

An Enigmatic Legacy: Organ Music and the Berlin Bach Traditions

DAVID SCHULENBERG

J.S. BACH HAS ALWAYS been regarded as one of the world's great organists. His reputation, although doubtless based in part on reports of those who had heard him play, must also have rested on his compositions. Disseminated primarily through manuscript copies, these traveled farther than he did—at first not much farther, but within a gradually expanding circle of musicians. The process is most clearly documented in Berlin, where copyists associated especially with Bach's second son Carl Philipp Emanuel and with his pupil Johann Philipp Kirnberger were directly or indirectly responsible for a substantial fraction of the eighteenth-century copies that survive. There were, however, multiple Bach traditions, even at Berlin. One group of manuscripts, from the circle of Johann Christian Kittel (one of Sebastian's last pupils), contains variant readings that have been taken to be late revisions by the composer. Some of these copies eventually made their way to Berlin, but probably only in the nineteenth century, when, however, they exerted considerable influence on the first collected editions of Sebastian's music. Well before then, however, another organist with Bach connections, Johannes Ringk, had arrived in Berlin, probably bringing Bach manuscripts with him.

The texts in these various groups of manuscripts generally represent distinct lines of transmission, sometimes preserving different stages of revision for individual pieces. They might also represent different traditions of Bach performance, with certain teachers and their pupils claiming, or believing, themselves to be disciples of a Bach performance routine. Remarkably, however, those closest to Bach—his sons Wilhelm Friedemann and Emanuel—seem to have had fraught relationships not only with their father's organ music but with the organ itself as an instrument.

During his lifetime Friedemann was viewed as having inherited Sebastian's greatness as a performer on, if not as a composer for, the organ. Emanuel, on the other hand, was known to have abandoned the instrument, as documented by his oft-cited remark to Charles Burney that he had lost the use of the pedals

through lack of practice.¹ These views of both composers are certainly rooted in truth, yet more can be said about their relationships to the organ and to their father's music. In what follows, I consider the role of the two eldest Bach sons—especially the underappreciated Friedemann—not only in the transmission of their father's organ works but in the establishment of a distinctive Bach historiography that emerged in the Prussian capital. Friedemann, who left few compositions of any sort, came to live in Berlin only late in life, in 1774. By then, Emanuel had been living in Hamburg for five years, having previously served Frederick “the Great” as court keyboardist since the beginning of his reign in 1740.² During his relatively short time in the Prussian capital, Friedemann somehow managed to alienate influential members of society, and he died poor and isolated. Yet he also established or confirmed his reputation as a virtuoso and as heir to his father's legacy, not only through a few legendary organ recitals but through his transmission of music manuscripts and perhaps a distinctive style of performance as well.

Prussia, Saxony, and the Bachs

Although their music has been cultivated at Berlin since at least the mid-eighteenth century, the Bachs were originally a Thuringian clan, subjects of minor Saxon dukes. As Capellmeister at Cöthen, Sebastian had served the ruler of a state bordering on the margraviate of Brandenburg (a Prussian dominion), and he had visited Berlin to buy a harpsichord for his employer.³ But Emanuel was apparently the first member of the family to reside in Prussian territory, attending university at Frankfurt (Oder) before joining the *Capelle* of the newly crowned King Frederick. This move distinguished him from his older brother Friedemann, who had stayed closer to home, spending the first part of his career in the Saxon capital Dresden. Friedemann moved to Halle, the other Prussian university town, in 1746, but he remained in important ways

¹ “M. Bach has so long neglected organ-playing, that he says he has lost the use of the pedals”; *The Present State of Music in Germany, The Netherlands, and United Provinces*, 2nd ed., corrected (London, 1775), 275.

² The exact date on which Emanuel entered royal Prussian service is uncertain; although he worked for Frederick at least occasionally even before the latter's coronation, official records of his court engagement begin only in 1741. See Mary Oleskiewicz, “The Court of Brandenburg-Prussia,” in *Music at German Courts, 1715–1760: Changing Artistic Priorities*, ed. Samantha Owens, Barbara Reul and Janice Stockigt (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell, 2011), 93.

³ On Sebastian's visit in 1719, which apparently led to the Brandenburg Concertos, see Christoph Wolff, *Johann Sebastian Bach: The Learned Musician* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2000), 209.

a Dresden composer, mingling elements of the Italianate style favored in that city with the counterpoint and disciplined motivic work that we associate with Sebastian Bach.

To be sure, the idea of distinct styles associated with Dresden and Berlin, respectively, is something of an invention of nineteenth-century Prussian music historiography. As Mary Oleskiewicz has shown, the so-called Berlin style, represented especially by Quantz, the Graun brothers, and King Frederick himself, was really a transplanted Dresden style.⁴ Yet Martin Falck, writing in 1913, belittled the Saxon elements in Friedemann's music as decadent echoes of the Italian opera favored there.⁵ It is not hard to discern a similar line, positing hard-edged Protestant counterpoint against soft-headed Catholic homophony, in the earlier biographical writings of Carl Herrmann Bitter, whose 1867 book on the Bach sons was dedicated to the Prussian queen Augusta (soon to be German empress).⁶ During the twentieth century, an antithesis between the two styles was taken for granted by music historians, even entering popular culture, becoming, for example, part of the back story to Traugott Müller's 1941 film *Friedemann Bach*. One of the few memorable products of the Nazi cinema, the film is a fanciful, almost entirely unhistorical concoction inspired by a nineteenth-century novel and a more recent opera by Paul Graener.⁷ In one scene, Friedemann performs before the Elector of Saxony and his court, taking the place of his father in a cinematic version of the famous contest between Sebastian Bach and the French harpsichordist Marchand.⁸ Notable here is the contrast between the austere artistic Friedemann Bach, played by Gustav Gründgens, and the pompous, Frenchified Saxons for whom he performs. This presumably reflects a politically correct view of the story that would have been particularly favored in wartime Germany under the Nazi regime.

⁴ See Mary Oleskiewicz, "Quantz and the Flute at Dresden: His Instruments, His Repertory, and Their Significance for the *Versuch* and the Bach Circle" (PhD diss., Duke University, 1998), especially chap. 5.

⁵ *Wilhelm Friedemann Bach: Sein Leben und seine Werke* (Leipzig: Kahnt, 1913), 142; further discussion in David Schulenberg, *The Music of Wilhelm Friedemann Bach* (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2010), 17ff.

⁶ *Carl Philipp Emanuel und Wilhelm Friedemann Bach und deren Brüder*, 2 vols. (Berlin: Wilhelm Müller, 1868).

⁷ Graener's 1931 opera *Friedemann Bach* was based loosely on the popular Albert Emil Brachvogel, *Friedemann Bach: Ein Roman*, 3 vols. (Berlin: Janke, 1858). Relevant clips from the film are readily available on youtube.com.

⁸ On the Bach-Marchand contest, see Wolff, *Johann Sebastian Bach*, 179–82.

