Berlin, then at Dresden, where arranged Bach's aborted contest with Marchand.

Wagner, Joachim (1690–1749), organ builder, active in Berlin and elsewhere in Brandenburg-Prussia.

Wagner, Richard (1813–83), composer; his concept of *Leitmotiv* influenced Schweitzer's understanding of recurring motives in Bach's music
Walter, Johann (1496–1570), poet and composer, with Luther created the early repertory of German chorales.

Walther, Johann Gottfried (1684–1748), composer and musical lexicographer, Bach's second cousin and organist at Weimar during Bach's time there.

Wecker, Gottlob Christoph (1707–74), pupil of Bach at Leipzig, later cantor at Schweidnitz in Silesia.

Weckmann, Matthias (?1616–1674), keyboard player and composer, pupil of Schütz, later organist at Hamburg.

Weiss, Christian (1671–1736), pastor of St. Thomas's Church, Leipzig, Bach's father confessor.

Weiss, Sylvius Leopold (?1686–1750), composer and lutenist, worked at Dresden; Bach arranged one of his lute sonatas for keboard and violin.

Weldig, Adam Immanuel (1667–1716), singer and master of the pages at Weimar, godfather of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach; moved to Weissenfels after the arrival of the Bach family, who rented from him.

Wender, Christian Friedrich (d. after 1768), organ builder at Mühlhausen, son of the following.

Wender, Johann Friedrich (1655–1729), organ builder based in Mühlhausen, where J. S. Bach played his instruments.

Werckmeister, Andreas (1645–1706), organist and writer on music, author of numerous publications on organs and related subjects, including tuning and temperament.

Westhoff, Johann Paul von (1656–1705), violinist and composer, court musician at Weimar, where he might have taught the young Bach; published six suites for unaccompanied violin.

Wilcke, Johann Caspar (d. 1731), court trumpeter at Zeitz, later Weissenfels; father of Anna Magdalena Bach.

Wilcke, Johann Caspar (1691–1766), court trumpeter at Zerbst, son of the preceding.

Wild, Friedrich Gottlieb (b. 1700), pupil of Bach at Leipzig, later organist at St. Petersburg.

Wilhelm Ernst, duke of Saxe-Weimar (1662–1728), Bach's employer at Weimar, a patron of the arts and initially probably admired Bach, whom he imprisoned prior to releasing him from service.

Wilhelm, count of Schaumburg-Lippe-Bückeburg (1724–77), employer of J. C. F. Bach and dedicatee of C. P. E. Bach's *Zwey Trio*.

Winckler, Johann Heinrich (1703–70), instructor (*quartus*) at St. Thomas School, Leipzig, which he honored in a libretto set by Bach (BWV Anh. 18).

Witt, Christian Friedrich (ca. 1660–1717), composer, Capellmeister at Gotha.

Wolff, Christian (1679–1754), rationalist philosopher, taught at Halle until expelled by King Friedrich Wilhelm I; reinstated by Frederick "the Great."

Zachow, Friedrich Wilhelm (1663–1712), composer and organist at Halle, Handel's teacher; Bach would have known a suite by him in the Möller Manuscript.

Zelenka (Xelenka), Jan Dismas (1679–1745), Czech composer and court violone player at Dresden; wrote masses and other sacred vocal works, several of them probably performed by J. S. and W. F. Bach.

Ziegler, Johann Gotthilf (1688–1747), keyboard player and composer, organist at Halle; briefly a pupil of Bach at Weimar, he later engraved the latter's Partitas for harpsichord.

Ziegler, Mariane von (1695–1760), poet and librettist, author of texts for nine of Bach's sacred cantatas; daughter of the disgraced Leipzig burgomaster Romanus.

Zimmermann, Gottfried (d. 1741), entrepreneur at Leipzig, sponsored Bach's performances with the Collegium Musicum at his coffee house.

Bibliography

Frequently cited reference sources

AmB — Amalienbibliothek (a collection within D B, the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek in Berlin)

BC — *Bach-Compendium: Analytisch-bibliographisches Repertorium der Werke Johann Sebastian Bachs*. 1985–. Edited by Hans-Joachim Schulze and Christoph Wolff. Leipzig and Dresden: Peters.

BD — *Bach-Dokumente I: Schriftstücke von der Hand Johann Sebastian Bachs*. 1963. Edited by Werner Neumann and Hans-Joachim Schulze. Kassel: Bärenreiter.

BD 2 — *Bach-Dokumente II: Fremdschriftliche und gedruckte Dokumente zur Lebensgeschichte Johann Sebastian Bachs*. 1969. Edited by Werner Neumann and Hans-Joachim Schulze. Kassel: Bärenreiter.

BD 3 — *Bach-Dokumente III: Dokumente zum Nachwirken Johann Sebastian Bachs*. 1972. Edited by Hans-Joachim Schulze. Kassel: Bärenreiter.

BG — Bach, Johann Sebastian. 1851–1900. *Werke*. 46 vols. Edited by the Bach-Gesellschaft. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel. Numerous reprints.

BuxWV — Karstädt, Georg. 1974. *Thematisch-systematisches Verzeichnis der musikalischen Werke von Dietrich Buxtehude: Buxtehude-Werke-Verzeichnis*. Wiesbaden: Breitkopf und Härtel.

BWV — Schmieder, Wolfgang. 1990. *Thematisch-systematisches Verzeichnis der musikalischen Werke Johann Sebastian Bachs: Bach-Werke-Verzeichnis*. 2d edn. Wiesbaden: Breitkopf und Härtel. Originally published Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1950.

D B — Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek

F. — Falck, Martin. 1913. *Wilhelm Friedemann Bach: Sein Leben und seine Werke*. Leipzig: Kahnt. 2d ed., 1919.

HWV — *Händel-Handbuch*. 1978–. 5 vols. Kassel: Bärenreiter.

KB — *Kritischer Bericht* (critical commentary volume for the NBA; see below)

NBA — Bach, Johann Sebastian, 1954–. *Neue Ausgabe sämtlicher Werke*. Edited by the Johann-Sebastian-Bach-Institut, Göttingen, and the Bach-Archiv, Leipzig. Kassel: Bärenreiter. *Kritische Berichte* (editorial reports) appear in separate volumes.

NBR New Bach Reader, The: A Life of Johann Sebastian Bach in Letters and Documents. 1998. Edited by Hans T. David and Arthur Mendel. Revised and enlarged by Christoph Wolff. New York: Norton.

TWV Ruhnke, Martin, ed. 1984. *Georg Philipp Telemann: Thematisch-Systematisches Verzeichnis seiner Werke. Instrumentalwerke*. Band 1. Kassel: Bärenreiter.

W. Wotquenne, Alfred. 1905. *Catalogue thématique des oeuvres de Charles Philippe Emmanuel Bach (1714–1788)*. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel. Reprints, 1964, 1972, as *Thematisches Verzeichnis der Werke von Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach*.

Literature

Adlung, Jakob. 1758. *Anleitung zu der musikalischen Gelahrtheit*. Erfurt: Jungnicol.

———. 1768. *Musica mechanica organoedi*. Edited by Lorenz Albrecht and with additional annotations by Johann Friedrich Agricola. Berlin: Birnstiel.

Ahrens, Christian. 2007. "Neue Quellen zu J. S. Bachs Beziehungen nach Gotha." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 93: 45–60.

———. 2014. "Johann Sebastian Bach, Johann Heinrich Eichentopf und die Hautbois d'amour in Leipzig." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 100: 45–60.

Allsop, Peter. 1999. *Arcangelo Corelli: New Orpheus of Our Times*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Altschuler, Eric Lewin. 2001. "J. S. Bach and the Reiche Portrait: Trumpet Major?" *Musical Times* 142: 29–31.

Ambrose, Z. Philip. 2005. J. S. Bach: *The Vocal Texts in English Translation with Commentary*. 2 vols. Philadelphia: XLibris; revised 2006. Quotations are from the version online at http://www.uvm.edu/~classics/faculty/bach/.

Anson-Cartwright, Mark. 2013. "Subdominant Returns in the Vocal Music of J. S. Bach." *Eighteenth-Century Music* 10: 253–76.

Apfelstedt, H. F. Th. 1856. *Geschichte des fürstlich-schwarzburgischen Hauses.* Sondershausen, 1856.

Axmacher, Elke. 1978. "Ein Quellenfund zum Text der Matthäus-Passion." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 64: 181–91.

Bach, Carl Philipp Emanuel. 1753–62. *Versuch über die wahre Art das Clavier zu spielen*. 2 vols. Berlin. Translated by William J. Mitchell as *Essay on the True Art of Playing Keyboard Instruments* (New York: Norton, 1949).

———. 1772–73. Autobiography. In *Carl Burney's der Musik Doktors Tagebuch seiner musikalischen Reise*, translated by Christoph Daniel Ebeling and Johann Joachim Christoph Bode, 3 vols., 3:199–209. Hamburg. English translation by William S. Newman as "Emanuel Bach's Autobiography." *Musical Quarterly* 51 (1965): 363–72.

———. 1790. *Verzeichniß des musikalischen Nachlasses des verstorbenen Capellmeisters Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach*. Hamburg: Schniebes. Annotated facsimile edition by Rachel Wade as *The Catalog of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach's Estate: A Facsimile of the Edition by Schniebes, Hamburg, 1790.* New York: Garland Publishing, 1981. Transcription online at http://www.cpebach.org/pdfs/resources/NV-1790.pdf.

Bärwald, Manuel. 2014. "Der Kopialienhandel von Johann Caspar Dietel und die frühe Telemannpflege unter dem Patronat des sächsischen Landadels." In *Komponisten im Spannungsfeld von höfischer und städtischer Musikkultur: Bericht über die Internationale Wissenschaftliche Konferenz, Magdeburg, 18. und 19. März 2010, anlässlich der 20. Magedeburger Telemann-Festtage*. Ed. Carsten Lange and Brit Reipsche, 227–37. Hildesheim: Olms.

Bakker, Pieter. 2015. *Postmodern Numbers: Ruth Tatlow on Proportions in the Written Music of Johann Sebastian Bach*. Trans. Pleuke Boyce. Schraard: Kunst en Wetenschap. Published online.

Begbie, Jeremy. 2013. *Music, Modernity, and God: Essays in Listening.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Beißwenger, Kirsten. 1992. *Johann Sebastian Bachs Notenbibliothek*. Kassel: Bärenreiter.

———. 2002. "Rezeption und Verbreitung des Wohlemperierten Klaviers I zu Lebzeiten Johann Sebastian Bachs: Mit einem Exkurs über den Schreiber Anonymus Vr bzw. Anonymus 12 von Yoshitake Kobayashi." In *Bach, Das Wohltemperierte Klavier I: Tradition, Entstehung, Funktion, Analyse: Ulrich Siegele zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Siegbert Rampe, 7–25. Munich: Katzbichler.

———. 2017. "Other Composers." Trans. Emerson Morgan. In In *The Routledge Research Companion to Johann Sebastian Bach*, ed. Robin A. Leaver, 237–64. Abingdon: Routledge.

Bellotti, Michael. 2001. "Johann Pachelbel als Lehrer." In *Bach und seine mitteldeutschen Zeitgenossen: Bericht über das Internationale Musikwissenschaftliche Kolloquium Erfurt und Arnstadt 13. bis 16. Januar 2000*, ed. Rainer Kaiser, 8–44. Eisenach: Wagner.

Berger, Karol. 2007. *Bach's Cycle, Mozart's Arrow: An Essay on the Origins of Musical Modernity.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Besseler, Heinrich. 1956. "Markgraf Christian Ludwig von Brandenburg." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 43: 18–35.

Birke, Joachim. 1966. *Christian Wolffs Metaphysik und die zeit genössische Literatur- und Musiktheorie: Gottsched, Scheibe, Mizler*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Bitter, Carl Herrmann. 1865. *Johann Sebastian Bach*. 2 vols. Berlin: Schneider.

———. 1868. *Carl Philipp Emanuel und Wilhelm Friedemann bach und deren Brüder*. 2 vols. Berlin: Wilhelm Müller.

