

The Keyboard Music of Wilhelm Friedemann Bach
Updates and Corrections

Chapter 1

“But any biography of these composers must remain incomplete in ways that is not the case for musicians whose inner life, emotional as well as musical, is better documented . . .” (p. 5).

Friedemann’s inner life has nevertheless been reconstructed fictionally in the novels, films, and operas mentioned on pages 12–13. To these must be added Lauren Belfer’s 2016 novel *And After the Fire*, which, although continuing the tradition begun by Brachvogel of making Friedemann a lover of certain wealthy young women, in other respects paints plausible pictures of both the aging composer and his youthful pupil Sara Levy.

“One long-standing enigma . . . his fourth cousin” (p. 11)

The exact kinship relationship of Friedemann to J. C. Bach of Halle is less certain and probably more remote than is indicated here. The “Halle Clavier Bach” was descended from Lips (Philippus) Bach, who might have been a brother or son of Veit Bach (Friedemann’s great-great-grandfather). All that can be said assuredly is that the two probably were distantly related, with one or more common ancestors, but none within five generations as suggested here. J. C. Bach of Halle belonged to the same Meiningen branch of the family that also produced the composer Johann Ludwig (his uncle) and the painters Gottlieb Friedrich and Samuel Anton Bach (his cousins).

Table 1.2. Works of Wilhelm Friedemann Bach, listed by genre (p. 16)

The list of Friedemann’s compositions has been expanded by the identification of a large manuscript now in Vilnius (National Library of Lithuania, MkGrn-7) containing many compositions, apparently for keyboard, in the hand of J. C. Bach of Halle. Among them are two substantial compositions that lie outside the genres listed in table 1.2: a French overture and a minuet with thirteen variations. There are also a few variations on a previously known minuet, as well as additional smaller compositions: two short fantasias, four little chorale settings, and five dances and other little pieces. All of these are further discussed below, chiefly in addenda for Chapter 3 (transcriptions are offered elsewhere on this website).

Despite generally clear script, the manuscript contains many errors, especially missing ties and occasional lacunae; such readings are emended in my transcriptions. Most of the “new” pieces, moreover, incorporate unidiomatic leaps and voice-crossings or unduly wide gaps between parts. Such things suggest that Friedemann was writing not for a “live” performer but for a mechanical instrument of some kind, as he is known to have done in other compositions. Peter Wollny’s thematic catalog of Friedemann’s music, which became available in 2013, nevertheless lists the “new” pieces as keyboard compositions; they are cited below by his “BR” (Bach-Repertorium) numbers. The catalog also includes listings for numerous spurious works, a few of which are also considered below with other addenda for Chapter 3.

Chapter 2

“I do not give instruction” (p. 46; see also p. 292n. 27)

The claim that Friedemann did not teach during his Berlin years is based not only on Friedemann's own declaration but on a 1779 letter of Kirnberger to Forkel (in Bitter, 2:323: "auch Lection geben mag er nicht"). This same letter is the principal source for Friedemann's break with both Emanuel and Kirnberger. Friedemann's own statement about not teaching is quoted in an addendum (*Beilage*) to Zelter's letter to Goethe dated April 6, 1829. Absent from most editions of the Zelter-Goethe correspondence, the latter was printed in *Briefwechsel zwischen Goethe und Zelter in den Jahren 1796 bis 1832*, ed. Friedrich Wilhelm Riemer, vol. 5 (Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1834), 209–10. Zelter relates that "a wealthy learned father of an only son had me offer Friedemann the opportunity to give a music lesson that would have been well paid for; 'I don't teach' was his answer" ("Ein wohlhabender gebildeter Vater eines einzigen Sohnes sandte mich ab, dem Friedemann eine erkleckliche Unterrichtsstunde anzutragen: 'Ich informire nicht' war seine Antwort"). Peter Wollny, "Anmerkungen zur Bach-Pflege im Umfeld Sara Levys," in *"Zu groß, zu unerreichbar": Bach-Rezeption im Zeitalter Mendelssohns und Schumanns*, edited by Anselm Hartinger et al. (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf und Härtel, 2007), 39–49 (cited: 42), refers to Kirnberger's letter without further identifying it.

Chapter 3

Chorales (pp. 66–67)

Four little chorale settings in the Vilnius manuscript (BR A101–104) are surely Friedemann's, unlike the seven doubtful ones that make up F. 38/1. All are in three parts except at final cadences, but the attempt to incorporate original, sometimes chromatic, harmony within the thin texture leads to some clumsy voice leading (as in the skipping middle voice in measure 2 of the second setting). BR plausibly suggests that these are related in some way to the Halle clock pieces, which include two psalm settings (BWV Anh. 141–42 = BR A71–72). The tunes set here, only three of which are among those used by J. S. Bach (and those in slightly different versions) are: (1) "Christus, der ist mein Leben"; (2) "Die Seele Christi heilge mich"; (3) "Sey Lob und Ehr" (= "Es ist das Heil uns kommen her"); and (4) "Nun freut euch, lieben Christen."