Equally notable in this scene is the harpsichord on which Friedemann performs. What we hear on the soundtrack is likely a jangling two-manual twentieth-century instrument by the firm of J. C. Neupert. But what we see on screen appears to be the so-called white harpsichord by Michael Mietke, a single-manual instrument with elaborate chinoiserie decoration by Gerard Dagly, still preserved in Charlottenburg palace in Berlin (not far from the Babelsberg studio where the film was shot).⁹ It was for a two-manual harpsichord by Mietke that Sebastian had traveled from Cöthen to Berlin in 1719. The present Charlottenburg instrument lacks the sixteen-foot stop heard on the film soundtrack; favored by mid-twentieth-century harpsichordists under the influence of the German *Orgelbewegung*, this type of harpsichord sound is no longer in favor. Yet the so-called Bach harpsichord in the Berlin Instrumentenmuseum, on which this organ-like sound ideal was founded, has undergone a partial rehabilitation in recent years; it includes a sixteen-foot rank, and it appears that Mietke also made harpsichords with sixteen-foot ranks.¹⁰ No member of the Bach family could ever have played on an instrument sounding like the one heard in the film, with its coarse action and anachronistic timbre, yet it is a late, vulgarized product of the Berlin Bach tradition, in which father and son are melded into a single unhistorical icon.

The actual music of the scene consists of extracts strung together from three of Friedemann's keyboard fantasias.¹¹ Remarkably, a performance of this type, involving fragments of existing pieces connected by improvised bridges, may have been what Friedemann typically performed in his public appearances, to judge from his preserved works and accounts of his Berlin recitals.¹² Such an approach to improvisation is distinct from that taught by Emanuel Bach, who

⁹ On the Mietke instrument, see Edward L. Kottick, *A History of the Harpsichord* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2003), 323–25 and color plate 23. Kottick dates the “white” Charlottenburg harpsichord to 1702–4. The instrument shown in the film is somewhat longer than the latter, with simpler decoration, and as its keyboard is never shown it was presumably a mere case and stand serving as a prop.

¹⁰ See Kottick, *A History of the Harpsichord*, 323 and 329–31, as well as Konstantin Restle, “Versuch einer historischen Einordnung des ‘Bach-Cembalos,’ *Jahrbuch des Staatlichen Instituts für Musikforschung Preussischer Kulturbesitz* (1996): 102–12.

¹¹ Although the composer Mark Lothar is credited with the music for the film as a whole, in this scene we hear passages from Friedemann's fantasias in E minor (F. 21), D minor (F. 19), and A minor (F. 22), played by the pianist Conrad Hansen according to the detailed credits listed at <http://www.klaus-archiv.de/00000097671275901.html>.

¹² Further discussion in Schulenberg, *The Music of Friedemann Bach*, 106ff.

presents improvisation as the elaboration of a bass line;¹³ Richard Kramer describes this bass-line *Gerippe*, or skeleton, as a way of “conceptualizing the process of composition.”¹⁴ But Friedemann evidently understood composition very differently, and his D-minor fantasia, F. 19, quoted in the film, even incorporates passages in the style of a fugue, which never occurs in any of Emanuel’s free fantasias. Of course, any combination of toccata-like and fugal passages within a piece in D minor continues to be a potent reference to the Bach tradition.¹⁵

As iconic as the latter sort of music might have seemed, in 1941 or today, as a symbol for Bach—any Bach—the compositional technique most admired in mid-eighteenth-century Berlin was an expressive form of melodic embellishment or variation, deployed within clearly articulated, regular formal designs—da capo arias as well as early versions of what we now call sonata-allegro form. This was the art practiced by virtuoso singers as well as instrumental soloists and composers, and Emanuel Bach adopted it whole-heartedly as a fundamental element of his style.¹⁶ Friedemann avoided variation technique throughout his life, and his formal designs never fell into any sort of routine. Forkel famously reported that both sons consciously avoided imitating their father’s style,¹⁷ and perhaps they also consciously swerved away from one another’s style as well. But Friedemann certainly preserved more of Sebastian’s idiom than Emanuel did, retaining, for example, four-part imitative textures in the ritornellos of his keyboard concertos, whereas Emanuel typically employed the homophonic two- or three-part writing also found in the works of Quantz and the Grauns.

¹³ In his *Versuch über die wahre Art das Clavier zu spielen*, vol. 2 (Berlin: Winter, 1762), chap. 41; English translation by William J. Mitchell as *Essay on the True Art of Playing Keyboard Instruments* (New York: Norton, 1949), chap. 7.

¹⁴ Richard Kramer, *Unfinished Music* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 113.

¹⁵ The “Toccat and Fugue” in D minor, BWV 565 was well established by 1941 as a quintessential Bach work. It was played on piano (in transcriptions by Tausig and Busoni) as well as organ, and it had been heard on the soundtrack of Rouben Mamouian’s 1931 film *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*; Disney used Stokowski’s orchestrated version (first recorded in 1927) to open the 1940 film *Fantasia*.

¹⁶ Hence the emphasis on varied reprises (the variation of repeated passages) in both Emanuel’s *Versuch* and within his actual compositions. On Emanuel’s reliance on “composition as variation,” as well as the early version of sonata form prevalent in his instrumental music, see David Schulenberg, *The Instrumental Music of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1984), chaps. 4 and 6.

¹⁷ Johann Nicolaus Forkel, *Ueber Johann Sebastian Bachs Leben, Kunst und Kunstwerke* (Leipzig: Hoffmeister und Kühnel, 1802), 44; translation in Hans David, Arthur Mendel, and Christoph Wolff, eds., *The New Bach Reader: A Life of Johann Sebastian Bach in Letters and Documents* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1998), 458.

In one glaring respect, however, both sons shared a common departure from their father's legacy: hardly any organ music with independent pedal parts can be clearly traced to either of them. Of the twenty distinct items included in the most recent critical edition of Emanuel's compositions for organ, only three incorporate pedal parts; two are brief pieces of uncertain provenance, and in the one that is assuredly by Emanuel the pedal part is rudimentary.¹⁸ That is unsurprising, in view of Emanuel's position at Berlin as chamber musician in a famously secular court. Friedemann, however, spent the greatest part of his life employed as a church organist, and the critical edition of the works of Friedemann Bach, now in progress, will include only a few of the pieces that previous editors have accepted as the composer's organ music.¹⁹ For most of the latter, however, serious questions can be raised about the attribution, the designation as organ music, or both. Friedemann's actual organ music—that is, the virtuoso pieces with which he is reported to have impressed audiences at Braunschweig and Berlin—has vanished without a trace, if indeed it was ever written down at all. The *pedaliter* fugues and chorale settings transmitted under his name are at best student work, most of them probably imitations or adaptations of Handelian or Bachian style by musicians of the late eighteenth or even early nineteenth centuries.²⁰

What, then, could have been the role of either Emanuel or Friedemann in establishing a Bach organ tradition at Berlin? In the case of Emanuel, it would have been chiefly that of custodian of manuscripts that he presumably inherited after Sebastian's death. Although his own manuscripts do not survive, they evidently served as exemplars for copies still in Berlin archives. Friedemann probably played a similar role, if we can believe the report of Wilhelm Rust, one of the nineteenth-century editors of Sebastian's organ music. Rust wrote that a number of the manuscript sources used for his edition had come from Friedemann Bach, who had sold them to the Prussian Count Voß-Buch; Rust

¹⁸ See Annette Richards and David Yearsley, eds., *Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach: Organ Works*, Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach: The Complete Works I/9 (Los Altos, CA: Packard Humanities Institute, 2008).

