A Musical ‘Notage à Trois’:
The relationship revealed between three manuscript versions of J. S. Bach’s
*Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas and Partitas?*

Penelope Ruth Reiss

This thesis is presented for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

School of Law, Business and Arts

Charles Darwin University

March, 2016
“Soli Deo Gloria”

(Glory to God)
I hereby declare that the work herein, now submitted as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy of the Charles Darwin University, is the result of my own investigations and all references to ideas and work of other researchers have been specifically acknowledged. This thesis contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any University, and to the best of the candidate’s knowledge and belief, the thesis contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference is made in the text of the thesis.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying online via the University’s Open Access repository eSpace.

Penelope Reiss

29 March 2016
Acknowledgments

In order to successfully complete the challenging journey of writing this thesis I have come to rely on a complex web of relationships and support from many people. In particular, I am most grateful for the assistance and support of the following:

I am indebted to the school for the time needed to undertake this study, to the Principal and Head of School for supporting this study and my students for their avid interest in the context, while holding me accountable to time frames.

Crucial to the success of this text was the ongoing and unwavering support and assistance of my supervisor Professor Martin Jarvis. I felt encouraged, respected and believed in throughout this process, while also being inspired and challenged to dig deeper into the emerging narrative as it unfolded.

I am grateful to the many people who offered to read through the study and provide editorial assistance. I am also grateful to my brother for reading through the study in its early beginnings, clarifying aspects of my work and opening my eyes to a new way of thinking. I am thankful to my immediate and extended family who were suddenly thrown into the obsessive world of thesis writing and who celebrated significant milestones with me along the way.
Abstract

In addition to what is recognised as Bach’s ‘1720 Autograph’, two known and accepted manuscript versions exist of Johann Sebastian Bach’s Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas and Partitas (BWV 1001–1006). One is believed to be an incomplete copy made by Johann Peter Kellner. This, however, contains numerous unexplained and what seem to be purposeful divergences, such that its authenticity as a copy of the final autograph is questionable. This manuscript is thought to have derived from an early working version of Bach’s, and, as such offers an insight into the compositional origins and history of these works.

The other version, which musicologists currently claim was made by Bach’s second wife, Anna Magdalena, is traditionally accepted as being copied from the final ‘1720 Autograph.’

Bach scholars have commented on the divergences between Kellner’s manuscript and the ‘1720 Autograph’. Apart from Jarvis (2007), however, no direct comparison has been made between all three versions of the manuscripts.

Therefore, the aim of this thesis is to examine all three manuscripts using the techniques of forensic document examination and present a new hypothesis regarding the relationship between these three manuscript versions, and thus determine how this may affect our current understanding of the compositional process involved in the writing of the Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas and Partitas (BWV 1001 – 1006).
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Introduction

Background to the study

The J.S. Bach *Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas and Partitas* form a central collection of works for all serious students of the violin. Their compositional origins and their musical purpose, however, are not clear. As a musician, I have been aware of these works since I first encountered them as a young violin student. In recent times, I have explored them further as a teacher of violin with my own students and have become increasingly intrigued by their origins.

This research project emerged following the doctoral research, which was undertaken by Dr Martin W.B. Jarvis OAM and presented in his Ph.D. Thesis in 2007, titled *Did J.S. Bach Write the Six Cello Suites?* Jarvis made an unprecedented challenge against the authorship of the *Six Cello Suites* (BWV 1007–1012). Until Dr Jarvis’ research was undertaken, Bach’s authorship of these works had never been formally challenged, even though no extant autograph manuscript by Bach has ever been discovered, nor any documented evidence by Bach regarding the existence of such a set of works. The only manuscript of the *Cello Suites*, known to have originated from within the Bach household, is in the hand of Anna Magdalena Bach, and it is traditionally accepted as being a ‘copy’ of Bach’s supposed missing

---

2 For convenience throughout the remainder of this thesis, unless quoting others, the *Six Cello Suites* (BWV 1007–1012) will be referred to as the *Cello Suites*.
3 While this has never been formally challenged, there has been much polemic regarding the relationship of Anna Magdalena’s manuscript to Kellner’s supposed copy. See Jarvis 2007.
4 It should be noted that this is not, in itself, unusual. There is no documented evidence, in the form of a reference by Bach to the *Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas and Partitas* either; however, the manuscript of these works exists in what is known as the ‘1720 Autograph.’
5 Anna Magdalena was J.S. Bach’s second wife.
autograph. Using the well-established techniques of musical analysis, and, for the first time, the science of forensic document examination (FDE) as his main research methodology, Jarvis argued that it was highly unlikely that Bach himself composed the *Six Cello Suites*, and that Anna Magdalena was possibly the principal composer of these works. Jarvis (2007) states:

*In final conclusion, the evidence of both the Forensic Document Examination and the comparative morphological examination, point very strongly away from Johann Sebastian as the composer of the Cello Suites. As there is no unequivocal evidence to identify an alternative composer, it can only safely be concluded that the Cello Suites were most likely written by a hitherto unrecognised composer. However, Schwanenberger’s words ecrite par Madame Bachen “Written by Mrs Bach...” may possibly offer a clue as to the identity of that composer.*

While Jarvis admits his conclusions may not be “100% correct,” the implications of his research suggest that Anna Magdalena, as was often the case during this historic

---


7 Forensic Document Examination (FDE) is the scientific study of documents and handwriting for the purpose of demonstrating authenticity or otherwise.

8 The initial controversy over Jarvis’s findings was further ignited recently, with the release of the documentary *Written by Mrs Bach* 2015 video recording, BBC, UK. At this time, it appears that the current status quo amongst Bach scholars with regard to Jarvis’s finding, is one of polarisation. The cellist, Steven Isserlis, publicly refuted Jarvis’s theory, describing it as “pure rubbish” (see Limelight Magazine, 2014, http://www.limelightmagazine.com.au/news/steven-isserlis-slam-bach%E2%80%99s-wifes-claim-cello-suites), while others are in agreement, suggesting that his theory explains some of the more unusual musical aspects of the *Cello Suites*. Whether or not Jarvis’s findings will ever firmly gain traction within Bach academic circles remains to be seen. However, there are indications it is being seriously considered. Recently, the cellist, Attilia Kiyoko Cernitori, recorded the *Cello Suites* under the name of Anna Magdalena Wilcken-Bach. See https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v0szigFryYk.


10 Personal communication 20 October 2015.
period, was a composer\textsuperscript{11} who was “\textit{hidden from history},”\textsuperscript{12} and that her traditional role as simply a copyist of Bach’s music may need to be reconsidered. This particularly warrants further investigation in light of Jarvis’s use of FDE as a progressive approach to determining the authorship of compositions through the scientific study of the handwriting contained within the manuscripts and other relevant documents. Jarvis’s (2007) research raised concerns surrounding previous scholarly research into this area and suggested that the initial analysis of Bach’s handwriting may have been flawed because the principles of forensic handwriting examination\textsuperscript{13} were not applied when determining authorship. Not since the 1980s has any new investigation into the handwriting characteristics of Bach and Anna Magdalena been undertaken, nor has any scientific methodology ever been applied prior to Jarvis’s research.

During his research into the \textit{Cello Suites}, Jarvis also had cause to examine the so-called ‘1720 Autograph’\textsuperscript{14} of the \textit{Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas and Partitas} P 967 and to compare it with the manuscript versions of the works by Johann Peter Kellner P 804 and Anna Magdalena P 268, as the two sets of works exist together within a combined manuscript. This gave rise to several observations, which potentially challenged the accepted consensus concerning these works. Jarvis identified a significant number of divergences between the Final Fair Copy (FFC) and Anna Magdalena’s manuscript (which is a supposed copy of the FFC), and

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{11} Before the advent of readily available printed music, all musicians either copied other musicians’ music or composed their own.
\textsuperscript{12} Laurence, A. 1994, p. 3 describes, “The term ‘hidden from history’ is used when the history of a hitherto neglected group begins to appear: as, for example, in the case of black history, women’s history, lesbian and gay history and, most recently, the history of gypsies and travelling people.”
\textsuperscript{13} Forensic handwriting examination is a technique within the broader field of Forensic Document Examination, which includes the examination of inks and paper etc.
\textsuperscript{14} For reasons that I will make clear later in this thesis the ‘1720 Autograph’ will be referred to as the Final Fair Copy or FFC.
\end{quote}
concluded that the divergences in Anna Magdalena’s copy could not be easily explained as copying errors and further, the divergences were of such a magnitude, that her manuscript could not possibly have been copied from the FFC. Most intriguingly, he identified a number of occasions within the [Johann Peter] Kellner manuscript, where the divergences he identified between Anna Magdalena’s manuscript and the FFC coincided with the writing contained within Kellner’s manuscript. Jarvis’s results did not support the accepted understanding of the manuscripts regarding their origins and the accepted compositional process of the works, and instead strongly suggested that collaboration may have occurred between Kellner and Anna Magdalena within these compositions. This was further reinforced by Jarvis’s discovery of what appeared to be Anna Magdalena’s handwriting in the Kellner manuscript of the *Cello Suites*. Finally, Jarvis’s forensic investigation into the historically accepted extreme similarity in the style of music calligraphy of Anna Magdalena and Bach brought into question the music calligraphy style, which has been used in the FFC exemplar, since the known exemplar seems often more closely aligned with that of Anna Magdalena’s music calligraphy than that of Bach’s. This appears to defy the principle of forensic handwriting examination, which states:

*...it may be fairly assumed that a developed handwriting being the product of modification and adaptation to the needs and abilities of the writer, will be*

15 A copying error may be considered as such if it makes no musical sense or if the ‘principle of common error’ appears to apply. See Chapter VI of this thesis where this is discussed in greater detail.

16 See Jarvis, 2007 pp. 286-290, where the possibility of Anna Magdalena’s handwriting in Kellner’s copy of the *Six Cello Suites* is discussed. Jarvis provides clear evidence to support the proposition that Anna Magdalena was involved. The examination undertaken in the preparation of this thesis has since discovered what appears to be Anna Magdalena’s music calligraphy in other works contained within Kellner’s Konvolut, (that is, bundle of papers).

peculiar to the individual; in view of its complexity, the probability of any two persons having handwritings which are so similar that the presence of one or more consistent dissimilarities cannot be demonstrated, is extremely small.\textsuperscript{18}

Jarvis recognised that his investigation into the three manuscript versions of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas was not exhaustive, because it focused mainly on the Adagio of the G minor Sonata (BWV 1001) by way of example and that further investigation of the manuscripts was required to provide more conclusive findings. As Jarvis’s investigation examined very limited parts of the three source manuscripts from the 1720s comparatively, the research undertaken in this thesis is far more extensive. My investigation indicates that no other study has yet been undertaken that has directly compared these three manuscript versions in such detail. For the purpose of this thesis, an examination of the G minor Sonata (BWV 1001) in its entirety, the A minor Grave (BWV 1003), the Fugues of the A minor Sonata (BWV 1003) and C Major Sonata (BWV 1005), and the Chaconne of the D minor Partita (BWV 1004) was undertaken.

\textbf{The objective of this thesis}

The objective of this research, is to determine, through application of the forensic examination process and a manuscript comparison, the extent of the coincidences and divergences that exist in both the music calligraphy and handwriting contained within three of the extant manuscript sources\textsuperscript{19} of the Six Unaccompanied Violin

---


\textsuperscript{19} The details of the Sources of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas will be discussed in Chapter III of this thesis, pp. 69-72. Source C is not contemporaneous for the purpose of this study and is therefore not relevant however Source C will be discussed in Chapter III (3.3) p. 68.
Sonatas and Partitas (BWV 1001-1006) all believed to have been written in the 1720s. The manuscripts are ostensibly in the scribal hands of Johann Sebastian Bach (Source A); Anna Magdalena Bach (Source B); and Johann Peter Kellner (Source D). Specifically, the key research question to be investigated in this thesis is:

> Given that there are three extant manuscripts of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas for Violin Solo Senza Basso attributed to Johann Sebastian Bach, and given that the relationships among them are not at all clear, what can be deduced regarding the relationship the three manuscripts have to each other using a forensic scientific approach?

In order to answer this question, the techniques of forensic handwriting examination will be applied to analyse the music calligraphy, and the handwriting contained within the three manuscript versions (Sources A, B and D), listed above. This forensic handwriting examination, along with a detailed examination and comparison of each bar of the selected works from the Violin Sonatas and Partitas, will thus enable the researcher to determine if there is any evidence that challenges traditionally held beliefs, regarding the accepted relationship between the three manuscript versions.

---

20 For convenience throughout the remainder of this thesis, unless quoting others, the Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas and Partitas (BWV 1001-1006) will be referred to as the Violin Sonatas and Partitas.

21 Hereafter, unless quoting others, Johann Sebastian Bach will be referred to as Bach, Anna Magdalena Bach as Anna Magdalena and Johann Peter Kellner as Kellner. The short hand descriptors for the manuscripts of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas will be: Johann Sebastian Bach’s = FFC, Anna Magdalena’s = AMB and Johann Peter Kellner’s manuscript = JPK.


23 ‘Music-calligraphy’ refers to the system of symbols that constitutes the music writing.
The evidence obtained from the examination of the manuscripts and which will be presented in this thesis, may have implications regarding the compositional development of the Bach manuscript, usually referred to as the ‘1720 Autograph,’ of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* (BWV 1001-1006). Thus, a key focus of this research is to establish what the commonly and traditionally held views are regarding the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas*. In addition, the research will examine any possible inaccuracies within the current understanding of Bach’s compositional working methods, with specific reference to the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas*, and the radically different version of the same works in the manuscript made by Kellner, as well as the additional extant manuscript made by Anna Magdalena.24 An investigation into the filiations and transmission of the three manuscript versions, therefore, forms the central part of this thesis.

By providing a new and deeper understanding of both Kellner and Anna Magdalena’s manuscripts, this thesis seeks to add clarification to the compositional process surrounding the creation of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas*, which in turn, may assist in establishing a more detailed understanding of the chronology and authenticity (or otherwise) of the FFC.

Based on the above observations, this thesis, therefore, has several aims. There is a need to further investigate the variant readings25 between the manuscripts as identified by Jarvis (2007) and expand on these initial observations. This detailed

---

24 As this thesis questions the compositional process of these works, Anna Magdalena’ and Kellner’s manuscripts will be described throughout this thesis as a ‘manuscript version’ of the works and not as a ‘copy.’

inter-comparison of the manuscripts may then determine if the above assertions are valid within the context of a more comprehensive investigation. A thorough critical examination and comparison of selected works of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* is, therefore, warranted.²⁶

A further objective of this thesis is to further explore the methodology of the recent FDE process undertaken into the *Cello Suites*, and determine if this approach may be more accurate and scientifically based than the preceding handwriting examination studies of Bach’s works. There is an apparent research lacuna in this area associated with a paucity of scientifically based knowledge, following the previous studies by Emery (1953),²⁷ Dadelsen (1957, 1988)²⁸ and Kobayashi (1989),²⁹ none of which were based on any recognised scientific rigour. Additionally, there has been no significant review of the handwriting characteristics of Bach and Anna Magdalena in recent times, other than Jarvis (2007), which, as noted, was the first to apply thorough scientific forensic analysis techniques to such an exacting extent.

Within this thesis, there will be an additional investigation into the outcomes of Tatlow’s most recent findings with regard to levels of parallel proportions discovered within Bach’s works (and identified by Tatlow as existing within the

²⁶ It is acknowledged that this is not a full examination of the collection of works. The extent of the similarities and divergences already discovered within the works listed above provide ample data for a plausible study.


Violin Sonatas and Partitas) and whether this new information is of significance in regards to the compositional process of the three manuscript versions.

Further, all previous studies into the Kellner manuscript, (for example, the work undertaken by Braunlich (1981), Stinson (1989), and most recently Szabo (2015)), have offered a number of plausible theories as to the origin and existence of Kellner's manuscript, but the results obtained have been inconclusive. One question to which this thesis seeks to determine the answer, that has never been adequately explained, is how and why Kellner came to copy in 1726 an incomplete version of a set of works accepted as being completed by Bach in 1720.

It is anticipated, therefore, that the results obtained from this thesis may establish whether or not any relationship does, in fact, exist between these manuscript versions, which might ultimately determine whether a different compositional process may have occurred, and which may answer the key research question posed earlier.31

31 See p. 6 of this thesis.
CHAPTER I LITERATURE REVIEW

The sparseness of evidence about the daily activities...of J. S. Bach has meant that later biographers...have resorted to speculation in these areas...Much of the present book already questions what the evidence appears to say...Arguing from the music to the person, biographers of the last two centuries or so have brought forward many hypotheses about the devices and desires of J.S. Bach, doing so according to fashions in biography. – Peter Williams

1.1 Preamble

Historically, all that has ever been written about the Violin Sonatas and Partitas is predicated on an assumption, which is that the manuscript of the works was completed in 1720 and that it is an autograph manuscript entirely in the hand of Bach. Further, the Violin Sonatas and Partitas were composed entirely by Bach.

This literature review, therefore, critically examines what has been written by scholars in the later part of the Twentieth Century, and in more recent times, with regard to the Violin Sonatas and Partitas. Further, and because they are inextricably linked, it also presents in a summary form what has been written about the so-called 'sister group' of works, the Six Cello Suites.

34 For a comprehensive study of the literature associated with the Cello Suites, see Jarvis 2007.
1.2 Braunlich, H. 1981

Although Kellner’s manuscript of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* was initially dismissed as being a source of any great importance owing to the significant discrepancies contained within, Braunlich sought to explain the discrepancies between Kellner’s manuscript (Source D) and the FFC (Source A) by suggesting that “...the original or originals which Kellner copied represented an older version than Bach’s own autograph of 1720.”

Further, Braunlich states:

...The [1720] autograph, indeed has been written with exceptional care; it has all the earmarks of a final fair copy. Thus it is not unlikely that the composer also made some musical revisions or improvements while making that final copy...A comparison of Source A (the autograph) with Source D, should therefore provide interesting insights into the compositional process of J.S. Bach.

Braunlich suggests that the discrepancies that exist between Source D and Source A were as a result of “...wrong notes, omitted passages and measures, which were inadvertently copied twice,” but also states, “...there remain quite a few

---

35 Helmut Braunlich (1929-2013) was a German-American violinist, composer and musicologist. See Braunlich, H. 1981 Johann Peter Kellner’s Copy of the Sonatas and Partitas for Violin Solo by J.S. Bach, *Bach*, 12/2, pp. 2-10.
36 In scholarly writings, Kellner’s manuscript is referred to as Source D and the FFC as Source A. See Chapter III (3.3), p. 68 of this thesis, where a detailed discussion of the sources is presented.
38 Ibid.
39 Ibid. p. 3.
discrepancies between Source A and Source D, which cannot be explained as mistakes.\textsuperscript{40}

Instead, Braunlich suggests that these ‘mistakes’:

\begin{quote}
...represent Bach’s real intention at a stage of composition preceding the final autograph. Of course, such readings tend to seem grossly inferior to the final version, which has long been familiar to students of Bach’s works. Inferior, no doubt, they are; yet they reveal a certain logic of their own which is not without interest.\textsuperscript{41}
\end{quote}

Braunlich lists the main discrepancies between the two Sources as being:

- Bars 35-41 of the G minor Fugue, which do not appear in Kellner’s version. Of this Braunlich says, “...the proof that this is not a mere oversight exists in the second half of Kellner’s measure 34, which, departing from the autograph, smoothly bridges the gap of the missing measures[ sic].” He goes on to say, “...Obviously the composer, after finishing the work, added seven measures[ sic] and changed the preceding two beats to adjust to the new situation.”\textsuperscript{42}

- The C Major Fugue, whereby in Kellner’s version the last section of the da capo form is not written out but the words ‘da capo’ appear after the end of the middle section. Of this discrepancy Braunlich states, “Only at some later stage Bach wrote out the final section and altered its beginning

\textsuperscript{40} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{41} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{42} Ibid. The addition of seven measures in the G minor Fugue may be better understood in the context of Tatlow’s findings regarding parallel proportions, discussed in Chapter IV of this thesis, pp. 151-162.
(measures 290-297) by adding parts and making minor changes, which is what Source A shows.”

- Four sizable Sections of the Ciacona, [sic] which do not appear in Source D. Of the first of these variations at Bars 21-24 Braunlich states:

  We should regard the first of these as a copying mistake, mostly because the absence of these four measures[sic] would severely impair the phrase balance which is strongly established at the beginning. Also, the jump from measure 20 – 25 entails an unacceptable melodic skip.

Braunlich says that Bars 85-220 of Source A (FFC), which correspond with Kellner’s version are eight bars shorter and contain incongruities that cannot be understood to be anything but mistakes by the copyist. From this he concludes, “We may suppose then, that this represents Bach’s own first version (Bowings have been retained although they are unclear and inconsistent).” He discusses what he describes as the “...most striking discrepancy” as occurring at “…the end of the section in D Major and the return to d minor [sic]. The last thirty-two measures[sic] of the major section and the first eight in the minor do not appear in Source D. There results a strangely abrupt return to the minor key (measures 176 directly to 217 in the standard version), which is disconcerting in its seeming lack of

---

43 Ibid. p. 4. The “da capo” of the C Major Fugue is discussed in further detail in Chapter VI (6.11.1) p. 279 of this thesis.
44 Ibid.
45 Ibid.
46 Ibid.
47 Ibid.
logic. But, again, this can hardly be a mistake, for in Source D the key signature of one flat, which indicates the return to d minor is placed in such a manner that an inadvertent omission of forty bars seems highly unlikely."\textsuperscript{48}

Braunlich’s observations permit him to draw some conclusions regarding the history of composition of Bach’s works for unaccompanied violin. He states,

After finishing initial versions, Bach reviewed the works and, in 1720, made a careful copy of the whole set of Sonatas and Partitas. During this working-over he extended the Fugue in G minor, the Fugue in C Major, and the Ciacona\textsuperscript{[sic]} in D minor. The added sections are notable for the idiomatic treatment of harmonic progressions in broken chords and arpeggios. It would seem as if the composer, during the intervening period, had become impressed with the effectiveness of certain violinistic figures.\textsuperscript{49}

Further:

In the Ciacona\textsuperscript{[sic]} he also inserted several variations which bring back the rhythm of the opening, thus giving it a higher thematic significance in the movement. Furthermore, when reviewing his works, he sometimes seems to have been dissatisfied with the originally conceived tempo. He then indicated a faster pace by changing metric markings for some movements. In the Ciacona\textsuperscript{[sic]}, although there is no specific indication of a faster

\textsuperscript{48} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid. p. 9.
tempo for the final version, a slower tempo would seem to facilitate certain interpretational problems of the older one.\textsuperscript{50}

If Braunlich’s claims are correct, however, Bach must have commenced working on these compositions well before 1720.\textsuperscript{51}

Finally, Braunlich cites Spitta’s\textsuperscript{52} observations of the Ciacona [Chaconne] and the comments he made with regard to the music added into the work during the last phase of composition, and which Spitta apparently regarded as the most characteristic and admirable,

...in several cases, and with great effect, especially in the middle and at the end, he returns to the eight bars of the opening...\textsuperscript{53}

...from those tremulous arpeggios that hang almost motionless, like veiling clouds above a gloomy ravine, till a strong wind drives and rolls them together and scourges them down among the tree tops, which groan and toss as they whirl their leaves into the air - to the devotional beauty of the movement in D Major where the evening sun sets in the peaceful valley.\textsuperscript{54}

Although this is a poetic way of viewing this work, Spitta may be simply referring to the harmony and tranquillity achieved through Bach’s desire to achieve

\textsuperscript{50} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{51} This is refuted, however in the Neue Bach Ausgabe. See Neue Bach Ausgabe (NBA) 2001 vol. IX/3. This is also further discussed in Chapter III (3.3) of this thesis, The Six Violin Sonatas and Partitas and their Sources.
\textsuperscript{53} Ibid. p. 9.
\textsuperscript{54} Ibid.
musical perfection and to strive for the epitome of pleasure for the “Glory of God” – Soli Deo Gloria, or ‘SDG’ as Bach wrote at the conclusion of many of his works.