Pieter Dirksen, "Zum Umfang des erhaltenen Orgelwerks von Wilhelm Friedemann Bach" (full citation below under Bibliography), argues for attributing a few further organ chorales and fugues—both those considered in the present book and several "new" pieces—to Friedemann. Although I am grateful to Pieter for sharing his article with me prior to publication, I find that the basis of the argument lies chiefly in superficial thematic parallelisms. Without stronger evidence in the sources, I must continue to regard the connection of these pieces to the Bach tradition as tenuous at best.

Dances and Other Keyboard Pieces (pp. 67–73)

The additions to Friedemann's compositions in this category from the Vilnius manuscript are discussed individually below, together with a few addenda for previously known works.

Imitation de la chasse F. 26 (pp. 69–70)

To the two versions of this piece that were previously known, the Vilnius manuscript adds a third called *La caccia* (BR A51c). Clearly later than the others, this version adds staccato strokes and otherwise refines the notation while expanding the passages after the double bar (two measures are inserted after measure 14 and again after measure 30, among other changes). Also, the retransition is varied and tightened up (mm. 35–44 become mm. 39–46).

Prelude in C minor F. 29 (p. 70)

Peter Wollny suggests that the completion of the fragment left by Friedemann might have been the work of the Cöthen-born organist Carl August Hartung (1723–1800), who subsequently worked in Braunschweig and apparently was in contact with Friedemann during the latter's time there. See "Carl August Hartung als Kopist und Sammler" (full citation below under Bibliography), 95.

Overture in E-flat BR A59

The most important of the "new" pieces from Vilnius, the overture is unique in Friedemann's known output. It is a so-called French overture, comprising an opening section in dotted rhythm that returns after a fugue (actually a simple double fugue). Although clearly in orchestral style, it is entirely idiomatic to a keyboard instrument except for a few awkward spots (e.g., mm. 37, 81), which are no worse than some of those in the fantasias. Like the Suite F. 24, this is more likely a neo-Baroque piece than a survival from Friedemann's youth; the opening of the dotted section as well as the fugue subject practically quote the corresponding passages in the overture to Graun's *Cesare e Cleopatra*. One of very few works by Graun to open with a French overture, this was his second Berlin opera, premiered in December 1742 at the opening of King Frederick's opera house on Unter der Linden.

Whether the apparent allusions to Graun's overture were intentional is impossible to say, but Friedemann surely could have come across a score of the piece at Berlin, where the opera was long remembered. Distinctive to Friedemann is an "obstinate" passage in the initial dotted section (mm. 13–14) as well as several modulations through rarely used tonalities in both the fugue and the closing dotted sections. The latter, passing through E-flat minor, echoes the closing passage in the prelude in A-flat from part 2 of the *Well-Tempered Clavier* as it touches on A-flat minor and the Neapolitan F-flat in the final phrase (mm. 137–38). (The first page of this piece, missing in Vilnius, was seen here in the copy from D B Mus. ms. 38028; I am grateful to Claudio Astronio for sharing scans of both sources.)

Minuet with thirteen variations BR A110

Friedemann's only substantial set of variations, this appears at first glance to be a significant virtuoso keyboard work comparable in some respects to the polonaises. But whether this places the piece in the composer's Berlin period (as suggested in BR) must remain unresolved, especially in view of the surprisingly simple, even jejune, character of both the minuet itself and most of the variations. The theme is a poor one for a work of this type, inasmuch as both of its two eight-bar periods cadence in the tonic, and all four phrases start with the same descending line and the same rhythm; only phrase 3 makes even a pretence of departing from the tonic G major.

Perhaps the original minuet was not Friedemann's. Its style, however, would indeed seem to date it relatively late in his career, when he might have been consciously simplifying things, as in some of the Berlin sonatas. The variations, although employing characteristic passagework and occasionally ingenious voice leading or figuration, never rise much above the decorative, filling out each phrase in a way that is quite predictable once the pattern of each variation has been established. Nor is there much of an overarching form, apart from a general increase in liveliness toward the middle (variations 4–6) and again at the end (variations 11 and 13).

Although never achieving the intricacy of figuration or counterpoint found in some of the polonaises, the most athletic of the variations nevertheless approach the limit of what is physically playable by one human performer at the keyboard. This is particularly true of variations 11 and 13, whose rather banal

scales and arpeggios are complicated by sudden hand-crossings (or collisions) similar to those found in a few other works. Hence, in view of the small note values, they strengthen the impression that this composition was actually for a mechanical instrument, a view perhaps supported by the notation of variation 4 without the normal key signature of one sharp (cf. below on the Fantasia in G, BR A25).