¹⁹ At this writing only works evidently intended for stringed keyboard instruments have appeared. Liner notes by Peter Wollny for a CD recording by Friedhelm Flamme, *Wilhelm Friedemann Bach: Complete Organ Works* (Lübeck: Classic Produktion Osnabrück, 2010), CPO 777 527-2, suggest that the *pedaliter* fugue in G minor, F. 37, as well as the seven chorale preludes F. 38/1–7, will be accepted into the series *Wilhelm Friedemann Bach: Gesammelte Werke* (Stuttgart: Carus, 2009–) which Wollny is now editing.

²⁰ Further discussion in Schulenberg, *The Music of Friedemann Bach*, chap. 3.

describes the latter as a “Maecenas” for his support not only of “Bachian art” generally but of Friedemann specifically, from whom it has been supposed that Voß purchased not only music manuscripts but the large “Bach” harpsichord now in Berlin.²¹ Rust presumably wrote from personal acquaintance with the present counts of Voß, but perhaps also from family tradition; his grandfather, the composer Friedrich Wilhelm Rust (1739–96), had studied with Friedemann.²² But which of the many manuscripts that Voß donated to the then Royal Library in Berlin had really come from Friedemann is now impossible to say. The copyist of one important manuscript, containing thirteen preludes and fugues among other organ works by J. S. Bach, actually worked for Emanuel, not Friedemann.²³

The presence of the two Bach sons, as well as their manuscripts, in Berlin during the mid- and later eighteenth century raises the broader issue of their relationships with the ruling Hohenzollern dynasty. Emanuel’s supposed disfavor with the king, which allegedly led to ill treatment and low pay, is cast in

²¹ Rust, preface to *Joh. Seb. Bach’s Orgelwerke, erster Band*, Johann Sebastian Bach’s Werke 15 (Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1867), xv, describes the late Count Voß-Buch as “ein besonderer Mäcen Bach’scher Kunst und der Person Friedemann Bach’s,” continuing: “Friedemann Bach, der in Berlin den Rest der ihm übrig gebliebenen Werke seines Vaters verschleuderte, fand in dem gräflichen Hause stets willige, generöse Abnehmer. Was noch zu retten war, wurde heir gerettet, theils in zahlreichen Autographien, theils in authentischen Abschriften.” The tradition according to which the instrument now attributed to Harrass passed through Friedemann appears to be a conjecture based on Friedemann’s association with the counts von Voß.

²² The editor Rust, born in 1822, would have learned of the connection with Friedemann Bach through his father Wilhelm Karl Rust, a pianist; see the articles by Lutz Buchmann in *Grove Music Online* on all three members of the Rust family.

²³ This manuscript (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. Bach P 290) is in the hand of the copyist identified as Anonymous 303 in *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). This copyist was responsible for numerous manuscripts containing works of Emanuel Bach, some of which contain autograph entries (e.g., copies of the sonata W. 65/18 and of parts for the symphonies W. 176, 179, and 180, in Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. mss. Bach P 775 and St 235, 236, and 239, respectively). Its texts are close to those of manuscripts associated with Kirnberger. Copies of Sebastian’s organ works in the Amalienbibliothek (originally the music library of Princess Anna Amalia, curated by Kirnberger and now incorporated into the Berlin Staatsbibliothek) give readings similar to those of P 290 (notably those for BWV 543, 545, 546, 547, and 548 in AmB 60). The stemmatic relationships between the various manuscript copies now in Berlin of Sebastian’s preludes and fugues for organ, first systematically examined by Dietrich Kilian (see *Johann Sebastian Bach: Neue Ausgabe sämtlicher Werke, kritischer Bericht* for vols. IV/5–6 [Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1978–79]), are largely confirmed in a new edition by the present author, forthcoming from Breitkopf und Härtel (*Johann Sebastian Bach: Sämtliche Orgelwerke*, vols. 1–2).

a new light by Oleskiewicz's finding that he was in fact one of the most highly paid instrumentalists in the royal *Capelle*.²⁴ Despite leaving the court in 1767, he retained an honorary title as Capellmeister to Princess Anna Amalia, and he spoke only favorably of her brother Frederick in his remarks to Burney (whose own observations about Frederick's influence on music at Berlin are much more outspoken). Friedemann had apparently established his own Berlin connection before leaving Dresden in 1746, for his first published work, the sonata in D, F. 3, was published the previous year with a dedication to Georg Ernst Stahl, Prussian royal court counselor and son of the famous chemist and royal Prussian physician of the same name. When Friedemann visited Potsdam two years later with his father, he was newly employed within the Prussian realm and evidently was establishing contacts in the capital city, including one with the theorist and critic Marpurg.²⁵ At Halle, Friedemann seems to have concentrated on composing church pieces (sacred cantatas). But the largest of all his extant vocal compositions is the serenata *O Himmel, schone*, F. 90, which was composed and performed in honor of the king's birthday in 1758, celebrating the seizure of Silesia early in the Seven Years' War. This might well have been written, like Sebastian's works in honor of the Saxon ruling house, with an eye to gaining an appointment in the capital city.

Standing in the way, perhaps, would have been the presence there not only of Emanuel Bach but also of other pupils of Sebastian, such as Kirnberger. Although the latter may initially have been friendly toward Friedemann, the two had broken off by 1778 or so. Upon his arrival in Berlin in 1774, Friedemann evidently established cordial relations with both Kirnberger and his patroness; Kirnberger incorporated a number of Friedemann's works into Amalia's collection, and the princess herself wrote in glowing terms to her brother the king about the new arrival, on whom she bestowed some sort of pension or subsidy. Within a few years, however, Kirnberger was complaining in a letter to Forkel about Friedemann's machinations.²⁶ In 1779, Friedemann was nominated to become organist at the Marienkirche by none less than the future king Friedrich Wilhelm II. He would have succeeded Ringk, a pupil of Sebastian's friend

²⁴ See Mary Oleskiewicz, "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 (Richmond, VA: Organ Historical Society Press, 2007), 253–79.

²⁵ Nearly all the known biographical information about Friedemann, including the texts of most of the relevant surviving documents, appears in Falck, *Wilhelm Friedemann Bach*.