1.3 Stinson, R. 1985; 1989

Stinson’s work (1985;1989) provides the most detailed analysis of Kellner’s manuscript copies of Bach’s works, including the incomplete manuscript of the Bach Violin Sonatas and Partitas in Kellner’s hand (Source D). He deals specifically with Kellner’s reliability as a scribe, drawing on the major variants between the two manuscripts, which are found in three of the works; that of the D minor Chaconne (BWV 1004), C Major Fugue (BWV 1005), and the G minor Fugue (BWV 1001). Stinson attempts to explain how these variant readings came to be; however, like Braunlich (1981), Stinson limits his study of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas to these three major variants and at no time compares the Kellner and Bach manuscripts (Source D and Source A) with that of the Anna Magdalena (Source B) manuscript. This is of significance because according to Jarvis (2007) “…there are many other identified smaller divergences in the manuscript, not dealt with by Stinson, which may bring into question our understanding of the relationship between all three manuscripts.”

Stinson provides details of Kellner’s background and attempts to explain the ambiguous relationship between Bach and Kellner, but admits their exact relationship remains unclear. He suggests that, “…the fact that Kellner was twenty

55 The concept of musical perfection is discussed in further detail in Chapters IV of this thesis p. 123.
57 See Jarvis 2007, p. 254.
years Bach’s junior implies a student-teacher association." 58 However, there is no contemporaneous source to support this assertion. 59 Further, Stinson says:

According to Kellner’s son, Johann Christoph (1736-1803), his father was a “…good friend” of Bach’s; J.A. Hiller, on the other hand, claimed in 1791 that Kellner was one of Bach’s best students. Yet Kellner’s own remarks on the subject, published in his autobiography of 1754, are too nebulous to document either report: “I had formerly partly seen and partly heard very much of a great master of music. I found exceeding pleasure in his work. I mean the late Capellmeister 60 Bach in Leipzig. I longed for the acquaintance of this excellent man, and I was, in fact, fortunate enough to enjoy the same." 61

Stinson (1989) examines other Bach keyboard works, purported to be copied by Kellner, with the purpose of establishing authenticity and chronology of several of Bach’s major works. While Stinson’s work is important in providing a detailed study of the three major variants, it is similar to Braunlich (1981), in that it does not provide any detailed comparison of the other movements of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas and nor does it include, as previously stated, any direct comparison with the Anna Magdalena manuscript (Source B) of these works.

58 Stinson 1989, p. 15.
59 Kellner was born in 1705 and Johann Sebastian Bach was born in 1685.
60 Unless quoting others in this thesis, the German spelling of the word “Kapellmeister” will be used.
Stinson observes that many of Bach’s works, including the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas*, are “…still somewhat misunderstood or neglected, owing in part to the absence of a comprehensive study of the Kellner circle copies.”\(^{62}\)

He proposes that Kellner and Bach did not meet until 1727, stating, “…manuscript evidence suggests that Kellner and Bach were not acquainted prior to 1727. Of the surviving autographs that Kellner evidently used as exemplars, none can be securely dated before the period 1727-1732.”\(^{63}\)

This comment, however, creates a timeline ambiguity, as the date on the first page of Kellner’s manuscript of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* is “1726” - one year prior to the date Stinson suggests he and Bach became acquainted. This date is repeated again on the manuscript’s last page, where it more specifically states – ‘Frankenhayn. d. 3. Jul/1726.’\(^{64}\) Owing to this timeline ambiguity, and although there is no physical evidence to support this position, Stinson suggests that any of Kellner’s copies of Bach manuscripts preceding 1727, must have been copied from manuscripts already circulating in Thuringia.\(^{65}\)

Stinson states:

> It can also be shown that in four instances during 1725 to 1727, when Kellner made copies of Bach’s works for which there are no extant manuscripts, he copied from manuscripts other than those autographs,

\(^{62}\) Ibid. p. 55.  
\(^{63}\) Ibid. p. 17.  
\(^{64}\) See Stinson, R. 1985, p. 199.  
\(^{65}\) Ibid. p. 18.
even though they were in existence at the time. In each case the Kellner

copy gives readings that differ from those in the autograph.\textsuperscript{66}

On this basis, Stinson therefore argues that Kellner’s copy must logically have
originated from another source, which was an earlier working version of Bach’s,
therefore using a non-autographed exemplar.\textsuperscript{67}

This thesis challenges this statement by Stinson and suggests that it would be
highly unlikely that Bach would have allowed an unfinished and inferior draft of
the works to be in circulation in Thuringia and available for others to ‘copy.’\textsuperscript{68}

This thesis also questions why it should be that Kellner was the only known
person to make a supposed copy of this supposed exemplar, (which, as Stinson
suggests, was somehow circulating in Thuringia), when all other known copies of
Bach’s works in general circulation were of the complete works.\textsuperscript{69}

Like Braunlich (1981), Stinson (1989) offers some possible explanations as to
why Kellner’s manuscript differs so greatly from the final autograph, and what
his possible motives were for preparing his copy of the violin works in the first
place, given “…any involvement he had with the violin…was decidedly subordinate
to his activities as a copyist, composer, and performer of keyboard music.”\textsuperscript{70}

Stinson summarises the possible explanations for this as follows:

\textsuperscript{66} Ibid. p. 17. In addition to Kellner’s supposed early draft of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas, the other three
manuscripts, according to Stinson, are BWV 772, BWV 848 and BWV 953.

\textsuperscript{67} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{68} For Bach to do this, it would defy the principle of Soli Deo Gloria. See Chapter V p. 212 of this thesis, where
this is discussed with regards to the concept of musical perfection.

\textsuperscript{69} The only other source that is incomplete as a collection, is a copy supposedly made by Johann Andreas
Kuhnau, who copied only the first of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas (BWV 1001) in its entirety. This source
is discussed in Chapter III of this thesis.

\textsuperscript{70} Stinson 1989, p. 59.
Kellner was not a violinist of great technical ability,\textsuperscript{71} and therefore left out many of the difficult sections of the \textit{Violin Sonatas and Partitas}. This would account for the significant section of technically difficult music missing from the D minor Chaconne (BWV 1004).\textsuperscript{72}

Stinson further addresses Kellner’s questionable ability as a violinist, stating:

\begin{quote}
...only four of his forty-six Bach copies contain works other than solo keyboard composition; his only surviving instrumental works are for solo keyboard and he mentions no works for other instrumental media in the work-list of his autobiography...It should also be mentioned that four of Kellner’s pupils...are reported to have studied keyboard with him but violin with others — implying that Kellner lacked experience as a violinist. It soon becomes a matter of considerable doubt that Kellner had the technical ability to have performed these works...nor is there any evidence he might have prepared a copy from which someone else could perform.\textsuperscript{73}
\end{quote}

As Kellner was not known to be a violinist, however, it would appear there is no reason why he would even choose to simplify the pieces at all. Stinson’s statement implies that Kellner must have copied the works with the intention of playing them himself. If Kellner were copying these works for other reasons i.e. keyboard transcriptions, reference copies or distribution, it would make no

\textsuperscript{71}The only documented reference that Kellner was a violinist is by his son Johann Christian. Stinson 1989, p. 59, cites Kellner’s son, Johann Christian Kellner, who stated that his father played the violin but “…to what degree of proficiency is unclear.” According to Stinson there is no reference to violin playing by Kellner himself in his autobiography.

\textsuperscript{72}In an article published in 1920, violinist and musicologist Andreas Moser proposed that Kellner excluded certain sections of the Chaconne because of the technical difficulties they posed. See Stinson 1989, p. 64.

\textsuperscript{73}Stinson 1989, pp. 59-60.
difference if he were capable of playing the more technically challenging passages and he would simply reproduce them as faithfully as possible.

Stinson continues the discussion of Kellner's ability as a violinist, stating, "We cannot presume, however, that Kellner sought only to produce a simplified performing score because his copy also preserves some of the Chaconne's most technically challenging passages, including the thirty-second-note figuration of mm. 65-69."\(^4\) As such, it appears unlikely to be a plausible explanation.

With regard to the dating of his manuscript version, Stinson believes Kellner prepared the Violin Sonatas and Partitas at about the same time as the manuscript of the Cello Suites – "Significantly, these two manuscripts...appear to have been prepared at about the same time (specifically, during the first half of 1726)."\(^5\) This thesis notes, however, that there is no evidence to support the proposition that the Cello Suites were copied by Kellner in the same year. Stinson points out that Kellner also wrote the word 'Frankenhayn' before the date on his copy of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas,"...and that this indicates... not only the year it was made, but also where it was prepared."\(^6\)

Eppstein (1990),\(^7\) states:

---

\(^4\) Ibid. pp. 64-65.

\(^5\) Ibid. p. 60.

\(^6\) See Stinson 1989, p. 13, "[in] 1725 Kellner successfully auditioned for the cantorate in neighboring Frankenhain, where he stayed for over two years." See also Chapter I of this thesis, 'Literature Review'.

\(^7\) Eppstein, H. 1990, p. 14, Sechs Suiten fur Violincello Solo BWV 1007-1012, NBA Vol. 6/2, Kassel, Bärenreiter.
...the writing forms in the main part resemble those in the copy of the Bach Violin soli dated by Kellner “Anno 1726,” that Kellner’s copy of the Cello Suites dates from that same year of 1726... in the first half of the year 1726.

Eppstein did not carry out any scientific handwriting analysis, however, and was therefore not aware of the degree of change a person’s handwriting would undergo over a period of time. The notion, as suggested by Stinson (1985) that one can date the two works to within the same year “...On the basis of its script,” defies the principle of forensic handwriting examination, which states “…Changes in handwriting of mature writers are generally very slight and cover periods of years...therefore consideration of handwriting is not a useful tool for dating documents.”

Therefore, to achieve the dating of documents using handwriting, to that suggested level of precision, i.e. dating to within a few weeks or months, is not possible under normal circumstances, based solely on handwriting.

Jarvis (2007) suggests, however:

_Given the page separation of over 110 pages in the Konvelut[sic] manuscript and that Kellner’s copy of the Cello Suites is not dated, it is not unreasonable, on that basis, to suggest that Kellner might well have copied_

---

78 See NBA vol. 6/2: 14 “…Die Schriftformen im Hauptteil gleichen denen in der von Kellner “Anno 1726” datierten Kopie der Bachschen Violinsoli Faszikel 22 im sieben Konvelut). Nach Stinson ist die Hs. in der ersten Hälfte des Jahres 1726” (The same handwriting in the main part is the same as Kellner’s in year 1726 from the copy of Bach’s violin solo Fazikel 22 in the same konvolut. According to Stinson it is the handwriting in the first half of the year 1726).

79 Ibid.

80 Stinson 1985, p. 201.

the Cello Suites at a much later date, of perhaps more than a year, after his copy of the violin works.\(^{82}\)

There is no documented evidence either to suggest Kellner was a cellist,\(^ {83}\) and Stinson therefore surmises, “...the natural conclusion is that Kellner copied the cello suites primarily to have a reference copy at his disposal”.\(^ {84}\) He then continues, “...the same is likely to be true of the violin works”\(^ {85}\) He continues, however, “...the possibility that he also had keyboard transcription in mind should not be dismissed out of hand.”\(^ {86}\) Stinson further states, “...two of Kellner’s pupils are known to have been active as keyboard transcribers, implying that he may have used keyboard transcription as a pedagogical tool.”\(^ {87}\) He then adds, “...I am not proposing by any means, however, that Kellner planned on transcribing all six suites for keyboard. The sheer size of such an undertaking would have been prohibitive...”\(^ {88}\)

With regard to the length and ordering of the works, Stinson considers the possibility, which was raised by Braunlich (1981), that Kellner’s copy represents a first draft of these works:

One might conjecture, therefore, that Kellner’s copy represents Bach’s first draft of the collection since three of its movements are considerably shorter than the versions in the autograph. The next step in this line of reasoning, because of the huge ordering discrepancies between the two sources, would

\(^{82}\) Jarvis 2007, p. 293.

\(^{83}\) No source has ever been discerned that mentions Kellner in conjunction with the ‘Cello.

\(^{84}\) Stinson 1989, p. 60.

\(^{85}\) Ibid. p. 61.

\(^{86}\) Ibid. p. 60.

\(^{87}\) Ibid. Other evidence to support this is presented throughout Stinson’s book.

\(^{88}\) Ibid. p. 61.
be that Bach substantially changed the ordering of the set when he revised these movements.89

Stinson then says, “...certain peculiarities in the ordering and numbering of the pieces in Kellner’s copy suggest that it is derived from a source or sources that presented the works in the same order found in the autograph.”90 He eventually concludes, however, “...from the discussion of Kellner’s scribal methods, it seems likely that Kellner himself is the culprit. Just think of his (unauthorised?) ordering of the Aria Variata.”91

Stinson does not discuss the cost of paper92 or the considerable time involved in reproducing such an early and incomplete working draft of the works.

Stinson examines the omitted sections of the D minor Chaconne, the C Major Fugue and the G minor Fugue and after a detailed analysis of the cuts in the Chaconne, suggests that certain passages may have been cut due to its excessive length or for keyboard transcription. He concludes, “...whatever the case, the evidence leads us to suspect that [Kellner] knowingly excised portions of the Chaconne as he copied it,”93 and adds, “Kellner’s possible reasons for making these

89 Ibid.
90 Ibid. p. 61.
91 Ibid. Stinson 1989, p. 59 further states, “The Aria Variata (BWV 989) in P 804/21 omits the eighth and ninth variations (as well as inserting the tenth variation between the fourth and the fifth), even though it appears to drive from the same lost exemplar as J.T Krebs’s copy in in P 801 which preserves the work in a much more conventional format.”
cuts are, of course, not nearly as important as the realisation that this variant, obviously corrupt, cannot be authentic Bach.”

Stinson points out that the two variants contained within the G minor Fugue and C Major Fugue, “...do appear to represent genuine early versions.”

Stinson concludes by proposing that Bach revisited the fugues at a later date and during this process changed the status of the works:

...through very similar means. All three [revised] passages involve extensive pedal points that lead to major cadences, cadences that in each instance are dramatically delayed by repetition or sequence in the upper voices. It seems that Bach also changed the meter from simple time to cut common time. These similarities imply that the fugues may have been revised at around the same time. Regrettably, it is impossible to determine when these revisions might have been made. The autograph supplies only a terminus post quem non of 1720.

At no point does Stinson suggest that the revision process may have involved Bach’s wife, Anna Magdalena.

1.4 Szabo, Z. 2015

Szabo’s study is contextually relevant to this thesis as it is of a similar nature, in that Szabo has undertaken a detailed manuscript comparison between the Anna

94 Ibid.
95 Ibid.
96 Latest possible date.
97 Stinson 1989, p. 70
Magdalena manuscript and Kellner manuscript versions of the *Cello Suites*. Szabo describes Kellner’s manuscript of the *Cello Suites* as existing in the same “extensive miscellany”\(^99\) as the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* and adds, “...according to studies on handwriting, paper and ink, [the works] stem from the same period.”\(^100\)

Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of these works also exists as a double manuscript (konvolut),\(^101\) and is generally thought to have been written around 1727/1728.\(^102\) Szabo states that the surviving Bach autograph of the Lute transcription of the fifth Cello Suite\(^103\) was “...penned sometime between 1727 and 1732, around the time when Anna Magdalena prepared her script of all the Suites,”\(^104\) which therefore provides evidence that the date of Kellner’s manuscript of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* (dated 3rd July 1726 and written as such by Kellner at the end of the works on page 146 of the konvolut) is likely to be correct.\(^105\)

\(^99\) Szabo 2015, p. 71.
\(^100\) Ibid.
\(^101\) The Anna Magdalena manuscript and the Kellner manuscript of the *Cello Suites* and *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* both exist as a double manuscript known as a konvolut. The Bach manuscript of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* exists only as a single manuscript and no autograph version of the *Cello Suites* has been found to exist. See Jarvis, 2007. The term konvolut, and its relevance to this study will be discussed in Chapter III (3.12) p. 111 of this thesis.
\(^102\) The dating of the *Cello Suites* is discussed in further detail in this Chapter of the thesis (1.5) “The Six Cello Suites” p. 46.
\(^103\) There is a Lute transcription of the fifth Cello Suite in the hand of Bach (BWV 995), which has survived. This is the only Suite in the collection, however, that was transcribed for Lute by Bach.
\(^104\) Szabo 2015, p. 75.
\(^105\) Ibid.
Szabo observes that while Kellner’s “...dependability”\textsuperscript{106} as a copyist, “...has often been questioned in the past because of his well-documented copying mistakes,”\textsuperscript{107} he suggests:

\begin{quote}
...a re-evaluation of the evidence shifts the focus from the problem of his copying errors to a number of issues of more fundamental consequence and ultimately to the important question of the exemplars from which he was working.\textsuperscript{108}
\end{quote}

Further:

\begin{quote}
These exemplars [of the Cello Suites and Violin Sonatas and Partitas] appear to have been unavailable to, or at least not used by any of the people who made the other surviving copies, and as neither of these exemplars has survived, this leaves Kellner’s copy as our only circumstantial evidence of their existence.\textsuperscript{109}
\end{quote}

This statement conflicts with Stinson’s (1989) suggestion that the exemplar of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas, from which Kellner supposedly copied must have been circulating (and therefore, available) in Thuringia for Kellner to copy.\textsuperscript{110} Both are in agreement, however, that no one other than Kellner copied from this missing exemplar.

\textsuperscript{106}Ibid. p. 71.
\textsuperscript{107}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{108}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{109}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{110}See page 17 of this thesis.
As with Stinson (1989), Szabo is unable to adequately explain why Kellner apparently copied these works for solo violin, but suggests the reason he copied Bach’s keyboard works can be easily explained:

_He may simply have wanted to keep reference copies of those works and perhaps use the keyboard compositions as teaching and performing material for himself and his students. As an organist, he was able to use and enjoy these copies with immediate effect; however copying the string compositions did not have similar benefits._

With regard, however, to both the string collections Kellner apparently copied, he states:

_There is no record of his teaching or performing on string instruments — indeed four of his students learned keyboard with him and violin with others — and no evidence of him composing solo works for strings. If he intended to make clavier arrangements of the string solos at a later stage, they have not survived. Nor is there any indication that he would have prepared these copies for financial gain._

Referring to the Bärenreiter Urtext edition of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas*, Szabo notes that Kellner’s manuscript is described there as being, “_...irrelevant for the purposes of scholarly-critical edition,_” but suggests that a re-evaluation of the Kellner manuscript is warranted because the supposed copying errors may

---

111 Ibid. p. 72.
112 Ibid. Tatlow 2015, suggests, however, that Kellner’s manuscript was a commission, “The Six Solos attracted at least two commissions. In 1726 Johann Peter Kellner...copied an early five-solo version of the collection. No accounts survive to indicate the fee paid to Bach by...Kellner.” p. 134.
113 Szabo 2015, p. 73.
indicate a process where the works were being copied to the best of the copyist’s abilities. Therefore, in the case of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas his "...copying output should be scrutinised.... for signs of careless copying as well as intentional alterations of his exemplar."\textsuperscript{114}

Szabo discusses the term ‘dependability’ [of a copyist] as having two conflicting interpretations:

- The degree of care with which the copy was prepared in terms of the level of concentration and neatness, or,

- The recognition that the task is to recreate the works to the best of his abilities, without altering content.\textsuperscript{115}

He then suggests Kellner’s ‘dependability’ must be questioned in both regards and that “...premeditated alteration suggests an interventionist attitude.”\textsuperscript{116}

Szabo addresses Stinson’s (1989) claim that Kellner may have tampered with the length and even the content of his exemplar(s) during the copying process. He states:

\textit{This may well be true in the case of works written for his own instruments, organ and clavier (alterations that he was able to try out and modify immediately); however it seems less likely that he would have attempted to venture into re-composition while copying for violin or cello.}\textsuperscript{117}

\textsuperscript{114} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{115} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{116} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{117} Ibid. p. 77.
Szabo is in agreement with Stinson (1989) as to the importance of Kellner’s manuscript, if indeed it is an early working draft of these works:

*If Kellner’s model were indeed an authentic first version of the cycle, that would increase the significance of his copy and it would automatically become the best available representation of an early draft, giving us a rare insight into Bach’s compositional practice. In turn that could provide a logical explanation for the different length and order of the movements, and even for some minor changes of harmonies or notes.*

Szabo is in accordance with Stinson that the differences between the FFC and Kellner’s version are “…of such magnitude that they make it highly improbable that Kellner’s is a direct copy of this autograph” and, as such, Szabo suggests:

*...it seems more likely that Kellner must therefore have modelled his script on...a different authorial script, probably an earlier draft which itself could have undergone significant revisions by the composer at a later stage. This draft may not have been fully composed (which is quite different from movements ‘missing’ or ‘omitted’) or, if written on single pages, some sheets may have been damaged or lost while being passed back and forth between composer and copyist.*

---

118 Ibid.  
119 Ibid.  
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Addressing the possibility, as cited in Stinson (1989), that Kellner took “…unauthorised liberties”\footnote{See Stinson 1989, “In the critical commentary to the NBA violin-works volume the only statement made regarding their authenticity is that they should in no way be interpreted as the results of “unauthorised liberties.”” p. 56.} when supposedly copying the Violin Sonatas and Partitas, Szabo suggests it is unlikely, stating:

Kellner seems to have done an easily readable, decent copying job with some, but not many, clear copying errors, and that in the complete movements of the Violin Solos, there is no evidence whatever of him tampering with his exemplar. The consistent if not perfect copying standard in the completed movements suggests that Kellner copied these movements to the best of his abilities. It seems unlikely therefore that he would have applied radical cuts and other changes in only three movements and arbitrarily eradicated many more.\footnote{Szabo 2015, p. 77.}

Szabo does not provide a reason as to why the exemplar from which Kellner apparently copied was made unavailable to anyone other than Kellner, or why only Kellner would have been given access to this incomplete version. It is noted in this thesis that there is only circumstantial evidence of the existence of such an exemplar.