Minuets in F and F minor BR A50

The copy in Vilnius deepens the puzzle of these two little canonic minuets, which Friedemann as well as Emanuel Bach seems to have known from his student years and re-used in various forms. The Vilnius manuscript actually gives both pieces twice, the second time in a version (BR A 50b) simpler and presumably earlier than the first and lacking the inner voice of the latter (BR A 50a). Three variations of minuet 1 follow, rather more elegant if not markedly more original than the thirteen attached to BR A110; the style of the variations seems markedly later than that of the minuets themselves.

Emanuel published both pieces in what was presumably his own varied version (W. 116/7). Here the first minuet most closely resembles the first *variation* of Friedemann's minuet 1, whereas Emanuel's second minuet resembles the *simpler* version of Friedemann's minuet 2. The two pieces also recur as the final (fourth) movement of the Sinfonia F. 67 (BR C2) and as movements in the sonatas F. 6A (BR A11c, found later in this ms) and F. 1A (BR A2b). The relationships between the versions of both movements are summarized below, listed in order of increasing complexity.

- F. 6A/2 2d mvt. of sonata in F: minuet 1 in F, strictly in two parts, with a trio in D minor elsewhere transposed as the polonaise F. 13/2 in c
- F. 67/4 4th mvt. of sinfonia in F: minuet and trio in three parts (unison violins)
- BR A50b 2d pair of pieces in the Vilnius manuscript: minuets 1–2 in F–f, both strictly in two parts but with small melodic embellishments (including ornament signs) added to the same bass and treble lines present in the other versions
- BR A50a 1st pair of pieces in the Vilnius manuscript, identical to the preceding except for a few slurs and appoggiaturas
- W. 116/7 “Zwo abwechselnde Menuetten vom Herrn Capellmeister Bach, in Hamburg” published in *Musikalisches Vielerley* (Hamburg, 1770): minuets 1–2 in F–f, strictly in two parts (apart from mm. 7–8 of both minuets) but with many additional melodic embellishments, slurs, and ornament signs
- BR A50b three variations on minuet 1, following the second pair of pieces in the Vilnius ms (these variations lack a separate entry or catalog number in BR); the first two measures of each half in variation 1 are identical to the corresponding measures in W. 116/7/1, but otherwise the latter composition is distinct, and the two subsequent variations are unique.

Both movements might derive from a model given by Sebastian as an exercise in composing or improvising variations and embellishments. The general style recalls that of the minuets and other pedagogic pieces in the second little keyboard book for Anna Magdalena Bach (P 225). The initial strain of minuet 1, moreover, is a simple version of measures 1–4 of the duet “Herr, fange an und sprich der Segen” from the wedding cantata BWV 120a of about 1729—better known as the opening movement of BWV 120, used also as the third movement in a variant of the G-major sonata for violin and keyboard BWV 1019 that probably dates from the mid-1720s. Hence the tune was evidently a favorite of Sebastian's, and both Emanuel and Friedemann might have composed versions of it or used it in their own teaching.

A few awkward voice crossings suggest that the ensemble version in the sinfonia F. 67 (probably a Dresden work) preceded BR A50a. On the other hand, similarities to W. 116/7/1 suggest that the latter, published in 1770, might have preceded (or even instigated) Friedemann's variations of minuet 1. The style of the third variation, in particular, seems relatively late (as indicated, for example, by the chromatic passing tone in m. 8), and the wide gaps there between the parts are shared with the E-minor fantasia F. 20—which, perhaps not coincidentally, is also dated 1770 (see below).

Minuet and trio in C and C minor BRA109

This minuet and trio, although less problematical in terms of origin than BR A50, presents equally puzzling problems of performance. Although simple musically, and short, minuet 1 contains a few wide gaps between the three parts and unidiomatic octave writing that again raise the possibility of having been conceived for a mechanical instrument (or perhaps taken from an work for ensemble).

Allegros in D and D minor BR A107–108

Listed in BR as separate pieces, these appear in the Vilnius manuscript as a pair, although only the D-major allegro has a concordance. Both movements are mature in style, but whereas the first, in two parts, is reasonably idiomatic for the keyboard, the second, in three parts, is only barely playable by one player, who must be able to reach a tenth with the left hand.

March in F BR A57

Another work from the Vilnius manuscript, this is also known as a clock piece; indeed the title is present only in the version for mechanical instrument (BWV Anh. 146), which differs in just a few details. Less distinctive than the March in E-flat F. 30, it is a simpler version of the same popular mid-century type, replete with triplets which often move in parallel thirds and sixths: a prettified march that would not be out of place sounding from a music box.

Sonatas (pp. 73–87)

On what seem to be keyboard versions of the flute sonatas in F major and E minor, see the addenda below for Chapter 4.

Canonic minuet movements in the sonatas F. 1 and F. 6 (pp. 77–79)

See above on the “new” minuets in F major and F minor (BR A50).

