

*A Kalmus Classic Edition*

Johann Sebastian

**BACH**

**THE WELL-TEMPERED CLAVIER**

48 PRELUDES AND FUGUES

VOLUME II

Edited by

DR. HANS BISCHOFF

FOR PIANO










K 03037





## TABLE OF EMBELLISHMENTS



For the uninitiated performer the following indications will suffice — in reference to this volume.

1) Grace notes, like all other embellishments, enter ON the beat — not before it. Unless indicated otherwise, they should be executed quickly.

2) The trill (**tr** or ) generally begins on the auxiliary note. There is usually an after-beat, unless this is replaced by one or more indicated notes. The after-beat is unnecessary before a descending second. The symbol for the trill with an up-beat is  or . The trill starting on the lower note  and the one starting on the upper note  usually both end with an after beat. The following symbols may also be used to indicate the same:  and . The short trill  is usually tied to the upper second preceding. Its symbol frequently takes the place of  and **tr**.

3) The mordent  or  often takes the tone a minor second lower as the auxiliary note, although the neighboring note is sometimes a major second lower. (Compare Turk, Ch. IV p. 61.)

4) The turn  placed over a note is executed , placed between two notes it is played . In dotted rhythm, the turn proper ends on the dot .

5) The slurred note  is played .

6) Other embellishments are explained in the annotations.

## PREFACE

An autograph of the A flat major Fugue from the second volume of the Well Tempered Clavier is in the possession of the Royal Library in Berlin. To the best of our knowledge there is no other source-material extant stemming directly from the composer's own hand. Our text-criticism is, therefore, based on altogether different factors than those involved in our editing of the first volume of the Well Tempered Clavier.

On the authority of Schwenke, the second volume of Preludes and Fugues was put together in 1744. The same year (i.e. 1744) appears inscribed in a strange handwriting at the conclusion of one of the Altnikol copies of the work. There can be no doubt that Bach intended the combined work to create an integral whole as a counterpart to the first volume of the Well Tempered Clavier. However, one cannot prove indubitably that Bach intended to give this work the same title which he gave to the work written more than twenty years earlier.

According to Hilgenfeldt, there is an autograph dating from the year 1740; such a copy is entirely unknown to me. The entire character of the manuscript tradition of this work is such, that it is my own opinion that Bach never really made a complete copy of the entire work, whereas he had actually made three copies of the first volume of the Well Tempered Clavier. Since he has fused into one collection a series of formerly completed preludes and fugues, some remaining unchanged, others being transposed, still others completely altered, with the empty spots here and there replaced by new compositions, we can presume that Bach possessed only individual manuscripts of the various pieces; some of these he copied more than once, with many points of deviation in the different versions. This explains why Bach's pupils received various versions of the same composition for purposes of recopying and study. It also clarifies the striking fact that the most important manuscripts, i.e., those of Kirnberger, Altnikol and Fürstenau—not to mention the less-important ones—present some compositions in very mature and highly-developed versions, others in relatively primitive form. It will become evident from our annotations to the text that none of the manuscripts can lay claim to the sort of finality that would have been attached to an authoritative manuscript actually made by Bach himself. Another observation is in order at this point. Altnikol had made his first copy of the second volume of the Well Tempered Clavier on the basis of many individual manuscripts of different periods and in various stages of development. It is highly improbable that he would have made a second equally careful copy, based on precisely the same source-material, if Bach had left a complete original manuscript of his own, embodying his ultimate conception of the work in question.

Another important point can be mentioned apropos the clarification of some of the peculiarities of the manuscript tradition. It appears that the owners of manuscript, made on the basis of older sources, frequently inserted the variants which subsequently appeared in later copies. It is also possible that Bach, in teaching his students, occasionally indicated more or less isolated corrections in the earlier versions. These manifestations can be proved only to a relatively small degree in the manuscript copies which we have at hand; nevertheless, they serve to explain the phenomenon of early and late variants appearing in the same manuscript.