Blanken, Christine. 2015. "Christoph Birkmanns Kantatenzyklus 'Gott-geheiligte Sabbaths-Zehnden' fon 1728 und die Leipziger Kirchenmusik under J. S. Bach in den Jahren 1724–1727." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 101: 13–74.

———. 2018. "Neue Dokumente zur Erbteilung nach dem Tod Johann Sebastian Bachs." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 104: 133–53.

Blume, Friedrich. 1963. "Outlines of a New Picture of Bach." Trans. Stanley Godman. *Music & Letters* 44: 214–27.

Bojanowski, Paul von. 1903. *Das Weimar Johann Sebastian Bachs*. Weimar: Hermann Bölhaus Nachfolger.

Boomhower, Daniel F. 2017. "Zur handschriftlichen Überlieferung der h-Moll-Messe in Berlin und Wien in der zweiten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 103: 11–31.

Boyd, Malcolm. 1996. "Bach, Telemann und das Fanfarenthema." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 82: 147–150.

———, ed. 1999. *Oxford Composer Companions: J. S. Bach*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

———. 2000. *Bach*. Third edition. New York: Oxford University Press. Electronic edition, 2006.

Braatz, Thomas. 2018. "Johann Sebastian Bach's Performance Environment in the *Nicolaikirche* from 1723to 1750." Accessed June 3, 2018 <http://www.bach-cantatas.com/Articles/Nikolaikirche-Braatz.pdf>.

Brainard, Paul. 1983. "The Aria and Its Ritornello: The Question of 'Dominance' in Bach." In *Bachiana et alia musicologica: Festschrift Alfred Dürr zum 65. Geburtstag*, edited by Wolfgang Rehm, 39–51. Kassel: Bärenreiter.

Breig, Werner. 1976. "Bachs Violinkonzert d-moll: Studien zu seiner Gestalt und seiner Entstehungsgeschichte." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 63: 7–34.

———. 1990. "Die geschichtliche Stellung von Buxtehudes monodischen Orgelchoral." In *Dietrich Buxtehude und die europäische Musik seiner Zeit: Bericht über das Lübecker Symposion 1987*, ed. Arnfried Edler and Friedhelm Krummacher, 260–74. Kassel: Bärenreiter.

Buelow, George J. 1974–75. “In Defence of J. A. Scheibe Against J. S. Bach.” *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association* 101: 85–100.

Bund, Conrad. 1984. “Johann Ludwig Bach und die Frankfurter Kapellmusik in der Zeit Georg Philipp Telemanns.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 70: 117–29.

Bunge, Rudolf. 1905. “Johann Sebastian Bachs Kapelle zu Cöthen und deren nachgelassene Instrumente.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 2: 14–47.

Burgess, Geoffrey, and Bruce Haynes. 2004. *The Oboe*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Burney, Charles. 1773. *The Present State of Music in France and Italy*. London.

———. 1775. *The Present State of Music in Germany, The Netherlands, and United Provinces.* 2d edn., corrected, 2 vols. London.

———. 1782. *A General History of Music*. Vol. 2. London.

Burrows, Donald. 2012. *Handel*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Butler, Gregory G. 1983. “Ordering Problems in J. S. Bach's *Art of Fugue* Resolved.” *Musical Quarterly* 69: 44–61.

———. 1984. “J. S. Bach and the Schemelli *Gesangbuch* Revisited.” *Studi musicali* 13: 241–57.

———. 1986. “The Engraving of J. S. Bach’s ‘Six Partitas.’” *Journal of Musicological Research* 7: 3–27.

———. 1988.“Neues zur Datierung der Goldberg-Variationen.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 74: 219–23.

———. 1990. *Bach’s Clavier-Übung III: The Making of a Print. With a Companion Study of the Canonic Variations on “Vom Himmel hoch.”* Durham: Duke University Press.

———. 1992. “Johann Sebastian Bachs Gloria in excelsis Deo BWV 191: Musik für ein Leipziger Danfest.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 78: 65–71.

———. 1995. “J. S. Bach’s Reception of Tomaso Albinoni’s Mature Concertos.” In *Bach Studies 2*, ed. Daniel R. Melamed, 20–46. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1997. “Toward a More Precise Chronology for Bach’s Concerto for Three Violins and Strings BWV 1064a: The Case for Formal Analysis.” In *Bachs Orchesterwerke: Bericht über das 1. Dortmunder Bach-Symposion 1996*, ed. Martin Geck et al., 235–47. Witten: Klangrfarben.

———. 1999. “The Question of Genre in Bach’s Fourth Brandenburg Concerto.” In *Bach Perspectives*, vol. 4, ed. David Schulenberg, 9–32. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

———. 2000. "J. S. Bachs Kanonische Veränderungen äber 'Vom Himmel hoch' (BWV 769): Ein Schlußstrich unter die Debatte um die Frage der 'Fassung letzter Hand.'" *Bach-Jahrbuch* 86: 9–34.

———. 2002. "The Printing History of J. S. Bach's *Musical Offering:* New Interpretations." *Journal of Musicology* 19: 306–31.

———. 2007. "The Origins of J. S. Bach's 'Wie jammern mich doch die verkehrten Herzen,' BWV 170/3." In *Music and Its Questions: Essays in Honor of Peter Williams*, ed. Thomas Donahue, 227–36. Richmond, Va.: OHS Press.

———. 2008. "Scribes, Engravers, and Notational Styles: The Final Disposition of Bach's Art of Fugue." In *About Bach*, ed. Gregory G. Butler, George B. Stauffer, and Mary Dalton Greer, 111–23. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

———. 2016. "The Choir Loft as Chamber: Concerted Movements by Bach from the Mid- to Late 1720s." In *Bach Perspectives*, vol. 10, ed. Matthew Dirst, 76–86. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Butler, Lynn Edwards. 2010. "Leipzig's Organs in the Time of Bach." *Keyboard Perspectives* 3: 87–100.

———. 2016. "Bach's Report on Johann Scheibe's Organ for St. Paul's Church: A Reassessment." In *Bach Perspectives*, vol. 10, ed. Matthew Dirst, 1–15. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Butt, John. 1988. "Bach's Organ Sonatas BWV 525–530: Compilation and Recomposition." *Organ Yearbook* 19: 80–90.

———. 1993. Review of Eric Chafe, *Tonal Allegory in the Vocal Music of J. S. Bach*. *Music and Letters* 74: 289–94.

———. 1998. "Reconstructing Bach?" Review of Andor Gomme, reconstruction of Bach, St. Mark Passion (BWV 247). *Early Music* 26: 673–75.

———. 2010. *Bach's Dialogue with Modernity: Perspectives on the Passions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cammarota, Robert M. 1986. "The Repertoire of Magnificats in Leipzig at the Time of J. S. Bach: A Study of the Manuscript Sources." Ph.D. diss., New York University.
———. 2001. "On the Performance of 'Quia respexit . . . omnes generationes' from J. S. Bach's *Magnificat*." *Journal of Musicology* 18: 458–89.

Carter, Stewart. 1991. "The String Tremolo in the Seventeenth Century." *Early Music* 19: 42–59.

Chafe, Eric. 1991. *Tonal Allegory in the Vocal Music of J. S. Bach*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

———. 2014. *J. S. Bach's Johannine Theology: The St. John Passion and the Cantatas for Spring 1725.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Clark, Stephen L., trans. and ed. 1997. *The Letters of C. P. E. Bach*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Claus, Rolf Dietrich. 1998. *Zur Echtheit von Toccata und Fuge d-moll BWV 565*. 2d edn. Cologne: Dohr.

Cole, Warwick. 2019. "Notation and the Origins of Bach's Cello Suite in C Minor (BWV 1011)." *Early Music* 47:241–54.

Cortens, Evan. 2015. "'Durch die Music gleichsam lebendig vorgestellet': Graupner, Bach, and *Mein Herz schwimmt im Blut*." *BACH Journal* 46/1: 74–110.

Countouris, Nicola. 2016. *The Changing Law of the Employment Relationship: Comparative Analyses in the European Context*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.

Cox, Harvey H., ed. 1985. *The Calov Bible of J. S. Bach*. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press.

Crist, Stephen A. 1988. "Aria Forms in the Vocal Works of J. S. Bach, 1714–24." Ph.D. dissertation, Brandeis University.

Cron, Matthew. 2004. "The Obbligato Organ Cantatas of J. S. Bach in the Context of Eighteeth-Century Practice." Ph.D. diss., Brandeis University.

———. 2016. "Music From Heaven: An Eighteenth-Century Context for Cantatas With Obbligato Organ." In *Bach Perspectives*, vol. 10, ed. Matthew Dirst, 87–118. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Czok, Karl. 1982. "Sächsischer Landesstaat zur Bachzeit." *Beiträge zur Bachforschung* 1: 25–31.

Dadelsen, Georg von. 1958. *Beiträge zur Chronologie der Werke Johann Sebastian Bachs*. Trossingen: Hohner.

———. 1963. "Zur Entstehung des Bachschen Orgelbüchlein." In *Festschrift Friedrich Blume zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Anna Amalie Abert and Wilhelm Pfannkuch, 74–79. Kassel: Bärenreiter.

———. 1986. "Anmerkungen zu Bachs Leipziger Jahren." In *Festschrift Martin Ruhnke zum 65. Geburtstag*, edited by members of the Institut für Musikwissenschaft der Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg, 68–82. Neuhausen: Hänssler.

Dirksen, Pieter. 1992. “The Background to Bach’s Fifth Brandenburg Concerto.” In *The Harpsichord and Its Repertoire: Proceedings of the International Harpsichord Symposium Utrecht 1990*, ed. Pieter Dirksen, 157–85. Utrecht: STIMU: Foundation for Historical Performance Practice.

———. 2002. “Bachs ‘Acht Choralfughetten’: Ein unbeachtetes Leipziger Sammelwerk?” In *Bach in Leipzig—Bach und Leipzig: Bach-Konferenz Leipzig 2000*, ed. Ulrich Leisinger (Leipziger Beiträge zur Bachforschung, 5), 155–182. Hildesheim: Olms.

———. 2003. “Ein verschollenes Weimarer Kammermusik Johann Sebastian Bachs? Zur Vorgeschichte der Sonate e-moll für Orgel (BWV 528).” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 89: 7–36.

———. 2008. “J. S. Bach’s Violin Concerto in G Minor.” In *Bach Perspectives*, vol. 7, ed. Gregory Butler, 21–54. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

———. 2010. “Zur Echtheit der Johann Christoph Bach (1642–1703) zugeschriebenen Clavierwerke.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 96: 217–48.

———, ed. 2010a. *Johann Sebastian Bach: Sämtliche Orgelwerke.* Volume 5: *Sonaten, Trios, Konzerte*. Wiesbaden: Breitkopf und Härtel, 2010.

Dirst, Matthew Charles. 2012. *Engaging Bach: The Keyboard Legacy from Marpurg to Mendelssohn*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Dreyfus, Laurence. 1987. *Bach’s Continuo Group: Players and Practices in His Vocal Works*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Dürr, Alfred. 1951. *Studien über die frühen Kantaten Johann Sebastian Bachs*. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel. 2d edn., 1977.

———. 1976. *Zur Chronologie der Leipziger Vokalwerke J. S. Bachs*. 2d edn. Kassel: Bärenreiter. Originally published in *Bach-Jahrbuch* 44 (1957): 5–162.

———. 1978. “Tastenumfang und Chronologie in Bachs Klavierwerken.” In *Festschrift Georg van Dadelsen zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Thomas Kohlhase and Volker Scherliess, 73–88. Neuhausen: Haenssler.

———. 1986. “Kein Meister fällt vom Himmel.” *Musica* 40: 309–12.

———. 1992. “Zur Parodiefrage in Bachs h-moll-Messe: Eine Bestandsaufnahme.” *Die Musikforschung* 45: 117–38.
———. 2000. *Johann Sebastian Bach: St. John Passion: Genesis, Transmission, and Meaning*. Trans. Alfred Clayton. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2005. *The Cantatas of J. S. Bach With Their Librettos in German–English Parallel Text*. Rev. and trans. Richard D. P. Jones. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dahlqvist, Reine. 1993. “Gottfried Reiche's Instrument: A Problem of Classification.” *Historic Brass Society Journal* 5: 174–91.