The Concerto F. 40 in G (p. 93)

With regard to the intended instrument for this work and the very low notes mentioned in relation to example 3.26, see below on “Instrumentation” in Appendix 1. The piece appears in the Vilnius manuscript under the title “Sonata,” in the late version but with the exceptionally low DD of measure 1/26 replaced by D.

Polonaises (p. 96)

Nigel Springthorpe, “The Polonaise and Mazurka in Mid-Eighteenth Century Dresden” (full citation below under Bibliography), 187n. 10, finds it “inconceivable that W. F. Bach did not attend civic

Redouten in the period 1733–1746 and that it was not ‘court ballet’ but functional dances in the polonaise style” at Dresden from which he derived his familiarity with the dance (p. 96). In short, the polonaise was popular, and not only at court, although this does not contradict the original point that members of the Bach family were less likely to have seen actual Polish folk dances than stylized court versions of the same.

Fantasias (pp. 102–13)

To the list of pieces in Table 3.3 (p. 104) must be added the fantasias in D minor (BR A105) and G major (BR A106) from the Vilnius manuscript, which contains all ten of the previously known fantasias as well. The copies in Vilnius are of great significance for several of these works, as noted below. Entries follow for fantasias already known to Falck, then for the two “new” ones and a few spurious pieces.

Fantasias in D minor and D major F. 18 and F. 17 (pp. 106–7)

One of the surprises in the Vilnius manuscript was that it gives the music of the D-major fantasia as a concluding allegro for the D-minor fantasia; F. 17 follows the latter on a new page after a *Volti* (“turn”) indication but with no new title heading. This seems to explain the absence of a “Da capo” after the six-bar *Larghetto* that concludes F. 18 (in the wrong key) in other sources. It also makes sense musically, given the similarity of the passagework in the quick opening portion of F. 18 to that in F. 17.

If the Vilnius source solves the problem of the correct form of F. 18, it does not explain why other copies got it wrong or whether the whole piece (that is, F. 18 + F. 17) was in fact meant for a mechanical instrument. The latter suggestion, made in the original book, reflected the impossibility of a single human playing either the D-minor or the D-major allegro as fluently as the notation implies. Moreover, even the Vilnius manuscript gives a double bar after measure 8 in F. 18. The editor Peter Schleuning took this double bar to stand for a “Fine” after the “Da capo” that he assumed should follow the *Larghetto*. It remains possible, therefore, that F. 18 was conceived as a stand-alone fantasia in ternary form and was later combined with F. 17, either by the composer or by the copyist of the Vilnius manuscript. The resulting composite piece was doubtless not the only instance of a fantasia thus cobbled together.

Fantasia in A minor F. 23 (pp. 108–9)

Despite the useful information about other fantasias provided by the Vilnius manuscript, the latter offers no support for the supposition (expressed in BR) that this piece is incomplete as we have it.

Fantasia in E minor F. 20 (pp. 109–10)

Here as in F. 23, the Vilnius manuscript offers no solution to a problem evident in other sources: the presence of only three beats in measure 55, which appears identically in the Vilnius copy. On the other hand, the hypothesis that this, like other pieces in the Vilnius manuscript, might have been intended for a mechanical instrument could explain some of its oddities; might this also be related to the unique presence of a date (1770) in the copy in P 329?

Fantasia in D minor F. 19 (pp. 110–11)

The book raises the possibility that measures 5–8 were copied out of order when they recur in the recapitulation (mm. 133–34, 131–32). If so, however, the Vilnius source offers no evidence for this, agreeing with other sources as it does in F. 23 and F. 20.

Fantasia in E minor F. 21 (pp. 111–13)

The most important contribution of the Vilnius manuscript to the canon of Friedemann's works, after its unique preservation of the Overture in E-flat, is the inclusion of seven measures which fill the gap found after measure 157 in the two previously known sources of the large E-minor fantasia, F. 21. Neither of my conjectural efforts to fill the lacuna, shown in Example 3.40, came particularly close to what Friedemann actually wrote (see example below). After continuing the pattern of measures 156–57 for two more bars, he introduced new figuration, accelerating the harmonic rhythm to a whirlwind in measure 161—which modulates downward by fifth on every beat—before pausing on the dominant of the following section. The absence of this music from the other copies, which also failed to leave sufficient space for it, might be due to Friedemann's having deleted a shorter version of the passage in the original composing score, on which the other manuscripts might have been based. But it might also reflect a separate origin for the ensuing Grave from that of the opening passage of this fantasia, which is recapitulated a few bars later in what is now measure 170 (175 in Schleuning's edition).