²⁶ Kirnberger's letter is reproduced in Bitter, *Carl Philipp Emanuel und Wilhelm Friedemann Bach und deren Brüder*, 2:322.

Kellner, but the appointment was blocked on the basis of Friedemann's alleged bizarre behavior and alcoholism.²⁷ Similar charges would continue to circulate, coloring the nineteenth- and twentieth-century reception of Friedemann.

Whether Emanuel Bach was involved in any of this is unknown, but a break between him and his brother would not have been implausible. The rupture between Friedemann and Kirnberger might also lie behind the latter's famous report that both Emanuel and Sebastian Bach had been *antirameauisch*, that is, opposed to the incipient theory of harmonic function disseminated by the French composer Jean-Philippe Rameau.²⁸ Kirnberger's remark was intended to counter suggestions coming from Marpurg that Sebastian Bach had taught anything resembling Rameau's theory; it might also have discouraged publication of Friedemann's treatise, which has left no trace.²⁹ Historians of music theory seem not to have questioned the accuracy of Kirnberger's report. Yet it is also possible that Sebastian's views or teaching methods developed over time and that Friedemann received different instruction from his younger siblings. If so, the Berlin line obscured this, representing Sebastian's teaching instead as perfect and, not incidentally, anti-French.³⁰ Still, the sort of keyboard music that enjoyed greatest popularity there in the 1770s and 1780s is probably represented not by Friedemann's (or Sebastian's) works but by the simpler works that Emanuel Bach and Kirnberger had been composing and publishing during the previous decades.

Darrell Berg has written about the modest demands made on the player in Emanuel's organ sonatas, of which at least one assuredly and probably at least four were composed for Princess Anna Amalia; Berg argues that the one-movement sonata or prelude W. 70/7 of 1756 must also have been

²⁷ Ulrich Kahmann reproduces the relevant documents (a series of internal government memos) in *Wilhelm Friedemann Bach: Der unterschätzte Sohn* (Bielefeld: Aesthesis-Verlag, 2010), 259ff., after Friedrich-Wilhelm Donat, *Christian Heinrich Rinck und die Orgelmusik seiner Zeit* (Bad Oenhausen: Theine & Peitsch, 1933), and Christoph Henzel, "Zu Wilhelm Friedemann Bachs Berliner Jahren," *Bach Jahrbuch* (1992): 107–12.

²⁸ This statement, expressed as if based on a pronouncement or letter that Kirnberger had received from Emanuel, appears as a sort of endorsement at the end of Kirnberger's *Die Kunst des reinen Satzes in der Musik*, 4 pts. in 2 vols., (Berlin and Königsberg, 1771–79), 2:188.

²⁹ Marpurg described Friedemann's *Abhandlung vom Harmonischen Dreyklang* as "ready" (*fertig*) in his *Historisch-kritische Beyträge zur Aufnahme der Musik*, 5 vols. (Berlin, 1754–78), 1:431.

³⁰ Not coincidentally did Kirnberger also publish a short work on the "true foundations" of harmony, illustrated with analyses of works by Sebastian and implicitly representing the latter's teaching: *Die wahren Grundsätze zum Gebrauch der Harmonie* (Berlin and Königsberg, 1773).

72 *f* *p* *f* *p* *f*

[Ped.]

77 *p*

80 *f* *p*

Example 1 Orgelsonate mit dem Pedal, von C. P. E. Bach, W. 70/7, mm. 72–83, from Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale Albert 1.er, ms. 3918 (copy by Johann Heinrich Michel, with autograph title)

Adagio

2

Ped.

4 Prestissimo

Example 2 Toccata Con Fuga: pedaliter. ex d. b. di J. S. Bach, BWV 565, from Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. Bach P 595 (copy by Johannes Ringk)

composed specifically for the princess to play.³¹ With its rudimentary pedal part and numerous octave doublings between the hands, this work is remote from what we would consider idiomatic German organ music, based on our acquaintance with Sebastian's works (see Example 1). Yet such textures do make a fine effect on a good instrument, and somewhat similar conceits occur in a piece preserved on the fringes of the Bach tradition but long considered a definitive organ work: the so-called Toccata and Fugue in D minor, BWV 565 (see Example 2).

Emanuel surely understood that music for a dilettante princess must not only be easy to play but also devoid of the virtuoso features of works that he and his father had composed for their own performances. Too demonstrative a solo part would have been inappropriate for a princess—especially one whose tastes ran toward austere counterpoint.³² It is odd, therefore, that Emanuel's prelude completely avoids the imitative counterpoint that the composer had recently explored in several fugues. Today we might assume that the Fugue in E-flat, W. 119/6 was inspired by Sebastian's *Art of Fugue*, which Emanuel had recently seen through the press together with Marpurg. But stylistically this piece has at least as much in common with the more generic examples of choral fugues that were being incorporated during the same period in such works as Carl Heinrich Graun's *Tod Jesu* and *Te Deum*.³³ Emanuel's inclusion of several somewhat comparable fugues in his later vocal works could have been inspired as much by an impulse to surpass his late Berlin court colleague as to emulate his father.

In fact the mid-1750s saw a flurry of interest at Berlin in imitative counterpoint. This is unlikely to have been sparked by the famous visit of the aging Sebastian Bach to Potsdam in 1747, which had led to the *Musical Offering*, dedicated to the king and based on the latter's theme. More likely, Sebastian's invitation to the court—if not merely an outcome of his fame as an organist and his status as royal Polish court composer—reflected existing interest in counterpoint on the part of the king and his chief musicians, including Graun and Quantz; as Oleskiewicz has shown, the king pursued interests in counter-

³¹ See Berg, "C. P. E. Bach's Organ Sonatas: A Musical Offering for Princess Amalie?" *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 51 (1998): 489–90; Berg cites a letter in which Emanuel refers to his having composed the sonata in B-flat, W. 70/2 for the princess.

³² For further consideration of Princess Anna Amalia's abilities as a performer at the organ, see Kerala Snyder's essay in this volume.

³³ The two sacred works by the king's resident opera composer were both published by Breitkopf in Prussian-occupied Leipzig during the Seven Years' War, in 1757 and 1760, respectively.

point in several fugal movements in his own compositions, and his repertory continued to include concertos by Quantz that also contain fugues.³⁴ Viewed in this light, it no longer seems so surprising that Marpurg should have published his *Abhandlung von der Fuge* at Berlin in 1753–54, its second volume on canon dedicated jointly to Friedemann and Emanuel.