Eberhard, Johann August. 1800. “Erklärung.” *Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung* 2, cols. 870–75.

Engelke, Bernhard. 1908. *Johann Friedrich Fasch: Sein Leben und seine Tätigkeit als Vokalkomponist*. Halle: Kämmerer.

Eppstein, Hans. 1969. “Grundzüge in J. S. Bachs Sonatenschaffen.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 55: 6–30.

———. 1970. “Zur Vor- und Entstehungsgeschichte von J. S. Bachs Tripelkonzert a-moll (BWV 1044).” *Jahrbuch des Staatlichen Instituts für Musikforschung Preussischer Kulturbesitz* 3: 34–45.

Enßlin, Wolfram, and Uwe Wolf. 2007. “Die Prediger-Einführungsmusiken von C. P. E. Bach: Materialien und Überlegungen zu Werkbestand, Entstehungsgeschichte und Aufführungspraxis.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 93: 139–78.

Exner, Ellen. 2012. “C. P. E. Bach At His Word: A Reconsideration of the Early Berlin Years.” *Eighteenth-Century Music* 9: 253–60.

———. 2016. “The Godfather: Georg Philipp Telemann, Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach, and the Family Business.” *Bach: The Journal of the Riemenschneider Institute* 47/1: 1–20.

Falck, Martin. 1913. *Wilhelm Friedemann Bach*. Leipzig: C. F. Kahnt Nachfolger.

Feld, Ulrike, and Ulrich Leisinger, eds. 2003. *Musik am Meininger Hofe*. Denkmäler mitteldeutscher Barockmusik, vol. 1/2. Leipzig: Hofmeister.

Forkel, Johann Nicolaus. 1802. *Ueber Johann Sebastian Bachs Leben, Kunst und Kunstwerke*. Leipzig: Hoffmeister und Kühnel. Facsimile, Frankfurt am Main: H. L. Grahl, 1950. Translation in NBR, 417–82. Edited by Walther Vetter. Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1968.

Freyse, Conrad. 1956. “Johann Christoph Bach (1642–1703).” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 43: 36–51.

———. 1959. “Das Porträt Ambrosius Bachs.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 46: 149–55.

Fritz, Barthold. 1757. *Anweisung, wie man Claviere, Clavecins, und Orgeln . . . gleich rein stimmen könne*. Second edition. Leipzig: Breitkopf. The first edition appeared the previous year.
Fröde, Christine. 1982. “Die Wohnung Johann Sebastian Bachs in der Thomasschule in Leipzig.” In *Beiträge zur Bachpflege der DDR*, 10:5–22. Leipzig: Nationale Forschungs- und Gedenkstätten Johann Sebastian Bach der DDR.

———. 1984. “Zu einer Kritik des Thomanerchores von 1749.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 70: 53–58.

Fürstenau, Moritz. 1861–62. *Zur Geschichte der Musik und des Theaters am Hofe zu Dresden.* 2 vols. Dresden: Kuntze.

Geck, Martin. 2006. *Johann Sebastian Bach: Life and Work*. Trans. John Hargraves. Orlando: Harcourt. Originally published in German as *Johann Sebastian Bach: Leben und Werk*. Reinbek: Rowohlt, 2000.

Gerber, Ernst Ludwig. 1790–92. *Historisch-Biographisches Lexicon der Tonkünstler*. 2 vols. Leipzig: Breitkopf.

———. 1812–14. *Neues historisch-biographisches Lexikon der Tonkünstler*. 4 vols. Leipzig: Kühnel.

Geuting, Matthias. 2006. *Konzert und Sonate bei Johann Sebastian Bach: Formale Disposition und Dialog der Gattungen*. Kassel: Bärenreiter.

Giegling, Franz. 1974. "Die 'Perfidia': Ein wenig beachteter Baustein barocker Gestaltung." *Schweizer Beiträge zur Musikwissenschaft*: 47–49.

Glöckner, Andreas. 1975. "Bach and the Passion Music of His Contemporaries." *Musical Times* 116 : 613–16. This is a shortened version of the article published in German in 1977 (below).

———. 1977. "Johann Sebastian Bachs Aufführungen zeitgenössischer Passionsmusiken." *Bach-Jahrbuch*: 75–119.

———. 1981. "Neuerkenntnisse zu Johann Sebastian Bachs Aufführungskalender zwischen 1729 und 1735." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 67: 43–75.

———. 1985. "Zur Chronologie der Weimarer Kantaten Johann Sebastian Bachs." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 71: 159–64.

———. 1988. "Zur Echtheit und Datierung der Kantate BWV 150 'Nach dir, Herr, verlanget mich.'" *Bach-Jahrbuch* 74: 195–203.

———. 1988a. "Gründe für Johann Sebastian Bachs Weggang von Weimar." In *Bericht über die Wissenschaftliche Konferenz zum 5. Internationalen Bachfest der DDR in Verbindung mit dem 60. Bachfest der Neuen Bachgesellschaft*, ed. Winfried Hoffmann, 137–43. Leipzig: Deutsche Verlag für Musik.

———. 1990. "Die Musikplege an der Leipziger Neukirche zur Zeit Johann Sebastian Bachs." *Beiträge zur Bachforschung* 8 (complete volume).

———. 1995. "Neue Spuren zu Bachs 'Weimarer' Passion." *Leipziger Beiträge zur Bach-Forschung* 1: 33–46.

———. 1996. "'Das kleine italienische Ding'—Zu Überlieferung und Datierung der Kantate 'Amore traditore' (BWV 203)." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 82: 133–37.

———. 2000. "Eine Michaeliskantate als Parodievorlage für den sechsten Teil des Bachschen Weihnachts-Oratoriums?" *Bach-Jahrbuch* 86: 317–26.

———. 2008. "Johann Sebastian Bach und die Universität Leipzig: Neue Quellen (Teil I)." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 94: 159–95.

———, ed. 2008a. *Kalendarium zur Lebensgeschichte Johann Sebastian Bachs. Erweiterte Neuausgabe*. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.

Górny, Tomasz. 2019. "Estienne Roger and His Agent Adam Christoph Sellius: New Light on Italian and French Music in Bach's World. *Early Music* 47: 361–70.

Graeser, Wolfgang. 1924. "Bachs 'Kunst der Fuge.'" *Bach-Jahrbuch* 21: 1–104.

Greer, Mary Dalton. 1996. "The Sacred Duets and Terzets of Johann Sebastian Bach: A Study of Genre and Musical Text Interpretation." Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University.

———. 2008. "From the House of Aaron to the House of Johann Sebastian: Old Testament Roots for the Bach Family Tree." In *About Bach*, ed. Gregory G. Butler, et al., 15–32. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Grychtolik, Alexander Ferdinand. 2013. "Anmerkungen zu den Aufführungsstätten J. S. Bachs in Weimar." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 99: 309–18.

Grzybowski, Andrzej. 2013. "John Taylor and Johann Sebastian Bach: More Information Still Needed." *Acta ophthalmologica* 91: e250–e252.

Häfner, Klaus. 1977. "Über die Herkunft von zwei Sätzen der h-Moll-Messe." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 63: 55–74.

———. 1987. *Aspekte des Parodieverfahrens bei Johann Sebastian Bach: Beiträge zur Wiederentdeckung verschollener Vokalwerke*. Laaber: Laaber-Verlag.

Heartz, Daniel. 2014. "Abel, Christian Bach, and Gainsborough." In *Artists and Musicians: Portrait Studies from the Rococo to the Revolution*, ed. Beverly Wilcox, 168–206. Ann Arbor: Steglein.

Heber, Noelle. 2017. "Bach and Money: Sources of Salary and Supplemental Income in Leipzig From 1723 to 1750." *Understanding Bach* 12: 111–25.

Heeg, Georg. 2008. "Wohnung J. S. Bachs in Köthen." EFRE-Projekt 6.12.4.06.00004, online at www.heeg.de/images/Bachhaus-klein.pdf, dated Feb. 15, 2008.

Heinichen, Johann David. 1728. *Der General-Bass in der Composition*. Dresden. Partial translation by George J. Buelow as *Thorough-Bass Accompaniment According to Johann David Heinichen*, revised edition. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1992.

Helmbold, Hermann. 1930. "Die Söhne von Johann Christoph und Johann Ambrosius Bach auf der Eisenacher Schule." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 27: 49–55.

Henrici, Christian Friedrich. 1727–32. *Picanders ernst-scherzthafft und satyrische Gedichte*. 3 vols. Leipzig: Johann Theodor Boetio [and daughter], 1727, 1729, 1732.

Henze-Döhring, Sabine. 2009. *Markgräfin Wilhelmine und die Bayreuther Hofmusik*. Bamberg: Heinrichs.

———. 2012. *Friedrich der Große: Musiker und Monarch*. Munich: Beck.

Henzel, Christoph. 2003. "Agricola und Andere: Berliner Komponisten im Notenarchiv der Sing-Akademie zu Berlin." *Jahrbuch des Staatlichen Instituts für Musikforschung Preussischer Kulturbesitz* 10: 31–98.

Heyde, Herbert. 1985. "Der Instrumentenbau in Leipzig zur Zeit Johann Sebastian Bachs." In *300 Jahre Johann Sebastian Bach* (exhibition catalogue, Internationale Bachakademie, Staatsgalerie, Stuttgart, 1985), 73–88. Tutzing: Hans Schneider.

———. 1988. "Das Instrument von Gottfried Reiche." *Beiträge zur Bach-Forschung* 6: 96–109.

Hill, Moira. 2015. "Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach's Passion Settings: Context, Content, and Impact." Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University.

Hill, Robert, ed. 1991. *Keyboard Music from the Andreas Bach Book and the Möller Manuscript*. Harvard Publications in Music, 16. Cambridge, MA: Department of Music, Harvard University (distributed by Harvard University Press).

Hilse, Walter. 1973. "The Treatises of Christoph Bernhard." *Music Forum*, vol. 3, ed. William Mitchell and Felix Selzer, 1–196. New York: Columbia University Press.

Hobohm, Wolf. 1973. "Neue 'Texte zur Leipziger Kirchen-Music.'" *Bach-Jahrbuch* 59: 5–32.

Hoffmann-Erbrecht, Lothar. 1950. "Bachs Weimarer Textdichter Salomo Franck." In *Bach in Thüringen: Festgabe zum Gedenkjahr 1950*, pp. 120–34. Weimar: Thüringer Volksverlag.

Hofmann, Klaus. 1982. "Bachs Kantate 'Ich lasse dich nicht, du segnest mich denn' BWV 157: Überlegungen zu Entstehung, Bestimmung und originaler Werkgestalt." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 68: 51–80.

———. 1993. "Neue Überlegungen zu Bachs Weimarer Kantaten-Kalendar." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 79: 9–29.

———. 1995. "'Großer Herr, o starker König: Ein Fanfarenthema bei Johann Sebastian Bach." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 81: 31–46

———. 1997. "Nochmals: Bachs Fanfarenthema." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 83: 177–79.

———. 1998. "Perfidia-Techniken und -Figuren bei Bach." In *Die Quellen Johann Sebastian Bachs; Bachs Musik im Gottesdienst*, ed. Renate Steiger, 281–99. Heidelberg: Manutius.

———. 1998a. "Auf der Suche nach der verlorenen Urfassung: Diskurs zur Vorgeschichte der Sonate in h-moll für Querflöte und obligates Cembalo von Johann Sebastian Bach." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 84: 31–62.

———. 1999. "Ein verschollenes Kammermusikwerk Johann Sebastian Bachs: Zur Fassungsgeschichte der Orgelsonate Es-Dur (BWV 525) und der Sonate A-Dur für Flöte und Cembalo (BWV 1032)." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 85: 67–79.

———. 2000. "Die Motette 'Lobet den Herrn, alle Heiden' (BWV 230): Alte und neue Probleme." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 86: 35–50.

———. 2002. "Anmerkungen zum Problem 'Picander-Jahrgang.'" *Bach-Jahrbuch* 88: 69–87.

———. 2004. "Zur Echtheit der Triosonate G-Dur BWV 1038." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 90: 65–85.

———. 2013. "Anmerkungen zu Bachs Kantate 'Mein Herze schwimmt im Blut' (BWV 199)." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 99: 206–21.