The image shows a musical score for the Fantasia in E minor, measures 156 through 162. The score is written for piano and consists of three systems of music. Each system has a treble clef on the upper staff and a bass clef on the lower staff. The key signature is one sharp (F#) and the time signature is common time (C). Measure 156 begins with a treble staff containing a series of eighth notes and a bass staff with a similar rhythmic pattern. Measure 159 continues this pattern. Measure 161 shows a significant increase in rhythmic density, with many sixteenth notes in both staves. Measure 162 concludes with a [Grave] marking, indicating a change in tempo and mood, with a slower, more sustained melodic line in the treble and a simple harmonic accompaniment in the bass.

Fantasias in D minor and G major BR A105–106

Although listed together in a single supplementary entry in the new thematic catalog (under “Nachträge”), these are distinct pieces of different types, probably even intended for different media. The D-minor fantasia is in rounded binary form, as is F. 14, but unlike the latter it is decidedly

retrospective in style, each half beginning in the manner of an allemande. It recalls allemandes in Sebastian's First Partita in B-flat (BWV 825) and Handel's HWV 449 (also in D minor), as well as an allemande in C minor that was misattributed to Bach as BWV 834—in each case on account of the arpeggiation for the right hand that follows the initial chord. But thereafter Friedemann's piece veers away from any conventional type of movement, and near the end (m. 30) it introduces repeated notes reminiscent of "La caccia." By that point Friedemann seems to have lost the train of his compositional thought, but this is a strong piece up to measure 21, where the forward motion is maintained only by a few repeated notes in the bass. The stylistic heterogeneity probably bears out the suggestion (made in BR) that this is an early work, perhaps contemporary with "The Hunt" and other pieces preserved in P 226.

The G-major fantasia, on the other hand, is so close to F. 22, also in G, that it must be another clock piece, presumably from the Halle years. It is even less readily manageable by a human performer than F. 22; on the other hand, it is significantly longer, constituting a three-part sonata form (with divisions at mm. 15 and 37) rather than a binary form. It remains through-composed, however, and perhaps its curious notation in the Vilnius manuscript (without key signature) had something to do with its being intended for transcription onto a clockwork mechanism.

Misattributed pieces

The list of spurious works in the new catalog of Friedemann's works includes several fantasias by Johann Wilhelm Hässler (1747–1822) that have long masqueraded as Friedemann's, most recently on several CD recordings. At least one of the latter compositions was among the first pieces to be printed and performed under Friedemann's name in the later nineteenth century (for details, see my "Enigmatic Legacy," listed below under Bibliography, p. 24n. 1). Another spurious work, a fugue in C minor by Sebastian Bach's friend Johann Peter Kellner, was good enough to be published anonymously in an anthology edited by C. P. E. Bach (*Musikalisches Vielerley*, 1770). There it immediately follows a sonata by J. C. F. Bach, which may explain its occasional attribution to the latter, but the two works are in different keys and have nothing else in common either. The fugue's conventional *stile antico*, maintained throughout except in a stylistically anomalous coda, also has nothing to common with any keyboard music by W. F. Bach, whose name seems to have been attached to the piece arbitrarily (as it is, for example, on imslp.org).

Chapter 4

In Table 4.1 on page 131, note a should read simply "Slow movement"; delete "(through-composed)." As noted below, the sinfonia F. 71 is no longer lost.

Trio in B-flat F. 50 (p. 130)

A manuscript copy of the original version of this work for two violins and continuo has been reported by Christine Blanken (see under Bibliography below).

Flute sonatas (pp. 145–49)

Whether Friedemann's two flute sonatas indeed originated as keyboard pieces, as assumed on pages 145–46, is cast in doubt by the versions of the two compositions in the Vilnius manuscript (described above). Although published as keyboard sonatas in volume 1 of the *CW*, these scores (BR A9 and A11d), are unlikely to have been intended for a keyboard instrument. In addition to containing much

that is unidiomatic to the keyboard, both ascend to high g”, a note that does appear in at least one mature keyboard sonata by W. F. Bach, but which is not to be expected in an ostensibly early work composed at Dresden. Possibly the copyist J. C. Bach of Halle found the piece notated on two staves in an autograph, without a title clarifying the instrumentation. Or could Friedemann himself have passed it off as a keyboard piece, despite its distinct unsuitability for that medium?

Sinfonia in B-flat F. 71 (p. 164)

This work is no longer lost (as indicated in Table 4.6, p. 150, and in the List of Works, p. 286). A manuscript source dating from Bach’s Halle period has been reported by Christine Blanken (see under Bibliography below). The sinfonia will be published in an appendix of a forthcoming volume of the *CW*. Until the latter appears, the relationship of F. 71 to the *torneo* in the doubtful *Ouverture* BWV 1070 (discussed on p. 164) must remain uncertain.

Suite in G minor BWV 1070 (pp. 164–65) and Concerto in G minor F. deest (pp. 190–96)

For a more detailed discussion of the attributions of these compositions, see my article “An Enigmatic Legacy” (full citation below under Bibliography).