Friedemann Bach in Berlin

Years later the king famously recalled Sebastian's visit in a conversation with Baron Gottfried van Swieten; less well known is the king's reference in the same conversation to Friedemann's arrival in Berlin in 1774. Friedemann had played a recital at the Berlin Marienkirche on June 10, 1774;³⁵ shortly afterwards, Frederick, although praising this "great organist named Bach," informed van Swieten that Friedemann did not equal his father.³⁶ The implication is that Frederick himself had heard Friedemann perform on the organ, which is not impossible, although the king's attendance is not recorded. Princess Amalia had written to her brother on March 24, 1774, praising Friedemann in glowing terms;³⁷ this may well have piqued the curiosity of the king, who could easily have arranged to hear Friedemann's organ playing, not necessarily with the latter's knowledge. Van Swieten goes on to recount the King's singing of the theme which he had given Sebastian Bach for what became the *Musical Offering*; according to Swieten, the king considered Sebastian superior to Friedemann on the basis of his having improvised fugues in four, five, and eight parts. Evidently, then, the king was quite clear on the distinction between father and son, as were others who,

³⁴ See "The Trio in Bach's *Musical Offering*: A Salute to Frederick's Tastes and Quantz's Flutes?" in *Bach Perspectives, Volume 4: The Music of J.S. Bach: Analysis and Interpretation*, ed. David Schulenberg (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999), 80–84.

³⁵ As reported by Henzel, "Zu Wilhelm Friedemann Bachs Berliner Jahren," 111–12, citing newspaper announcements published the previous day.

³⁶ "entre autres il [le roi] me parla musique, et d'un grand organiste nommé Bach, . . . cet artiste est doué d'un talent supérieur à tout ce que j'ai entendu ou pu imaginer en profondeur de connoissances harmoniques et en force d'exécution; cependant ceux qui ont connu son Père ne trouvent pas encore qu'il l'egale." Van Swieten, letter of July 26, 1774 to Austrian state chancellor Wenzel Anton Fürst von Kaunitz; item 790 in Hans-Joachim Schulze, ed., *Dokumente zum Nachwirken Johann Sebastian Bachs*, Bach-Dokumente 3 (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1972), 276; translated in David, Mendel, and Wolff, *New Bach Reader*, 366–67.

³⁷ For the letter, see Peter Wollny, "'... welche dem größten Concerte gleichen': The Polonaises of Wilhelm Friedemann Bach," in *The Keyboard in Baroque Europe*, ed. Christopher Hogwood (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 178.

unlike Swieten, had been able to hear both of them.³⁸

Friedemann's first public performance as organist at Berlin appears to have taken place in 1766. Little is known about it, but further performances in 1774 and 1776 are documented in contemporary newspaper advertisements and reviews. The reviews are disappointingly vague about the details of these performances, but it must have been due especially to these recitals that Friedemann continued to be known into the nineteenth century as an organ virtuoso. Forkel, whom Friedemann had visited in 1773, mentions the "grand and solemn" character of Friedemann's organ playing, as opposed to the elegance of his "clavier" playing, but he fails to specify what pieces were played in this manner.³⁹ The Berlin newspaper reports are likewise silent on Friedemann's actual repertory, merely describing general qualities of his performance that might have characterized improvisations as well as compositions—or perhaps some combination of pre-existing and extemporized pieces.⁴⁰

Clues to what Friedemann's improvisations might have been like emerge from some of the keyboard fantasias that he appears to have written down during his final decade at Berlin. A number of these are essentially medleys, fragments or in some cases entire movements from previously composed pieces joined together by transition passages; a few of the fragments incorporate fugal passages. Yet even the latter are very different from anything composed by Sebastian, and in general these pieces are also remote from the free fantasias composed by Emanuel, who left only one "medley"-type fantasia.⁴¹ Friedemann's fantasias are preserved in manuscript copies that belonged to collectors such as Sara Levy in Berlin and the Baltic noble Ulrich von Behr, son-in-law of the diplomat Hermann Carl Count Keyserlingk. These copies might have been prized as souvenirs of performances given by Friedemann at concerts or soirées; Behr wrote to Forkel that he had paid very well for two of them.⁴²

³⁸ Another comparison, also unfavorable to Friedemann, was that of Pisendel, who wrote to Telemann that the Bach sons, apart from Emanuel, could not "hold a candle" (*das Waßer reichen*) to the father; undated letter from 1750, in Georg Philipp Telemann, *Briefwechsel*, ed. Hans Grosse and Hans Rudolf Jung (Leipzig: VEB Deutscher Verlag für Musik, 1972), 354.

³⁹ "Wenn ich Wilh. Friedemann auf dem Clavier hörte, war alles zierlich, fein und angenehm. Hörte ich ihn auf der Orgel, so überfiel mich ein heiliger Schauer. Dort war alles niedlich, hier alles groß und feyerlich" (Forkel, *Johann Sebastian Bachs Leben*, 18).

⁴⁰ Further on Friedemann's Berlin performances, including references to the specific newspaper reports, in Kahmann, 231–32 and 240, and Schulenberg, *The Music of Friedemann Bach*, 104–5.

⁴¹ The Fantasia in C, W. 61/6, the final work published in the series "for *Kenner und Liebhaber*."

⁴² One hundred ducats, according to a letter to Forkel preserved alongside the latter's copy (by an

Behr's two fantasias are specifically for the clavichord (*per il Clavicordio solo*), according to the title in Forkel's manuscript copy. But despite Forkel's report about the distinct character of Friedemann's "clavier" playing, his approach to organ performance might not have been entirely different. Performances on both instruments, whether in public recitals or for private patrons or small domestic gatherings, might have consisted chiefly of medleys: passages from existing works linked by improvised transitions and cadenzas.⁴³ Such is essentially the form of the two fantasias for Behr; an organ improvisation could naturally take the same form, even if the expressive character or the structure of the individual sections was somewhat different.

Nevertheless, Friedemann's only surviving works from the period of the fantasias that can be connected to the organ, apart from a brief sketch (F. 35), are the eight *manualiter* fugues that Friedemann dedicated to Anna Amalia shortly after his arrival in Berlin.⁴⁴ These fugues, like Emanuel's, are disappointing and puzzling for those expecting a serious musical response to Sebastian's contrapuntal music. But Marpurg's *Abhandlung von der Fuge* provokes a similar response from anyone seeking a level of theoretical discourse suitable for serious engagement with Sebastian's fugues; Marpurg does little beyond pointing out standard elements of counterpoint, such as tonal answer and stretto. Despite her tutelage under Kirnberger, Anna Amalia's understanding of fugue probably remained at the rudimentary level of Marpurg's analyses, founded perhaps on examples in the *stile antico* and its echoes in contemporary works, including Graun's.

Friedemann, perhaps in view of his brother's rather plodding effort in W. 119/6—the piece had been published by Marpurg,⁴⁵ and Friedemann must have seen it—avoided anything so pretentious, nor did he risk appearing to imitate either Graun or their father's more substantial contrapuntal pieces in the eight

unidentified hand), in Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. Bach P 328.

⁴³ Perhaps sensing this, Friedhelm Flamme includes one of the two fantasias for Behr (F. 15) on his recording of Friedemann's organ works.

⁴⁴ The autograph (Brussels, Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal, 25905 MSM) provides no instrumental designation, and a Berlin copy (Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. 30386) assigns them only to "le clavecin ou l'orgue," but the works have long been taken to be for organ. The dedication itself, in a copy evidently prepared for the princess (Berlin, Amalienbibliothek, Mus. ms. 463), makes no mention of instrumental medium.