\subsection*{1.4.1 The Chaconne}

There are a total of ninety-six bars missing in the Chaconne in Kellner’s manuscript. Of this major variant, Szabo states:
Finding an adequate explanation for these absent sections (particularly in the Chaconne but also in the other two fugues)...has been one of the most frequently debated subjects in the otherwise under-explored field of Kellner's copying activities.\textsuperscript{123}

He acknowledges the scholarly literature on this subject, which, as noted previously in Stinson (1989), suggests the reasons for this as being:

- The missing sections in the Chaconne make the work easier to play\textsuperscript{124}
- They were cut owing to its excessive length
- Kellner's copy may have been intended to assist with the preparation of a keyboard transcription\textsuperscript{125}

However, he states, "...while all these suggestions are possible in principle, they are not supported by any direct evidence."\textsuperscript{126}

Further, he suggests that this often debated research:

...has approached the subject from the same direction: looking through the incomplete, broken-up prism of Kellner's copy, the well-known, final version of the Chaconne can only be recognised as its model if we accept that the copy was severely mutilated.\textsuperscript{127}

\textsuperscript{123} Ibid. p. 78.
\textsuperscript{124} See Stinson 1989, who discusses an article published in 1920 where the violinist and musicologist Andreas Moser proposed that Kellner excluded certain passages from his copy of the Chaconne because of the technical difficulties they pose for the violinist. Stinson refutes this statement by Moser, however, stating, "...we cannot presume that he sought only to produce a simplified performing score because his copy preserves some of the Chaconne's most technically challenging passages..." pp. 64-65.
\textsuperscript{125} See Stinson 1989.
\textsuperscript{126} Szabo 2015 p. 78.
\textsuperscript{127} Ibid.
Szabo suggests instead that Kellner's vastly different, excised version of the Chaconne should instead be approached from a different narrative. He states:

*A different approach might lead us to a quite different conclusion, if we look at Kellner’s script as an imperfect but essentially true copy of a putative (now lost) autograph. Is it possible that he did not seek to ‘improve’ Johann Sebastian’s solo violin compositions by repeatedly cutting substantial chunks out of them, but rather that his source was a considerably shorter one, suggesting an earlier draft evidenced through Kellner’s copy?* Contemplating the problem from this angle, new questions have to be asked, most importantly: which variants in Kellner’s copy are not merely mistakes, but could be considered as an earlier authorial alternative, discarded during a subsequent revision?\(^{128}\)

He then goes on to say:

*A small but characteristic example to illustrate the importance of this last question is the appearance of the French violin clef. In the autograph of the Violin Solos, Bach always puts the French clef at the beginning of a bar, with the exception of one single case: in bar 85 of the Chaconne, the switch to the French clef takes place after the third quaver, not only mid-bar but not even before a full beat. If Kellner’s copy represents an earlier version of the movement, it might offer an explanation for this anomaly. In Kellner’s transmission, bars 81–84 (corresponding to bars 85–86 in Bach’s autograph) are twice as slow as the familiar version (semiquavers instead*

\(^{128}\)Ibid. p. 78
of demi-semiquavers, following the pace of the previous bars), thus lasting for four full bars, and the French clef, being written at the identical place, is therefore positioned on a bar line. If Bach revised the Chaconne from Kellner’s model, that is, his own earlier draft, he may have decided to write down the bars in question at double speed without bothering to change the position of the French clef, which, as a result of this revision, was repositioned to halfway through the bar.\textsuperscript{129}

This statement is challenged in this thesis, however, and the suggestion is offered instead that the reason the French violin clef is positioned differently by Bach in the FFC in this one single case, may point to a different compositional process taking place.

Concluding his discussion of the Chaconne, Szabo states:

\begin{quote}
In all, there are almost forty differences between Kellner’s copy and the autograph of the Chaconne...over half of the variances are probably the result of simple copying errors; some small, affecting only one or two notes, some...extensive. However, the outstanding challenging and fascinating feature of Kellner’s script is the relatively large number of plausible textural variants; harmonically adequate versions, which sound perfectly acceptable but different from the known version. If indeed authentic, they must have been revised thoroughly before the final copy was written out.\textsuperscript{130}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{129} Ibid. p. 79.  
\textsuperscript{130} Ibid.
And further, “...while these alternatives of the musical text in a draft version are adequate, their later authorial revision is a possibility which cannot be lightly dismissed.”

Finally, of the Chaconne, Szabo says that although four of the five cuts to the Chaconne in Kellner’s manuscript are:

...hardly noticeable when Kellner’s copy is played, the fifth cut cannot be explained as a valid alternative, in light of the fact that the listener misses out on one of the most extraordinary musical moments of the Chaconne, the cathartic transition from D minor to D Major.

This statement is in agreement with Braunlich (1981) who drew a similar conclusion.

Szabo continues:

The hypothetical Bach autograph may have been incompletely, but surely not incompetently, written, suggesting that this [fifth cut in the Chaconne] represents a clear copying error on Kellner’s part. Kellner may have accidentally skipped two musical lines but again, it is unlikely and without precedent elsewhere in this copy; it is conceivable, however, that spilled ink, a torn page or similar accidental damage may have prevented him from copying the missing fifteen bars. In any case, the clear structure of

---

131 Ibid.
132 Ibid.
133 See Braunlich 1981.
multiples of four bars in the other cases of missing bars makes an error of some sort more likely than deliberate alteration of the text.\footnote{134}

He further suggests:

\textit{Even in draft form, the Chaconne was conceived as an extraordinary movement right from the outset. That could also explain why in the order that appears in Kellner’s transmission, the D minor Partita is the final piece of the whole set, with the unsurpassable Chaconne at the very end of the manuscript.}\footnote{135}

In light of a more detailed comparison of several other movements being undertaken in the course of the examination for this thesis, whereby Kellner’s incomplete manuscript has been found to have many other variant readings, which can only be described as being of a different compositional quality, Szabo’s position cannot be justified.\footnote{136}

\footnote{134}Ibid.
\footnote{135}Ibid. p.81. The re-ordering of the Chaconne and the possible reasons for this are discussed in Chapter VI of this thesis pp.216-220.
\footnote{136}Evidence of this has been uncovered, for example, in the A minor Fugue BWV 1003, and will be detailed through the course of this thesis.
1.4.2 Kellner's copy of the *Cello Suites*

Szabo states that there are four manuscript copies of the *Cello Suites*, none of which is "...entirely satisfactory and they all differ from one another significantly." According to Szabo, Kellner’s manuscript version "...presents a plausible alternative musical text. These alternatives typically follow musical sequences better and are often more complex than the [other] versions..." Szabo suggests that the relationship between the four manuscript versions of the *Cello Suites* can be:

...clarified to some extent through the method that in classical philology is called the principle of common error. If the same error appears in more than one source it is usually safe to assume either that they were copied from the same model or that one was copied from the other truthfully, including its discrepancies.

He notes that Kellner’s transmission (*Cello Suites* Source [B]) provides, in about a dozen cases, notes which were in fact likely to be correct, whereas the three other Sources [A] (Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the Cello Suites), [C], and [D] (both late 18th Century copies of the *Cello Suites*) share the same errors. He then suggests Kellner’s manuscript of the *Cello Suites* may "...be of more value than previously acknowledged" and further:

---

137 Source A is in Anna Magdalena’s hand (D-B, Mus.ms P 287) Sources C (D-B,Mus.ms Bach P 289, Faszikel 10) and D (A-Wn, Mus. Hs. 5007 [S.m.5007]) are late eighteenth century copies of these works.
138 Szabo 2015, p. 73.
139 Ibid. p. 74.
141 Ibid. 73. See also Jarvis 2007 on this subject.
142 Ibid.
Kellner’s copy, with its more interesting readings of the same passages might equally be authentic, mirroring a revised authorial script from a later date than the one at the disposal of his colleagues.\textsuperscript{143}

Additionally, Szabo considers Kellner’s copy of the fifth Cello Suite to be a more accurate representation than Anna Magdalena’s “…less neatly-written score containing many revisions,”\textsuperscript{144} stating:

…Kellner’s model in the case of the 5\textsuperscript{th} Suite…seems to have been a revised autograph, and if that is true, then it follows that he would be likely to have worked from the same revised autograph for the whole cycle.\textsuperscript{145}

It should be noted that Kellner’s reliability as a copyist has been questioned by scholars on many occasions, but that his transcription of the fifth Cello Suite, among others, appears to be a far more accurate representation than other existing copies. This provides reason to dispute whether his reputation as an inaccurate copyist is, in fact, warranted.

According to Szabo, the Lute transcription of the fifth Cello Suite (BWV 995), which is in the hand of Bach, agrees with Kellner’s copy on at least ten occasions, whereby the other three manuscripts do not. In accordance with the principle of common error, therefore, Szabo suggests Kellner was copying from the same Source used by Bach when arranging the Lute Suite. He states, “…Kellner’s transmission of the 5\textsuperscript{th} Suite appears to have originated at an autograph source and

\textsuperscript{143} Ibid. p. 74.
\textsuperscript{144} Ibid. p. 76.
\textsuperscript{145} Ibid.
not the same exemplar that AMB [Anna Magdalena] used when preparing her copy of the Suites.\textsuperscript{146}

Further, he notes:

\textit{Anna Magdalena’s copy, with its remarkably high number of inaccuracies, may have been copied from a less neatly written score containing many revisions. Kellner’s model in the case of the 5\textsuperscript{th} Suite, on the other hand, seems to have been a revised autograph, and, if that is true, then it follows that he would be likely to have worked from the same revised autograph for the whole cycle.}\textsuperscript{147}

This raises many questions, however, such as why Anna Magdalena would not have had access to the original Bach autograph as Kellner did, considering it was her husband’s work,\textsuperscript{148} and why she would therefore have copied from an inferior, incomplete or otherwise inaccurate version of the transcript to which Kellner somehow had access.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{146}Ibid. p. 75.
\textsuperscript{147}Ibid. p. 76. See also the possible filiations of the fifth Suite sources detailed in Jarvis 2007, p. 281.
\textsuperscript{148}This comment is particularly interesting in light of the traditional understanding that Anna Magdalena was a more dependable copyist that Kellner.
\end{flushright}
1.4.3 Parallel traits between the copies

Szabo goes on to explore the parallel traits between the *Cello Suites* and the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas*, and draws the following conclusions:

In both cases, these revolutionary sets of six multi-movement solo string works were composed in or before 1720; in both cases, in or before 1726, a manuscript of these compositions was given to and copied by Kellner. Both original models appear to have been lost...In both cases we appear to be working with the remaining silhouettes of objects—probably authorial manuscripts—that disappeared a long time ago.\(^{149}\)

He says that while it makes “*perfect sense*”\(^{150}\) to view these works as earlier working versions, this hypothesis is clouded by two facts:

- Kellner’s unintentional copying errors;
- Intentional and arbitrary amendments to his model.\(^{151}\)

Szabo notes a further similarity between the Kellner versions of the collections, stating, “*The unintentional copying errors are frequent and plainly evident in both sets,*” but importantly, he clarifies in a footnote, “…*the work of Anna Magdalena is marred by similar errors.*”\(^{152}\)

\(^{149}\) Ibid. p. 81.
\(^{150}\) Ibid.
\(^{151}\) Ibid.
\(^{152}\) Ibid.
However:

In most cases, they are easy to recognise as the notes or rhythms copied incorrectly are different from the version given in other known sources, and look or sound odd in the musical texture (for instance, they add an extra beat to the bar [and] break an existing musical sequence). However, in a number of cases, divergent notes or rhythms in Kellner’s copies present a valid alternative which may reflect his original source.\(^{153}\)

Szabo suggests that the discrepancies between the two manuscript versions by Kellner and Bach of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas, have resulted in the long held viewpoint that there has been a “deliberate corruption”\(^{154}\) by Kellner of the original, but notes there is:

...practically no evidence of him deliberately altering the musical text in his transmission of the Cello Suites (save where he added an extra note to the last tonic chord of three movements), thus it seems most unlikely that he would have changed his professional behaviour radically when copying similar works by the same composer at around the same time. We therefore have to consider the other alternative: that he copied, to the best of his ability, exactly what was in front of him. His model may well have been a different (and to us unknown) version, probably an earlier and incomplete draft. This would help to explain the previously listed

\(^{153}\) Ibid.
\(^{154}\) Ibid.
differences between his copy and the surviving Bach autograph, which he may never have seen.\textsuperscript{155}

A further discrepancy between the two collections is the great extent of the differences between the autograph of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas and Kellner's version, which is at odds with the considerably lesser degree of divergences between Anna Magdalena's manuscript of the Cello Suites and Kellner's manuscript version. As such, Szabo suggests, “It therefore seems plausible to conclude that there must have been significant differences between his exemplars. The chronological order of events may explain this seeming anomaly.”\textsuperscript{156}

This chronological order of events, referred to by Szabo, appears to be based on the existing traditional understanding of the transmission of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas and their sources. He suggests:

\textit{It seems logical that in the case of the Violin Solos where he practically had to ‘stand in line’, he did not receive the fair copy autograph but an earlier, unrevised version, whereas the version of the Cello Suites that he had copied may have been the same, apparently revised, version of the Suites that Bach himself used during the compositional work of the Lute Suite, BWV 995.}\textsuperscript{157}

Once again this statement is challenged in this thesis, in view of the fact that Szabo has made this assumption based on the traditional understanding of the

\textsuperscript{155} Ibid. p. 82.
\textsuperscript{156} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{157} Ibid.
transmission of the sources, much of which cannot and has never been proven, and therefore remains at best as educated conjecture.  

Szabo acknowledges that his suggestion that Anna Magdalena did not prepare her version of the *Cello Suites* from the same exemplar Kellner used:

...remains problematic...however, the uncorrected copying errors and consistently imprecise articulation of her copy could be explained if she was working from a hastily drafted working manuscript rather than a fair copy. It is also conceivable that the autograph that Kellner was given had not been returned (for any number of reasons) to the Bach household in Leipzig by the time she started her work on making [Source] A.  

This further reinforces the question raised above relating to how Kellner came to be in possession of a more mature draft of the *Cello Suites* than the one to which Anna Magdalena had access.

Based on the study presented above, Szabo therefore concludes:

*We have to consider the possibility of two Bach autographs of very different calibre at Kellner’s disposal: in the case of the Violin Solos, a draft or an early version, and in the case of the Cello Suites, a revised copy. Kellner’s copies of the string solos may reveal evidence of these important Bach autographs that have not survived and to which, to the best of our knowledge, no other later copyist had access. The concurrent examination*

---

158 See Chapter III pp. 68-73 of this thesis, where the various sources and possible transmissions of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* are detailed.

159 Szabo 2015, p. 82.
of the two copies offers considerably more than recognising the hallmarks of an ‘exceedingly careless scribe’. While recognising that Kellner’s copying was often imprecise, it is of crucial importance not to confuse the work of the inaccurately copying cantor with the exemplar that he used."\textsuperscript{160}

Further, as a result of the observations made, Szabo then states:

We have to look at Kellner’s reading of the Cello Suites with renewed interest, as it is likely to have been based on a more mature authorial version of the Suites than any to which the other copyists had access. If this is correct, it would throw a different light on other variations specific to Kellner’s manuscript that have hitherto been customarily dismissed, but which may have mirrored the composer’s later intentions. On the other hand, the Violin Solos in Kellner’s copy may reflect an incomplete and unrevised early autograph, thus allowing a rare glimpse into the workings of the composer’s mind. While some of its omissions are indeed due to copying errors, other differences between this copy and Bach’s autograph might help to understand the composer’s process of revising draft versions of his compositions.\textsuperscript{161}

Szabo closes by saying:

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{160} Ibid. pp. 82-83.
\textsuperscript{161} Ibid. p. 83.
Without these copies [of Kellner’s] we would not know that these [earlier] models ever existed (although in both cases, it makes perfect sense that they did).\textsuperscript{162}

Finally, although copying errors are frequent, Szabo concludes, "Kellner’s copies present a valid alternative which may reflect his original source."\textsuperscript{163}

Questions raised in Szabo’s study and which are not adequately explained are:

- How Kellner came to obtain a copy of the version from which he copied and how it came to be disseminated in Thuringia.
- Why no other versions of this exemplar appear to have been made by anyone else and all other known copies of these works are complete.
- Why Kellner copied an incomplete version in 1726 when the 1720 FFC was supposedly in circulation for approximately seven years.\textsuperscript{164}

\textsuperscript{162} Ibid. p. 83
\textsuperscript{163} Ibid. p. 81
\textsuperscript{164} As detailed, Szabo attempts to explain this by suggesting that Bach’s original (FFC) was in such demand to copy, Kellner had to ‘stand in line’ and thus chose to copy an earlier, incomplete version. It is noted, however, that if Bach’s FFC was in such demand, as suggested by Szabo, no such performance of these works was ever documented until February 8, 1840 when the first known complete performance took place. See Chapter III (3.4) of this thesis ‘Reception History’ pp. 74-83.
1.5 The Six Cello Suites

The *Six Cello Suites* pose many questions, such as, why is there no manuscript in Bach’s hand; for whom and why were they composed; when were they composed? In this section, what has been written about them in recent times will be presented.

1.6 Boyd, M. (ed.) 2001\(^{165}\)

It is not known whether the *Cello Suites* were originally conceived as a collection of six works. Bach scholars and music historians have debated this question for many years, citing the more unusual musical aspects of some of the works. Boyd (2001) discusses the layout of the “suite” adopted by Bach during the Köthen years, in particular the additional pairs of dances at the end of each suite as well as the commencement of each suite with a prelude. Boyd states that Bach’s obvious concern for symmetry, and the “uniformity” of the *Cello Suites* “…might suggest they were planned as a set from the start.”\(^{166}\) Boyd goes on to say, however:

...but there are good reasons for thinking that the last two may have originated independently of the others. In the first place, they are noticeably more difficult to play, with a higher proportion of multiple stops and (in No. 6, at least) more virtuoso passagework. They are also somewhat longer, No. 5 beginning with an extended prelude and fugue. More than this, No. 6 is actually for a different instrument, one with an extra string tuned to e’ (a fifth higher than the normal top string), while No. 5 employs scordatura, the highest string being tuned down from a’ to

\(^{166}\) Ibid. p. 94.
g’. Scordatura was often used in violin music by Bach’s German predecessors (the sonatas of Biber provide some familiar examples), but why Bach employed here a practice which he never used elsewhere is something of a puzzle. It cannot have been to facilitate fingering, which is often more awkward than with normal tuning, and it seems unlikely that it was done to give the music a darker colouring, as has often been suggested.\textsuperscript{167}

Boyd continues his discussion into the unusual use of scordatura in the Fifth Suite and suggests that it may have something to do with the version of this Suite for Lute, an instrument that is tuned in fourths. Boyd points out, however,

\ldots the autograph of [the Lute Suite] BWV 995 dates from 1727–31, several years after Anna Magdalena’s fair copy of the cello suites. While this does not rule out the existence of an earlier version for lute, it seems just as likely that in the fifth cello suite Bach was reviving a tuning which had been standard in the early history of the autograph and which was occasionally revived in the late seventeenth century as a scordatura…\textsuperscript{168}

Boyd concludes his discussion of the Cello Suites by offering a comparison with the Violin Sonatas and Partitas,

\textit{The Six Suites are today in the repertory of every cellist who can master their technical challenges…In a similar way the six sonatas and partitas…which demand even more of the performer, occupy an unchallenged position in the

\textsuperscript{167} Ibid. pp. 94-95
\textsuperscript{168} Ibid.
literature of violin music. It is likely that Bach wrote them for a particularly
gifted player...but they also reflect his own mastery of violin technique.\textsuperscript{169}

1.7 Text Volume Schwemer & Woodfull-Harris (ed.) 2000\textsuperscript{170}
What little is known of the \textit{Cello Suites} is covered by Bettina Schwemer and
Douglas Woodfull-Harris in the text volume to the \textit{Six Cello Suites}.

The date of composition of the \textit{Cello Suites} is unknown. Schwemer & Woodfull-
Harris (2000), date the \textit{Cello Suites}, as “...sometime between 1727 and 1731.”\textsuperscript{171}
The only essentially complete manuscript of them that exists, is in Anna
Magdalena's music-hand and is known as Source A.\textsuperscript{172} The \textit{Cello Suites} are
important to the historical context of this study because they appear in Anna
Magdalena's konvolut together with the \textit{Violin Sonatas and Partitas}.\textsuperscript{173} It is
thought that Anna Magdalena made this two-part collection for the violinist
Georg Heinrich Ludwig Schwanenberger (1696-1774). The title page of her
combined manuscript is not dated, and further, it is believed to have been written
by Schwanenberger.\textsuperscript{174}

\begin{flushright}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{169} Ibid. p. 95.
\textsuperscript{170} Schwemer & Woodfull-Harris (eds.) 2000 \textit{Text Volume to 6 Suites a Violoncello Solo senza Basso}. Kassel,
Bärenreiter.
\textsuperscript{171} Jarvis 2007, p. 249.
\textsuperscript{172} In scholarly writings, Anna Magdalena's copy (D-B, Mus. ms. P 269) is usually referred to as Source A and
exists as a complete version of the \textit{Cello Suites}. Her manuscript has traditionally been accepted as being the
most authentic version. Szabo 2015, p. 83, has made recent claims that Kellner's version (although
incomplete, and which is known as Source B [D-B, Mus. Ms. P804, Faszikel 40]) may in fact be a more
authentic version of the works. Szabo suggests that it appears “...to have been based on a more mature
authorial version...”
\textsuperscript{173} Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the \textit{Violin Sonatas and Partitas} are State Library of Berlin D-B, Mus. ms
P 268 and the \textit{Cello Suites} are D-B, Mus. ms P 269.
\textsuperscript{174} Eppstein, H. 1990, \textit{Sechs Suiten für Violoncello Solo BWV 1007 – 1012}. NBA Vol. 6, No. 2, Kritischer Bericht,
Kassel u.a.: Bärenreiter. See Chapter IV in this thesis where Schwanenberger's involvement in the
preparation of the manuscript is discussed pp. 149-151.
\end{flushright}
A further, almost complete, manuscript of the *Cello Suites*, made by Johann Peter Kellner also exists in a konvolut with the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas*.\(^{175}\)

The discovery of Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the *Cello Suites* is attributed to Alfred Dorffel, who found the manuscript in Berlin\(^{176}\) and “…rescued it from obscurity…”\(^{177}\) His publication of the manuscript:

> ...marked the beginning of a new major phase. For the first time, Anna Magdalena’s manuscript was announced as a source of key importance; all later editors were obliged to pay attention to it, often taking extremely divergent views regarding its reliability and authenticity…\(^{178}\)

It is not known which was written first, the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* or the *Cello Suites*, and opinion is divided on this. While the title page suggests that the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* were written first, simply by virtue of their placement above the *Cello Suites* (as shown in the italicised section below), musical evidence demonstrates this is not necessarily the case.\(^{179}\)

The title page of Anna Magdalena’s combined manuscript or Konvolut (believed to be written by the musician Schwanenberger), reads:

\(^{175}\) The *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* appear first in Kellner’s Konvolut and are D-B, Mus.ms P 804, Faszikel 22; the *Cello Suites* are D-B, Mus. ms. P 804, Faszikel 40. Kellner’s Konvolut is discussed further in Chapter III of this thesis.

\(^{176}\) Although the exact date of discovery by Dorffel is not known, the manuscript of the *Cello Suites* was discovered sometime after 1841 (the date they were bequeathed to the Berlin Royal Library) but well before 1879 when the edition was published as part of the Bach Gesamtausgabe (Complete Bach Edition) by the Bach Gesellschaft (Bach Society).


\(^{178}\) Ibid.

\(^{179}\) This is the case with the 1725 *Notebook for Anna Magdalena*. A detailed study of this collection, undertaken by Georg von Dadelsen (1998), states “The Chronological disorder of this last section seems to a part of the plan concerning the overall layout. The...two Suites...were copied earlier than the pieces immediately preceding them…” Bärenreiter Kassel 2000 ‘Afterword’, p. 13.
Therefore, while it may appear that Bach wrote the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* intending to have the *Cello Suites* as a complimentary group of works to the collection, no conclusive evidence for this has ever been established.