Chapter 5

Additions and corrections for table 5.1 (pp. 204–5)

Lasset uns ablegen (F. 80) was originally for Advent; Emanuel Bach used it at Pentecost when he performed it at Hamburg.

Friedemann’s use of vocal works by others (pp. 236–39)

To Friedemann’s adaptations of his father’s vocal music might be added at least one by another composer. A manuscript copy of a Magnificat for four voices and instruments in D by Jan Dismas Zelenka, with corrections probably by Friedemann, raises the possibility that he performed this and other Dresden works during his Halle period, and that his own church works were influenced by them. The greatest number of additions to the score are indications of which instruments should play in various passages. Rubrics at the outset of the score indicate that it was originally conceived for an ensemble with two viola parts but (apparently) only one violin part, doubled by oboes. The added indications presumably served to adapt Zelenka’s score to the forces available to Friedemann at Halle, preceding the copying of individual parts.

The manuscript in question is a score by a copyist identified as Gottlob Harrer (Cambridge, Harvard College Library, bMUS Mus 83); bound with it is a violin part that has been reported as being in Friedemann’s hand, although the script does not resemble his. On the other hand, the handwriting of the numerous verbal additions in the score is close to that of his known autographs. This source suggests that Friedemann adapted and performed not only works of his father but also those of the Dresden musician who was probably the most original if not the most prolific or influential composer during Friedemann’s tenure there. The Magnificat, ZWV 108 in the thematic catalog by Wolfgang Horn and Thomas Kohlhase (*Zelenka Dokumentation: Quellen und Materialien*, Wiesbaden: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1989), follows traditions of Dresden rather than Leipzig or Berlin in comprising just three movements. Most of the text is set in the opening section, which is followed by the *Suscepit Israel* and final Amen. The latter, a fugue in *stile antico*, lacks independent instrumental parts. Friedemann’s

Amen F. 99/1 is similarly conceived and might have been used in place of this or other fugal Amen choruses in works of this type.

Although Zelenka's work on the whole is remote in style from the Magnificat settings of J. S. and C. P. E. Bach, and from Friedemann's own vocal music, one passage briefly calls to mind the vivid virtuoso choral writing in works such as his Easter piece *Erzittert und fället* (F. 83) and might have been the sort of thing heard at Dresden that inspired it (see example below).

Example. Zelenka, Magnificat in D (ZWV 108), doubling instrumental parts omitted

The image displays a musical score for Zelenka's Magnificat in D (ZWV 108), specifically focusing on the vocal parts. The score is arranged in two systems. The first system includes four vocal staves labeled S (Soprano), A (Alto), T (Tenor), and B (Bass). The lyrics for this system are: "dis-per - sit, dis-per - sit su-per-bos, dis - per-sit dis - per-sit su-per -". The second system continues the lyrics: "bos men - te cor - dis su - - - is, per - sit su-per - bos men - te cor - - - dis su - - - is, bos men - te cor - dis su - - - is per - bos men - te cor - - - dis su - - - is, de - po-su - it". The musical notation includes treble and bass clefs, a key signature of two sharps (D major), and a common time signature (C). The lyrics are written below the notes, with hyphens indicating syllables that span across multiple notes.

Telemann also may have provided material for a work that Friedemann presented in church, although in this case the relationship is one of modeling rather than arrangement or adaptation. Peter Wollny (2012, 27–8) argues that both text and music of the church piece *Der Höchste erhöret* F. 86 (including the aria “Das Herze klopft,” ex. 5.15) are modeled on those of the cantata for the seventh Sunday after Trinity in Telemann's *Engel-Jahrgang*, published in 1749 (so called for the vignette of an angel or *putto* on the title page). Indeed, not only do the texts of the arias parody those by Daniel Stoppe for the Telemann work, but the musical character, key, and some of the specific motivic material of each are too closely parallel to have arisen by coincidence. Wollny rightly notes, however, that there is no question of

outright musical parody or paraphrase; indeed, Telemann never takes up the obvious word painting introduced by Friedemann on the word *klopft* (beat or throb; cf. ex. 5.15)—even though the subject doing the throbbing in Telemann’s aria is a poor man with a stick (*Der Arme . . . mit seinem Stabe*), not “the heart” (*Das Herz*). In this case, therefore, Friedemann is actually more “painterly” than Telemann. In the second aria, however, Telemann gives the violins slurred thirty-seconds, reminiscent of the aria “Ergiesse dich” in BWV 5; these depict, more vividly than Friedemann’s triplets (for obbligato organ), the rain (*Regen*) which is mentioned in the first line of both texts. One might conclude that, as in other compositions that open with derivative material, Friedemann took a suggestion from another work before making himself master of it with matter of his own.