———. 2015. "Anmerkungen zu Bachs Kantate 'Ich hatte viel Bekümmernis' (BWV 21)." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 101: 168–76.

———. 2018. "Gehörte die Oboe da caccia zu Bach's Weimarer Kantateninstrumentarium?" *Bach-Jahrbuch* 104: 69–80.

Hoppe, Günther. 1986. "Köthener politische, ökonomische und höfische Verhältnisse als Schaffensbedingugen Bachs (Teil 1)." *Cöthener Bach-Hefte* 4: 13–39.

———. 2000. *Bach-Gedenkenstätte Schloss Köthen: Kleiner Führer durch die Ausstellung*. Köthen: Historisches Museum.
Hübner, Maria. 2002. "Zur financiellen Situation der Witwe Anna Magdalena Bach und ihrer Töchter." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 88: 245–55.

———. 2006. "Neues zu Johann Sebastian Bachs Reisen nach Karlsbad." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 92: 93–107.

———. 2018. "Die Kaffeehäuser von Gottfried Zimmermann und Enoch Richter in Leipzig." *Bach-Jahbruch* 104: 43–67.

Ishii, Akira. 2013. “Johann Sebastian Bach, Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach, and Johann Jacob Froberger: The Dissemination of Froberger’s Contrapuntal Works in Late Eighteenth-Century Berlin,” *BACH: The Journal of the Riemenschneider Bach Institute* 44/1: 46–133.

Jauernig, Reinhold. “Bach in Weimar.” 1950. In *Bach in Thüringen: Festgabe zum Gedenkjahr 1950*, 49–105. Weimar: Thüringer Volksverlag.

Jerold, Beverly. 2011. “The Bach-Scheibe Controversy: New Documentation.” *BACH Journal* 42/1: 1–45.

———. 2017. “Performance Conditions, Standards, and Bach’s Chorus.” *Musical Times* 158: 55–70.

Jones, Richard D. P. 2006–13. *The Creative Development of Johann Sebastian Bach*. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Karp, Karp. 1973. “Structural Details of Two J. H. Eichentopf Oboi da Caccia.” *Galpin Society Journal* 26: 55–57.

Kast, Paul. 1958. *Die Bach-Handschriften der Berliner Staatsbibliothek.* Trossingen: Hohner. Second, expanded edition as *Die Bach-Sammlung: Katalog und Register nach Paul Kast: Die Bach-Handschriften der Berliner Staatsbibliothek, 1958, vollständig erweitert und für die Mikrofiche-Edition ergänzt.* Edited by the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin–Preußische Kulturbesitz. Munich: Saur, 2003.

Kerman, Joseph. 2005. *Opera as Drama*. Revised fiftieth anniversary edition. Berkeley: University of California Press. First edition. New York: Knopf, 1956.

Kevorkian, Tanya. 2017. “Households.” In *The Routledge Research Companion to Johann Sebastian Bach*, ed. Robin A. Leaver, 99–115. Abingdon: Routledge.

———. Forthcoming. *Weddings, Rumbles, and Tower Musicians: Music and Urban Life in Baroque Germany*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.

Kirkendale, Ursula. 1980. “The Source for Bach's *Musical Offering*: The *Institutio oratoria* of Quintilian.” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 33: 88–141.
Kittel, Johann Christian. 1808. *Der angehende praktische Organist*. 3 vols. (the first expanded and correctred). Erfurt: Beyer und Maring.

Knoll, Mark W. 2016. “A Few Reflections on Bach’s Family.” In *The Sons of Bach: Essays for Elias N. Kulukundis*, ed. Peter Wollny and Stephen Roe, 270–88. Ann Arbor: Steglein.

Kobayashi, Yoshitake. 1988. “Zur Chronologie der Spätwerke Johann Sebastian Bachs Kompositions- und Aufführungstätigkeit von 1736 bis 1750.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 74: 7–72.

———. 1989.“Zur Teilung des Bachschen Erbes.” In *Acht kleine Präludien und Studien über Bach*, ed. Kirsten Beißwänger, 66–76. Wiesbaden: Breitkopf und Härtel.

———. 1995. “Quellenkundliche Überlegungen zur Chronologie der Weimarer Vokalwerke Bachs.” In *Das Frühwerk Johann Sebastian Bachs: Bach-Kolloquium Rostock 1990*, ed. Karl Heller and Hans-Joachim Schulze, 290–308. Cologne: Studio.

Koch, Ernst. 2006. “‘Jakobs Kirche’: Erkundungen im gottesdienstlichen Arbeitsfeld Johann Sebastian Bachs in Weimar.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 92: 37–64.

———. 2009. “‘Aus der Tieffen . . .’: Zum Entstehungskontext der Kantate BWV 131 von Johann Sebastian Bach.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 95: 75–94.

Kollmar, Ulrike. 2006. *Gottlob Harrer (1703–1755), Kapellmeister des Grafen Heinrich von Brühl am sächsisch-polnischen Hof und Thomaskantor in Leipzig: Mit einem Werkverzeichnis und einem Katalog der Notenbibliothek Harrers*. Beeskow: Ortus.

Koprowski, Richard. 1975. “Bach ‘Fingerprints’ in the Engraving of the Original Edition [of the *Art of Fugue*].” *Current Musiology* 19: 61–67.

Koster, John. 1996. “The Quest for Bach’s *Clavier:* An Historiographical Interpretation. *Early Keyboard Journal* 14: 65–84.

———. 1999. “The Harpsichord Culture in Bach’s Environs.” In *Bach Perspectives*, vol. 4, ed. David Schulenberg, 57–77. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. Reprinted in Peter Walls, ed., *Baroque Music.* Farnham: Ashgate, 2011.

Kottick, Edward L. 2003. *A History of the Harpsichord*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: University of Indiana Press.

Kraft, Günther. 1956. “Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des ‘Hochzeitsquodlibet’ (BWV 524).” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 43: 140–54.

Kramer, Richard. 1973. “Beethoven and Carl Heinrich Graun.” In *Beethoven Studies,* edited by Alan Tyson, 18–44. New York: Norton.

Krautwurst, Franz. 1986. “Anmerkungen zu den Augsburger Bach-Dokumentation.” In *Festschrift Martin Ruhnke zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by members of the Institute für Musikwissenschaft of the University of Erlangen-Nürnberg. Neuhausen-Stuttgart: Hänssler.

Kremer, Joachim. 1993. “Die Oraganistenstelle an St. Jakobi in Hamburg: Eine ‘convenable station’ für Johann Sebastian Bach?” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 79: 217–22.

Kretzschmar, Hermann. 1910. “Das Notenbuch der Zeumerin.” In *Jahrbuch der Musikbibliothek Peters für 1909*, ed. Rudolf Schwartz, 57–72. Leipzig: C. F. Peters.

Kulukundis, Elias N. 2016. “Johann Gottfried Bernhard Bach: Fact and Fiction—A Remembrance and Birthday Tribute.” In *The Sons of Bach: Essays for Elias N. Kulukundis*, ed. Peter Wollny and Stephen Roe, 260–69. Ann Arbor: Steglein.

Küster, Konrad. 1989. “Die Frankfurter und Leipziger Überlieferung der Kantaten Johann Ludwig Bachs,” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 75: 65–106.

———. 1996a. “‘Der Herr denket an uns’ BWV 1996: Eine frühe Bach-Kantate und ihr Kontext.” *Musik und Kirche* 66: 86–96.

———. 1996. *Der junge Bach*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt. Consulted as e-book. N.p.: Endeavour Press, 2015.

Lacher, Reimar F. 2005. *Friedrich Georg Weitsch (Braunschweig 1748–1828 Berlin): Maler, Kenner, Akademiker*. Berlin: Mann.

Landmann, Ortrun. 1983. *Die Telemann-Quellen der Sächsischen Landesbibliothek: Handschriften und zeitgenössische Druckausgaben seiner Werke*. Studien und Materialen zur Musikgeschichte Dresden, vol. 4. Dresden: Sächsische Landesbibliothek.

Langusch, Steffen. 2007. “‘. . . auf des Herrn Capellmeisters Bach recommendation . . .’: Bachs Mitwirken an der Besetzung des Kantorats der Altstadt Salzwedel 1743/44.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 93: 9–43.

Leaver, Robin A., ed. 1985. *J. S. Bach and Scripture: Glosses from the Calov Bible*. St. Louis: Concordia.

———. 1993. “Bach and the German Agnus Dei.” In *A Bach Tribute: Essays in Honor of William H. Scheide*, ed. Paul Brainard and Ray Robinson, 163–71. Kassel: Bärenreiter, and Chapel Hill: Hinshaw.

———. 2010. “Bach’s Organ Music in the Context of the Liturgy. *Keyboard Perspectives* 3: 147–60.

———. 2012. “The Organist Encounters the Hymnologist: J. S. Bach and J. C. Olearius in Arnstadt.” *Understanding Bach* 7: 21–28.

———. 2013. “Bachs lateinische Kantate ‘Gloria in excelsis Deo’ BWV 191 und eine lateinische Rede über Lukas 2:14.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 99: 329–34.

———. 2013a. “Bach’s Mass: ‘Catholic’ or ‘Lutheran’?.” In *Exploring Bach’s B-Minor Mass*, ed. Yo Tomita et al., 21–38. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2014. “Letter Codes Relating to Pitch and Key for Chorale Melodies and Bach’s Contributions to the Schemelli *Gesangbuch*.” *BACH Journal* 45/1: 15–33.

———. 2016. “Bach’s Choral-Buch? The Significance of a Manuscript in the Sibley Library.” In *Bach Perspectives*, vol. 10, ed. Matthew Dirst, 16–38. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

———. 2017. “Churches.” In *The Routledge Research Companion to Johann Sebastian Bach*, ed. Robin A. Leaver, 142–90. Abingdon: Routledge.

Leaver, Robin A., and Derek Remeš. 2018. “J. S. Bach’s Chorale-Based Pedagogy: Organs and Continuity.” *BACH Journal* 49/1: 116–50.

Ledbetter, David. 2002. *Bach’s Well-Tempered Clavier: The Forty-Eight Preludes and Fugues*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

———. 2009. Unaccompanied Bach: Performing the Solo Works. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Leonhardt, Gustav. 1952. *The Art of Fugue, Bach’s Last Harpsichord Work: An Argument*. The Hague: Nijhoff.

Levin, Robert D. 2010. Review of Karol Berger, *Bach’s Cycle, Mozart’s Arrow: An Essay on the Origins of Musical Modernity*. *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 63: 658–84.

Lockwood, Lewis. 2003. *Beethoven: The Music and the Life*. New York: Norton.

Lück, Heiner. 2011. “Calvinismus und Reformiertes Bekenntnis als Existenzgrundlagen für den Staat? Betrachungen zur frühneuzeitlichen Verfassungsgeschichte Anhalts.” In *Calvin und Calvinismus: Europäische Perspektiven*, ed. Irene Dingel and Herman Selderhuis , 47–66. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Lundberg, Mattias. 2011. *Tonus Peregrinus: The History of a Psalm-Tone and Its Use in Polyphonic Music.* Farnham: Ashgate.

McClary, Susan. 1987. “The Blasphemy of Talking Politics During Bach Year [1985].” In *Music and Society: The Politics of Composition, Performance, and Reception*, ed. Richard Leppert and Susan McClary, 13–62. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Marissen, Michael. 1985. “A Trio in C Major for Recorder, Violin, and Continuo by J. S. Bach?” *Early Music* 13: 384–90.

———. 1988. “A Critical Reappraisal of J. S. Bach’s A-Major Flute Sonata.” *Journal of Musicology* 6: 367–86.

———. 1992. “On Linking Bach’s F-Major Sinfonia and his Hunt Cantata.” *BACH Journal* 23/2: 31–46.

———. 1991. “Organological Questions and their Significance in J. S. Bach’s Fourth Brandenburg Concerto.” *Journal of the American Musical Instrument Society* 17: 5–52.

———. 1995. “The Theological Character of J. S. Bach’s Musical Offering.” In *Bach Studies 2*, ed. Daniel R. Melamed, 85–106. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1995a. “Bach and Recorders in G.” *Galpin Society Journal* 48: 199–204.