The Anna Magdalena manuscript of the *Cello Suites* (known as Source [A])\(^{180}\) is assumed to be a copy of the alleged ‘missing autograph’ (known as Source [X]), and along with the incomplete copy of the *Cello Suites* by Kellner (known as Source [B]), has formed the basis of countless editions over the years since they were first published in 1824 under the title ‘*Six Sonates ou Etudes [sic] Pour Le Violoncelle Solo Composée Par J. Sebastien Bach Oeuvre Posthume*’\(^{181}\) in Paris. As cited in Jarvis (2007) “...One Pierre Norblin, claimed to have...discovered the manuscript of the Cello Suites in Germany after a long search.”\(^{182}\) According to Dimitry Markevich there are in excess of ninety-four editions of the *Cello Suites*.\(^{183}\)

\(^{180}\) Schwemer & Woodfull-Harris (eds.) 2000.

\(^{181}\) Ibid. p.5:

\(^{182}\) Ibid. p. 5. See also Jarvis 2007, p. 9.

\(^{183}\) Markevitch, D 2000, *The Recent Editions of the Bach Cello Suites*, http://www.cello.org/Newsletter/Articles/markevitch.htm. Accessed 27 03 2014. Markevitch was the publisher of the *Cello Suites* edition in 1964, and discoverer of the Westphal manuscripts of the *Cello Suites*. Since Markevitch’ article was written in 2000, there are now likely to be in excess of 100 editions.
In his essay, Tomita explores Anna Magdalena's reliability as a copyist of Bach's music. He states:

...no one appreciates [Anna's] contributions more than today's musicologists, for her copies are usually "neat and accurate" and are often among the most important primary sources when Bach's autographs do not survive.

Tomita's essay has a central purpose. At its core, it is an attempt to re-evaluate Anna Magdalena's performance as a copyist and challenge existing theories, so that "...a broader and multi-dimensional picture of Anna as copyist may emerge." In turn, according to Tomita, this may then determine if, "...any particular patterns or tendencies in her copying activities emerge when these are placed in [a] broader chronological context." In doing this, Tomita explores the Sources of Anna Magdalena's copies and her reliability as a copyist within the chronological and situational context of her life, i.e. "...the typical situations in which she worked." For example, when discussing how her music calligraphy becomes 'rough' towards the end of her copy of BWV 226, Tomita adds the footnote, "...we may also need to consider that she was eight months pregnant with her seventh child."

---

184 Tomita, Y. 2007, 'Anna Magdalena as Bach's Copyist', Understanding Bach, 2, Bach Network UK, pp. 59-76.
186 Ibid.
187 Ibid. p. 61
188 Ibid.
189 Ibid.
190 Ibid.
and when describing the cello part she copied for the 1722 Missa [BWV 226] as being “…particularly full of errors which were corrected by Bach,” he adds the footnote “…Anna must have been six months pregnant with her tenth child Johann August Abraham (5 Nov. 1733 – 6 Nov. 1733) when she made the copy, which may have affected her effectiveness as copyist.”

Accordingly, Tomita suggests that, of the 2536 separate surviving copies of Bach’s works, Anna Magdalena’s output was relatively small, which may be understandable in the context of her life with him. He states, “It is obvious that Anna’s copies are few in number, when compared with those made by the regular copyists – including two of the Bach’s eldest sons – who assisted Bach’s Cantata production.” Tomita suggests this may be because, “Anna’s participation was restricted to winter months when the Thomaner boys presumably fell ill in greater numbers than in other seasons.”

Tomita provides an updated list of Bach’s works thought to be copied out by Anna, and which were originally tabulated by Dadelsen in 1957. Tomita lists the first three works (presumably copied by Anna Magdalena) as works for string instruments - the Violin Sonatas and Partitas, the Cello Suites and the Violin Sonata in G Major. Tomita is of the opinion that all three works for strings were copied between 1727 and 1731 and that, “…all three copies were made for two former

---

191 Ibid. p.64.
192 Ibid. p. 64. It is noted in this investigation that there is no evidence to support these comments.
193 Ibid. p. 63.
194 Ibid.
195 Ibid.
196 Whether or not this is indicative of Anna Magdalena’s knowledge of string instruments and that Bach may have considered that ability foremost, is not known.
students of Bach’s, Schwanenberger[sic] and Boineburg, who presumably purchased them.\textsuperscript{197}

It is noted in this thesis that Tatlow (2015), states:

\begin{quote}
The [Six Solos] attracted at least two commissions. In 1726 Johann Peter Kellner...copied an early five-solo version of the collection; and sometime between 1727 and 1731, Bach’s second wife, Anna Magdalena, transcribed the Six Solos and the Cello Suites...for Georg Friedrich Schwanberg[sic], who himself made a single title page for the set of two collections.\textsuperscript{198}
\end{quote}

Tomita theorises that Bach and Anna Magdalena clearly worked on and discussed the manuscripts (she copied) together. He states:

\begin{quote}
There are other interesting and attractive cases of Anna’s copying. To me, the most intriguing are where the MSS contain the handwriting of both her and her husband, intertwined in such a manner that they must surely have discussed something about the copies they were making together.\textsuperscript{199}
\end{quote}

To demonstrate this, Tomita uses by way of example the G Major Sonata (BWV 1021), stating:

\begin{quote}
BWV 1021 was produced jointly by the couple: Anna copied the music and Bach provided the title, movement headings and figures for continuo, while, presumably, he also proof-read Anna’s portion at the same time.\textsuperscript{200}
\end{quote}
He does not, however, describe the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* as such, and from this it can only be ascertained that Tomita chooses to remain within the traditional position regarding this collection, i.e. Anna Magdalena made her ‘copy’ of these works directly from the FFC with no involvement from Bach. Irrespective, Tomita’s statement regarding the collaborative effort of Bach and Anna Magdalena further supports the hypothesis that there was regular and ongoing collaboration occurring between them, and, although not explored in his essay, it seems reasonable to assume that this would have been the case with the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas*. Further, this essay does not explore any of the anomalies between Anna Magdalena’s manuscript version and the FFC. Nor does Tomita make any mention of the Kellner manuscript of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* or any other of Kellner’s manuscripts.

Tomita is of the opinion that, “…In those instances where both Bach’s autograph and Anna’s copy survive, scholars generally agree that Anna copied from Bach’s extant autograph.”\(^{201}\) He describes the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* as being, “a flawless fair copy.”\(^{202}\)

Tomita discusses the generally accepted understanding of Anna Magdalena as a reliable copyist of Bach’s music. He cites Schwemer and Woodfull-Harris (2000) who state:

*Anna Magdalena is generally considered a reliable copyist who followed her models in great detail and did not introduce arbitrary changes. It is therefore safe to assume that the handwriting, beaming, stemming and*

\(^{201}\) Ibid. p. 63.

\(^{202}\) Ibid.
Page turns in the Anna Magdalena Bach MS fairly accurately reflect the writing in the autograph.²⁰³

Tomita also cites a similar observation made by Beisswenger (2000):²⁰⁴

AMB was a conscientious copier, who was faithful to the source in an extreme measure (even reproducing changes of pages and staves). What is problematic, however, is her transcription of the articulation marks, particularly of the slurring, which is categorised by negligence and prodigality. The relationship between the autograph of the Cello Suites and AMB’s copy of them must be similar to that between the autograph of the violin solos and her transcription. Aside from a few copying errors, the musical text most likely reproduces the reading of the autograph quite faithfully.²⁰⁵

Despite the views of Woodfull-Harris and Beisswenger described above, Tomita states that the Cello Suites:

…contain an unusually large number of inaccuracies and copying errors. One must ask how many of these blunders should be ascribed to her. It seems contradictory for some scholars to claim that Anna copied it from Bach’s fair copy. How would a neat and accurate copyist produce such an error-ridden manuscript? Does it not seem more sensible to suppose that

²⁰³ Ibid., p. 65. See also Schwemer & Woodfull-Harris, 2000, p. 6.
Anna copied in a hurry, or perhaps from a less neatly-written score containing many revisions?  

If this is the case, however, the same must be said of Anna Magdalena’s version of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas, which is also found to be plagued with errors, when compared to the FFC.

In his discussion of the Cello Suites, Tomita does not draw any comparison to Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas, nor does he reference any of the number of divergences that exist between the FFC and Anna Magdalena’s manuscript, which this thesis will address.

The most plausible reason offered in this thesis as to why Tomita does not delve more deeply into this area is that a Bach autograph of the Cello Suites does not exist; therefore, Anna Magdalena’s manuscript has always been considered the most valid reference source available. This was never the case with the Violin Sonatas and Partitas. As such it is likely that her manuscript version of these works was never scrutinised to the same degree as the Cello Suites have been.

Tomita cites the numerous “weaknesses” in Anna Magdalena’s copies, which were originally identified by Emery (1953), as being: the positioning of slurs, ties and ornaments and an overall “lack of consistency” in her writing. He

---

206 Ibid. p. 60. This view is also held by Szabo 2015, who suggests that Anna Magdalena copied her version of the Cello Suites from a different version to that of Kellner, whose copy he believes represents a more authentic attempt.
207 Ibid. p. 68.
discusses another of Anna’s “weaknesses” on Emery’s list — the issues of vertical alignment in polyphonic texture, stating:

Another of Anna’s weaknesses was her lack of knowledge about the vertical alignment of notes in polyphonic texture... examples of which can be found in almost every copy... Even when Anna carefully follows Bach’s handwriting, this problem comes through frequently in her manuscripts.209

Throughout the article, Tomita comments on the importance of understanding the context in which Anna Magdalena copied a work, as this, in his opinion, affected the quality of the copy she made. After stating that from 1723 until 1727 Anna Magdalena produced a child annually, he concludes, “...one could imagine how difficult it would have been to maintain her focus for long periods of time.”210

Referring to the fact that the Cello Suites and the Violin Sonatas and Partitas were apparently made as a sales copy, Tomita concludes they “...should have been copied more reliably than many of the performance parts she had made.”211 While this scenario remains plausible, there is no discernible evidence (that has ever been found) that Anna Magdalena’s copies were made to be purchased. Further, Schwanenberger’s handwriting has been found to exist in her copy of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas, and it is also his hand on the title page.212 If this was the case, this thesis questions why Anna Magdalena would not have done this herself, if she were making copies. Further, it would also be expected that the titles would

209 Ibid. This is not the case with her manuscript version of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas, where the vertical alignment is noted as being precise overall.
210 Ibid. p. 72.
211 Ibid.
212 See Jarvis, 2007 who states, “Hans-Joachim Schultze... identified the three titles (one for the combined works, and one for the violin solos and cello solos) as being in the hand of Schwanenberger.” p. 245.
have been copied out in full.²¹³ The involvement of Schwanenberger in the preparation of the manuscripts challenges the notion that these copies were made for purchase.

After a detailed study of the works Anna Magdalena is considered to have copied for Bach, including Anna Magdalena’s copies of performance parts, Tomita states, “All three observations indicate that Anna was not among Bach’s main work-horse copyists, but was someone on whom Bach could rely in times of emergency.”²¹⁴ In fact Tomita believes it was often a case of “…who was available when,”²¹⁵ which determined which helper he used. Tomita offers a study of Anna Magdalena’s copy of the Well-Tempered Clavier Book II and says that each of Anna’s copies, “…shows different and unpredictable problems in different aspects of notation.”²¹⁶ He concludes that based on this, “…Bach did not really expect a professional level of accuracy and consistency from her…she was there when Bach urgently needed someone who could prepare parts for imminent performance.”²¹⁷ Further, “Although she made many mistakes, she must have been a better choice than many others that Bach could have chosen at the time.”²¹⁸

Tomita also attempts to explain how Anna Magdalena developed a music calligraphy so similar to Bach’s and suggests, “…it seems natural to suppose that Anna learned it from Bach by copying his music, imitating his style; she continued

²¹³ There are numerous discrepancies between the titles of the movements contained within Anna Magdalena’s manuscript version and that of the FFC. These are detailed in Chapter VI (6.4.1–6.4.3) of this thesis pp. 223 -226.
²¹⁴ Ibid. p. 63.
²¹⁵ Ibid. p. 64.
²¹⁶ Ibid. p. 71.
²¹⁷ Ibid.
²¹⁸ Ibid.
to do this for the first couple of years of her marriage, until she found her own shapes and styles.”

Tomita offers no proof, however, to support this notion, and in the absence of any proof of this, it remains only a supposition. He acknowledges that Dadelsen made a similar observation regarding the similarity of their music calligraphy. Tomita also proposes the possibility that sharing the same quill would have resulted in similar writing styles. Jarvis and Found (2010) demonstrated that this assertion could not be validated.

Tomita then concludes his essay with the suggestion that studying Anna Magdalena’s copies of her husband’s work, “…may open a new window through which further details of the couples working relationship can be learned.”

---

219 Ibid. p. 66. Jarvis 2007, claims that it is likely that Anna Magdalena was Bach’s pupil from as early as 1713. p. 208.
220 Ibid.
221 Jarvis and Found have published the results of a series of experiments in the Proceedings of the International Graphonomics Society, 2011, in their paper presented at the Australia and New Zealand (ANZ) Forensic Science Symposium, Sydney, which demonstrates that this assertion by Tomita cannot be supported experimentally.
222 Dr Bryan Found is the chief forensic scientist of the Victorian Police, Victoria, Australia.
224 Tomita 2007, p. 67.
1.9 Summary

It is apparent from the literature review that attempts to create argument for the origins of both the Violin Sonatas and Partitas and the Cello Suites are restricted by the belief that both works flowed from the hand of Bach, the master musician. In taking this unchallenged position, the authors have limited the potential for their own conclusions at the outset, and have merely added to the list of questions, which continue to surround both sets of works.

Recent dissemination of publications by Jarvis (2007; 2010)\textsuperscript{225} and Tatlow (2006; 2007; 2015)\textsuperscript{226} in particular, provide further significant information and evidence as to Bach’s compositional styles, the role of his copyists and the possible implementation of analytical design across his collections of works.

This thesis will shed light on the origins of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas and the Cello Suites and offer a new hypothesis, presenting an analysis of the historical context for both the Violin Sonatas and Partitas and the Cello Suites, as well as a forensic examination and comparison of several of the works from the three extant manuscripts of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas.


CHAPTER II RESEARCH METHODS

2.1 Introduction
This chapter summarises the research methods used in the preparation of this thesis and in accordance with the principle aim of the study, which is to investigate whether there is evidence to support the hypothesis that a different compositional process of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* took place. It explains the research objectives, research questions formulated from the aims of the study, methodologies used, and how this has guided the collection of information and development of theory.

2.2 Research objectives
As detailed earlier in this thesis, several sources of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* are extant. The principal aim of this investigation, however, is to determine the relationship between (only) three of these extant manuscript versions. These are: Sources A (attributed to Bach), B (Anna Magdalena) and D (Kellner’s partial manuscript).\(^{227}\) It is hypothesised that a different relationship (from that which is traditionally understood) may exist between these manuscripts. As such, further detailed investigation and comparison of the three manuscripts to gather evidence and determine what hypothesis this evidence could provide to support a different compositional process.

2.3 Key research question
As stated earlier, given that there are three extant manuscripts of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* for Violin Solo Senza Basso attributed to

\(^{227}\) See Chapter III (3.3) pp. 68-73 of this thesis, for a discussion of all sources and transmissions of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas*. 
Johann Sebastian Bach, and given that the relationships among them are not at all clear, what can be deduced regarding the relationship the three manuscripts have to each other using a forensic scientific approach; viz. similarities and divergences between the manuscript versions in order to establish scribal attribution?

Following a detailed review of scholarly literature to date, a number of more specific research questions have been framed and further refined during the course of the developing research design. These are:

1. Is there any forensic evidence that Kellner’s manuscript of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas actually represents a compositional exercise given to him by Bach?

2. Do the coincidences and divergences between Anna Magdalena’s manuscript and Kellner’s exist because of the compositional process?

3. Is there evidence that Schwanenberger, as a violinist, was directly involved in the compositional revision process leading to the FFC of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas?

4. Is there evidence that suggests that the date of 1720 on the FFC of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas represents the year in which the works were begun, rather than the date of the year of completion?

5. Is there evidence to support the proposition that Kellner’s version was revised by Anna Magdalena prior to a final revision made by Bach, which he then created in accordance with his original compositional intent?
2.4 Methodologies used

The three methods of investigation used to develop and investigate the hypothesis are:

1. Manuscript investigation and comparison. High quality digital manuscripts obtained from Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, were used to conduct a detailed forensic examination of the three manuscript versions of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas*. The investigation detailed the coincidences and divergences contained therein and attempted to explain whether these coincidences and divergences existed as a result of the composition process hypothesized in this study. When a scanner was required, an HP Scanjet G4101 was used, scanning at 600dpi.

2. Scientific evidence. Forensic handwriting examination (FHE) methodology was used to examine and compare the music calligraphy and handwriting features contained within the three manuscript versions of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas*. Using high quality digital manuscripts as detailed above using the modular system established by Found and Rogers. The Modular System is a system of handwriting identification used to train forensic document examiners by the police forces of Australia (and New Zealand). It is designed as a step–by-step process ensuring that there is a minimum of opportunities for the Examiner to make errors of judgement. It is recognised that the lack of access to the original documents always places a limitation on any examination of a document for forensic purposes. That being said, the examination undertaken for this thesis was limited to the examination of features which are unaffected by not being original documents.
3. A musicological comparison of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* and other sources against the historical backdrop. Musicological evidence obtained from historical sources and the manuscripts, enabled conclusions to be drawn regarding the compositional process of creating the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas*.
CHAPTER III HISTORICAL CONTENT

*Autograph is by no means proof of his authorship…it is precisely the most conscientious experts who, by reason of their conscientiousness - and especially as their knowledge of Bach’s work increases - have refrained from all too categorical repudiations or authentications.* - Hans Vogt

3.1 Preamble

This chapter will focus on the historical context of the three manuscripts of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas*. The purpose of this is to clarify what the currently accepted understanding of the relationship is between the three manuscripts, and to make clear the perceived relationship the scribes had to one another.

3.2 The so-called ‘1720 Autograph’ (FFC) by Bach

Bach scholars have never questioned the approximate dating of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas*. Their chronology and authenticity are considered to be secure, based on the date of 1720, which appears on the title page. Further, the manuscript is considered to have been signed off by Bach. Figure 1 shows one

---


231 It is very difficult to verify Bach’s actual signature owing to the lack of known sources. Bach employed a secretary at certain times, and they may have signed on his behalf. See Jarvis 2007, p. 98.
of the two writings of the name ‘Bach’ that can be confirmed as genuine, because they come from the Confessional Register in the Church at Köthen.\textsuperscript{232}

![Figure 1: One of two occurrences with the name ‘Bach’](image1)

Below is the title page of the works “\textit{Sei Solo a Violino Senza Basso Accompannato Libro Primo Da Joh. Seb. Bach Ao. 1720}”.

![Figure 2: The title page of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas](image2)

\textsuperscript{232} For a detailed discussion of the writing of the name ‘Bach,’ see Jarvis 2007, Chapter III pp. 157–70.
The investigation undertaken in the preparation of this thesis, however, challenges the dating of the ‘1720 Autograph’ (FFC) as being the date of completion, leading to the suggestion that a different compositional process occurred, resulting in the 1720 ‘FFC’ actually being completed at a date much later than the year 1720. Further detail of this is discussed in subsequent sections.233

Stinson (1989) describes the Violin Sonatas and Partitas as being among those works by Bach “…whose authenticity and chronology are relatively secure. They are preserved in an autograph...dated 1720 in the composer’s own hand.”234 However, he also describes them as:

...particularly interesting (and problematic) with respect to their authenticity, chronology and compositional history. Yet they are still somewhat misunderstood or neglected, owing in part to the absence of a comprehensive study of the Kellner-circle copies.235

Bach’s music is commonly divided into three general time periods — his early works up until 1717, his work after his move to Köthen from 1717-1723, and his work after his move to Leipzig in 1723 until his death in 1750.236 The year 1720 was roughly three years into the Köthen period of Bach’s life, during which time Bach was no longer required to write only sacred music for the Church as was the

233 Jarvis 2008, in an unpublished paper presented at the Royal Academy of Music in London, September 2010, identifies that the handwriting on the title page is not the same as in the body of the work. He also makes reference to this in the Association of Forensic Document Examiners’ Journal 2010 Volume 20, pp. 49-61.
235 Ibid.
236 See Jarvis 2007, p. 5.
case in Weimar. Instead, he was free to experiment with secular music owing to his Court appointment. The unchallenged premise that Bach completed these works in 1720, however, indicates that he must have commenced them much earlier in order for the FFC to be completed by 1720. The *Kritischer Bericht* (Critical Report) in the *Neue Bach Ausgabe* (NBA) says:

...for musical reasons, a date much earlier than 1720 seems improbable.

Compared to other works known or presumed to have originated during his Weimar period...the violin writing is much more mature... [Further]

...the spacious proportions of the movements and the superior workmanship likewise point to Bach’s Cöthen [sic] period rather than the Weimar years."

### 3.3 The Six Violin Sonatas and Partitas and their sources

There are a number of preserved, extant manuscripts of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas*. All but one (Source L) are currently housed in the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin. They are detailed as follows:

**Source [A] P 967** is attributed to J.S. Bach and is usually referred to as the ‘1720 Autograph.’ The traditionally accepted position is that Bach wrote these works in 1720 during his time at the Köthen Court. Although the date 1720 has

---

237 Jarvis 2007, p.7, writes that during his time at Köthen, “He became a court composer with responsibility for writing for the Prince and not exclusively for church situations. This was an opportunity for Johann Sebastian to grow in musical stature and to broaden his musical experience by concentrating on the composition of secular music.” p. 7


239 Source L is located at Leipzig Bibliothek CLVXZ:BM../34 5689.

240 All Bach scholarly literature to date, refers to these works as being written in the year 1720, which was the mid- point of Bach’s appointment at the Court of Köthen. See Forkel, J. N, 1802 On Johann Sebastian’s Life, Genius, and Works New York: Da Capo. 1970., Vienna House 1974. (Originally Ed. by Charles Sanford Terry, Constable, 1920) through to Szabo (2015).
traditionally been considered secure (it appears as such on the title page), it is highly improbable, however, that Source A was the original source of these works, and that earlier working versions must have existed prior to the writing out of the FFC.\textsuperscript{241} According to the NBA the manuscript is “...one of the most beautiful of all his autograph scores...remarkable for the painstaking accuracy of its musical text. As a result it poses hardly any questions for a modern scholarly-critical edition.”\textsuperscript{242}

Of this manuscript, Stinson also states, “As a fair copy — as opposed to a heavily corrected composing score — this source tells us little about the set prior to its final version.”\textsuperscript{243} It is not known for whom the manuscript was prepared, or what the impetus was behind the writing of these works, though Bach scholars have surmised various reasons, which will be detailed during the course of this thesis.

All editions of these works, since the first publication of the NBA Critical Report consider this manuscript, of all extant sources, to be the one of highest authority.

Source [B] P 268 is attributed to Anna Magdalena and exists in a combined manuscript with the Cello Suites. It is traditionally thought that Anna Magdalena made her copy from Source [A] sometime around 1727/1728.\textsuperscript{244}

Source [C] P 267 is contained in a combined manuscript of which BWV 1001–1005 are in the hand of an unknown copyist believed to be have been made sometime in the first half of the 18\textsuperscript{th} Century. The pianist, Georg Poelchau,

\textsuperscript{241} Source A (D-B. Mus. ms. P 967) exists as a perfect manuscript copy of the works with no corrections or alterations. As such, it is likely that other (draft) versions existed prior to this one.


\textsuperscript{243} Stinson 1989, p. 55.