The G-Minor Mass F. 100 (pp. 239–41)

The discussion of this work (including table 5.6) requires modification. As indicated in the new catalog, Friedemann’s original manuscript parts and vocal score, containing vocal parts and transposed continuo part, have been acquired by the Bach-Archiv in Leipzig as part of the Kulukundis Collection. These supplement the incomplete score in SA 236 that was used in the preparation of the present book, making possible a complete recording of the work (by the Rastatter Hofkapelle, directed by Jürgen Ochs, on Carus 83.429, Stuttgart, 2010) and its eventual publication in volume 11 of the *CW*. In addition to a Kyrie and a closing fugue (“Du bist allein”) in *stile antico* with *colle parti* instruments, the work includes a setting in accompanied-recitative style for soprano and strings of the opening of the Gloria (“Herr Gott, himmlischer König”).

The unfinished opera Lausus und Lydie F. 106 (pp. 263–64)

It was Plümicke who engaged Friedemann to compose the opera, not the latter who sought out a librettist (as indicated on page 263). And it was the libretto, not the music, to which Plümicke refers when he writes that the opera remained “unprinted.” But there can be no question that Plümicke, writing about himself in the third person, approached Friedemann and not another member of the Bach family. Falck, who quoted the relevant sentence, has been accused of arbitrarily supplying the composer’s given names within parentheses, thereby making the reference more specific than it actually was. Although Falck did insert Plümicke’s name (after the ambiguous pronoun *er*), he gave the opening clause of the passage exactly as it appears in the original: “Für den durch sein grosses musikalisches Genie berühmten Herrn (Wilhelm Friedemann) Bach unternahm er [Plümicke] hiernächst in den Jahren 1778 und 1779 die Verfertigung einer ernsthaften Oper (nach Marmontel): Lausus und Lydie, worinn er besonders die Chöre der Alten (in so fern solches möglich ist) wieder auf die Bühne zu bringen versuchte—Doch ist selbige weil die Komposition kränklicher Umstände des Komponisten wegen unbeendigt verblieben, bis jetzt noch ungedruckt.”

Appendix 1

The reference on page 273 to example 5.18 is incorrect; the reference should be to example 5.26.

Instrumentation (pp. 267–68)

More could be said about the preferred medium of Friedemann’s keyboard music—harpsichord, clavichord, or fortepiano. Only his earliest works, such as the pieces with French titles F. 26 and 27, can be played entirely satisfactorily on the harpsichord. Other compositions seem to demand some dynamic capability, and certain ones appear to have been conceived primarily for mechanical instruments, not keyboards played by a human with two hands. Yet it must be admitted that we simply

do not know on what instruments any of these works were most commonly played, or whether Friedemann had a preferred instrument at any particular time in his career. Certainly there is no basis for asserting, as Paul Simmonds does in a recent review (*Early Music* 38 [2010]: 625), that the D-major sonata F. 3 “was probably intended for the harpsichord.” Dresden, where it was composed, knew fortepianos as well as more exotic types of dynamic keyboard instruments. The dedication of the published edition of the sonata to a figure at the Berlin court likewise points to someone familiar with additional instruments besides the harpsichord, which can hardly be considered an ideal medium for this piece. (The word *Cembalo*, as in the work’s published title, is a generic term in mid-eighteenth-century sources and does not mean specifically “harpsichord.”)

On the other hand, the possible usefulness of particular types of special harpsichords for this and other pieces should not be dismissed. Sebastian’s pupil and successor as organist at Weimar, Johann Caspar Vogler, owned an extraordinary harpsichord with pedals and a six-octave manual compass CC–c”” (advertised for sale in 1766 by his widow; see Carl G. Anthon, “An Unusual Harpsichord,” *Galpin Society Journal* 37 [1984]: 115–6). Although there is no known connection between Vogler and Friedemann Bach, other than their living for a time in the same city, on this instrument the revised version of Friedemann’s concerto F. 40, with its low DD, might have been played as written. Appendix 1 of the present book dismisses the reliability of the source in which this very low note appears. But the same note was apparently available on the large English harpsichords by Schudi that King Frederick kept at the Neues Schloß in Potsdam. These instruments might also have been available to the king’s sister Princess Anna Amalia (see Latcham, “Pianos and Harpsichords For Their Majesties,” 383; full citation below under Bibliography), and through her to Friedemann. One might also have managed that note and others on the sixteen-foot rank of the instrument usually attributed to Johann Heinrich Harass—sometimes described as having been owned by Friedemann—which is now in the Musikinstrumenten-Museum of the Staatliches Institut für Musikforschung, Berlin (cat. no. 316); see *Das Berliner “Bach-Cembalo”: Ein Mythos und seine Folgen*, ed. Konstantin Restle and Susanne Aschenbrandt (Berlin: Musikinstrumenten-Museum, 1995). In short, it is possible that F. 40 was revised at Berlin with such instruments in mind—though it also remains possible that the extreme low notes in this version do reflect some sort of misunderstanding by a copyist.