The relationship of the Kirnberger and Altnikol manuscripts to each other is quite a remarkable one. Their deviations of text seem to proceed concurrently, in an evenly alternating supply. The more beautiful version sometimes appears in one manuscript, sometimes in the other. Neither of them goes back to the oldest sources in any instance where a composition has undergone thorough subsequent reconstruction, even though it is known to date back to an earlier creative period.

It is obvious that one cannot make an infallible decision in the many instances handed down to us in various versions, as to which form was the final one and which variant is the most beautiful. We have, therefore, decided that the most feasible course to follow is to include the specific variant above or below the text proper in order to enable the performer to make his own choice. Despite the deep interest inherent in a careful study of Bach's method in refining and revising his compositions, one must, nevertheless, admit that some absolutely authentic deviations are of such scant importance that one can scarcely speak of actual improvement.

Despite my intention to present a thorough survey of all the interesting variants, in addition to a precise and well-authenticated text, I did not make a fetish of detail to the extent of citing isolated, unimportant deviations from notoriously undependable sources. I have also made relatively few references to the printed editions, since they generally add nothing towards the actual evaluation of a particular version. Nevertheless, one will find a very adequate exposition of all the worthwhile deviations from the old editions of Simrock, Nägeli and Hoffmeister—insofar as these variants are not supported by the authoritativeness of important manuscripts. It would certainly be quite futile to give a complete record of every omitted tie and similar matters of detail.

Moreover, I have frequently limited myself to the mention of manuscripts in groups rather than individually—in those instances where the Kirnberger text is followed by one group of manuscripts, the Altnikol text by another. Despite this frequent method of group-reference, I believe that I have attained a desirable degree of precision in my commentary of the text. The annotations contain a detailed elucidation of the origin of the ornaments appearing in smaller type, or in parentheses, whose authenticity has not been completely established. I have omitted the ornaments which appeared in untrustworthy manuscripts without additional substantiation; I have similarly omitted the frequently recurring confusion of mordents and inverted mordents, from which even the good sources are not entirely free.

Ties which are authenticated by the manuscripts appear in heavier type than the phrasing indicated by the editor; staccato notes which are traditional are marked with dashes instead of dots.

As I have mentioned previously, the only autographic source at my disposal is the A flat major Fugue contained in P. 274 of the Royal Library in Berlin. Practically identical with it is the clear though not authoritative copy—(P. 213).

A series of manuscripts obtained by Prof. Wagner in Marburg from Prof. Bach, now the property of the Berlin Library (P. 416), was also considered an autograph. (Compare Vol. XIV of the Bach-Gesellschaft Edition, page 18, no. 14a.) The supplement to this manuscript was a copy discovered by Mr. Fürstenau, of Dresden, at a second-hand bookseller's shop. Thus our reference to #416—Fürstenau embraces two manuscripts which together form an almost complete copy of the entire second volume of the Well Tempered Clavier. The only items missing are the Prelude and Fugue in G major and the B major Fugue. The manuscript #416—Fürstenau is doubtless of great value; it was probably written during Bach's lifetime. However, it is full of careless mistakes and contains a number of subsequently added details. At times the handwriting undoubtedly manifests characteristics similar to those of an actual autograph; it frequently contains early versions—sometimes the earliest ones known. Manuscript No. 210 in the Royal Library in Berlin definitely belongs to the same group as the above mentioned manuscript; it reproduces the errors in script with such accuracy that one cannot ascribe this purely to chance. However, this manuscript is so undependable that the variants contained in it are rarely worth mentioning.

Of special importance are the two complete copies by Altnikol. The first of these, also used by Kroll, is probably the older of the two; however, my only proof in support of this contention lies in the peculiar rhythmic notation in the B minor Prelude. The second Altnikol copy came into the possession of the Royal Library in Berlin quite recently. Both copies are based on the same sources. The deviations contained in them are of slight consequence, excepting the subsequent alterations made by alien hands. The manuscript which I refer to as "Altnikol I" is particularly distinguished by its generally correct presentation of ornaments; however, it is inadequate in that numerous excellent ornaments have been omitted.