\textsuperscript{244} NBA 2001, Vol. X/7.
discovered Source C in St Petersburg in 1814. A copy of BWV 1006 exists in a
different hand. This unknown copyist is thought to have produced this version
in the second half of the 18th Century. In 1841 the manuscript found its way to
the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin where it has remained since.\textsuperscript{245}

**Source [D] P 804** is in the hand of Johann Peter Kellner and dated 3rd July 1726.
This source exists as an incomplete version of the works. It was initially
dismissed in the NBA as being “...irrelevant for the purposes of a scholarly critical
edition...”\textsuperscript{246} owing to its incomplete nature.

**Source [E] P 968** is in the hand of an unknown copyist. Hans-Joachim Schulze,\textsuperscript{247}
however, has hypothetically allocated the writing to the Köthen organist Emanuel
Leberecht Gottschalk (died 1727) and employed from 1719 as a copyist of the
Köthen Court orchestra.\textsuperscript{248} Importantly, “...no signed examples of Gottschalk’s
handwriting have yet been discovered to verify this assumption.”\textsuperscript{249} Therefore, in
the absence of any other signed examples of Gottschalk’s handwriting with which
to compare this copy, and hence any definitive proof, it remains conjecture by
Schultz. It is noted that during the second half of the eighteenth century many of
Bach’s pupils, among others, copied his works.\textsuperscript{250} It is, therefore, considered more
plausible (and particularly in relation to the neatness and accuracy of this copy)
that an unknown scribe could just as easily have copied it at a later date.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{245} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{246} NBA 2001, Vol. XI/12.
\item \textsuperscript{247} Hans-Joachim Schultz is a German musicologist and was appointed Director at the Leipzig Bach Archive in 1986.
\item \textsuperscript{248} Wolff 2000, p. 193.
\item \textsuperscript{249} NBA, 2001 Vol. XI/15.
\item \textsuperscript{250} See Stinson 1989, pp. 2-3.
\end{itemize}
Source [F 1+2] exists in two portions and it is believed that the unknown copyist completed this version sometime in the second half of the 18th Century.

Source [G] P 573 is a copy by Johann Gottfried Berger “...presumably toward the end of the 18th Century”...[that] “...may have been copied directly from ... (Source A) or the Köthen manuscript (Source E) or from a source closely related to the two manuscripts.”

Source [H] P 236 is described as being a “...copyist's manuscript from the early 19th Century, transposed down a twelfth and written in the bass clef.”

Source [L] is a copy of the G minor Sonata (BWV 1001) only in its entirety. It is described in the NBA as a copy made by Johann Andreas Kuhnau in 1723, “...apparently directly from the autograph.” The precise date of 1723 given to this manuscript apparently:

...results from the fact that Kuhnau used the earlier form of the soprano clef when copying the first movement...“and that “...the last occurrence of this clef is found in his parts for Bach’s first annual cycle of Cantata’s....Viewed in this light, Kuhnau’s copy of the G minor Sonata must therefore [have] originated in late June or early July 1723.

---

251 Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Prussian Foundation Cultural Heritage, Am. B. 70a+b.
254 Ibid.
255 Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin Prussian Foundation Cultural Heritage, Poet. Mus. ms. 31.
256 Johann Andreas Kuhnau (1703-1745) was a student and copyist of Bach’s in Leipzig.
While the above comment is an interesting theory concerning Kuhnau, there is no evidence to support the suggested chronology of Kuhnau's copy and it should be noted that "...the earlier form of the soprano clef"\textsuperscript{259} referred to in the NBA above appears in the first movement of the G minor Sonata only, with the remaining movements containing his later clef sign. This may suggest that Kuhnau wrote out the first movement at an earlier date than the remaining movements of the Sonata. The writing of the words "Volti Cito"\textsuperscript{260} however, appear at the bottom of the first movement, indicating to segue to the next movement, which may suggest the fugue had already been written, or that there was an eventual intention for a fugue to be composed. Viewed in this light, several alternatives appear to exist. It is possible that Kuhnau may have either reverted back to the earlier clef version for the first movement and then corrected it to the later version for the remainder of the sonata, or alternatively, written the remaining movements at a later date. In the absence of any firm documentation, however, to support any of these scenarios, this also remains inconclusive and is noted to be conjecture by Bach scholars.

Additionally, Kuhnau was Bach's copyist in Leipzig and there is no evidence to suggest that he was in Köthen in 1723 or that the manuscript was available to him.

Further, the G minor Sonata (BWV 1001) is the only work of the collection of six, which was copied by Kuhnau. Kuhnau was known to be Bach’s principal copyist

\textsuperscript{259} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{260} The term "Volti Cito" is defined as an instruction to turn the page. The term "Volti Subito" (meaning to turn quickly) is used at other times in the 'Violin Sonatas and Partitas'. Grove, G. & Stanley, S. 1980, (2 ed. Fuller, J.A), *The new Grove dictionary of music and musicians*, Grove.
in Leipzig\textsuperscript{261} and it is not known why he did not copy the collection in its entirety. It therefore remains questionable whether or not the complete manuscript of the \textit{Violin Sonatas and Partitas} was in existence at the time Kuhnau supposedly made his copy of the G minor Sonata.

\textsuperscript{261} Johann Andreas Kuhnau (1703-1745) attended the Thomasschule in Leipzig from 1718 to 1728, studied privately with Bach and was Bach’s main copyist in Leipzig from 1723 to 1728 http://www.bach-cantatas.com/Lib/Kuhnau-Johann-Andreas.htm. Accessed 13 09 2015.
3.4 Reception history of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas

...one can only imagine what impression was made by the

six extraordinary sonatas for unaccompanied violin,

BWV 1001-1006 (dated 1720) – Davitt Maroney\textsuperscript{262}

As discussed previously, the traditional understanding of these works is that Bach completed them in the year 1720 during his time at Köthen when he was composing secular music. It was during this time in Köthen, for example, that the Six Brandenburg Concertos (BWV 1046-1051)\textsuperscript{263} were written. Wolff (2000) describes the works produced at this time:

\begin{quote} 
During this brief but fertile period, Bach was free from the demands of religious duties and could let his imagination soar. He was also happy, free from constant chafing against frugal and conservative authorities, and buoyed by an appreciative patron – at least until 1721 when Leopold took a wife hostile to art.\textsuperscript{264} \end{quote}

There is no known or documented record that the Violin Sonatas and Partitas were performed any time soon after 1720. Wolff (2000) lists the Violin Sonatas

\begin{footnotes}
\item[263] See NBR 1989. The date of composition of the Six Brandenburg Concertos is considered secure. The title page has a dedication to the Margrave of Brandenburg and there is documentation in the form of a letter from Bach to the Margrave of Brandenburg, dated March 24, 1721 when the works were bestowed on him. pp. 92-93. See also Wolf 2000, who dates these works securely to the Köthen years but considers the 1723 presentation copy for the Margrave of Brandenburg to have been prepared from a revised edition, the origin of which may date to the Weimar years. p. 196.
\item[264] Wolff 2000, p. 195. 
\end{footnotes}
and Partitas among others of Bach's instrumental compositions that can be securely dated to the Köthen years, and states that they were performed at regular courtly functions. This, however, cannot be verified, and it is reasonable to assume that, if they were publicly performed in their entirety soon after the supposed completion date of 1720, there would be some form of documentary commentary of them, particularly owing to the absence of the Basso Continuo, as well as the unusual and challenging polyphonic writing for the violin, but no such commentary has been discovered. Further, although it may be reasonable to assume that the works were written or originally intended for domestic use within the Bach household, this cannot be verified either.

According to the NBA Critical Report (2001):

*It is uncertain whether Bach himself played [these] pieces on the violin. There is much evidence, however to suggest that they could be optionally played on keyboard instruments. The most telling piece of evidence is a statement by Bach’s pupil, Johann Friedrich Agricola: “their author oft played them on the clavichord himself, adding as much harmony as he deemed to be necessary...”*  

---

265 See Wolff 2000, p. 196.
266 Typical works of the Baroque period had a basso continuo accompaniment; however unaccompanied works were not unheard of. Westhoff’s *Unaccompanied Works* and Biber’s Passacaglia from the *Mystery Sonatas* are two examples of polyphonic works written prior to the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas*. Boyd, 2001 states, “Bach would certainly have known all, or most, of these, but his set of sonatas and partitas far surpasses them in both technique and musical interest.” p. 96. Wolff, C. 2000, further states that the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* “...seem conceptually indebted to Johann Paul von Westhoff’s 1696 publication of solo violin partitas, the first of its kind...Bach would have met him in 1703.”p. 133.
267 The composer Heinrich Biber had previously written an unaccompanied Passacaglia, built on 65 repetitions of the descending tetrachord (g’–f’–e’–d’). This was considered a monumental polyphonic piece, the outstanding work of its type before the Bach Chaconne. ‘Biber’ (6 ed.), *Oxford Dictionary of Music* viewed 1 March 2016.
As stated earlier, for whom the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* were originally composed, why and what the impetus was behind their composition is unfortunately not known, although it is suggested that a possible model for the works may have come from the German violinist, Johann Paul von Westhoff (1656-1705). Westhoff, who had been a member of the Dresden Court Orchestra at Weimar from 1694-1697, had published an earlier set of unaccompanied works for solo violin.\(^\text{270}\)

As such, the impetus to write unaccompanied works for violin possibly developed early in Bach’s compositional life. According to Jones (2007), during his time at Weimar:

\[...he \text{ would have encountered two of the leading German violin virtuosos of the time in 1703 and 1709 respectively, namely Johann Paul von Westhoff and Johann Georg Pisendel}...\text{Above all, however, Bach would have been acquainted with the rich German and Austrian tradition of virtuoso violin music to which not only Westhoff and Pisendel subscribed, but also Johann Heinrich Schmelzer, Heinrich Ignaz Franz von Biber, and Johann Jacob Walther.}\(^\text{271}\)

Jones further states:

\[The \text{ solo violin music of these composers frequently requires multiple-stopping, pseudo-polyphonic writing, high positions and brilliant passage work, all of which are in much demand throughout Bach’s Violin Solos of}\]


1720. Most of the solo violin music of this great tradition is accompanied by basso continuo, but on occasion works were written ‘a violin solo senza basso’ (for unaccompanied violin), notably the Passacaglia that crowns Biber’s mystery Sonatas of c. 1676, a Sonata in A minor (of unknown date) by Pisendel and several pieces in Pisendel’s Dresden collection. Most significant, however, are Westhoff’s Six Suites for unaccompanied violin (Dresden, 1696), the only known collection of its kind before the Bach Violin Solos.²⁷²

Although Bach may well have been acquainted with Westhoff’s unaccompanied works for violin,²⁷³ studies of these works reveal significant musical differences:

Although Westhoff’s suites bore hardly any stylistic resemblance to Bach’s works, both have the common goal of transferring a polyphonic texture to unaccompanied violin while adhering to the rules of strict counterpoint, thereby elevating this species of composition to the realm of high art.²⁷⁴

It is not known for whom the works may have been intended, or who may have commissioned them:

The cycle has occasionally been mentioned in connection with the Dresden Concertmaster Johann Georg Pisendel,²⁷⁵ who was personally acquainted

²⁷² Ibid.
²⁷³ See Wolff 2000, where it states, “Westhoff, one of the pre-eminent violinists of his time, played in the Weimar Court Capelle until his death in 1705. Bach would have met him in 1703” p. 133.
²⁷⁴ NBA 2001 Vol. VIII/2.
²⁷⁵ See Wolff 2000, “Johann Georg Pisendel (1687-1755), a student of Vivaldi’s and later concertmaster at the Dresden court. Pisendel travelled through Weimar in 1709, when from all appearances he and Bach performed this concerto with the court capelle. Telemann, then Capellmeister at the neighbouring court of Saxe-Eisenach, may well have participated in such a performance, or Bach and Pisendel could have played the work with the Eisenach Capelle as well,” p. 134.
with Bach from 1710. However we have no way of knowing whether the works were intended for Pisendel, or indeed whether he was aware of them at all.  

It seems likely, however, that Pisendel would have performed the works if they had been written for him, and therefore, some record of this would exist, but there is none. As such, it is unlikely that Pisendel is the person for whom Bach composed the violin works.

What may be of more significance regarding the origin of the unaccompanied works for violin is that Westhoff’s compositions of 1696. Forkel (1802) details this:

Bach’s first attempts at composition, like all early efforts, were unsatisfactory. Lacking special instruction to direct him towards his goal, he was compelled to do what he could in his own way...He realised that musical ideas need to be subordinated to a plan and that the young composer’s first need is a model to instruct his efforts. Opportunely, Vivaldi’s Concertos for the Violin, then recently published, gave him the guidance he needed.” Bach “…conceived the happy idea of arranging them for Clavier. Hence he was led to study their structure, the musical ideas on which they are built, the variety of their modulations, and other characteristics.  

---
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Vivaldi published his collection of *L'estro Harmonica Violin Concertos* Op. 3 in 1711.\(^\text{278}\)

*Vivaldi’s works taught him how to think musically...* [Forkel elaborates on the idea of musical thinking by emphasizing that] *...order, coherence and proportion - or better, ...order/organisation, coherence /connection /continuity and proportion /relation /correlation...must be brought to bear on musical ideas*. Bach then recognised in Vivaldi’s concertos a concrete compositional system based on musical thinking in terms of order, coherence and proportion – an illuminating though abstract, historical definition of Vivaldi’s art as exemplified in his concertos.\(^\text{279}\)

If Vivaldi’s works were indeed a “*critical moment, perhaps the culmination point, in a development of self-guided learning that...peaked in a thoroughly analytical approach*”\(^\text{280}\) it would suggest a maturing of his compositional style, as noted previously in the NBA and detailed in the discussion of sources in this thesis. It would be reasonable to suggest, therefore, that the date of commencement of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* came sometime after Bach undertook his detailed studies and transcriptions of Vivaldi’s works during the mid-Weimar years of 1713-1714.\(^\text{281}\)

As such, these two events (Westhoff’s unaccompanied works, along with Bach’s newly acquired knowledge of structure, gained from his detailed study of

\(^{278}\) Wolf 2000, p. 170.

\(^{279}\) Ibid.

\(^{280}\) Ibid. p.170.

\(^{281}\) See Wolff 2000, pp. 168-170.
Vivaldi’s Violin Concertos) may have combined to provide the inspiration to produce a similar set of solo violin works with a sound compositional structure.

The first known publication of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas was only the Fugue movement from the C Major Sonata (BWV 1005), which appeared in Jean Baptiste Cartier’s L’Art du Violin published in 1798.\textsuperscript{282} It was not until 1843, however, that the first complete publication was prepared by Ferdinand David in Leipzig.\textsuperscript{283} A steady stream of publications has continued to this day.

While the importance of these works to the contemporary violinist’s repertoire cannot be overstated, this was not the case in Eighteenth Century Germany.

Fabian (2005) writes:

\begin{quote}
Nowadays Bach’s Six Sonatas and Partitas for solo violin (BWV 1001-1006) are regarded as touchstones of any violinist’s technical and musical maturity. This has not always been the case.\textsuperscript{284}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
They were largely ignored in the 18\textsuperscript{th} Century in Europe. Their historic appearance on the international concert platform in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century is traceable to Mendelssohn’s role in reviving Bach’s compositions in
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{283} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{284} Ibid. p. 1.
He requested that [Ferdinand] David perform the Chaconne. However, David obliged [only] when Mendelssohn agreed to accompany him on the piano. The performance took place on February 8, 1840 and David offered the Preludio from the E Major Partita as an encore, also with accompaniment.

The fact that these works were written specifically without basso continuo could account for the lacklustre reception history they originally received. (Ferdinand) David’s request to be accompanied no doubt reflects the general feeling that the public may not have been receptive to such (unaccompanied) works at the time, or prepared to make the adjustment needed for these works. This is no doubt due to the prominence and expectation of the continuo part in Baroque compositions and the lack of public exposure to such repertoire. In the Baroque period, the continuo part was considered an essential element of compositions. It was described as being a “…universal participant in early eighteenth century textures.” For a composer such as Bach to write six works for violin ‘senza basso’ was exceptional. Bach’s interest in polyphonic writing, however, and particularly in the experimentation with polyphonic writing for a single melody stringed instrument, could provide the reason. Bach as a composer appeared to push the boundaries and according to Wolff (2000), “…as Newton

---

286 The violinist, Ferdinand David, was known to be a friend of Mendelssohn’s. Given Mendelssohn was responsible for the Bach revival it is not unexpected that Mendelssohn requested that he perform the Chaconne as part of the Bach revival.
287 Fabian 2005, p.5.
288 The same was true of the Cello Suites. See Jarvis 2007, where the reception history of the Cello Suites are discussed. p. 8.
brought about fundamental changes and established new principles in the world of science, Bach did the same in the world of music, both in composition and performance.”

Was it Bach’s intention to apply the robust principles of science and mathematics to the early development of his manuscript design and musical architecture?

Despite these works being published in their entirety in 1802, all sources seem to agree that it was not until 1890 that these works were first actually performed unaccompanied by [Joseph] Joachim in both Germany and London. A review of that concert by Bernard Shaw in The Star, reads:

[Joachim] played Bach’s Sonata in C at the Bach Choir Concert at St James’s Hall on Tuesday. The second movement of that work is a fugue some three or four hundred bars long. Of course you cannot really play a fugue in three continuous parts on the violin; but by dint of double stopping and dodging from one part to another, you can evoke a hideous ghost of a fugue that will pass current if guaranteed by Bach and Joachim. That was what happened on Tuesday. Joachim scraped away frantically, making a sound after which an attempt to grate a nutmeg effectively on a boot sole would have been as to the strain of an Eolian (sic) harp. The notes which were musical enough to have any discernible pitch at all were mostly out of tune.

---

290 Wolff 2000, p. 9.
291 This question will be addressed in the next chapter of this thesis.
292 Joseph Joachim (1831-1907) was a Hungarian violinist, conductor, composer and teacher.
293 Fabian 2005, p.5.
It was horrible – damnable! Had he been an unknown player, introducing an unknown composer, he would not have escaped with his life.  

Fabian states that it was Joachim who attempted the first recording of the G minor Adagio (BWV 1001) and the B minor Partita (BWV 1002) and this is further confirmed by Guttman (2004) who writes, of Joachim’s career, “When he concluded his fabulous career in 1903 by cutting five records to preserve his artistry, he devoted two to Bach – the Adagio from the First Sonata and the Bourree [sic] from the First Partita.”

Evidently, excerpts continued to be recorded from these works until 1934 when Yehudi Menuhin recorded the complete set of works. Following Menuhin’s recordings, a steady stream of recordings of the complete set of works has continued to this day.

Although there is no way of knowing with any degree of certainty why Bach wrote these works, or for whom, it has been surmised by Guttman (2004) that he wrote them as an “...intellectual exercise in musical polyphony for solo violin, rather than any specific violinist of the time, due to their technically difficult nature.”

Irrespective of all of the above, the only certainty is that it was not until many years after the Bach revival started in the 1820s that these pieces began to be

297 Ibid.
performed regularly, and it was not until the Twentieth Century that these six works took their rightful place among the masterpieces of violin repertoire.

3.5 Bach as violinist

It is important when discussing the compositional history and authorship of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas that an assessment of Bach’s ability to design, compose and execute these works is undertaken. The complex nature, in particular, of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas and the predominant movements within various parts of the works (the two fugues and the Chaconne, for example) would suggest the skill of a knowledgeable and experienced violinist to develop the initial architecture of the manuscripts at the very least. Evidence of Bach’s ability as a violinist, under his role of Concertmaster while employed at Weimar between the years 1714 and 1717, is discussed in Wolff (2000), where it is stated, “For cantata performances under Bach’s direction, it is safe to say the concertmaster led the capelle from the first violin.”

The role of Concertmaster, would, to our modern ears, automatically suggest “violinistic duties” as a matter of course, yet Jarvis (2007) states:

We might be tempted to consider that his mention of Concert Master was an oblique reference to violin playing, and to see it as the same as the contemporary function of Concert Master, that is to say, as Principal Violinist in an orchestra. At Weimar, however, this was not the case, as the title was given to J.S. Bach for status reasons only – his duty statement

---

299 Lester 1999, p. 8
makes no mention of violin playing, but mentions only organ playing, taking rehearsals and, by inference, composing.\textsuperscript{300}

Finally, whilst there are many known composition/keyboard students, there is no known violin pupil of his, which seems very odd if he was a renowned violinist.\textsuperscript{301}

The works in question are seminal works for solo violin and considered to be some of the most challenging of a violinist’s repertoire. As a collection of works, the \textit{Violin Sonatas and Partitas} have been described as occupying an unchallenged position in the literature of solo violin music.\textsuperscript{302} Bach’s son, Carl Phillip Emanuel (C.P.E) is the first to describe the importance of these works as forming a fundamental basis for a violinist’s repertoire. In a letter to Forkel, dated 1774, he states, “One of the greatest violinists told me once that he had seen nothing more perfect for learning to be a good violinist, and could suggest nothing better to anyone eager to learn, than the said Violin Solos without Bass.”\textsuperscript{303} This comment to Forkel, however, suggests C.P.E’s ignorance of these works and/or of violin technique – i.e. it is not possible to “learn to play” the violin, as he suggests, via these works, as demonstrated by the reception history detailed above.\textsuperscript{304} Further, C.P.E goes on to provide the only primary source evidence of Bach as a violinist which has ever been recorded. He states:

\textsuperscript{300}Jarvis 2007, p.6.
\textsuperscript{301}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{302}Boyd 2001, p. 95.
\textsuperscript{303}NBR 1998, p. 397.
\textsuperscript{304}This is similar to the \textit{Cello Suites} whereby Casals undertook a 12-year study of the works before he was prepared to play them publicly. See Jarvis 2007, p.10.
...As the greatest expert and judge of harmony, he liked best to play the viola, with appropriate loudness and softness. In his youth, and until the approach of old age, he played the violin cleanly and penetratingly, and thus kept the orchestra in better order than he could have done with the harpsichord.  

Irrespective of whatever the level of violin playing was that he achieved, undeniably, Bach is better known for his ability and performance on keyboard instruments than on the violin. When Johann Adolf Scheibe called Bach’s musical credibility into question in the now famous article published in 1737, Johann Abraham Birnbaum issued the following retort “...The honourable Court Composer is a great composer, a master of music, a virtuoso on the organ and the clavier without an equal but in no sense a Musicant.” As the specificity of his virtuosic ability on both the organ and clavier is argued in the public domain, this would seem an ideal opportunity to mention any virtuosic violinistic ability as well, had it been of a level worthy of repute. This would have added considerably to the persuasive power of Birnbaum’s argument, but no such statement was made.

Bach’s family history suggests Bach obtained some level of violinistic ability. His father was known to be a highly regarded professional violinist, and very much in demand as a teacher to train students for the profession of musician. This

---

306 See Wolff 2000, Johann Adolph Scheibe was the author of a now famous article published in 1737, which was vitriolic in its attack on Bach’s musical credibility. pp. 1-2. See also NBR 1998, p. 341.
being the case, it is possible and indeed likely that Bach was taught to play the violin as a child by his father.

Aged ten, Bach was orphaned, and went to live with his brother. There is no evidence as to whether or not he continued to learn the violin at the school to which he was sent. Wolff suggests that his musical training, including issues as to whether or not he was a violin player are uncertain but it is most likely that he started keyboard instruments when he went to Ohdruf.

Notwithstanding all of the above, and in light of any documented evidence other than that recorded by his son, it seems likely that Bach was a violinist of some ability, although to what level of skill he reached is not established. It is questionable, therefore, that he achieved the same level of virtuosity as other well documented violinists of the time such as Vivaldi and Corelli. Lester (1999) supports this theory:

...[Bach] may not have been famous as a violinist like his Italian contemporaries Arcangelo Corelli (1653-1713) and Antonio Vivaldi (1653-1713). But Bach certainly had sufficient experience on the instrument to develop a deep understanding of its possibilities.