To the compositions that Friedemann has long been suspected of having written for clockwork mechanisms, including the Fantasia F. 22, must be added many of the “new” pieces present only in the Vilnius manuscript. Of the unica in that source, only four may be genuine keyboard pieces:

- Overture in E-flat (BR A59)
- Minuets in F and F minor (BR A18), version in 2 parts, including 3 variations on minuet 1
- La Caccia (F. 26), late version
- Fantasia in D minor (BR A105).

The remainder may have been intended originally for mechanical instruments, perhaps of different types:

- Minuet and Trio in C and C minor (BR A109)
- Allegros in D and D minor (BR A50)
- March in F (BR A57)
- Four chorales (BR A101–104)
- Fantasia in G (BR A25)
- Minuet with 13 variations (BR A110).

The march in fact appears elsewhere as a clock piece (BWV Anh. 146, the source of the title, which is lacking in the Vilnius manuscript). Also possibly meant for clockwork instruments were the Fantasias in D minor and D major (F. 18 and 17), given in the Vilnius source as a single composition. All these pieces incorporate wide gaps between the parts and figuration that is almost impossible for a live performer to play at a reasonable tempo. Similarly unidiomatic are these arrangements (also from Vilnius) of other compositions:

Minuets in F and F minor (BR A18), version in three parts, from the Sinfonia F. 67
Sonata in E minor (BR A9), from the Flute Sonata BR B17 (mvt. 2 also in Sonata F. 202)
Sonata in F (BR A11d), from Flute Sonata BR B18 (mvts. 1–3 from F. 6C, 6B, and 1B).

Only the smaller of these pieces (BR A109, A50, A57, and A101–104) are confined to the compass of the known clock pieces (listed as BWV Anh. 133–150), which do not descend below C or rise above e⁷. But in other respects the “new” Fantasia in G (BR A25) and the Minuet with 13 variations, as well as the composite fantasia F. 18 / F. 17, are so similar in texture and general style to the clock pieces, and so impractical for “live” performance, that the proposition must be entertained that they were written for one or more other mechanical instruments, perhaps in Berlin rather than in Halle. That quite substantial music might be composed for such contraptions during the later eighteenth century is demonstrated by Mozart’s K. 594, 608, and 616.

Bibliography

Belfer, Lauren. *And After the Fire*. New York: HarperCollins, 2016.

Blanken, Christine. “Ein wieder zugänglich gemachter Bestand alter Musikalien der Bach-Familie im Verlagsarchiv Breitkopf & Härtel.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 99 (2013): 79–128. A talk giving portions of the same material was presented in English at the 2014 meeting of the American Bach Society (“Recently Rediscovered Sources of Music of the Bach Family in the Breitkopf ‘Firmenarchiv’ in Leipzig”).

Dirksen, Pieter. “Zum Umfang des erhaltenen Orgelwerks von Wilhelm Friedemann Bach.” In *Wilhelm Friedemann Bach und die protestantische Kirchenkantate nach 1750*, ed. Wolfgang Hirschmann and Peter Wollny, Forum Mitteldeutsche Barockmusik, vol. 1 (Beeskow: Ortus, 2012), pp. 391–412.

Latcham, Michael. “Pianos and Harpsichords For Their Majesties.” *Early Music* 36 (2008): 359–96.

Schulenberg, David. “An Enigmatic Legacy: Two Instrumental Works Attributed to Wilhelm Friedemann Bach.” *BACH: Journal of the Riemenschneider Bach Institute* 41/2 (2010): 24–60.

Springthorpe, Nigel. “The Polonaise and Mazurka in Mid-Eighteenth Century Dresden: Style and Structure in the Music of Johann Christian Roellig.” *Eighteenth-Century Music* 13 (2016): 183–209.

Williams, Peter. “The Road to Damascus.” *Musical Times* 152 (2011): 109–13. Includes a review of the present book.

Wollny, Peter. “Carl August Hartung als Kopist und Sammler Bachscher Werke.” *Bach-Jahrbuch* and 97 (2011): 81–101.

———. “‘Fleißige, reine Arbeit’ oder ‘Abglanz einer großen Schule’? Wilhelm Friedemann Bach und die protestantische Kirchenkantate nach 1750.” In *Wilhelm Friedemann Bach und die protestantische*

Kirchenkantate nach 1750, ed. Wolfgang Hirschmann and Peter Wollny, Forum Mitteldeutsche Barockmusik, vol. 1 (Beeskow: Ortus, 2012), pp. 13–31.

———, ed. *Wilhelm Friedemann Bach: Thematisch-systematisches Verzeichnis der musikalischen Werke (BR-WFB)*. Bach-Repertorium: Werkverzeichnisse zur Musikerfamilie sBach, vol. 2. Stuttgart: Carus, 2012.

Updated March 16, 2017