⁴⁵ In his anthology *Clavierstücke mit einem practischen Unterricht für Anfänger und Geübtere* (Berlin, 1762–63). The work also circulated in numerous manuscript copies, most but not all based on the print (see Richards and Yearsley, *Organ Works*, 115).

fugues of F. 31.⁴⁶ The set as a whole does, however, resemble the latter's inventions and sinfonias, consisting of relatively brief imitative pieces in a variety of keys. But Friedemann eschews brilliance or virtuoso display for its own sake; all are for manuals only, restricted to three parts. Although minor works, these eight *manualiter* fugues represent a successful solution to the problem of how to write a fugue after Sebastian Bach. Unlike Friedemann's other keyboard music, only once do they exceed a four-octave compass, leaving them entirely playable on the organ. Amalia's response to them is unknown. Although incorporating clever counterpoint alongside fashionable *galant* or *empfindsamer* expressive gestures, including numerous appoggiaturas, the fugues are above all witty and conversational. In this they resemble the trio sonatas that had provided many of the musical illustrations in Marpurg's treatise. Only the concluding piece in the set, in F minor, is a *Kunstfuge* that explores the various contrapuntal possibilities of its subject, and although Mozart saw fit to arrange it for string trio, it too incorporates light, even homophonic episodes.⁴⁷

One of the fugues even contains echoes of a composer that one would never suspect in a Berlin Bach piece: Domenico Scarlatti. Friedemann, more than anyone else in the Bach circle, had cultivated the Scarlattian trick of crossing hands since his earliest pieces.⁴⁸ No such tricks occur here, yet the E-minor fugue (F. 31/5) contains other types of quirky writing reminiscent only of Scarlatti and another idiosyncratic musician, Jan Dismas Zelenka. Sebastian had admired the Bohemian composer, whom Friedemann probably met during his Dresden years. The unusually long subject of the E-minor fugue recalls Zelenka, but the intensive development of a recurring half-step motive from the subject at times sounds remarkably like Scarlatti. Friedemann here goes about as far from Sebastian's style as one could imagine, while maintaining the pretense of extending the latter's tradition of contrapuntal keyboard writing (see Example 3).

⁴⁶ Closer to Sebastian are a number of fugues in Friedemann's vocal works, especially the Agnus Dei in D minor (F. 98b)—one of several versions of a long choral fugue that combines echoes of J. S. Bach's late works in *stile antico* (including the "Confiteor" of the B-minor Mass) with elements of galant style.

⁴⁷ On Mozart's arrangement for string trio (K. 404a) and its prelude (of uncertain attribution), preserved in Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. Bach P. 228, see Yo Tomita, "A New Light Shed on the Origin of Mozart's KV 404a and 405 Through the Recent Source Study of J. S. Bach's Well-Tempered Clavier II" (paper read at the British Musicology Conference at King's College, London, April 18, 1996), online at <http://www.mu.qub.ac.uk/tomita/bmc1996/KV405.html>.

⁴⁸ Examples occur already in "L'imitation de la chasse" (F. 26), preserved in the Bach-family manuscript Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. P 226 of ca. 1735.

Example 3 W. F. Bach, *Fugue in E minor, F. 31/5, mm. 29–38, from Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Amalienbibliothek, Mus. ms. 463*

Despite their clear three-part textures, these fugues are harder to play than they sound, twisting the hands into challenging contortions. Friedemann would not have performed them publicly; not only were they dedicated to a member of the ruling family, and therefore her property, but their witty, unassuming style and lack of virtuoso display would have made them unimpressive to the general public. Apart from the last one, these fugues would have seemed utterly unserious beside any of his father's major organ works. But did Friedemann ever perform his father's music at Berlin, even privately? Forkel mentions hearing Friedemann play Sebastian's organ sonatas, which have long been suspected of having been composed for him. But a manuscript copy partly in Friedemann's hand, now in Berlin, seems to have got there by way of Braunschweig, the city Friedemann visited before coming to the Prussian capital. He stayed with the organist Carl Heinrich Ernst Müller, whom he may have given it in lieu of rent.⁴⁹

In addition to the organ sonatas, Friedemann may also have performed his father's arrangement of the D-minor double violin concerto by Vivaldi, op. 3,

⁴⁹ Evidence for Friedemann's visit includes a note by Ferdinand Griepenkerl in the manuscript Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. Bach P 202 (a copy of the *Well-Tempered Clavier*). Dated 1835, the note identifies one of the hands in the manuscript as that of the Braunschweig cathedral organist Müller, who died that year aged 82. Müller was thus born in 1753 (see Peter Wollny, "Carl August Hartung als Kopist und Sammler Bachscher Werke," *Bach-Jahrbuch* 97 [2011]: 92) and would have been a young man when Friedemann visited; nevertheless it was evidently from him that Griepenkerl received this manuscript and with whom Friedemann stayed during his visit. Wollny raises the possibility that a number of other sources have a similar provenance, among them the manuscript of Sebastian's organ sonatas (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. Bach P 272), which was copied jointly by Anna Magdalena Bach and Friedemann.

no. 11 (R. 565). Friedemann is notorious for having altered the autograph of this work (BWV 596), naming himself as composer.⁵⁰ Perhaps this was not so heinous an offense at the time as it seems today, if a purchaser was interested in having the manuscript as a souvenir of having heard Friedemann play the work. Whether or not Friedemann indeed performed the concerto, that he did, in a sense, make it his own is suggested by echoes of it in one of his most original compositions, a *sinfonia* in the same key (F. 65) composed at Dresden.⁵¹ Another echo of Sebastian's organ version of the concerto was evidently heard in the re-arrangement of one movement back into orchestral form, as part of an anonymous *sinfonia* that was probably in the repertory of the Sing-Akademie at Berlin during the early nineteenth century. The *sinfonia* incorporates two additional movements that have little to do stylistically with Vivaldi, Sebastian, or Friedemann Bach. But they provide an idea of what could pass for Bachian music during the reign of Friedrich Wilhelm III (1797–1840), when the manuscript probably originated.⁵²

That this music is stylistically remote from Sebastian's would have been clear to Berlin music lovers if Friedemann and others had been regularly performing J. S. Bach's works publicly during the later eighteenth century. Burney reported hearing the organist of the Petrikirche, Carl Volkmar Bertuch, play a "most learned and difficult double fugue" by Sebastian for organ with pedals during his visit to Berlin in 1771.⁵³ Bertuch must have played such music regularly in order to be able to present it for his English visitor without much, if any, advance notice. At the Marienkirche, Ringk and his successor Johann Samuel Harson were both reputed to be masterful players of Sebastian's works.⁵⁴ Yet one wonders to what degree their reputations were formed by playing pieces such as the D-minor "Tocatta and Fugue," BWV 565 and the rudimentary A-Minor Praeludium, BWV 551. Both are preserved in copies by Ringk, and

⁵⁰ In Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. Bach P 330; see Karl Heller, ed., *Johann Sebastian Bach: Neue Ausgabe sämtlicher Werke, kritischer Bericht* for vol. IV/8 (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1980), 21ff.