Lester then continues:

In truth, we hardly need historical evidence to prove Bach’s deep understanding of the violin; his violin music demonstrates that he was both 

---
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a violinist and a composer. It is reasonable to assume...that Bach had enough knowledge and experience of the violin to have a thorough deep understanding of composition for the violin.\(^{311}\)

Further, Lester states:

...innumerable passages in (Bach’s) solo pieces [the Violin Sonatas and Partitas] lie beautifully under the fingers...only a composer who knew intimately how violin technique works – who could think compositionally as a violinist – could have crafted such perfect solo-violin music.\(^{312}\)

While this last statement clearly contradicts the previous one, its relevance to the composition of ‘violinistic’ works is questioned anyway, in the context that many other of the most technically difficult and virtuosic violin works were written by composers who were not documented violinists. Musicians such as Brahms, Tchaikovsky and Mendelssohn, who composed Violin Concertos that are among the most popular and challenging in the repertoire, are examples of this.\(^{313}\)

Therefore, it is still unknown as to whether or not Bach was capable of performing his own violinistic compositions, given the level of ability necessary to perform these works.

\[^{311}\] Ibid.

\[^{312}\] Lester 1999, p.10.

\[^{313}\] While none of these composers were noted violin virtuosos themselves, they composed some of the most challenging violin music in the repertoire. It is noted that these composers had significant influence from some of the greatest violinists of the day. For example, Brahms was a noted friend of the violinist Joseph Joachim, as was Tchaikovsky. Mendelssohn had a professional collaboration and friendship with the violinist Ferdinand David. In a letter dated 30 July 1838, Mendelssohn wrote to David, “I should like to write a violin concerto for you next winter. One in E minor runs through my head, the beginning of which gives me no peace.” See Reitz, J 1970, Letters of Felix Mendelssohn, 1833-1847, Ayer. It is highly likely that their input was sought in the writing of their violin works. Likewise, input from a contemporary violinist was likely to have been needed for the composition of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas. See Chapter IV (4.6) of this thesis where Schwanenberger’s role in the compositional process of these works is discussed pp. 149-151.
The accepted position that Bach, “...had enough knowledge and experience of the violin to have a thorough and deep understanding of composition for the violin”\textsuperscript{314} has never been challenged and nor does this study attempt to do so. The fact that there is no record of violin students under Bach’s tutelage is also unusual, particularly as, “Bach was [one of] the most active, dedicated, and prolific teachers the world has seen. As a result, many students of his worked to disseminate his music and teachings through their own writings.”\textsuperscript{315}

It thus seems reasonable to assume that any of Bach’s violin students would have copied and disseminated his violin works throughout Europe; but there is no evidence of this.

Further, according to Wolff (2000):

\begin{quote}
...technical virtuosity never predominates (his compositions); it becomes a functional element within the composition as a whole. Therefore the compositional intent behind the Violin Sonatas and Partitas was not to showcase the instrumentalist’s ability on the instrument, but to showcase Bach’s compositional ability to write for “...voices and instruments a homogenous language of considerable density.”\textsuperscript{316}
\end{quote}

It is thus possible that the technical demands and virtuosity of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas arose purely as a result of Bach’s compositional intent to write polyphonomically for violin, rather than being written specifically with a violinist’s

\textsuperscript{314}Lester 1999, p. 10.
\textsuperscript{315}Wolff 2000, p. 9
technical capacity in mind, i.e. the degree of difficulty was secondary to the compositional intent. As such it is possible that violinistic advice may have been required during the compositional process to provide realistic information as to whether the notes were achievable.

As much of Bach’s works were composed mainly for domestic use, it is possible that he composed the Six *Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas and Partitas* as well as the *Six Accompanied Violin Sonatas* either for his own use or for someone within the Bach household.\(^{317}\) In the absence of any known violin performances by Bach, however, and in the absence of any factually acknowledged information that cannot be challenged, it could be considered highly plausible that Bach had compositional assistance with these works possibly from within his family circle, particularly when considering the technical demands of them. It is also probable that technical input from a leading contemporary violinist of the time may have been sought.

### 3.6 Bach as teacher

It is well known that Bach was a dedicated teacher. Wolff (2000) states that Bach had a “...steady supply of gifted and versatile university students who received private lessons from him. Some sixty such senior students can be confirmed, though the actual number may be well above a hundred.”\(^{318}\)

For the purposes of this thesis, however, it is his role as a teacher of composition that is most relevant. While there is no evidence to suggest Bach involved himself

---

\(^{317}\) Hans, V. 1988.

\(^{318}\) Wolff 2000, p. 327.
in theoretical discourse and literary discussion of the day, it appears that his interest in these contemporary theories and hypothesis, guided to a certain extent his compositional output and subsequently his teaching methods. This is evidenced by his summary of Niedt’s ‘Thoroughbass Manifesto’ at the end of the 1725 Notebook for Anna Magdalena. As a teacher of composition, “Bach satisfied his own desire to engage in practical theory by designing writing projects that would suit his teaching aims.”\footnote{Ibid. p. 307.} Wolff (2000) cites Carl Philipp Emanuel who states:

> Since he [Bach] himself had composed the most instructive pieces for the clavier, he brought up his pupils on them. In composition he started his pupils right in with what was practical, and omitted all the dry species of counterpoint that are given in Fux and others. His pupils had to begin their studies by learning pure four-part thoroughbass. From this he went to chorales; first he added the basses to them himself, and they had to invent to the alto and tenor. Then he taught them to devise the basses themselves.\footnote{Ibid. p. 328.}

Wolff (2000) further cites Carl Philipp Emanuel, who states, “While the rules we were given were good and abundant, the needed examples were lacking.”\footnote{Ibid. p. 308.}

Bach’s influence as a composer and teacher was obviously passed on to his students and he expected them to compose in the manner he did. Wolf, (2000) states, “For Bach, the ultimate rationale for being a musician, that is, a performer-
composer, was not to pursue some sort of mental construct, but “...to make a well sounding harmony to the honor of God and the permissible delectation of the soul.” Bach may have achieved this by creating the structure of the composition, the proportion levels and concrete points of references. This is discussed in greater detail in Chapter V.

322 Ibid. pp. 308-309.
3.7 Bach's life and religion

The mechanics of Bach’s faith – the structured and systematic way he applied his religion to his working practices – is something that anyone searching to understand him either as a man or as a composer needs to address. - John Gardner\textsuperscript{323}

Bach spent the first nine and a half years of his life in the town of Eisenach – a town steeped in Lutheranism.\textsuperscript{324} In 1693 he attended the same Latin school Martin Luther had attended 200 years earlier.\textsuperscript{325} When he was orphaned at the age of ten, he was sent to Ohrdruf to live with his brother, Johann Christian Bach (1671 – 1721).\textsuperscript{326} There he attended the Ohrdruf Lyceum in the north German city of Luneburg from 1696 -1700, a school, “...renowned principally for its theological teaching.”\textsuperscript{327} It was here that Bach was first introduced to the work of Leonhard Hutter.\textsuperscript{328}

\textsuperscript{324} Eisenach was the town where Martin Luther was born and raised. See Gardner 2013 Chapter Five - Mechanisms of Faith.
\textsuperscript{325} Williams 2004, p. 12.
\textsuperscript{326} See Williams 2004. Bach’s elder brother, Johann Christoph Bach, was a pupil of Pachelbel and from 1690 was organist in Ohrdruf.
\textsuperscript{328} Hutter was a German theologian of Lutheran faith. In 1610 he wrote the Compendium Locorium Theologicorum described as being “...a systematic summary of Christian doctrine derived from the bible and early Lutheran theological writings.” See Wolff 2000, p.40. Bach studied the subject matter throughout his schooling and frequently used and referred to it in later years during his time at the St. Thomas School in Leipzig. (See Herz, 1946, p.126).
The influence of religion on Bach’s life appears to be centered on two important factors – Hutter’s teachings and the Lutheran beliefs regarding the function and purpose of music.\textsuperscript{329}

It is these two factors combined, which appeared to form the basis of his future teaching and compositional processes.

Herz (1946) says:

\textit{Hans Besch,\textsuperscript{330} in his admirable and comprehensive study of Bach’s faith, finds in Hutter’s work actually a key to a theological understanding of Bach’s religion. One principle doctrine of Hutter, which Besch dwells on may serve as an illustration. It concerns the apostles and prophets whose mouths, tongues, hands and styluses have all been but tools of divine inspiration…Bach in true Lutheran spirit did all his work In Nomine Jesu.}\textsuperscript{331}

Martin Luther’s own thoughts on the power of music are disclosed in a letter written to the Catholic composer Ludwig Senfl, “\textit{I am not ashamed to confess publicly that next to theology there is no art which is the equal of music. For it alone, after theology, can do what otherwise only theology can accomplish.}”\textsuperscript{332}

\textsuperscript{329} Martin Luther’s belief was that music was of God, not of man. In 1530 he famously said, “\textit{music was next to theology.}” So strong were his beliefs about music and worship that he wrote these words, “\textit{Next to the word of God, the noble art of music is the greatest treasure in the world. It controls our hearts, minds and spirits. A person who does not regard music as a marvellous creation of God does not deserve to be called a human being; he should be permitted to hear nothing but the braying of asses and the grunting of hogs!}” See Herz 1946, pp. 124-138.

\textsuperscript{330} Besch 1938. \textit{J.S. Bach, Frömmigkeit und Glaube}, Verlage C. Bertelsmann, Gutersloh.

\textsuperscript{331} Herz 1946, p. 126.

\textsuperscript{332} Eggert, K, Martin Luther, ‘God’s Music Man’, Paper delivered to the students and faculty of Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary on November 10, 1983, the 500th anniversary of Luther’s birth.
It is widely acknowledged that Bach credited his musical ability as a God-given gift and was of the belief that his music was a vessel, through which God worked. Bach “...used music as a medium to present the Lutheran doctrines of Christianity.”

Besch (1938) as cited in Herz (1946) says, “There is not one link in the chain of Hutter’s thoughts which is not of decisive significance for the understanding of Bach.”

Besch further states:

_Bach does not forget to remind his readers of the “aim and reason” of all music: God’s Glory. The J.J. (Jesu Juva) with which Bach begins each composition is to him, the Orthodox Lutheran, a humble prayer for God’s assistance and inspiration; the S.D.G (Soli Deo Gloria) with which he closes his work is the thanksgiving for the prayer heard._

A further example (as mentioned earlier), of Bach’s belief in the creation of perfect harmonies to the Glory of God, is evident in his rewording of Niedt’s book on thoroughbass. It appears Bach passed the following doctrine onto his students:

_Figured Bass is the most perfect foundation of music. It is executed with both hands in such a manner that the left hand plays the notes written

_333 Herz 1946, p. 127._
_334 Ibid._
_335 Ibid. p. 128._
_336 Niedt’s, *Die Musikalische Handleitung* is one of the better known thoroughbass treatises of the Baroque, due largely to the fact that Bach copied out parts of it for his own instructional purposes. Bach’s rewording of it appears in the 1725 Notebook for Anna Magdalena published by Barenreiter Kessel (1980)._
down and the right hand adds consonances and dissonances. The result is an agreeable harmony to the Glory of God and the justifiable gratification of the senses. For the sole aim and reason the figured bass, as with all music, should be nothing other than God's Glory and pleasant recreations. Where this is not kept in mind there can be no true music, but only an infernal scraping and bawling.337

Bach's philosophy of life leads to the figures of Christ as understood by the orthodox Lutherans. Bach's art and his religions are but one and the same. Nobody in music perceived and interpreted the sacred and the miraculous more powerfully and more purely than Bach.338

Bach's Lutheran faith clearly played a major role in the fundamentals and key underpinnings of his compositional process and no doubt were evident in his teaching methodologies. It is not unrealistic to assume that Bach's students would have been disciples of his compositional process. They, too, may have held the same fundamental underpinnings in their style of musical composition. Both Kellner and Anna Magdalena are known to have signed off some of their works with the term Soli Deo Sit Gloria.339

Ultimately, however, very little is known of Bach's religious life in terms of primary source documentation. There is evidence that he studied the Bible

337 Herz 1946, p. 127.
338 Ibid. p. 126.
339 "Soli Deo Gloria" means "Glory to God alone", or, perhaps a freer translation might be "Glory only to God". The addition of "sit" in the second phrase is only adding the verb "to be" in the subjunctive mood. In precise terms the second phrase can be translated "May there be glory to God alone".
carefully and annotated comments appear against certain chapters. In his discussion of Bach’s theological library, Wolff (2000) states:

*Of particular importance are Bible commentaries...and books of a homiletic character. These works, especially those relating to the Calov Bible, which shows heavy underlining, annotations, and many other traces of regular use, shed light on Bach’s reading habits and on his study of biblical exegesis...*\(^{340}\)

It is believed that his religious beliefs remained strong throughout his life and his compositional output of sacred works was numerous. It must be remembered, however, that his compositional output was reflective of his occupation at the time and an expectation of his role, and as such, would have dictated the type of music written.

Of equal importance, for example, are the educational pieces he wrote for his children, his enjoyment working with the Collegium Musicum and his desire to work outside the church during his Köthen appointment and his interest in writing secular music at this time.

In summary, while Bach himself may have been a religious man with deeply entrenched Lutheran religious beliefs, he may have believed that all music – regardless of its sacred or secular nature, was written “Soli Deo Gloria” - to the Glory of God.

\(^{340}\) Wolff 2000, p. 334.
3.8 Life for Bach in 1720

As the completion date of the manuscript of the FFC of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* is questioned in this study, it is important to understand, as far as is possible, the historical context of Bach’s life in 1720, given the complexities of this collection of works, and the subsequent length of time that was likely involved in the compositional process.

In December 1717, Bach moved from Weimar to Köthen to take up the position as Kapellemeister[341] for Prince Leopold.[342] The decision to move from Weimar to Köthen may have been an easy one for Bach to make in terms of musical promotion,[343] but resulted in a four week prison term imposed on him for wilfulness by the Duke of Weimar.[344] The distance between Köthen and Weimar was approximately 166 kilometres and came with certain logistical issues, because this would have been at least a two-day journey. By this stage, Bach had four children with his wife Maria Barbara.

In addition to these factors Prince Leopold of Köthen was a Calvinist[345] and a member of the Reformed Church, while Bach was a strict Lutheran. Of this, Herz (1946) states:

---

341 A Kapellemeister is a Director of Music.
342 Wolff 2000, p.178, states, “…and when the Cöthen capellmeistership fell vacant in 1717 [Prince] Leopold promptly proceeded to hire Bach.”
343 See Wolff 2000, pp.187-188 “The chapter as court organist in Weimar was closed, and he had now, at age thirty-two, reached the peak of the conventional music hierarchy. He was headed to Cöthen to take his place as princely capellmeister.”
344 See NBR 1989, p.80, “On November 6, (1717), the quondam concertmaster and organist Bach was confined to the County Judge’s place of detention for too stubbornly forcing the issue of his dismissal and finally on December 2 was freed from arrest with notice of his unfavourable discharge.”
345 See Wolff 2000, pp. 190-191 “In 1596, the still undivided duchy of Anhalt had adopted Calvinism as its state religion, in accordance with the principle cuius regio, eius religion…an agreement reached under the 1555 Peace of Augsburg by which the ruler’s religion was automatically declared the official faith of the region.”
When Bach became Kapellemeister at the ‘reformed’ court of Cöthen [sic] (1717-1723) he had to take issue with Calvinism. In view of the fact that the Calvinist doctrine was about as irreconcilable to a Lutheran as was Catholicism, it will not seem astonishing to see Bach send his children to the newly founded Lutheran rather than to the town’s outstanding ‘reformed school.’

Significantly, Bach included an Anti-Calvinist warning on the cover page of the 1722 Anna Magdalena Bach NoteBook. This is shown below in Figure 3 with the comments circled in red.

![Figure 3: The title page of Anna Magdalena’s 1722 Notebook](image)

Despite their opposing views on religion by all accounts, Bach seemed to enjoy a close relationship with the Prince and was clearly held in high esteem. The last of Bach’s children by his first wife, Maria Barbara was named after the Prince,

---

346 Herz 1946, p. 131.
who was also a godfather. They travelled together twice to “take the waters” at Karlsbad, Bohemia, on the advice of Prince Leopold’s physician. On the second such trip away, between May and July of 1720, Bach returned to Köthen to find that his first wife, Maria Barbara, was dead and had been buried on the 7th of July. No information exists to explain her early death at the age of 35. That year in March, Bach also turned 35. It was during the year 1720, according to Jarvis, that Anna Magdalena also commenced the Notebook for Wilhelm Friedemann Bach, Bach’s eldest male child, the title page of which states in translation “Little Clavier Book for Wilhelm Friedemann Bach, begun in Cöthen [sic] on January 22 A{nn}o 1720.” By March of 1721, Bach had also completed the Six Brandenburg Concertos and presented them to the Margrave of Brandenburg. In November of 1720 he visited Hamburg and was offered the post as organist at the Jakobikirche, which he declined. Bach was to remain in Köthen for a total of five and a half years as Kapellemeister at the Court of Prince Leopold and the year 1720 marks the mid-point of this period of time.

The Reformed Calvinist Church of Köthen had significantly different views on music. There was no expectation that Bach should compose organ or Church music, “…the ‘reformed’ court of Cöthen made no demands upon its Cappelmeister.

---

347 Wolff 2000, p. 199.
349 Ibid.
350 Ibid, p. 211.
351 Jarvis 2007.
353 Ibid, pp. 92-93.
354 See Wolff 2000, “…the post of organist of St. Jacobi’s Church had fallen vacant with the death on September 12 of Heinrich Friese, organist and clerk of the church…There can be no question that the thirty-five-year-old widower was unsettled by the devastating tragedy that had afflicted him and his family…” p. 211.
to provide ‘concerted’ church music.”

Bach was now free to experiment with other forms of instrumental music, although it is likely that he was doing this earlier anyway. Having no requirement to write sacred music for the Church did not appear to have bothered Bach in any case.

In summary, given the likelihood of a lengthy compositional process involved in the Violin Sonatas and Partitas, and the apparent issues Bach was dealing with at this time, it is questionable as to whether these works were commenced and completed during that single year. Additionally, and as previously mentioned, it is noted in the Critical Report that the ‘compositional maturity’ of these works indicates they were unlikely to have originated from the Weimar period.

It is therefore more plausible that Bach developed the initial premise of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas in 1720 and they were completed at a later date, in a similar manner to the 1720 Notebook for Wilhelm Friedemann.

3.9 Johann Peter Kellner as Bach’s copyist

Little is known of Thuringian born Johann Peter Kellner (1705-1772). He studied with the Grafenroda Kantor, Nagel from 1717-1722 and in 1722-1723 was an organ pupil of J.Schmidt at Zella. In 1725 -1728 he served in a school at Frankenhayn. His title page of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas states this

---

355 Herz 1946, p. 132.
356 Although likely, there is no published record of any secular works from his time in Weimar.
357 An entry in Niedt's "Thoroughbass Manifesto", states, "For the sole aim and reason the figured bass, as with all music, should be nothing other than God's Glory and pleasant recreations." See Herz, 1946.
location, along with the date 3rd July, 1726. Further information that exists about Kellner is detailed in Stinson (1989), who writes:

*Kellner was famous in his day as an organ virtuoso and seems to have been in demand throughout Thuringia as an organ recitalist and examiner. A prolific composer of vocal, as well as instrumental music, several of his keyboard works were printed during his lifetime.*\(^{360}\) He was also significant as a pedagogue, as is clear from his long roster of keyboard pupils. But it cannot be denied that Kellner is remembered today primarily for his Bach manuscripts.\(^{361}\)

As stated in the literature review, he was known to be personally acquainted with Bach, but in what capacity is not known. The suggestion by Stinson (1989) that he may have been a student of Bach’s indicates he would have participated in the copying of some music as a composition student, even perhaps as a form of payment for his lessons. Stinson says, “Not surprisingly, manuscript copies are frequently the by-products of student-teacher relationships.”

And:

*Bach’s colleagues diligently copied his music as well and they allowed their manuscripts to be copied by their colleagues and pupils. The result was a scribal network that, by virtue of its many channels, covered a good deal of Germany.*\(^{362}\)

---

\(^{360}\) It is not known who taught Kellner composition. His work output consists of works for keyboard, organ and vocal. The opening motif of his Organ Fugue in D minor (originally attributed to Bach) bears a strong resemblance to the Fugue from the G minor Sonata (BWV 1001).

\(^{361}\) Stinson 1989, pp. 13-14.

\(^{362}\) Ibid. p. 3.
According to Stinson, what is known for certain is that Kellner became the main copyist of Bach’s music, most prolifically his keyboard works. He states:

*One such copyist was the Grafenroda cantor, Johann Peter Kellner, unquestionably one of the most important copyists in the sources for Bach’s instrumental works, particularly the keyboard music. Besides being personally acquainted with Bach, he was a prolific copyist of Bach’s music. His Bach copies that have survived total forty-six manuscripts and it appears that several others have disappeared.*

One of these manuscripts to survive is his incomplete version of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas*.

Scholars have for decades been aware of the uniqueness of Kellner’s copy, “…but even the most thorough discussions remain superficial and inconclusive.”

It remains a perplexing aspect as to why Kellner would copy in 1726 a draft version of any works if its purpose was only to become a library reference copy. The completion of only certain sections and in a notably different order to that of the FFC points to the fact that Kellner’s manuscript is more likely to represent one of the earliest working draft attempts of these works.

For the purpose of this research, what is of particular interest is the range of the differences that exist between Kellner’s version, Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* and the FFC, and why these differences might exist. Of particular interest also, are the similarities that exist only between Kellner’s

---

363 Ibid.
364 Ibid. p. 56.
manuscript and Anna Magdalena’s (i.e. where they both differ in the same manner from the FFC). This is strongly indicative that there was collusion between Kellner and Anna Magdalena and that both manuscripts pre-date the FFC.

It is known that if Bach made alterations to his works he almost always made them longer and that many of his works underwent lengthy revisions and changes before a final copy was ready. Forkel (1802) describes Bach as:

...a great composer, who, like all composers was continually working on his compositions with a view to making them still more refined and better finished. Indeed, he actually attempted to improve some that were already perfect; any that were susceptible to improvement he improved...by constantly retouching his compositions Bach aimed at making them indisputable masterpieces.\(^{365}\)

A commencement date of 1720 as opposed to a completion date also appears more feasible when considering the context of the works in the year in question. (See Bach’s Life in 1720 above.) To investigate more fully, it is important to understand the Kellner copies of Bach’s works, his role as a copyist, and Kellner’s life in 1726, when his incomplete manuscript was prepared.