———. 1998. *Lutheranism, Anti-Judaism, and Bach’s St. John Passion.* New York: Oxford University Press.

———. 2003. “The Character and Sources of the Anti-Judaism in Bach's Cantata 46.” *Harvard Theological Review* 96: 63–99.

Marpurg, Friedrich Wilhelm. 1760–63. *Kritische Briefen über der Tonkunst*. 2 vols. Berlin: Birnstiel.

Marshall, Robert L. 1972. *The Compositional Process of J. S. Bach: A Study of the Autograph Scores of the Vocal Works*. 2 vols. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

———. 1986. “Organ or ‘Klavier’? Instrumental Prescriptions in the Sources of Bach's Keyboard Works.” In *J. S. Bach as Organist: His Instruments, Music, and Performance Practices*, ed. George Stauffer and Ernest May, 212–39. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

———. 2000. “Toward a Twenty-First-Century Bach Biography.” *Musical Quarterly* 84: 497–525.

———. 2017. “Father and Sons: Confronting a Uniquely Daunting Paternal Legacy.” In *Bach Perspectives*, vol. 11, edited by Mary Oleskiewicz, 1–23. Urbana, Chicago, and Springfield: University of Illinois Press.

Marshall, Traute. 2016. “Wo hat Bach die Celler Hofkapelle gehört?” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 102: 116–24.

Marshall, Robert L., and Traute M. Marshall. 2016. *Exploring the World of J. S. Bach: A Traveler’s Guide*. Urbana: University of Chicago Press.
Mattheson, Johann. 1713. *Das neu-eröffnete Orchestre*. Hamburg: Benjamin Schillers Wittwe.

———. 1717. *Das beschützte Orchestre*. Hamburg: Schiller.

———. 1719. *Exemplarische Organisten-Probe im Artikel vom General-Bass*. Hamburg: Schiller.

———. 1722–23 and 1725. *Critica musica*. Two volumes. Hamburg: Wierings Erben.

———. 1731. *Grosse General-Bass-Schule oder Organisten-Probe*. Hamburg.

———. 1739. *Der vollkommene Capellmeister*. Hamburg: Christian Herold. New edition by Friederike Ramm. Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1999. Translated by Ernest C. Harriss as *Johann*

Mattheson's Der vollkommene Capellmeister: *A Revised Translation with Critical Commentary*. Studies in Musicology, 21. Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Research Press, 1981.

———. 1740. *Grundlage einer Ehren-Pforte*. Hamburg: Author. Consulted in the quasi-facsimile edition by Max Schneider. Berlin: Liepmannssohn, 1910; reprint, Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1994.

Maul, Michael. 2001. "'Dein Ruhm wird wie ein Demantstein, ja wie ein fester Stahl beständig sein': Neues über die Beziehungen zwischen den Familien Stahl und Bach." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 87: 7–22.

———. 2004. "Johann Sebastian Bachs Besuche in der Residenzstadt Gera." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 90: 101–19.

———, ed. 2005. *J. S. Bach: Aria "Alles mit Gott und nichts ohn' ihn*." Kassel: Bärenreiter.

———. 2006. "Überlegungen zu einer Magnificat-Paraphrase und dem Leiter der Leipziger Kantatenaufführungen im Sommer 1725." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 92: 109–25.

———. 2007. "Neues zu Georg Balthasar Schott, seinem Collegium musicum und Bachs Zerbster Geburtstagskantate. *Bach-Jahrbuch* 93: 61–103.

———. 2010. "Johann Adolph Scheibes Bach-Kritik: Hintergründe und Schauplätze einer musikalischen Kontroverse." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 96: 154–98.

———. 2013. "'welche ieder Zeir aus den 8 besten Subjectis bestehen muß: Die erste 'Cantorey' der Thomasschule: Organisation, Aufgaben, Fragen." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 99: 11–77.

———. 2013a. "'The Great Catholic Mass': Bach, Count Questenberg, and the Musicalische Congregation in Vienna." In *Exploring Bach's B-Minor Mass*, ed. Yo Tomita et al., 84–104. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2013b. "Bach versus Scheibe: Hitherto Unknown Battlegrounds in a Famous Conflict." In *Bach Perspectives*, vol. 9, ed. Andrew Talle, 120–43. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

———. 2017. "'Having to Perform and Direct the Music in the Capellmeister's Stead for Two Whole Years': Observations on How Bach Understood His Post During the 1740s." *Understanding Bach* 12: 37–58.

———. 2018. *Bach's Famous Choir: The Saint Thomas School in Leipzig, 1212–1804*. Translation by Richard Howe of *'Dero berühmter Chor': Die Leipziger Thomasschule und ihre Kantoren, 1212–1804* (Leipzig: Lehmstedt, 2012). Woodbridge: Boydell Press.

Maul, Michael, and Peter Wollny. 2003. "Quellenkundliches zu Bach-Aufführungen in Köthen, Ronneburg und Leipzig zwischen 1720 und 1760." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 89: 97–141.

Maurer-Schmook, Sybille. 1982. *Deutsches Theater im 18. Jahrhundert*. Tübingen: Max Niemayer.

May, Ernest. 1996. “Connections Between Breitkopf and J. S. Bach.” In *Bach Perspectives*, vol. 2, ed. George B. Stauffer, 11–26. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Melamed, Daniel R. 1988. “The Authorship of the Motet ‘Ich lasse dich nicht’ (BWV Anh. 159). *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 41: 491–526.

———. 1995. *J. S. Bach and the German Motet*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1996. “J. F. Doles's Setting of a Picander Libretto and J. S. Bach's Teaching of Vocal Composition.” *Journal of Musicology* 14: 453–74.

———. 1999. “Constructing Johann Christoph Bach (1642–1703).” *Music & Letters* 80: 345–65.

———. 2002. “Die alte Chorbibliothek der Kirche Divi Blasii zu Mühlhausen.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 88: 210–16.

———. 2002a. “Bachs Aufführung der Hamburger Markus-Passion in den 1740er Jahren. In *Bach in Leipzig—Bach und Leipzig: Bach-Konferenz Leipzig 2000*, ed. Ulrich Leisinger (Leipziger Beiträge zur Bachforschung, 5), 289–308. Hildesheim: Olms.

———. 2004. “The Double Chorus in J. S. Bach’s *St. Matthew Passion* BWV 244.” *Journal of the American Bach Society* 57: 3–50.

———. 2005. *Hearing Bach’s Passions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2006. “Hat Johann Sebastian Bach die Lukas-Passion BWV 246 aufgeführt?” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 92: 161–69.

———. 2008. “The Evolution of ‘Und wenn die Welt voll Teufel wär.’” In *The Century of Bach and Mozart: Perspectives on Historiography, Composition, Theory, and Performance*, edited by Sean Gallagher and Thomas Forrest Kelly, 189–205. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Department of Music (distributed by Harvard University Press).

———. 2008a. “Bachs Schwester.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 94: 337–41.

———. 2011. “Johann Sebastian Bach and Barthold Heinrich Brockes.” In *Bach Perspectives*, vol. 8, ed. Daniel R. Melamed, 13–41. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

———. 2012. “Johann Sebastian Bach, Johann Gottfried Walther und die Musik von Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 98: 74–93.

———. 2014. “Multi-Day Passions and J. S. Bach’s *Christmas Oratorio*, BWV 248.” *Eighteenth-Century Music* 11: 215–34.

———. 2017. “How did *Aus Liebe* Get to be So Slow?” Paper presented at *Historical Performance: Theory, Practice, and Interdiscipinarity: Second Annual Conference Hosted by the Historical Performance Institute of the Indiana University Jacobs School of Music*, May 21, 2017. Abstract at https://music.indiana.edu/departments/academic/early-music/2017_HPI_Conf_Prog.pdf, pp. 29–30.

———. 2018. *Listening to Bach: The* Mass in B Minor *and the* Christmas Oratorio. New York: Oxford University Press, 2018.

———. 2021. “‘Parallel Proportions’ in J. S. Bach’s Music.” *Eighteenth-Century Music* 18 (2021): 99–121.

Melamed, Daniel R., and Michael Marissen. 1998. *An Introduction to Bach Studies.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Milka, Anatoly. 2014. “Warum endet die *Fuga a 3 soggetti* BWV 1080/19 in Takt 239?” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 100: 11–26.

———. 2017. *Rethinking J. S. Bach’s* The Art of Fugue. Trans. Marina Ritzarev. Ed. Esti Sheinberg. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.

Mizler von Kolof, Lorenz Christoph. 1738–54. *Musikalische Bibliothek, oder Gründliche Nachricht nebst unpartheyischem Urtheil von alten nd neuen musikalischen Schriften und Büchern*. 3 volumes in multiple parts, issued serially. Leipzig.

Neumann, Werner. 1950. *J. S. Bachs Chorfuge*. 2d edn. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel. Originally published 1938.

———. 1960. “Das ‘Bachische Collegium Musicum.’” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 47: 5–27.

———, ed. 1974. *Sämtliche von Johann Sebastian Bach vertonte Texte*. Leipzig: VEB Deutscher Verlag für Musik.

Nisbet, Hugh Barr (Barry). 1969. Review of Joachim Birke, *Christian Wolffs Metaphysik und die zeitgenössische Literatur- und Musiktheorie: Gottsched, Scheibe, Mizler*. In *Modern Language Review* 64: 220–21.

Odruch, Evelin, and Peter Wollny, eds. 2000. *Die Briefentwürfe des Johann Elias Bach (1705-1755)*. With contributions on the life and activities of Johann Elias Bach by Hans-Joachim Schulze et al. Hildesheim: Olms.

Oleskiewicz, Mary. 1998. “Quantz and the Flute at Dresden: His Instruments, His Repertory, and Their Significance for the *Versuch* and the Bach Circle.” Ph.D. diss., Duke University.

———. 1999. “The Trio in Bach’s Musical Offering: A Salute to Frederick’s Tastes and Quantz’s Flutes?” In *Bach Perspectives*, vol. 4, ed. David Schulenberg, 79–110. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

———. 2000. “The Flutes of Quantz: Their Construction and Performing Practice.” *Galpin Society Journal* 53: 201–20.

———. 2007. “‘For the Church As Well As For the Orchestra’: J. S. Bach, the *Missa*, and the Dresden Court, 1700–1750.” *BACH Journal* 38/2: 1–38.

———. 2007a. “Like Father, Like Son? Emanuel Bach and the Writing of Biography.” In *Music and Its Questions: Essays in Honor of Peter Williams*, ed. Thomas Donahue, 253–79. Richmond, Va.: OHS Press.

———. 2011. “The Court of Brandenburg-Prussia.” In *Music at German Courts, 1715–1760: Changing Artistic Priorities,* edited by Samantha Owens, Barbara M. Reul, and Janice B. Stockigt, 79–130. Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer.

———. 2013. “Quantz, Agricola und die Überlieferung von Händels Instrumentalmusik in Dresden und Berlin.” In *Telemann und Händel: Musikerbeziehungen im 18. Jahrhundert*, ed. Carsten Lange and Brit Reipsch, 192–226. Hildesheim: Olms.

———. 2017. “Keyboards, Music Rooms, and the Bach Family at the Court of Frederick the Great.” In *Bach Perspectives*, vol. 11, edited by Mary Oleskiewicz, 24–82. Urbana, Chicago, and Springfield: University of Illinois Press.

Otto, Rüdiger. 2007. “Ein Leipziger Dichterstreit: Die Auseinandersetzung Gottscheds mit Christian Friedrich Henrici.” In *Johann Christoph Gottsched in seiner Zeit: Neue Beiträge zu Leben, Werk und Wirkung*, ed. Manfred Rudersdorf, 92–142. Berlin: De Gruyter.
Paczkowski, Simon. 2017. *Polish Style in the Music of Johann Sebastian Bach*. Trans. Piotr Szymcza. Lanham: Roman & Littlefield.

Parrott, Andrew. 2000. *The Essential Bach Choir*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press.

Peters, Mark A. 2008. *A Woman’s Voice in Baroque Music: Mariane von Ziegler and J. S. Bach*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Petzoldt, Martin. 1998. “Bachs Prüfung vor dem Kurfürstlichen Konsistorium zu Leipzig.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 84: 19–30.