⁵¹ Further discussion in Schulenberg, *The Music of Friedemann Bach*, 162–63.

⁵² This dating is based on the watermark of the source, Berlin, Sing-Akademie (deposited in the Staatsbibliothek), SA 3261, as reported by Wolfram Enßlin, *Die Bach-Quellen der Sing-Akademie zu Berlin*, vol. 1 (Hildesheim: Olms, 2006), 289–91.

⁵³ *The Present State of Music in Germany, The Netherlands, and United Provinces*, 2:206.

⁵⁴ Carl Freiherr von Ledebur, *Tonkünstler-Lexicon Berlin's von den ältesten Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart* (Berlin: Ludwig Rauh, 1861), 224, quotes Harson's obituary to this effect.

Bach's authorship of both is suspect.⁵⁵

The composer and conductor Friedrich Wilhelm Zelter, who knew Friedemann personally and praises his organ improvisations, adds that he never heard him play a note of his father's music on harpsichord, piano, or clavichord.⁵⁶ Born and raised in Berlin, Zelter presumably would have had the opportunity to hear Friedemann's famous organ recitals there, and his statement leaves open the possibility that these had included works by Sebastian. Still, Zelter's reticence on the subject remains puzzling, suggesting that any such performances were rare.

Zelter's account is also the source of the oft-repeated claim that Friedemann did not teach at Berlin.⁵⁷ But we know that at Halle he taught F. W. Rust and others, and in Berlin Sara Levy is thought to have been his pupil.⁵⁸ Hence Zelter may not be an entirely reliable witness to events half a century or more in the past; he mentioned this to Goethe only to characterize Friedemann as someone who was stubborn enough to refuse demeaning employment even when he needed it. If, however, such a person had regularly performed his father's music early in his career, as when he auditioned for his Dresden position,⁵⁹ later in

⁵⁵ On Ringk's likely misattribution of BWV 565 to J. S. Bach, see Peter Williams, "BWV 565: A Toccata in D Minor for Organ by J. S. Bach?," *Early Music* 9 (1981): 330–37, and Rolf Dietrich Claus, *Zur Echtheit von Toccata und Fuge d-moll BWV 565*, 2nd ed. (Köln-Rheinkassel: Dohr, 1995); that of BWV 551 is discussed in my edition forthcoming from Breitkopf.

⁵⁶ "Seine Orgelextemporationen, besonders in seinen guten Stunden, waren die Bewunderung von Männern wie Marpurg, Kirnberger, Benda, Agrikola, Fasch, Bertuch, Ring [Ringck?], meistens vorzügliche Orgelspieler, die alle fühlten wie weit sie von ihm zurückgelassen wurden . . . Auf Flügeln, Fortepianos und Clavieren habe ich ihn noch öfter eben so bewundern müssen, wiewohl ich ihn niemals eine Note von seinem Vater spielen hören, was jeder wünschte." Friedrich Wilhelm Riemer ed., *Briefwechsel zwischen Goethe und Zelter in den Jahren 1796 bis 1832*, vol. 5 (Berlin: Puncker und Humblot, 1834), 210, from an undated "Beylage" that follows a letter to Goethe dated April 6, 1829 (in fact finished on April 11, as the final line indicates)—one month after Mendelssohn's famous performance of the Saint Matthew Passion, for which Zelter prepared the chorus of the Berlin Sing-Akademie.

⁵⁷ More precisely, Zelter quotes an unnamed person to the effect that Friedemann refused to give lessons: "Ein wohlhabender gebildeter Vater eines einzigen Sohnes sandte mich ab, dem Friedemann eine erkleckliche Unterrichtsstunden anzutragen: 'Ich informire nicht' war seine Antwort." *Briefwechsel zwischen Goethe und Zelter*, 209–10.

⁵⁸ The exact nature of Levy's studies with Friedemann appears to be undocumented; that they took place is an inference drawn from her having owned numerous copies of his music, some containing autograph entries (listed in Enßlin, *Die Bach-Quellen der Sing-Akademie zu Berlin*). Further on Friedemann's pupils in Schulenberg, *The Music of Friedemann Bach*, 46–47.

⁵⁹ Friedemann is generally supposed to have performed the G-major Praeludium, BWV 541 when he successfully applied for the position as organist at Dresden's Sophienkirche (further discussion in my forthcoming edition).

life he might have done so only under very special circumstances, as when he visited Forkel. Moreover, what he did play, especially in later years, might have been substantially different from what Sebastian had actually written.

Evidence for how Friedemann might have played his father's music is limited to an edition of Sebastian's Chromatic Fantasia and Fugue, published around 1819 by Forkel's pupil Ferdinand Griepenkerl, later professor at Braunschweig. The title of Griepenkerl's edition proclaimed its preservation of the elder Bach's performance tradition, as passed down through Friedemann Bach and Forkel.⁶⁰ It is hard to accept this claim at face value, as many markings in this edition are more suggestive of early Romantic performance practices than those of the first half of the eighteenth century.⁶¹ The same types of markings occur in Griepenkerl's edition of Friedemann's keyboard polonaises, F. 12, although they are absent from Friedemann's revised autograph of the first six pieces in the set, probably prepared after his move to Berlin.⁶²

Even if some of Griepenkerl's markings go back to Friedemann, it is likely that these editions conflate the latter's performance style with that of younger contemporaries while claiming it to be Sebastian's. Friedemann's style as a composer drew not only on Sebastian Bach but also on Johann Adolf Hasse, Carl Heinrich Graun, and the latter's brother Johann Gottlieb, who had been Friedemann's violin teacher. Some Berlin copies of trio sonatas by the Grauns show numerous added performance markings, including bowings that today seem more typical of nineteenth-century playing.⁶³ If Friedemann was incorporating pre-Romantic elements into his Berlin organ improvisations, some

⁶⁰ *Chromatische Fantasie für das Pianoforte von Johann Sebastian Bach: Neue Ausgabe mit einer Bezeichnung [sic] ihres wahren Vortrags, wie derselbe von J. S. Bach auf W. Friedemann Bach, von diesem auf Forkel und von Forkel auf seine Schüler gekommen* (Leipzig: C. F. Peters, n.d.), preface dated April 10, 1819.

⁶¹ For discussion and examples, see David Schulenberg, "Versions of Bach: Performing Practices in the Keyboard Works," in *Bach Perspectives*, vol. 4, ed. David Schulenberg (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999), 126–27.