As the title page of the Kellner manuscript states 3rd July 1726, Frankenhayn, it is possible that as a scholarly exercise, he commenced the development of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas based on a compositional design premise, or musical idea, given to him by Bach as a compositional assignment. Auditions for

---

compositional positions were often based on this model. Jones (2013) cites Mattheson, who informs us that in 1727 two themes from the C Major Fugue “...albeit in a different key (G)”\textsuperscript{366} were presented to candidates for the post of organist in Hamburg. The candidates were to improvise on the fugue as part of the audition process.\textsuperscript{367} Additionally, it was, in fact, this very concept that led to the early development and eventual composition of the Musical Offering.\textsuperscript{368}

As stated previously, it cannot be satisfactorily explained how Kellner obtained a supposed early manuscript version of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas by Bach, because there is no evidence that the FFC or any other version of these works ever left the Bach household in Köthen or Leipzig. As Kellner was one of Bach’s main copyists, however, there was clearly a pathway of communication between them. This theory is supported by the evidence of what appears to be Anna Magdalena’s handwriting in the final page of Kellner’s manuscript of the Six Cello Suites.\textsuperscript{369}

The fact that there is no evidence of the FFC or any other version of these works leaving the Bach household in Köthen or Leipzig remains a point of conjecture. However, as Schwanenberger’s hand exists on the title page of the Anna Magdalena Konvolut, it has been suggested that these works were specifically written for Schwanenberger. Tatlow (2015) states, “Bach’s second wife, Anna Magdalena, transcribed the Six Solos and the Cello Suites... for Georg Heinrich

\textsuperscript{366} Jones 2013, p. 89.
\textsuperscript{367} Ibid. pp. 89-90.
\textsuperscript{368} See Gardner 2013, The origin of the composition of the Musical Offering (BWV 1079) was the result of a theme provided to Bach in 1747 by Frederick the Great “…on which he was expected to extemporise, first in three, then in six part.” p. 227.
\textsuperscript{369} Jarvis 2007.
Ludwig Schwanberg...who himself made a single title page for the set of two collections."\textsuperscript{370}

Further, although Sources make it clear that Kellner was acquainted with Bach, how the two came to know each other has never been clearly established despite Kellner making no reference to ever being in either Köthen or Leipzig.\textsuperscript{371}

It would appear, however, that Kellner and Anna Magdalena had made an earlier acquaintance and this may have led to the potential link and student-teacher relationship, which is thought to have existed between Kellner and Bach. The most supporting evidence for this, as stated previously, is what appears to be Anna Magdalena’s input to the final page of the Six Cello Suites in Kellner’s konvolut, and the possible existence of her writing in the middle of Kellner’s konvolut.\textsuperscript{372}

Certainly, the differences between Bach’s known autograph and Kellner’s copy of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas are of such magnitude that they make it most improbable that Kellner’s is a direct copy of this autograph. It seems more likely that Kellner modelled his script on a different manuscript, probably an earlier draft which itself could have undergone significant revisions by the composer at a later stage. This draft may not have been fully composed (which is quite different from movements ‘missing’ or ‘omitted’) or, if written on single pages,

\textsuperscript{370} Tatlow 2015, p. 134.
\textsuperscript{371} Jarvis 2007 offers the scenario that Kellner may have been a potential suitor at the Bach household. Bach’s daughter Dorothea Catharina was four years younger than Kellner.
\textsuperscript{372} My investigation has discovered what appears to be Anna Magdalena’s handwriting in three fascicles of Kellner’s konvolut. This is discussed in detail in Chapter V (5.11) of this thesis.
some sheets may have been damaged or lost while passed back and forth between composer and copyist.\textsuperscript{373}

### 3.10 Anna Magdalena as Bach’s copyist

Anna Magdalena Wilcken (1701-1760), was born in the Thuringian city of Zeitz in 1701 and moved to Weissenfels in 1718.

She became Bach’s second wife on the 3rd of December 1721\textsuperscript{374} following the death of his first wife, Maria Barbara, in July of the previous year. It is commonly accepted that she moved to Köthen from Weissenfels around the second half of 1720 and that Bach met her sometime after that. Jarvis (2007), believes, however, there is a strong possibility that she met Bach well before the traditionally accepted date of around 1720/21 — possibly back to as early as 1713 — and that Bach may have been directly responsible for her employment at Köthen.\textsuperscript{375} As discussed earlier in Tomita, Jarvis (2007) conducted a forensic examination of the handwriting and music calligraphy of the Perpetual Canon for Four Voices, dated 1713, and found what he considers to be “...fairly conclusive”\textsuperscript{376} evidence of Anna Magdalena’s handwriting within this work. This would have been well before the first formal and documented appearance of her on 25th of September 1721 where it is recorded that she and Bach attended a christening.\textsuperscript{377}

In an essay titled, “Some Biographical Lessons,” Marshall (1990) states that because Bach had the title “…Actual Kapellemeister to the Court of Saxe-
Weissenfels it is almost certain that Johann Sebastian ...made the acquaintance of
the Wilcken family there when he composed BWV 208 – The Hunting Cantata – for
the birthday of the Duke of Weissenfels in 1713”378 [four years before his arrival at
Cöthen when Anna Magdalena was just 12 years old]. Further, Marshall is also of
the opinion that, “...it is likely that Bach himself, in his capacity as Kapellemeister
at Cöthen - a post he held from 1717 – was instrumental in recruiting Anna
Magdalena for the Cöthen musical establishment.”379

Wolff (2000), also entertains this possibility stating:

Quite possibly, Magdalena joined the Cöthen[sic] capelle around or before
June 15, 1721, in the high-ranking post of chamber musician. In this case,
Bach must have been assured of her extraordinary qualifications, either
from an audition ...or from a performance on some earlier occasion...it
would have been unusual for Bach not to have encountered at some time
the extended Wilcke family of musicians.380

The fact that Anna Magdalena was in Köthen in September of 1721 and married
to Bach by December of that year, could possibly suggest that they were already
well acquainted prior to this time.

With regard to her copying of Bach’s works, the generally accepted view of Anna
Magdalena is that she was a reliable and dependable copyist who was faithful to
the Source.

379 Ibid.
If this were the case, one might assume therefore, that the handwriting, beaming, stemming and page turns in the Anna Magdalena manuscript of the *Cello Suites* must fairly accurately reflect the writing in the composer’s original, if she were copying from it.

Jarvis (2007) makes the following observation about the ambiguous nature of her articulation markings in the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas*. He suggests:

> *It is plausible that what is in her version of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas represents only a sketch of the intended articulation and that that is why it is rough and ambiguous. Anna Magdalena’s manuscript then might form the intervening stage before the final version of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas. This would explain the divergence in the 1st Movement of the G minor Sonata and the Sarabande of the D Minor Partita...and the fact that her manuscript was devoid of genre titles, until they were added later by Schwanenberger.*

On this point, however, it is questionable whether this apparent negligence (or ‘weaknesses’ as described earlier by Emery) is, in fact, an indication that her work is more representative of compositional drafting, rather than copying the FFC.

---

381 Jarvis 2007, p. 337.
3.11 Hübner, M. 2004

Maria Hübner's, *Anna Magdalena Bach – Ein Leben in Dokumenten und Bildern*, is without doubt, the most significant text ever published on the life of Anna Magdalena. It was written to commemorate the tercentenary (2001) of her birth. Its format is the same as the NBA and gives documentary evidence of Anna Magdalena's life in a similar format, that is, date by date according to documents available. It is not a study of Anna Magdalena in a critical manner and therefore is mentioned here only for the purposes of completeness. Hübner does, however, confirm the statements of others quoted in this thesis; she also makes an interesting observation regarding the uniqueness of words written by Schwanenberger on the title page of the manuscript containing the *Six Cello Suites*, “...Das von Schwanberg383 geschriebene Titelblatt zu diesen Abschriften enthält einen für diese Zeit ungewöhnlichen Vermerk zur Kopistin.”

References to Anna Magdalena in the documents given in the New Bach Reader (NBR) are relatively scarce and amount to only about a dozen direct and indirect references. There is only one that contains Anna Magdalena's own words, in the form of a draft letter. Other references are those in the Köthen Court records relating to her marriage to Bach and payments made to her, and various other references such as the one contained in the Obituary by Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach and Johann Friedrich Agricola written in 1750, though not published until

---


383 As stated in Tatlow 2015, there are two commonly used variants of Schwanenberg's surname: Schwanberg (*BD II*, 239, the form he used to sign his name), and Schwanenberger (*BD II*, 224 and 248).

384 Translated as “The title page to these copies, written by Schwanberg, contains, for this period in time, an unusual note as to the copyist: écrite par Madame Bachen. Son Épouse.”
1754, where it states, “...He [Johann Sebastian] took for his wife, in Cöthen, in the year 1721, Mistress Anna Magdalena.”

None of the references give any particular insight into Anna Magdalena’s relationship with Johann Sebastian, either personal or professional except that Johann Sebastian does make reference to his wife being a singer, “...my present wife sings a good, clear soprano” in an excerpt from Johann Sebastian’s letter to Georg Erdmann, Imperial Russian Residence agent at Danzig, 28th of October 1730.

**3.12 The konvolut**

It is important to adequately define the term “konvolut” as it applied to the presentation of manuscripts in the 18th century. The term “konvolut” simply means “a bundle of papers.” For the purposes of this thesis it is defined as follows:

*Konvolut – refers to a collection of documents of related origin and/or premise stored, bound, wrapped or maintained as a specific set for the purposes of presentation and/or publication or for sale and/or auction.*

It is reasonable, then, that the term konvolut can be applied to a collection of a range of document types and for various purposes; i.e. a konvolut could simply represent a parcel of papers to be passed on or kept as a collection; or it could be

385 Hübner 2004, p. 53.
386 Ibid, p. 152.
388 This is my own definition of the term “konvolut” as it applies to the purpose of this research.
much more formal in its purpose, such as that of a collection of compositional assignments by a student for marking and grading by their teacher.

As part of the dissemination of the three manuscript versions, which form the basis of this research, it is important to note that collections of manuscript workings, in the form of Konvolut, are presented in the scribal hands of both Kellner and Anna Magdalena. Notably the absence of a formal Konvolut by Bach raises questions regarding the compositional practices and history of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas*, and also the *Cello Suites*.

### 3.13 Anna Magdalena’s konvolut

Anna Magdalena’s konvolut differs from that of Kellner in that it is the only extant complete version of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* and the *Cello Suites* produced in one discrete set of manuscript workings. It is commonly understood that this konvolut, prepared by Anna Magdalena, was originally untitled and was provided (possibly sold\(^{389}\)) to the highly skilled violinist, J.P. Schwanenberger, as a “Single Magnum Opus.”\(^{390}\)

The title and associated handwriting that appears on what was later written and used as a formal cover page to Anna Magdalena’s konvolut, is what is traditionally accepted as being in the hand of Schwanenberger.\(^{391}\)

---

\(^{389}\) See Tatlow 2015, “*No accounts survive to indicate the fee paid to Bach by either Schwanberg or Kellner.*” p. 134.

\(^{390}\) Jones 2013, p. 93.

\(^{391}\) NBA 2001 Vol. V1/2.
Regarding the *Six Cello Suites* and their sources, scholarly polemic has centred recently around the notion that Anna Magdalena must have copied her version of the *Cello Suites* from a different authorial script from which Kellner copied.\(^{392}\)

Additionally, the 2001 edition of the NBA Critical Report states:

\[\text{*Kellner copied from a different source than Anna Magdalena (A.M) Bach did. It has not yet been determined whether this source was a different J.S. Bach autograph (a composing score, a different clean copy) or a copy circulating among those more closely associated with J.S. Bach.*}^{393}\]

3.13.1 Schwanenberger

Georg Heinrich Ludwig Schwanenberger (1696-1774) was a chamber musician who held the position as violinist at the court Kapelle of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel.\(^{394}\)

Schwanenberger is known to have studied with Bach in Leipzig between the years 1727-1728.\(^{395}\) It is likely that he undertook active composition with him during this time. In 1727 he writes:

\[\text{\textit{I could wish that you should once hear Mr. Bach on the organ, for neither you nor anyone else in Braunschweig could hold your head before him; I never heard anything like it, and I must completely change my whole style of playing, for it is worth nothing. And in}}\]

\(^{392}\) See Szabo 2015, p. 77.
\(^{393}\) NBA, 2001 Vol. V1/2.
\(^{394}\) Wolff 2000, p. 375.
\(^{395}\) See NBR 1998, p. 325.
thoroughbass, too. I will if God pleases and keeps me healthy be uncommonly industrious, for I am eager to learn his style.\textsuperscript{396}

Spitta (1951) in his book, \textit{Johann Sebastian Bach: His Work and Influence on the Music of Germany} describes the relationship between Schwanenberger and Bach as follows:

\begin{quote}
...he seemed to have stood in the most confidential intimacy with Bach's family. He was in Leipzig in October, 1728, just when one of Bach's daughter's was baptised; one of her Godfather's was Johann Caspar Wulken and he not being able to be present, Schwanenberger stood as his proxy.\textsuperscript{397}
\end{quote}

No plausible explanation has ever been offered as why Anna Magdalena supposedly made a copy of the two collections of works for Schwanenberger or whether Schwanenberger “...coincidently assigned them to function as Libro Secondo continuation to the Libro Primo set of violin works.”\textsuperscript{398}

Jarvis (2007) states, “\textit{Hans-Joachim Schultze ...identified the three title pages (one for the combined works, and one each for the violin solos, and the cello solos)}\textsuperscript{399} as being in the hand of Schwanenberger.”\textsuperscript{400} It appears that, given he created the title page of the konvolut, he was somehow involved in the process of its creation. In addition, Schwanenberger also created the title page of the \textit{Cello Suites} within the konvolut, but not the title page of the \textit{Violin Sonatas and Partitas}. The NBA states:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{396} NBR 1998, p. 325.
\item \textsuperscript{397} Spitta 1951, p. 237.
\item \textsuperscript{398} NBA 2001, Vol.V1/2.
\item \textsuperscript{399} Smith personal communication 31 October 2013.
\item \textsuperscript{400} Jarvis 2007.
\end{itemize}
An additional descriptive title similar to this does not appear on A.M. Bach’s copy... of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas, thus leading to the reasonable assumption that Schwanenberg, mainly known as a violinist, was more interested in the violin, rather than the violoncello compositions, thereby necessitating a new title for them since they were no longer included in the double ‘set’ of compositions which he had originally acquired.401

Jarvis (2007) cites Eppstein (1990), who states:

Given that Schwanenberger was party to the creation [of the manuscript of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas] and that he was living in Leipzig until at least 1727, though it is uncertain when Schwanenberger exactly left Leipzig, it seems probable that the manuscript was created at that time.402

It is conceivable that Schwanenberger also executed Bach’s works for violin in the same way Joachim did for Brahms a century or more later and provided violinistic advice regarding these (and other) works. This may have even been as a form of payment for his lessons with Bach.

---

3.14 Kellner's konvolut

Kellner's konvolut, containing the Violin Sonatas and Partitas is formally recognised as shelf-mark P 804. The Staatsbibliothek provided copies of the entire manuscript workings for forensic examination. Kellner's konvolut contains the incomplete version of the Six Violin Sonatas and Partitas as has been detailed above (comprising Faszikel 22), followed by differing accompanied pieces of varying technicality (Faszikel's 23 - 39) and an (almost) complete version of the Cello Suites (comprising Faszikel 40).

While a thorough and complete investigation of the entire konvolut is outside the scope of this doctoral research, a dissemination of the various sections has been undertaken to provide important context in relation to this thesis.

Kellner's konvolut, in its entirety is described by Stinson (1989) as totalling "...almost 400 pages" of varying paper type, of which:

- The first pages contain his incomplete or partial version of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas;

- The following 110 pages contain a variety of manuscript versions in the form of faszikel's numbering seventeen (Faszikel 23 – Faszikel 39);

- The remaining pages contain an almost complete version of the Six Cello Suites in Kellner's hand, with what appears to be Anna Magdalena's scribal

---

403 See NBA 2001 Vol.V1/2 "Suite V is incomplete. The Sarabande has been left out and the Gigue has only the first nine measures before it breaks off...Suite V lacks any indication of scordatura."

hand on the final page and signed off as “Soli Deo Sit Gloria” in what once again appears to be in the handwriting of Anna Magdalena.

It is further noted by Stinson that:

...many of the fascicles have been trimmed to give the volume a uniform size (33.5 x 21.5cm. on the average)...and this process has resulted in the loss of headings and musical text in several places.\(^{405}\)

Further, and according to Stinson, it appears from the manuscript’s “...unwieldy thickness”\(^{406}\) that the fascicles had been brought together “...not to be performed from but to be preserved as a reference collection.”\(^{407}\)

It is not known how or for what reason these works were grouped together. Of this, Stinson says:

...one assumes this took place after Kellner’s death, for it is hard to imagine that he would have badly damaged his own copies just to group them into a volume that could not even be performed from.\(^{408}\)

It could be argued, however, that if the collating of these works resulted in some damage to them, and the trimming of the titles resulted in the loss of headings, it is more likely to have been undertaken by Kellner, who would have known what the headings were and would be less concerned if he lost them. If this had been done retrospectively (after Kellner's death) it is more likely that great care would

\(^{405}\) Ibid.
\(^{406}\) Ibid.
\(^{407}\) Ibid.
\(^{408}\) Ibid.
have been taken to preserve the headings of the works so as not to damage them in any way.

A forensic examination of P 804 clearly reveals that there are music-calligraphies in Kellner’s konvolut that cannot be identified as his. How and why these other music-calligraphies are present is difficult to explain at this distance in time from their execution, and from the date of the konvolut’s construction. What can be said unequivocally, however, is that one example of the mysterious music calligraphy appears to be very similar to that of Anna Magdalena; and, this proposition is reinforced by the appearance of what strongly appears to be Anna Magdalena’s handwriting in Kellner’s manuscript version of the Cello Suites. These two pieces of circumstantial evidence support the proposition that Kellner and Anna Magdalena may have been working collaboratively in some way — perhaps with Anna Magdalena performing some tutorial role to the younger Kellner.

### 3.15 Discussion of Kellner’s konvolut

In reviewing and investigating the collection of musical works that form Kellner’s konvolut the major findings are summarised below:

1. The version of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* contained within the Kellner konvolut represents an incomplete working of the entire collection. Its contents form Faszikel 22. It is noted that the completion on these works

---


are signed off in what appears to be Kellner's hand with the phrase “Soli Deo Sit Gloria” (see Figure 4).

![Figure 4: Kellner's signature in his manuscript of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas](image)

2. Faszikel 26, a Fantasia in D Major, is believed to be a copy of BWV 908, and it would appear that it is entirely in a music calligraphy noted to be very similar to Anna Magdalena. Further it is the only faszikel in the middle of the konvolut to be signed off at its completion with the phrase “Soli Deo Sit Gloria” (see Figure 5), also noted to be in the scribal hand of Anna Magdalena. The clefs of the faszikel are noted as being in the hand of Kellner, even though the music calligraphy contained within is in a different scribal hand.

![Figure 5: The sign off “Soli Deo Sit Gloria” at the end of Faszikel 26.](image)

---

411 The phrases “Soli Deo Gloria” and “Soli Deo Sit Gloria” can be used interchangeably. As detailed earlier, the addition of the word 'sit' simply adds the verb i.e. Glory to God Alone (Soli Deo Gloria) becomes 'May there be Glory to God Alone' (Soli Deo Sit Gloria). Of particular note is Bach’s sign off at the end of his compositions being “Soli Deo Gloria” or the initials SDG. Anna Magdalena always signs off “Soli Deo Sit Gloria”.

412 Faszikel 26 is discussed in greater detail, and an example of handwriting is provided, in Chapter V (5.13) of this thesis p. 205.
Stinson (1989) says that the authorship of BWV 908, which is Faszikel 26 in Kellner’s konvolut is in question, stating, “*It is with good reason that scholars continue to raise doubts about Bach’s authorship of these pieces.*”413 Furthermore Stinson states that this is one of only two works in “…*the Bach Canon, transmitted in “Partimento” (essentially a one staff, figured bass part containing occasional melodic suggestions from which a player was expected to improvise a complete composition.”*”414

3. Faszikel 38, a Preludium and Fugue in D Minor, believed to represent BWV 870a/1, 899, 870a/2, 900, is noted to have been written out by two distinct scribes, in what appears to be music-calligraphy very similar to both Kellner and Anna Magdalena. It is noted that what appears to be Anna Magdalena’s music-calligraphy constitutes the lower voice in the treble (alto) and the lower voice in the bass.

Stinson (1989) describes Faszikel 38 as a work, “*...whose authenticity is considered questionable,*”415 even though “*...three scribes with close ties to the Bach circle — attribute it to Bach.*”417 This is based on an unusual statement of -the Fugue subject “…*in the order tonic – dominant – dominant, instead of the typical alternating scheme tonic – dominant – tonic.*”418 Stinson concludes, however, that

---

413 Stinson 1989, p. 127.
414 Ibid.
415 Refer to Chapter 3 (3.6) of this thesis where Bach’s teaching methods are explained pp. 90-92.
416 Ibid.
417 Ibid.
418 Ibid.
because this work does not “…differ significantly from the keyboard music Bach composed in Cöthen...there is no reason to doubt its authenticity.”

4. Most interestingly, and perplexing, is the notation on the final page of Kellner’s version of the *Six Cello Suites*. The scribal hand is notated in what appears to be the music calligraphy of Anna Magdalena and again, the completion is signed off in what appears to be her hand with the phrase “Soli Deo Sit Gloria”. The handwriting of “Soli Deo Sit Gloria” at the end of Kellner’s *Cello Suites* does not match the handwriting of “Soli Deo Sit Gloria”, written by Kellner at the end of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* (Refer to Figure 4, p.117). This indicates that Anna Magdalena may have completed the *Cello Suites* contained within Kellner’s konvolut and signed off on them. What does this mean?

Figure 6: The sign off “Soli Deo Sit Gloria” at the end of Kellner’s faszikel.

---

419 Ibid.
420 See also Jarvis 2007.
3.16 Summary

In summary, what has been reflected on, in the historical context above, is the lack of concrete and scientific evidence to support many of the propositions that have been put forward by well-intentioned Bach scholars. In Chapter V, the science of FDE will provide scientifically verifiable evidence to support the final propositions of this thesis.
CHAPTER IV - BACH AND MUSICAL DESIGN

“The aim and final end of all music should be none other than the glory of God and the refreshment of the soul.” - Johann Sebastian Bach

4.1 Wolff, C. Johann Sebastian Bach – The Learned Musician421

Christoph Wolff’s book, reviews Bach’s compositional style and the contemporary influences throughout his life and associated musical achievements. Wolff explores the life and history of Bach with an emphasis on musical thinking, musical science and musical perfection, leading to the learned rigour with which he composed his music and carried out his duties, among others, as Kapellemeister of a number of well-developed and known Kapelles within various regions of Thuringia.