Pfau, Marc-Roderich. 2008. “Ein unbekanntes Leipziger Kantatentextheft aus dem Jahr 1735: Neues zum Thema Bach und Stölzel.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 94: 99–115.

———. 2015. “Entstanden Bachs vier späte Choralkantaten ‘per omnes versus’ für Gottesdienste des Weißenfelser Hofes?” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 101: 341–49.

———. 2018. “Telemanns *Probe-Music* für das Leipziger Thomaskantorat im Jahr 1722.”*Bach-Jahrbuch* 104: 95–111.

Picanders ernst-scherzthafft und satyrische Gedichte. 1727–32. 3 vols. Leipzig: Johann Theodor Boetio [and daughter], 1727, 1729, 1732.

Plamenac, Dragan. 1949. “New Light on the Last Years of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach.” *Musical Quarterly* 35: 565–87.

Plichta, Alois. 1981. “Johann Sebastian Bach und Johann Adam Graf von Questenberg.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 64: 24–30.

Poetzsch-Seban, Ute, ed. 2004. *Georg Philipp Telemann: Musikalische Werke: Geistliches Singen und Spielen: Kantaten vom 1. Advent bis zum Sonntag nach Weihnachten*. Georg Philipp Telemann: Musikalische Werke, vol. 39. Kassel: Bärenreiter.

———. 2006. *Die Kirchenmusik von Georg Philipp Telemann und Erdmann Neumeister: Zur Geschichte der protestantischen Kirchenkantate in der ersten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts*. Beeskow: Ortus.

Potter, Edward T. 2012. *Marriage, Gender, and Desire in Early Enlightenment German Comedy*. Rochester: Boydell & Brewer.

Printz, Wolfgang Caspar. 1676–77. *Phrynis oder Satyrischer Componist*. 2 vols. Quedlinburg (vol. 1) and and Sagan (Żagań) (vol. 2): Christian Ofels. Second edition in one volume. Dresden and Leipzig: Christoph Zimmermann, 1696.

Ranft, Eva-Maria. 1985. “Ein unbekannter Aufenthalt Johann Sebastian Bachs in Gotha?” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 71: 165–66.

Rathey, Markus. 2006. “Zur Datierung einiger Vokalwerke Bachs in den Jahren 1707 und 1708.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 92: 65–92.

———. 2012. “The Chorale Cantata in Leipzig: The Collaboration Between Schelle and Carpzov in 1689–1690 and Bach’s Chorale Cantata Cycle.” *BACH Journal* 43/2: 46–92.

———. 2012a. “Johann Sebastian Bach’s Passions: Recent Publications and Trends in Current Scholarship.” *BACH Journal* 43/1: 65–83.

———. 2013. “Zur Entstehungsgeschichte von Bachs Universitätsmusik ‘Gloria in excelsis Deo’ BWV 191.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 99: 319–28.

———. 2016. *Johann Sebastian Bach’s Christmas Oratorio: Music, Theology, Culture*. New York: Oxford University Press.

———. 2016a. *Bach's Major Vocal Works: Music, Drama, Liturgy*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

———. 2016b. "Printing, Politics, and 'A Well-Regulated Church Music': A New Perspective on J. S. Bach's Mühlhausen Cantatas." *Early Music* 44: 449–60.

Remeš, Derek. 2017. "J. S. Bach's Chorales: Reconstructing Eighteenth-Century German Figured-Bass Pedagogy in Light of a New Source." *Theory and Practice* 42: 29–53. Also published on the author's website (http://derekremes.com).

Reul, Barbara. 2011. "'Forgive Us Our Debts': Viewing the Life and Career of Johann Friedrich Fasch (1688–1758) Through the Lens of Finance." *Eighteenth-Century Music* 8: 261–86.

Richter, Bernhard Friedrich. 1902. "Eine Abhandlung Joh. Kuhnaus." *Monatshefte für Musik-Geschichte* 34: 147–154.

Rifkin, Joshua. 1975. "The Chronology of Bach's Saint Matthew Passion." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 61: 360–87.

———. 1978. "Ein langsamer Konzertsatz Johann Sebastian Bachs." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 64: 140–47.

———. 1982. "Bach's Chorus: A Preliminary Report." *Musical Times* 123: 747–54.

———. 1982a. Liner note to *J. S. Bach: Mass in B Minor*. The Bach Ensemble, directed by Joshua Rifkin. New York: Nonesuch, 1982. Consulted in the unpaginated booklet accompanying a 1992 CD re-release from the same label.

———. 1983. Liner note to *J. S. Bach: Oboe Concertos*. The Bach Ensemble, directed by Joshua Rifkin. Minneapolis: Pro-Arte.

———. 1986. "Bach's 'Orchestre.'" *Early Music* 14: 566–67.

———. 1988. Review of *Johann Sebastian Bach: Messe in h-moll: Faksimile-Lichtdruck des Autographs*, ed. Alfred Dürr, with commentary by Hans-Joachim Schulze. *Notes* 44: 787–98. The work reviewed is listed below as Schulze (1983).

———. 1988a. Liner note to *Bach, Vivaldi, Telemann: Violin Concertos*. The Bach Ensemble, directed by Joshua Rifkin. London: Decca.

———. 1989. Liner note to *Johann Sebastian Bach: Cantata BWV 8 [etc.]*. The Bach Ensemble, directed by Joshua Rifkin. London: Decca.

———. 1997a. "Besetzung—Entstehung—Überlieferung: Bemerkungen zur Ouvertüre BWV 1068." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 83: 170–76.

———. 1997b. “Verlorene Quellen, verlorene Werke: Miszellen zu Bachs Instrumentalkompositionen.” In *Bachs Orchesterwerke: Bericht über das 1. Dortmunder Bach-Symposion 1996*, ed. Martin Geck et al., 59–75. Witten: Klangrfarben.

———. 1999. “Zur Bearbeitungsgeschichte der Kantate ‘Wachet! betet! betet! wachet!’ (BWV 70).” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 85: 127–32.

———. 2000. “Siegesjubel und Satzfehler: Zum Problem von ‘Nun ist das Heil und die Kraft’ (BWV 50).” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 86: 68–86.

———. 2000a. “Bach’s Chorus.” Appendix 6 in Andrew Parrott, *The Essential Bach Choir*, 189–211. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2000.

———. 2002. *Bach’s Choral Ideal*. Dortmund: Klangfarbes Musikverlag.

———. 2002a. “Eine schwierige Stelle in der h-Moll-Messe.” In *Bach in Leipzig—Bach und Leipzig: Bach-Konferenz Leipzig 2000*, ed. Ulrich Leisinger (Leipziger Beiträge zur Bachforschung, 5), 321–31. Hildesheim: Olms.

———. 2003. “Bach’s Chorus: Some New Parts, Some New Questions.” *Early Music* 31: 573–80.

———, ed. 2006. *J. S. Bach: Messe h-moll / Mass in B Minor*. Wiesbaden: Breitkopf und Härtel.

———. 2007. “The ‘B-Minor Flute Suite’ Deconstructed: New Light on Bach’s Ouverture BWV 1067.” In *Bach Perspectives*, vol. 6, ed. Gregory G. Butler, 1–98. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
———. 2008. “Notenformen und Nachtragsstimmen: Zur Chronologie der Kantaten ‘Die Himmel erzählen die Ehre Gottes’ BWV 76 und ‘Also hat Gott die Welt eliebt’ BWV 68.” *Bach-Jahrbuch*: 203–28.

———. 2011. “Blinding Us With Science? Man, Machine, and the Mass in B Minor.” *Eighteenth-Century Music* 8: 77–91.

———. 2012. “Chorliste und Chorgröße bei Johann Sebastian Bach: Neue Überlegungen zu einem alten Thema.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 98: 121–43.

Roe, Stephen. 2016. “Johann Christian Bach and Cecilia Grassi: The Publication of *Amadis de Gaule*.” In *The Sons of Bach: Essays for Elias N. Kulukundis*, ed. Peter Wollny and Stephen Roe, 158–73. Ann Arbor: Steglein.

Rollberg, Fritz. 1927. “Johann Ambrosius Bach: Stadtpfeifer zu Eisenach von 1671–1695.” *Bach Jahrbuch* 24: 133–52.

Rosand, Ellen. 1979. “The Descending Tetrachord: An Emblem of Lament.” *Musical Quarterly* 65 : 346–59.

Rose, Stephen. 2011. *The Musician in Literature in the Age of Bach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rosen, Charles. 1997. *The Classical Style: Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven.* "Expanded edition." New York: Norton (originally published 1971).

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

Sassoon, Humphrey F. 2003. "Royal Peculiar: J. S. Bach's Musical Offering and the Source of Its Theme." *Musical Times* 144: 38–39.

Schabalina, Tatjana. 2008. "'Texte zur Musik' in Sankt Petersburg: Neue Quellen zur Leipziger Musikgeschichte sowie zur Kompositions- und Aufführungstätigkeit Johann Sebastian Bachs." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 94: 33–98.

———. 2009. "'Texte zur Music' in Sankt Petersburg: Weitere Funde." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 95: 11–48.

———. 2012. "Die 'Leges' des 'Neu aufgerichteten Collegium musicum' (1729): Ein unbekanntes Dokument zur Leipziger Musikgeschichte." *Bach-Jahrbuch*: 107–19.

For this author see also below under "Shabalina."

Scheibe, Johann Adoph. 1738–40. *Der kritische Musicus*. 2 vols. Hamburg: Wierings Erben.
———. 1745. *Critischer Musikus*. Neue, vermehrte und verbesserte Auflage. Leipzig: Bernhard Christoph Breitkopf.

Scheide, William H. 2001. "Nochmals BWV 50 'Nun ist das heil und die Kraft.'" *Bach-Jahrbuch* 87: 117–30.

Schering, Arnold. 1902–3. "Zur Bach-Forschung." *Sammelbände der Internationalen Musik-Gesellschaft* 4: 565–70.

———, ed. 1918. *Sebastian Knüpfer, Johann Schelle, Johann Kuhnau: Ausgewählte Kirchenkantaten*. Denkmäler deutscher Tonkunst, vol. 58–59. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel.

———. 1936. "Die hohe Messe in h-moll: Eine Huldigungsmusik und Krönungsmesse för Friedrich August II." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 33: 1–30.

———. 1941. *Musikgeschichte Leipzigs*. Volume 3: *Johann Sebastian Bach und das Musikleben Leipzigs im 18. Jahrhundert*. Leipzig: Kistner & Siegel.

Schiffner, Markus. 1985. "Johann Sebastian Bach in Arnstadt." *Beiträge zur Bach-Forschung* 4: 5–21.

———. 1988. “Die Arnstädter Hofkapelle: Regionales Zentrum der Musikpflege im historischen und zeitgenössischen Umfeld des jungen Bach.” *Beiträge zur Bach-Forschung* 6: 37–53.

Schröder, Dorothea. 2012. *Johann Sebastian Bach*. Munich: Beck.

Schröder, Karl Ernst. 1995. “Zum Trio A-Dur BWV 1025.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 81: 47–60.

Schubart, Christoph. 1953. “Anna Magdalena Bach: Neue Beiträge zu ihrer Herkunft und ihren Jugendjahren.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 40: 29–50.

Schulenberg, David. 1986. “Modes, Prolongations, and Analysis.” *Journal of Musicology* 4: 303–29.

———. 1992. “An Eighteenth-Century Composer Confronts Music History and Criticism: C. P. E. Bach and Handel.” *Bach* Journal 23/2: 5–30.

———. 1995. “‘Musical Allegory’ Reconsidered: Representation and Imagination in the Baroque.” *Journal of Musicology* 13: 203–39.

———. 1999. “Tempo Relationships in the Prelude of Bach’s Sixth English Suite: A Performance-Studies Approach,” *Journal of Musicological Research* 18: 139–60

———. 2006. *The Keyboard Music of J. S. Bach*. 2d, revised edition. New York: Routledge.

———. 2007. “Why We Know So Little About Bach’s Early Works: A Case Study (Two Keyboard Fugues).” In *Music and Its Questions: Essays in Honor of Peter Williams*, ed. Thomas Donahue, 169–203. Richmond: Organ Historical Society Press.