The last-mentioned manuscript exerted a tremendous influence on the copy of Schwenke; this copy, in turn, offers us a key to many of the versions appearing in the old printed editions.

Manuscript #207 also belongs to the Altnikol group; yet it frequently contains widely deviating versions which are definitely not authentic. However, the number of apocryphal changes is not as great as in the first part of this manuscript (i.e. pertaining to vol. I of the Well Tempered Clavier). I have, therefore, been able to make a number of quotations from this manuscript.

Forkel's copy (#212 in the Royal Library in Berlin) is of little interest in reference to the second volume of the Well Tempered Clavier. The compositions contained in it chiefly reveal the versions contained in the Altnikol manuscripts. Deviations similar in character to the notorious contractions of the preludes in the first volume of the Well Tempered Clavier are conspicuous by their absence.

In addition to the manuscripts of Altnikol, we designate the Kirnberger manuscript (belonging to the Amalien-library of the Joachimsthal High-School) as the principal codex for this volume of Preludes and Fugues. It has already been mentioned that we have almost always had to choose between the versions of Kirnberger and Altnikol; on many occasions we have been unable to choose one in preference to the other. Apart from its greater importance due to the absence of actual autographic sources, it appears that Kirnberger actually used the manuscript of the second volume of the Well Tempered Clavier much more as a reference-text than he did the manuscript of the first volume. The document has not remained entirely unsullied by alien hands, it does contain a number of distortions in the ornamentation, and it is not particularly dependable in the matter of slurring.

The following two manuscripts are either identical or almost identical with the Kirnberger copy; first, the complete copy in #49 of the Amalien-library, second, the collection of individual pieces contained in No. 211 of the Royal Library in Berlin.

In contrast to the manuscripts of Kirnberger and Altnikol—an eclectic point of view is represented by the following: (1) P. 206 in the Berlin Library, (2) a complete copy from the Dresden Library, (3) an incomplete collection contained in P. 209 in the Berlin Library. The latter is written in several different handwritings.

We must also mention the manuscript of the Bückeburg Bach (P. 226, Berlin), which contains the C major Prelude—also the oldest version of the Prelude and Fugue in D minor.

Finally, there are several very interesting manuscripts from the Kellner collection belonging to Mr. Roitzsch, of Leipzig. Of special importance are the old sketches of Nos. 1 and 15 in the volume.

Among the printed editions I have made a thorough comparison of Nægeli, Simrock, Hoffmeister and the Bach-Gesellschaft edition. Of these, Nægeli offered the principal material for quotation in his many arbitrary attempts at text-improvement.

I wish to express my sincere thanks to the following librarians: Dr. Kopfermann, Prof. Heller and M. Fürstenau, also to Mr. Roitzsch, of Leipzig,—for their friendly loan of various manuscripts.

Dr. Hans Bischoff.

Berlin, June 1884.



# PRAELUDIUM I. NB.

Andante espressivo (♩ = 54)

N.B. This prelude has been passed on to us in three different versions. The oldest of these (see Appendix 1) is contained in a manuscript from the "Clavierbuch" of J.P. Kellner, which Mr. Roitzsch, of Leipzig, has very kindly placed at my disposal. This piece seems to have been in existence as far back as 1725; its length is seventeen measures. The figuration appearing in this early version is simple. The transposed reiteration of the bulk of the piece—also the transition—is missing. A later version appears in the manuscripts of Fürstenau and Kirnberger as well as in No. 49 of the Amalien-library and the Berlin manuscripts Nos. 210 and 211. According to these sources, the prelude has the same length and structure as is contained in the final version appearing in our text. The development of the richer and more varied figuration in the second version is inferior to the final version only in matters of detail. The important deviations in text are given in the notes under alphabetical symbols. Our version of the prelude is based on the two manuscripts of Altnikol, which were also used by Schwenke and others. Other variants are listed under numerical symbols.

a) At+B natural according to Fürstenau. b) At+A instead of G according to Fürstenau.

c) d) e)