⁶² Autograph: Kraków, Uniwersytet Jagiellonski, Biblioteka Jagiellonska, Mus. ms. Bach P 699. Griepenkerl's edition: *Zwölf Polonoisen für das Pianoforte von Wilhelm Friedemann Bach. Mit einer Beschreibung und Bezeichnung des wahren Vortrags wie derselbe von Friede[man]n Bach auf Forkel und von Forkel auf seine Schüler übertragen worden* (Leipzig: C. F. Peters, n.d.), preface dated summer 1819.

⁶³ For example, the copy of a sonata in G minor for two violins and continuo by J. G. Graun (Graun WV Av:XV:37) in Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Amalien-Bibliothek, Mus. ms. 239/18, includes numerous long slurs extending over as many as six measures of 2/4 time, as well as what appear to be indications for upbow staccato (ascending arpeggios in eighths that bear both slurs and staccato dots).

such style might have come to seem appropriate as well for Sebastian's music before the end of the eighteenth century.

Griepenkerl's edition had no direct connection with Berlin. But it raises the larger issue of Bach editions, which have long been closely connected to the musical traditions of the Prussian capital. Reflecting the hierarchic, scientific approach to philology taken for granted in Prussian scholarship, nineteenth-century Bach editions regularized titles and notation. Rust, for example, published as "preludes and fugues" eighteen pieces that go by various titles in early sources. These were followed by three "toccatas," one of which, BWV 566 in E, is preserved in most sources as a *Praeludium*.⁶⁴ The regularization of titles may be immaterial, yet it obscures tangible differences in style and formal design as well as possible distinctions in how some of these pieces might originally have been used and understood. In other words, the genres of these pieces were redefined to suit preconceptions that probably reflected nineteenth-century pedagogy or performing practices.

Individual textual readings were similarly updated. The Buxtehudian tonality of several early works was recast as Rust and other editors accepted readings for accidentals that occur only in late sources.⁶⁵ The notation of fugues was revised to rationalize voice leading, bass lines were segregated to pedals (with consequences for performance practice and registration), and potentially significant genre distinctions disappeared.

The aging J. S. Bach probably started this process in his own late reworkings of many pieces, but it was continued by successors intent on burnishing the image of a perfect composer. The monumental Bach that emerges was expurgated of irregularities, the pieces grouped into homogeneous series. Reading between the lines in those old critical editions, however, one finds disciplined philology mixing with what Peter Williams has called "assertorial musicology": the pronouncement of truths based on unexamined assumptions or specula-

⁶⁴ Details in my forthcoming edition. No source designates either BWV 566 in E or the version in C (BWV 566a) as a toccata.

⁶⁵ For example, a sharp at the end of m. 40 of the C-major *Praeludium* BWV 566a, to modern ears required in order to keep the music at this point in the dominant (G), represents an anachronistic conception of the tonality of this work. Although it is possible that the sharp on the last note of the measure was Bach's own late revision, it is more likely a later addition by the copyist Christoph Friedrich Gottlieb Schwencke, notorious for his unreliable edition of the *Well-Tempered Clavier* (details in my forthcoming edition). Rust retained the sharp in his edition of the corresponding passage in the E-major version (BWV 566).

tions.⁶⁶ Although his musicality shines through his prefaces, Rust confused the hands of several copyists with that of Bach himself, and like other editors of his time he routinely privileged sources and readings that conformed with his own views of how Bach's music should sound and look notationally.

Emanuel and Friedemann were not the only members of the Bach circle prominent in late eighteenth-century Berlin. Ringk, organist at the Marienkirche, might have been a good player, but his chief contribution to the Bach legacy was to have made what is now the sole extant independent copy of the Toccata and Fugue in D minor. Accepted as Bach's without question by Rust, the work continues to be widely viewed as a defining example of the composer's organ music, despite the grave doubts that have been raised about both its style and its sources.⁶⁷ Clearly its style is one that organists and listeners have *wished*, probably since the late eighteenth century, to be that of J. S. Bach. It is grand, dark, and romantic; it sounds impressive on a decent organ, and it is relatively easy to play for a big pedal piece.

Kellner has been suspected of having composed it,⁶⁸ but might it have been an outright fabrication of Ringk? His improvisations, and perhaps those of Friedemann as well, might have sounded somewhat similar.⁶⁹ At a time when Sebastian's pieces were not well known, and when performers routinely assimilated older compositions to contemporary style (as suggested by Griepenkerl's editions), it would have been difficult to discern what by now are, or should be, obvious stylistic disparities. The continuing inclusion of this work in editions and recordings of "Bach" organ music may well be yet another example of the persistent influence of the Berlin Bach tradition.

Certainly the sons and pupils of J. S. Bach who were active in eighteenth-century Berlin all contributed, sometimes in unintended ways, to a local Bach

⁶⁶ As in his review of *Die Welt der Bach-Kantaten* (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1996–99), in *Organ Yearbook* 29 (2000): 202

⁶⁷ Despite Williams, "BWV 565" and Claus, *Zur Echtheit*, the work is assumed to be Bach's in, e.g., Christoph Wolff, *Johann Sebastian Bach* and will be included in the forthcoming edition by Jean-Claude Zehnder (vol. 4 of the new Breitkopf edition).

⁶⁸ See David Humphreys, "The D Minor Toccata BWV565," *Early Music* 10 (1982): 216–17. This is disputed on the basis of a statistical analysis of style elements by Peter van Kranenburg, "Assessing Disputed Attributions for Organ Fugues in the J. S. Bach (BWV) Catalogue," chap. 7 in *Tonal Theory for the Digital Age = Computing in Musicology* 15 (2007): 120–37, online at <http://www.cs.uu.nl/groups/MG/multimedia/publications/art/cm15-07-vankranenburg.pdf>.

⁶⁹ Burney, *The Present State of Music in Germany, The Netherlands, and United Provinces*, 2:207, mentions Ringk's fugue improvisations, although comparing him unfavorably to the organist of the Petrikirche, Johann Peter Lehmann, in "brilliance of finger."

tradition that has substantially shaped our own. The very idea of a collected critical edition of Bach's music is in some ways a Berlin invention, first glimpsed in Kirnberger's assembling of texts for Anna Amalia, whose library eventually included most of Bach's major works for organ and keyboard.⁷⁰ The theoretical ideal of pure composition, enshrined in the title of Kirnberger's compendium on the subject—The Art of Pure Composition in Music (*Die Kunst des reinen Satzes in der Musik*)—reflected the notion that Sebastian had perfected the art of music. It is not unrelated to the ideal of the perfected musical text, the *Fassung letzter Hand*, that is enshrined in an editor's *Gesamtausgabe*. Both ideas, although prefigured in Bach's own reworkings of his texts, reached fruition within Prussia's culture of learned autocracy. We continue to view the music of Bach and his sons through the lens of Hohenzollern Berlin, for better or worse.

⁷⁰ Critical attention to the texts in the manuscripts of the Amalienbibliothek is evident in the occasional inclusion of alternate versions, as for the fugue BWV 951 (in AmB 606), as well as in Kirnberger's annotations in various works, notably a copy of the *Well-Tempered Clavier* (in AmB 57).