———. 2008.“The *Sonate auf Concertenart:* A Postmodern Invention?” In *Bach Perspectives*, vol. 7, edited by Gregory Butler, 55–96. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press..

———. 2008a. “Fugues, Form, and Fingering: Sonata Style in Bach’s Preludes and Fugues.” In *Variations on the Canon: Essays in Musical Interpretation from Bach to Boulez in Honor of Charles Rosen on his Eightieth Birthday*, edited by Robert Curry, David Gable, and Robert L. Marshall, 12–21. Rochester: University of Rochester Press.

———. 2010. *The Music of Wilhelm Friedemann Bach*. Rochester: University of Rochester Press.

———. 2010a. “An Enigmatic Legacy: Two Instrumental Works Attributed to Wilhelm Friedemann Bach.” *Bach* Journal 41/2: 24–60.

———. 2010b. “Editing Bach’s ‘Preludes and Fugues’ for Organ.” *Organ Yearbook* 39: 59–72.

———. 2011. “An Enigmatic Legacy: Organ Music and the Berlin Bach Traditions.” *Keyboard Perspectives* 4: 153–74.

———. 2011a. “Modifying the Da Capo? Through-Composed Arias in Vocal Works by Bach and Other Composers.” *Eighteenth-Century Music* 8: 21–51.

———, ed. 2013–14. *Johann Sebastian Bach: Sämtliche Orgelwerke*. Volumes 1–2. Wiesbaden: Breitkopf und Härtel.

———. 2014. *The Music of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach*. Rochester: University of Rochester Press.

———. 2017. “Expression and *Discrétion:* Bach and Froberger.” *Bach Notes*, no. 26: 5–8 (online).

Schulze, Hans-Joachim. 1979. “Ein ‘Dresdner Menuett’ im zweiten Klavierbüchlein der Anna Magdalena Bach: Nebst Hinweisen zur Überlieferung einiger Kammermusikwerke Bachs.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 65: 45–64.

———. 1981. “Johann Sebastian Bachs Konzert: Fragen der Überlieferung und Chronologie.” In *Beiträge zum Konzertschaffen Johann Sebastian Bachs*, ed. Peter Ahnsehl, 9–26. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel..

———. 1983. Commentary to *Johann Sebastian Bach: Missa h-Moll BWV 232: Faksimile nach dem Originalstimmensatz der Sächsischen Landesbibliothek Dresden*. Neuhausen-Stuttgart: Hänssler.

———. 1984. *Studien zur Bach-Überlieferung im 18. Jahrhundert*. Leipzig: Edition Peters.

———. 1984a. “Bachs Helfer bei der Leipziger Kirchenmusik.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 70: 46–52.

———. 1985. “Besitzstand und Vermögensverhältnisse von Leipziger Ratsmusikern zur Zeit Johann Sebastian Bachs.” *Beiträge zur Bachforschung* 4: 33–46.

———. 1985a. “Johann Christoph Bach (1671–1721): ‘Organist und Schul Collega in Ohrdruf,’ Johann Sebastian Bachs erster Lehrer.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 71: 55–81.

———. 1985b. *Ey! wie schmeckt der Coffee süsse: Johann Sebastian Bachs Kaffee-Kantate in ihrer Zeit.* Leipzig: Verlag für die Frau.

———, ed. 1985c. *Die Thomasschule Leipzig zur Zeit Johann Sebastian Bachs: Ordnungen und Gesetze 1634, 1723, 1733*. Leipzig: Zentralantiquariat der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik.

———. 1999. “Texte und Textdichter.” In *Die Welt der Bach-Kantaten*, ed. Christoph Wolff, vol. 3, pp. 109–25. Stuttgart: Metzler.

———. 2006. *Die Bach-Kantaten: Einführungen zu sämtlichen Kantaten Johann Sebastian Bachs*. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt; and Stuttgart: Carus.

———. 2008. "Johann Friedrich Schweinitz, 'A Disciple of the Famous Herr Bach in Leipzig.'" In *About Bach*, ed. Gregory G. Butler, et al., 81–88. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

———. 2010. "Rätselhafte Auftragswerke Johann Sebastian Bachs: Anmerkungen zu einigen Kantatentexten." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 96: 69–93.

———. 2011. "Die Bach-Kantate 'Nach dir, Herr, verlanget mich' und ihr Meckbach-Akrostichon." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 97: 255–57.

———. 2013. "Anna Magdalena Wilcke: Gesangsschülerin der *Paulina*?" *Bach-Jahrbuch* 99: 279–95.

Scott-Prelorentzos, Alison. 1982. *The Servant in German Enlightenment Comedy*. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press.

Schweitzer, Albert. 1905. *J. S. Bach le musicien-poète*. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel. English translation by Ernest Newman as *J. S. Bach*. Leipzig and New York: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1911.

Schwinger, Tobias. 2012. "Der preußische Hofkomponist Johann Friedrich Agricola in seiner Rolle als Kirchenkomponist für die Kirche St. Petri in Berlin." In *Wilhelm Friedemann Bach und die protestantische Kirchenkantate nach 1750*, ed. Wolfgang Hirschmann and Peter Wollny, 195–220. Beeskow: Ortus.

Seiffert, Max. 1907–8. "Die Chorbibliothek der St. Michaelisschule in Lüneburg zu Seb. Bach's Ziet." *Sammelbände der Internationalen Musikgesellschaft* 9: 593–621.

Serauky, Walter. 1935–43. *Musikgeschichte der Stadt Halle*. 2 vols. Halle: Waisenhaus.

Shabalina, Tatiana. 2014. "Discoveries in St. Petersburg: New Perspectives on Bach and Poland. *Understanding Bach* 9: 25–48.

Sheldon, David A. 1975. "The Galant Style Revisited and Re-Evaluated." *Acta musicologica* 47: 240–70.

Shepherd, Alan. 2021. *Let's Calculate Bach: Applying Information Theory and Statistics to Numbers in Music*. Cham (Switzerland): Springer, 2021.

Siegele, Ulrich. 1983, 1984, 1985. "Bachs Stellung in der Leipziger Kulturpolitik seiner Zeit." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 69 (1983): 7–50; 70 (1984): 7–43; and 71 (1985): 63–77.

———. 2013. "Some Obserations on the Formal Design of Bach's B-Minor Mass." In *Exploring Bach's B-Minor Mass*, ed. Yo Tomita et al., 107–24. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Smend, Friedrich. 1926. “Die Johannes-Passion von Bach auf ihren Bau untersucht.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 23: 105–28.

———. 1928. “Bachs Matthäus-Passion: Untersuchungen zur Geschicht des Werkes bis 1750.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 25: 1–95.

———. 1951. *Bach in Köthen*. Berlin: Christlicher Zeitschriftenverlag.. Translated by John Page as *Bach in Köthen*, with annotations by Stephen Daw. St. Louis: Concordia, 1985.

Smend, Julius. 1921. “Predigt im Festgottesdienst in der St. Michaelis-Kirche zu Hamburg am Sonntag, den 5. Juni 1921, anläßlich des Neunten Deutschen Bachfestes.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 18: 1–8.

Smith, Mark. 1998. “Joh. Seb. Bachs Violoncello piccolo: Neue Aspekte—offene Fragen.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 84: 63–81.

Snyder, Kerala. 2007. *Dieterich Buxtehude: Organist in Lübeck*. Rev.edn. Rochester: University of Rochester Press.

Speerstra, Joel. 2004. *Bach and the Pedal Clavichord: An Organist’s Guide*. Rochester: University of Rochester Press.

Spitta, Philipp. 1873–80. *Johann Sebastian Bach*. 2 vols. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel. Trans. Clara Bell and J. A. Fuller-Maitland as *Johann Sebastian Bach: His Life and Influence on the Music of Germany, 1685–1750*. 3 vols. London: Novello, 1889; reprint in 2 vols., New York: Dover, 1952.

Sposato, Jeffrey S. 2018. *Leipzig after Bach: Church and Concert Life in a German City*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Stauffer, George B. 1996. “The Thomasschule and the Haus ‘zum Goldenen Bären’: A Bach-Breitopf Architectural Connection.” In *Bach Perspectives*, vol. 2, ed. George B. Stauffer, 181–203. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

———. 2008. “Music for ‘Cavaliers et Dames’: Bach and the Repertoire of His Collegium Musicum.” In *About Bach*, ed. Gregory G. Butler, et al., 135–56. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

———. 2010. “Bach’s Late Works and the Central German Organ.” *Keyboard Perspectives* 3: 113–30.

———. 2016. “Miscellaneous Organ Trios from Bach’s Leipzig Workshop.” In *Bach Perspectives*, vol. 10, ed. Matthew Dirst, 39–59. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Steiger, Renate. 1989. "'Amen, amen! Komm du schöne Freudenkrone': Zum Schlußsatz von BWV 61." *Musik und Kirche* 59: 246–51.

Stevens, Jane R. 1971. "An Eighteenth-Century Description of Concerto First-Movement Form." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 24: 85–95.

———. 2001. *The Bach Family and the Keyboard Concerto: The Evolution of a Genre*. Warren, Mich.: Harmonie Park Press.

Stiehl, Herbert. 1984. "Das Innere der Thomaskirche zur Amtszeit Johann Sebstian Bachs." *Beiträge zur Bachforschung* 3: 5–96.

Stinson, Russell. 1993. "Some Thoughts on Bach's Neumeister Chorales." *Journal of Musicology* 11: 455–77.

———. 1996. *Bach: The Orgelbüchlein*. New York: Schirmer Books.

Stockigt, Janice B. 2013. "Bach's *Missa* BWV 232[I] in the Context of Catholic Mass Settings in Dresden, 1729–1733." In *Exploring Bach's B-Minor Mass*, ed. Yo Tomita et al., 39–53. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2018. "Liturgical Music for a New Elector: Origins of Bach's 1733 Missa Revisited." In *Bach Perspectives*, vol. 12, ed. Robin A. Leaver, 63–83. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
Straus, Joseph N. 1986. "Recompositions by Schoenberg, Stravinsky, and Webern." *Musical Quarterly* 72: 301–28.

Suchalla, Ernst, ed. 1994. *Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach: Briefe und Dokumente: Kritische Gesamtausgabe*. 2 vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Swack, Jeanne. 1995. "Quantz and the Sonata in E-flat Major for Flute and Cembalo, BWV 1031." *Early Music* 23: 31-53.

———. 1999. "Modular Structure and the Recognition of Ritornello in Bach's Brandenburg Concertos." In *Bach Perspectives*, vol. 4, ed. David Schulenberg, 33–53. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Talle, Andrew. 2003. "Nürnberg, Darmstadt, Köthen: Neuerkenntnisse zur Bach-Überlieferung in der ersten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts/ *Bach-Jahrbuch* 89: 143–72.

Tarkkanen, Ahti. 2013. "Blindness of Johann Sebastian Bach." *Acta ophthalmologica* 91: 191–92.

Tatlow, Ruth. 2000. Liner notes to *J. S. Bach: Cantatas* [BWV 72, 73, 111, 156]. The Monteverdi Choir and The English Bach Soloists, directed by John Eliot Gardiner. Hamburg: Deutsche Grammophon.

———. 2015. *Bach's Numbers: Compositional Proportion and Significance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Telemann, Georg Philipp. 1972. *Briefwechsel: Sämtliche erreichbare Briefe von und an Telemann*. Ed. Hans Grosse and Hans Rudolf Jung. Leipzig: VEB Deutscher Verlag für Musik. Commentaries for the 126 letters are divided between the two editors, those in the first four sections being by Grosse, the remainder by Jung.

Terry, Charles Sanford. 1933. *Bach: A Biography*. 2d, rev. ed. London: Oxford University Press.

Thayer, Alexander Wheelock. 1969. *Life of Beethoven.* Translated by Henry Edward Krehbiel. Revised and edited by Elliot Forbes as *Thayer's Life of Beethoven*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Thielemann, Arne. 2012. "Zur Identifizierung des Magnificats BWV Anh. 30 aus Johann Sebastian Bachs Notenbibliothek." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 98: 217–23.

Tiggemann, Hildegard. 1994. "Unbekannte Textdrucke zu drei Gelegenheitskantaten J. S. Bachs aus dem Jahre 1729." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 80: 7–22.

Tomita, Yo. 2005. "The Simrock Edition of the Well-Tempered Clavier II." "First published online in April 2005; last revised on 25 November 2017" <http://www.mu.qub.ac.uk/tomita/essay/simrock/>

———. 2007. "Anna Magdalena as Bach's Copyist." *Understanding Bach* 2: 59–76.

Tosi, Pier Francesco. 1723. *Opinioni de' cantori antichi e moderni*. Bologna. Expanded German translation by Johann Friedrich Agricola as *Anleitung zur Singkunst.* Berlin, 1757. Annotated English translation by Julianne C. Baird as *Introduction to the Art of Singing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Towe, Teri Noel. 2002. "The Portrait of Bach that Belonged to Kittel." *The Tracker* 46/4: 14–18.

———. 2009. "The Face of Bach: The Queens College Lecture of March 21, 2001." Online, multiple pages beginning at http://www.bach-cantatas.com/thefaceofbach/QCL09.htm.

Treitler, Leo. 2015. "Speaking of the I-Word." *Archiv für Musikwissenschaft* 72: 1–18.

Vanscheeuwijck, Marc. 2008. "Una crisi in ambiente musicale bolognese: La polemica fra Giovanni Paolo Colonna e Arcangelo Corelli (1685)." In *Barocco padano*, vol. 5, ed. Alberto Colzani et al., 441–53. Como: Antiquae Musicae Italicae Studiosi.

———. 2010. "Recent Re-evaluations of the Baroque Cello and What They Might Mean for Performing the Music of J. S. Bach." *Early Music* 38: 181–92.

[Voltaire, pen name of François-Marie Arouet]. 1764. *Essai sur l'histoire générale . . . nouvelle edition . . . tome second*. Amsterdam.

Walther, Johann Gottfried. 1732. *Musicalisches Lexicon*. Leipzig: Wolffgang Deer.

———. 1955. *Praecepta der musicalischen Composition*. Ed. Peter Benary. Leipzig: VEB Breitkopf und Härtel.. The original manuscript (Weimar, Landesbibliothek, Hs Q 341c) is dated March 1708.

———. 1987. *Briefe*. Ed. Klaus Beckmann and Hans-Joachim Schulze. Leipzig: VEB Deutscher Verlag für Musik.

Welter, Kathryn. 2008. "A Master Teacher Revealed: Johann Pachelbel's *Deutliche Anweisung*." In *About Bach*, ed. Gregory G. Butler, George B. Stauffer, and Mary Dalton Greer, 3–13. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Wiemer, Wolfgang. 1979. "Johann Heinrich Schübler, der Stecher der Kunst der Fuge." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 65: 75–96.

———. 1987. "Ein Bach-Doppelfund: Verschollene Gerber-Abschrift (BWV 914 und 996) und unbekannte Choralsammlung Christian Friedrich Penzels." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 73: 29–73.

Wilhelmi, Thomas. 1992. "Carl Philipp Emanuel Bachs 'Avertissement' über den Druck der Kunst der Fuge." *Bach-Jahrbuch* 78: 101–5.

Williams, Peter. 1975. "Bach's Seven Fughette." *Musical Times* 116: 653–57.

———. 1980. *A New History of the Organ From the Greeks to the Present Day*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

———. 1980–84. *The Organ Music of J. S. Bach*. 3 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1981. "BWV 565: A Toccata in D Minor for Organ by J. S. Bach?" *Early Music* 9: 330–37.

———. 1984. "Bach's G-Minor Sonata for Viola da Gamba and Harpsichord BWV 1029: A Seventh Brandenburg Concerto?" *Early Music* 12: 345–54.

———. 1993. "Two Case Studies in Performance Practice and the Details of Notation 1: J. S. Bach and 2/4 Time." *Early Music* 21: 613–22.

———. 1994. "Two Case Studies in Performance Practice and the Details of Notation 2: J. S. Bach and Left-Hand–Right-Hand Distribution." *Early Music* 22: 101–13.

———. 2003. *The Organ Music of J. S. Bach*. Second edition of Williams (1980–84), vols. 1–2, in one volume. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2003a. “Is There an Anxiety of Influence Discernible in J. S. Bach’s *Clavierübung I?*” In *The Keyboard in Baroque Europe* (Festschrift for Gustav Leonhardt), ed. Christopher Hogwood, 140–56. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1997. *The Chromatic Fourth During Four Centuries of Music*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

———. 2015. “Sign Language.” Review of Eric Chafe, *J. S. Bach’s Johannine Theology* [et al.]. *Musical Times* 156: 101–4.

———. 2016. *Bach: A Musical Biography.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wolff, Christoph. 1968. *Der stile antico in der Musik Johann Sebastian Bachs: Studien zu Bachs Spätwerk*. Wiesbaden: Steiner.

———. 1976. “Bach’s *Handexemplar* of the Goldberg Variations: A New Source.” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 29: 224–41.

———, ed. 1985. *The Neumeister Collection of Chorale Preludes from the Bach Circle: Facsimile Edition of the Yale Manuscript LM 4708*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
———. 1986. “Johann Sebastian Bach’s Third Part of the *Clavier-Übung*.” In *Charles Brenton Fisk, Organ Builder*. Volume 1, *Essays in His Honor*, ed. Fenner Douglass, Owen Jander, and Barbara Owen, 283–91. Easthampton, Mass.: The Westfield Center for Early Keyboard Studies.

———. 1991. *Johann Sebastian Bach: Essays on His Life and Music.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. This volume contains revised reprints and translations of previously published writings, which, for the sake of convenience, are not separately cited in the present book.

———. 1992. “The Identity of the ‘Fratro Dilettissimo’ in the Capriccio B-Flat Major [sic] and Other Problems of Bach's Early Harpsichord Works.” In *The Harpsichord and Its Repertoire: Proceedings of the International Harpsichord Symposium Utrecht 1990*, ed. Pieter Dirksen, 145–56. Utrecht: STIMU: Foundation for Historical Performance Practice.

———. 1993. “Das Trio A-Dur BWV 1025: Eine Lautensonate von Silvius Leopold Weiss bearbeitet und erweitert von Johann Sebastian Bach.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 79: 47–67.

———. 1993a. “The ‘Agnus Dei’ of Bach's B-minor Mass: Parody and New Composition Reconciled.” In *A Bach Tribute: Essays in Honor of William H. Scheide*, ed. Paul Brainard and Ray Robinson, 233–40. Kassel: Bärenreiter, and Chapel Hill: Hinshaw Music.

———. 2000. *Johann Sebastian Bach: The Learned Musician*. New York: Norton.

———. 2003. “Descendants of Wilhelm Friedemann Bach in the United States.” In *Bach Perspectives*, vol. 5, ed. Stephen A. Crist, 123–130. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

———. 2008. “Sicilianos and Organ Recitals: Observations on J. S. Bach’s Concertos. In *Bach Perspectives*, vol. 7, ed. Gregory G. Butler, 97–114. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

———. 2011. “Under the Spell of Opera? Bach’s Oratorio Trilogy.” In *Bach Perspectives*, vol. 8, ed. Daniel R. Melamed, 1–12. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

———. 2016. “Did J. S. Bach Write Organ Concertos? Apropos the Prehistory of Cantata Movements with Obbligato Organ.” In *Bach Perspectives*, vol. 10, ed. Matthew Dirst, 60–75. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Wolff, Christoph, and Markus Zepf. 2012. *The Organs of J. S. Bach: A Handbook*. Trans. Lynn Edwards Butler. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Wollny, Peter. 1994. “Bachs Bewerbung um die Organistenstelle an der Marienkirche zu Halle und ihr Kontext.”*Bach-Jahrbuch* 80: 26–39.

———. 1995. “Wilhelm Friedemann Bach’s Halle Performances of Cantatas By His Father.” In *Bach Studies 2*, edited by Daniel R. Melamed, 202–28. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1996. “Zur Überlieferung der Instrumentalwerke Johann Sebastian Bachs: Der Quellenbesitz Carl Philipp Emanuel Bachs.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 82: 7–22.

———. 1997. “Neue Bach-Funde.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 83: 7–50.

———. 2001. “Neue Ermittlungen zu Aufführungen Bachscher Kirchenkantaten zm Zertbster Hof.” In *Bach und seine mitteldeutschen Zeitgenossen: Bericht über das Internationale Musikwissenschaftliche Kolloquium Erfurt und Arnstadt 13. bis 16. Januar 2000*, ed. Rainer Kaiser, 199–217. Eisenach: Wagner.

———. 2002. “Geistliche Musik der Vorfahren Johann Sebastian Bachs: Das ‘Altbachische Archiv.’” *Jahrbuch des Staatlichen Instituts für Musikforschung Preussischer Kulturbesitz*: 40–59.

———. 2010. “Zwei Bach-Funde in Mügeln: C. P. E. Bach, Picander und die Leipziger Kirchenmusik in den 1730er Jahren.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 96: 111–47.

———. 2010a. “C. P. E. Bach, Georg Philipp Telemann und die Osterkantate ‘Gott hat den Herrn auferwecket’ Wq 244.” In *“Er ist der Vater, wir sind die Bub'n”: Essays in Honor of Christoph Wolff,* edited by Paul Corneilson and Peter Wollny, 78–94. Ann Arbor: Steglein.

———. 2011. “Fundstücke zur Lebensgeschichte Johann Sebastian Bachs 1744–1750.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 97: 35–50.

———. 2013. “Eine unbekannte Bach-Handschrift und andere Quellen zur Leipziger Musikgeschichte in Weißenfels.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 99: 129–70.

———. 2015. “Vom ‘apparat der auserleßensten kirchen Stücke’ zum ‘Vorrath an Musicalien, von J. S. Bach und andern berühmten Musicis’: Quellenkundliche Ermittlungen zur frühen Thüringer Bach-Überlieferung und zu einigen Weimarer Schülern und Kollegen Bachs.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 101: 99–154.

———. 2016. “Neuerkenntnisse zu einigen Kopisten der 1730er Jahre.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 102: 63–99.

———. 2016a. “Eine unbekannte Bach-Handschrift und andere Quellen zur Leipziger Musikgeschichte in Weißenfels.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 99: 129–70.

Wollny, Peter, and Michael Maul. 2008. “The Weimar Organ Tablature: Bach’s Earliest Autographs.” *Understanding Bach* 3: 67–74.

Wollny, Peter, and Jean-Claude Zehnder, eds. 1998. *Aus dem Umkreis des jungen Johann Sebastian Bach: Neunzehn Orgelchoräle von Johann Sebastian Bach und dem Thüringer Umkreis aus der Handschrift Yale LM 4843*. Stuttgart: Carus.

Wustmann, Gustav, ed. 1889–95. *Quellen der Geschichte Leipzigs: Veröffentlichungen aus dem Archiv und der Bibliothek der Stadt Leipzig*. 2 vols. Leipzig: Duncker und Humblot.

Wustmann, Rudolf. 1910. “Sebastian Bachs Kirchenkantatentexte.” *Bach-Jahrbuch*: 45–62.

Yearsley, David. 2002. *Bach and the Meanings of Counterpoint*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2007. “Women at the Organ: A Fragment.” In *Music and its Questions: Essays in Honor of Peter Williams*, ed. Thomas Donahue, 119–41. Richmond: OHS Press.

———. 2013. “Hoopskirts, Coffee, and the Changing Musical Prospects of the Bach Women.” *Women and Music* 17: 27–58.

———. 2019. *Sex, Death, and Minuets: Anna Magdalena Bach and her Musical Notebooks*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Youngren, William H. 2003. *C. P. E. Bach and the Rebirth of Strophic Song*. Lanham, Md., and Oxford: Scarecrow Press.

Zegers, Richard H. C. 2005. “The Eyes of Johann Sebastian Bach.” *Archives of Ophthalmology* 123: 1427–1430.

Zitellini, Rodolfo. 2016. “Das ‘Thema Legrenzianum’ der Fuge BWV 574: Eine Fehlzuschrebung?” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 99: 243–59.

Zohn, Steven. 2008. *Music for a Mixed Taste: Style, Genre, and Meaning in Telemann's Instrumental Works*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.