Wolff presents interesting facts related to Bach’s compositional methods and the musical exemplars by which he learned (via self-taught means) the art of musical composition and through which he developed the compositional mastery for which he is so well known today. The depth and breadth of Wolff’s dissemination of Bach’s life in history is accepted as the basis for determination of the compositional role and history of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas. Notable evidence of Bach’s analytical process is detailed throughout various chapters of Wolff’s literature. Some early examples of this are detailed as follows:

If ever a musician employed the most hidden secrets of harmony with the most skilled artistry, it was certainly our Bach. No one ever showed so many ingenious and unusual ideas as he in elaborate pieces such as ordinarily seem dry exercises in craftsmanship.422

It emphasises that his music truly demonstrates the power of polyphony, an intrinsic harmonic structure, and an original and imaginative approach in the design of complex works.423

The complexity and intricate structure of Bach’s compositional works are acknowledged in a “…public literary dispute between Agricola424 and Filippo Finazzi…”425 Wolff cites Agricola, who wrote:

He [Finazzi] denies his [Bach’s] music the effect of pleasure for the listener who would not savour such harmony. Yet, assuming the harmonies [that is, musical structures] of this great man were so complex that they would not always achieve the intended result, they nevertheless serve for the connoisseur’s genuine delight. Not all learned people are able to understand a Newton, but those that have progressed far enough in profound science so they can understand him will find the greater gratification and real benefit in reading his work.426

422 Wolff, C 2000, citing from the obituary written by Carl Phillip Emmanuel Bach and Johann Friedrich Agricola in 1750 and published in 1754. p. 4
423 Ibid.
424 Johann Friedrich Agricola attended Leipzig University and studied with Bach from 1738 - 1741. He later became Kapellemeister at the Prussian Court of Berlin, where he played an influential role as a composer and prolific writer on music. See Wolff 2000, p. 330.
425 Ibid. p. 6. See also NBR 1989 pp. 337-353 for further details of the controversy leading to this comment.
426 Ibid.
The notion of “Musical Science” is discussed by Wolff, stating the importance of striving to achieve divine harmony in all aspects of life. He states:

*If the natural philosophy of Bach’s time defined itself as “...a science of all things that teaches us how and why they are or can be,” Bach’s musical philosophy might well be understood analogously: as the science of musical phenomena that teaches us how and why they are or can be, and also show how they relate to nature — God’s creation and Newton’s world system. The sheer scope and breadth of Newton’s intellectual endeavours, too, find their analogy in the enormous and unparalleled range of interests and enterprises that characterise Bach: the complete, the learned, the perfect musician.*

Music, then, with its traditional mathematical underpinning, provides an especially rich field of operation for a composer who was increasingly infected with scientific curiosity, totally uninterested in “dry exercises in [musical] craftsmanship,” but thoroughly committed to advancing “true music,” which Bach defined as music that pursued as its “ultimate end or final goal... the honour of God and the recreation of the soul.”

Wolff documents the Violin Sonatas and Partitas as being representative of Bach’s “major musical achievements in musical science” among other works, which also uncover “…the most hidden secrets of polyphony...the application of ingenious and unusual ideas and the employment of the most skilled artistry.” He states,

---

427 Ibid. p. 7.
428 Ibid. pp. 7-8.
429 Ibid. p. 8
430 Ibid. p. 8.
“Finally, of especial importance was Bach’s remarkable ability to synthesize the various components of his musical science in light of his strong sense for unified structures.”

Wolff discusses the concept of “Musical Thinking” defining it as the fundamental thought process required in “The Making of a Composer.” When discussing Bach’s turning point from keyboard and organ virtuoso to composer, Wolff states:

*The decision grew logically out of a deep-rooted drive to commit musical thoughts to paper, to think about and embark on their further elaboration, to refine the technical skills necessary for the theoretical underpinnings and compositional control of the music substance at hand, and constantly to challenge his musical imagination.*

The notion of musical thinking was by no means a new concept in compositional processes of the sixteenth and seventeenth century. In his development of compositional process and the formation of his “genuinely personal style,” Bach cited a number of exemplars. Wolff (2000) references the following reports by two of Bach’s eldest sons, as cited by Forkel (1802):

---

431 Ibid.
433 Ibid.
434 Ibid.
He soon began to feel that the eternal running and leaping led to nothing: that there must be order, connection and proportion in the thoughts, and that to attain such objec[tive]s, some kind of guide was necessary. Vivaldi’s Concertos for the violin, which were then just published, served him for such a guide.\textsuperscript{437}

...Bach’s study of Vivaldi represents a critical moment, perhaps the culmination point, in a development of self-guided learning that began with the study of fugue and peaked in a thoroughly analytical approach to the modern Italian concerto style of Vivaldi, the Marcellos, and their contemporaries, resulting in the emergence of new structural design.\textsuperscript{438}

Of this, Wolff says, “It is likely therefore that Bach himself passed on to his students and family the impression that his experience with Vivaldi’s compositions above all ‘...taught him how to think musically.”\textsuperscript{439}

Citing Forkel (1802), Wolff (2000) states:

...order/organisation, coherence/connection/continuity, and proportion/relation/correlation...must be brought to bear on musical ideas. Bach then recognised in Vivaldi’s concertos a concrete compositional system based on musical thinking in terms of order, coherence, and proportion.\textsuperscript{440}

\textsuperscript{437} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{438} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{439} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{440} Ibid. p.171.
Further:

*From the outset the contrapuntal elaboration of a theme held his interest and given his phenomenal gift of combination it became immaterial whether the theme was his own or that of another composer. In every instance, the theme presented a challenge to uncover its latent harmonic qualities so that in the final setting, all parts worked “wonderfully in and about one another, but without the slightest confusion” and therefore truly represented unity in diversity or musical perfection.*

It is also noted that Bach’s art of improvising and composing is always determined via concrete points of reference. This was first developed when Bach studied the works of Vivaldi and recognised a “concrete compositional system based on musical thinking in terms of order, coherence and proportion...” This formed the basis of developing the concept of musical perfection.

Vivaldi’s method of composition, which so obviously influenced Bach, was the concept of unity achieved through the process of “…defining the substance of a musical idea with the aim of elaborating on it, a process that observes the closely interrelated categories of order, connection and proportion and thereby unifying a piece.”

As Forkel (1802) observed, Bach studied the chain of the ideas and their relation to each other, the variety of the modulations and many other particulars. In short,

---

441 Ibid. p. 469.  
442 Ibid. p. 171.  
443 Ibid. p. 172.
whatever is covered under the proportion principle intimately relates to order and coherence as well:

As George Venzky, like Bach a member of Lorenz Christoph Mizler’s Society of Musical Science, put it, “God is a harmonic being. All harmony originates from his wide order and organisation... Where there is no conformity, there is also no order, no beauty, no perfection. For beauty and perfection consists in the conformity of diversity.”

Wolff defines Birnbaum’s description of harmony as accumulated counterpoint, [which] goes well beyond mere functionality when, in one of the most thoughtful and poetic descriptions of the inner workings of Bach’s harmonious polyphony, he addresses the essential aesthetic aspects of a contrapuntally conceived harmonic structure.

Where the rules of composition are most strictly preserved, there without fail order must reign... It is certain... that the voices in the works of this great master of music work wonderfully in and about one another, but without the slightest confusion... Now when all this is performed as it should be, there is nothing more beautiful than this harmony.

Notoriety of Bach’s ingenious and original ideas was continued even more explicitly in his Obituary, which read:

444 Ibid. p. 466.
445 Ibid. p. 467.
446 Ibid.
His melodies were strange, but always varied, rich in invention, and resembling those of no other composer.

...the tension between protecting objective precepts and pursuing subjective goals. Bach, for whom the “invention of ideas” constituted a fundamental requirement...understood the elaboration of musical ideas not as an act of free creation but rather as a process of imaginative research into the harmonic implications of the chosen subject matter.447

Wolff also cites Christian Friedrich Daniel Schubart, who identified in 1784-1785 (early after Bach’s death), the originality in his music and pronounced:

Johann Sebastian Bach was a genius of the highest degree; his spirit is so unique and individual, so immense that it will require centuries to really reach him... The original genius of Bach is readily recognisable.448

447 Ibid. pp. 466-467.
448 Ibid. p. 468.
The elaboration of musical themes appears to be what held Bach’s interest the most when composing:

*Elaboration requires the concrete application of musical science, that is, the knowledge of all possible implications held by a musical idea, as well as how and why they are possible.*

*The most important aspect of elaboration, however, is that it provides a method for working “industriously and painstakingly... at the improvement of nature” – for seeking, in other words, musical perfection.*\(^{449}\)

*Perfectly constructed and unique in sound, Bach’s compositions offer the ideal of bringing into congruence original thought, technical exactitude, and aesthetic beauty.*\(^{450}\)

It is important to define the term ‘musical design’ as it may have applied to Bach’s compositions and hence Wolff’s view of them. If the term ‘musical design’ is defined as being “the intellectual and practical activity encompassing the systematic study of the structure and behaviour of the physical and natural word through observation and experiment”\(^{451}\) and the words “physical and natural world” are replaced with “music,” it may come close to what a definition of ‘musical design’ might represent.

---

\(^{449}\) Ibid. p. 469.  
\(^{450}\) Ibid. p. 471.  
This definition thus permits the following points to be made:

- Musical design is an intellectual study – there is a thought process behind it. In addition to being guided by emotion or an ‘affection’, there is mental capacity involved.

- Musical design requires a practical application (activity) of this thought process, which culminates in a composition.

- Musical design encompasses the systematic structure and behaviour of music.\(^{452}\)

- Musical design requires observation and experiment. Bach was known to study the works of other composers and to continually experiment and push the boundaries of composition. His study of Vivaldi’s works permitted him to draw conclusions regarding his own compositions and experiment further as a result.

‘Musical design’ may therefore be defined as “the intellectual and practical activity encompassing the systematic study of the structure and behaviour of music through aural observation and experiment.”\(^{453}\)

If the definition of musical design, stated above, is accurate, then it would appear that Bach is, in every sense of the term, a ‘musical designer’. It is possible, however, that Bach took musical design even further in his quest for musical perfection. Bach was known to have a keen intellect and an interest in maths so

---

\(^{452}\) Nowhere is this more evident than in the *Well-Tempered Clavier* (BWV 846-893), which is a collection of works in all major and minor keys and within the structure of the *Musical Offering* (BWV 1079).

\(^{453}\) My definition.
the proportion levels that exist in his music may have simply been a formula Bach used as a basis for his compositions.

Having stated all of the above, the question is, on what scientific basis does Wolff et al base their attributions of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas?

### 4.2 Wolff, C. “Bach’s Music and Newtonian Science”

Following on from his earlier work, Wolff (2007) further attempts to demonstrate, via specific examples of Bach’s music, his “...remarkable ability to integrate and synthesis the various parameters and components of his musical science and his highly developed sense for the creation of unified structures.”

Wolff states that Bach’s achievements and stature as a composer were “publicly recognised” and that “...besides presenting himself as a virtuoso performer, Bach the composer considered himself a musical scholar producing works of musical science.” Wolff is of the opinion that Bach was influenced, “...notably in Leipzig...by the academic climate of intellectual inquiry and the search for truth propounded by philosophers [of the time].”

Bach’s student, Lorenz Mizler, who later founded The Corresponding Society of the Musical Sciences, defined philosophy as “…a science of all things that teaches us how and why they are or can be.” Wolff states, however, that although Bach was

---

455 Ibid. p.104.
456 Ibid. p. 96.
457 Ibid.
458 Ibid. p. 97.
459 This is discussed on p. 137 of this thesis.
460 Ibid. p. 98.
exposed to “…much abstract theoretical discourse of the time…he had no interest in contributing to it himself. He focused instead on a genuinely empirical approach that made him [instead] explore the most hidden secrets of harmony with the most skilled artistry, that is, push and expand the known limits of musical composition.”

He refers to the controversial argument between Agricola and Finazzi, where for the first time, a parallel is drawn between Bach and Isaac Newton.

Thereby, and according to Wolff, “…Bach’s music is best appreciated by connoisseurs, just as Newton’s writings are best understood by readers with a profound knowledge of science.”

Wolff then suggests that the recalling of Bach’s compositional ability as documented by Agricola and C.P.E Bach in the Obituary, “…emphasises that his music truly demonstrates the power of polyphony, the artful application of intrinsic harmonic structure and organisation, and his imaginative, uncommon and original approach to the design of complex works.”

---

461 Ibid.
462 Refer to p. 98
463 Ibid.
464 Ibid. p. 96.
He further states:

*Newtonian science implies that the search for truth encompasses both natural and divine principles...Newton created a revolution in a number of areas (most notably calculus and the theory of mechanics),...his work represents the pinnacle of the seventeenth-century scientific revolution.*

*Similarly...under the firm umbrella of seventeenth-century Lutheran theology, Bach’s musical discoveries – like Newton’s, whose works Bach almost certainly did not know - ultimately pointed to the operations of God.*\(^{465}\)

The five musical examples chosen in Wolff’s paper support the notion of Bach “*...as a scholarly-minded composer.*”\(^{466}\) After elaborating on the musical examples, Wolff states:

*We recognise, both in these examples and in general, Bach’s remarkable ability to integrate and synthesise the various parameters and components of his musical science and his highly developed sense for the creation of unified structures.*

Wolff goes on to say:

*...If Bach ever created a ‘revolution’ it was in his teaching of composition by fully integrating the principles of bass, harmony and counterpoint, elements that had previously been treated separately.*\(^{467}\)

---

465 Ibid. p. 99.
466 Ibid.
467 Ibid. p. 104.
Wolff concludes his argument, citing the musician and critic, Christian Schubart. Schubart wrote an appraisal of Bach, which appeared in a leading musical periodical in 1801:

> The name of Johann Sebastian Bach radiates supremely and sublimely above those of all German composers in the first half of the past century. He embraced with Newton’s spirit everything that has hitherto been thought about harmony [composition] and that has been presented as examples thereof, and he penetrated its depths so completely and felicitously that he must be justly regarded as the lawmaker of genuine harmony, which is valid up to the present day.

Although Wolff considers the parallels drawn between Newton and Bach to be appropriate, this is challenged by David Shavin (2000) who describes this approach by Wolff as “...ideological blindless and illiteracy.” He offers instead that it is the scientist Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646–1716) who was more influential on Bach’s working methods. In his review of Wolff (2000), Shavin suggests that the story of the last 27 years of Bach’s life in Leipzig, “...suffers somewhat from Wolff’s Newtonian bias” and devotes a paragraph to Leibniz’s influence in Leipzig. Here he states, “…Bach never worked in any Court or city that was bereft of Leibniz’s influence.”

---

468 Allgemeine Musikalische Zietung is described in Wolff’s essay as being “the leading periodical of the day, to which Beethoven and others subscribed.”

469 Ibid. p. 106.


471 Ibid. p. 63.

472 Ibid. p. 64.

473 Ibid. p. 65.
Irrespective of whoever the main scientific influence may have been on Bach, the comments made by both Wolff and Shavin are contextually relevant to the subject matter of this thesis as they provide information, which suggests that Bach was influenced by the scientific philosophers and mathematicians of the time and, in the absence of any firm documentation which explicitly states this, one must look to his contemporaries of the day, particularly those in Leipzig, who were likely to have influenced Bach and his working methods and in particular, the concept of musical design.

4.3 The Corresponding Society of Musical Sciences

The German physician, mathematician and musical scholar, Lorenz Christoph Mizler (1711-1778) founded the Korrespondierenden Sozietat der Musicalischen Wissenschaften (Corresponding Society of the Musical Sciences) in 1738.

According to his autobiography,474 Mizler commenced his musical training on the flute and violin. From 1724 to 1730 he studied at the Ansbach Gymnasium with Rector Oeder and Johann Matthias Gesner, who became director of Thomasschule zu Leipzig from 1731 to 1734. He enrolled at Leipzig University on the 30th of April, 1731, and chiefly studied theology; his teachers included Johann Matthias Gesner, Johann Christoph Gottsched and Christian Wolff. He took a bachelor’s degree in December 1733 and a master’s degree in March 1734.475 During this time, he also pursued the study of composition, and had some association with Bach, who he said he had the honour to call his ‘...good friend and patron.’476

474 Most of Mizler’s early life is recorded in his 1740 autobiography Grundlage einer Ehren-Pforte.
476 Ibid.
The purpose of the society was to disseminate information on new compositions and new ideas about the theory and practice of music. 477

However:

Even though Bach accepted Mizler’s invitation to join his corresponding society, whose aim was to study the science of music, Mizler understood that Bach never intended to ‘occupy himself with deep theoretical speculations on music, choosing rather to contribute musical compositions that demonstrated theoretical principles.” 478

Mizler was only an amateur composer but deeply interested in music theory, advocating the establishment of a musical science based firmly on mathematics and philosophy, and the imitation of nature in music. He translated Johann Joseph Fux’s Gradus ad Parnassum into German (the original was in Latin), having written of it “...this methodical guide to musical composition [is] among all such works the best book that we have for practical music and its composition.” 479 In intellect and study he was a polymath, his interests encompassing music, mathematics, philosophy, theology, law, and the natural sciences in great detail. He was influenced in philosophy by the ideas of Christian Wolff, Gottfried Leibnitz, and Gottsched 480

478 Tatlow 2015, p. 18.
479 Sadie, S. 1980.
480 Ibid.
The Musikalische Bibliothek, which he published between 1736 and 1754, is an important document of the musical life in Germany at the time,\textsuperscript{481} and includes reviews of books on music written from 1650 up to its publication. It appeared in four volumes with several faszikels. Mizler himself contributed commentaries and criticisms on the writings of Printz, Leonhard Euler, Scheibe, Schröter, Spiess, J.C. Gottsched, and J. Mattheson (particularly the latter two); Kritische Dichtkunst\textsuperscript{482} and Vollkommene Kapellemeister.\textsuperscript{483} His essays were detailed and perceptive and offer a useful musicological resource for present day scholars of Baroque music.

Mizler’s interest in the scientific aspects of music extended to methods of tuning. He considered Werckmeister’s temperament to be the best of its time, but thought that Neidhardt had subsequently improved on it. As regards Mizler’s own music, all that remains are the first three volumes of a four-volume collection of keyboard works entitled Sammlung auserlesener moralischer Oden (Leipzig, 1740-1746), a unique exemplar of which belonged to Dragan Plamenac (1895-1983).

\subsection*{4.3.1 Bach’s involvement with Mizler and the society}
Mizler was a contemporary of Bach and an important influence on his life. Lutz Felbick\textsuperscript{484} identifies the following facts regarding the relationship between Bach and Mizler:

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{481} Ibid.]
\item[\textsuperscript{482} Kritische Dichtkunst translates to “The Critical Art of Poetry.”]
\item[\textsuperscript{483} Vollkommene Kapellemeister means the “Complete Conductor.”]
\item[\textsuperscript{484} Felbick, L. 2013, J.S. Bach and Lorenz Mizler, \textit{American Bach Journal}, No.18, Spring, 2013. Accessed 01 03 2016.]
\end{itemize}
Bach joined the society in 1747, presenting on admission his *Canon Triplex* (BWV 1076) and the *Canonic Variations on ‘Vom Himmel hoch da komm’ ich her* (BWV 769), for organ.

The regulations of Mizler’s society, which, like his journal, remained in operation until 1754, required each member to pay an annual subscription of two thaler, to remain in correspondence with other members, and to send to the secretary (Mizler) at least once a year a scientific communication following the philosophical principles of Christian Wolff (1679-1754), and the literary style of Johann Christoph Gottsched. The scientific communication could take the form of a speculative musical composition, and members older than sixty-five were excused it altogether. The society, for its part, undertook to produce the member’s Obituary and to furnish the text of an ode or cantata in his honour, both of which would be published, along with his portrait, in the Musikalische Bibliothek. Bach’s Obituary duly appeared in the journal in 1754.

In 1748, Bach sent to the society the *Musical Offering* (BWV 1079), and for the following year his composition in lieu of a scientific dissertation, likely to eventually become *Die Kunst der Fuge* (BWV 1080). All of Bach’s works connected in one way or another with Mizler’s society have strong esoteric and enigmatic connotations and use variation and contrapuntal rigour as the basis of their construction.

As a contemporary of significance, and in the absence of any documentation to support Bach’s interest in musical sciences, his involvement with Mizler as his

---

485 The Art of Fugue.
contemporary must be acknowledged with some degree of importance. However, C.P.E. Bach (in letters to Forkel) casts doubt on their involvement and the breadth of their friendship.

4.4 Musical perfection

Wolff (2000) *Epilogue: Bach and the Idea of Musical Perfection* discusses Birnbaum’s essay of 1738, “...where he replaces Scheibe’s image of Bach as the “music maker” with that of “the virtuoso”487 He states:

_Birnbaum deliberately appealed to a discriminating audience, in particular to the “real connoisseur of true musical perfections,” he placed the bar as high as possible in addressing the “remarkable perfections that indisputably belong to the Hon. Court Composer alone.” Here Birnbaum revealed himself as a true and resourceful threesome... introducing into the discussion the concept of “musical perfection,” a notion as abstract as it is irrefutable._

---

Harmonia, the ancient Greek synonym relating to modern musical composition had prompted some discussion of the term “perfection” in the first place. Wolff puts this in to perspective of common philosophy and theology of the time:

*According to both Pythagorean philosophical doctrine and medieval theology, the harmony of the spheres produced consonant (if hidden) music, which reflected the perfection of the celestial world – a view that neither Kepler nor Newton disputed, leaving it one of the few fundamental truths still upheld by both philosophers and theologians of Bach’s time.*

*As George Venzky, like Bach a member of Lorenz Christoph Mizler’s Society of Musical Science, put it, “God is a harmonic being. All harmony originates from his wide order and organisation... where there is no conformity, there is also no order, no beauty, no perfection. For beauty and perfection consists in the conformity of diversity”.*

Wolff cites Birnbaum’s description of harmony as accumulated counterpoint goes well beyond mere functionality when, in one of the most thoughtful and poetic descriptions of the inner workings of Bach’s harmonious polyphony, he addresses the essential aesthetic aspects of a contrapuntally conceived harmonic structure:

*Where the rules of composition are most strictly preserved, there without fail order must reign... it is certain... that the voices in the works of this great master of music work wonderfully in and about one another, but*

---

488 Wolff, 2000 p. 466. The Pythagorean concept of the Harmony of the Spheres is outside the scope of this thesis.
489 Ibid.
without the slightest confusion... now when all this is performed as it should be, there is nothing more beautiful than this harmony."\(^{490}\)

Additionally:

Bach, for whom the “invention of ideas” constituted a fundamental requirement...understood the elaboration of musical ideas not as an act of free creation but rather as a process of imaginative research into the harmonic implications of the chosen subject matter.\(^{491}\)

As discussed earlier:

In every instance, the theme presented a challenge to uncover its latent harmonic qualities so that in the final setting, all parts worked “wonderfully in and about one another, but without the slightest confusion” and, therefore, truly represented unity in diversity, or musical perfection.

Elaboration requires the concrete application of musical science, that is, the knowledge of all possible implications held by a musical idea, as well as how and why they are possible.

The most important aspect of elaboration, however, is that it provides a method for working “industriously and painstakingly... at the improvement of nature” – for seeking, in other words, musical perfection.

\(^{490}\) Ibid. p. 467.  
\(^{491}\) Ibid. p. 468.
Perfectly constructed and unique in sound, Bach’s compositions offer the ideal of bringing into congruence original thought, technical exactitude, and aesthetic beauty.

Was Bach therefore a musical designer who believed a structured approach to his compositions was the surest way to achieve musical perfection to the Glory of God? For the purpose of this thesis it is necessary to establish that a rational and consistent system of manuscript design was in place.\footnote{492 It is also relevant that the establishment of a compositional model would have assisted Bach with the sheer volume of work he undertook.}

4.5 Evidence of compositional planning and musical perfection

Perfection, or Vollkommenheit, was an important concept in Bach’s time. Working from the biblical principle that God is the most perfect being, the concept of perfection was highly developed with widespread application.\footnote{493 Tatlow 2007, p. 54.}

Vitruvius, in his treatise on architecture, De Architectura, asserted that there were three principles of good architecture: durability, utility and beauty.\footnote{494 http://www.clinicalarchitecture.com/blog/clinical-architecture-healthcare-it-blog/january-2009/three-principles-of-good-architecture/ Accessed 23 07 2015.}

The standard and attainment of beauty in architecture involves order, arrangement, and symmetry. In a design, each component is considered separately, as well as proportionally to the whole. While these principles were upheld in Bach’s time as the attainment of architectural beauty, the eminent music theorist Johann Mattheson provided principles of a similar nature in his list of thirty-three Guidelines of Compositional Planning.
In addition to making a sketch or plan “...just as you would design a house”\textsuperscript{495} Mattheson tells the composer to aim for similar proportions in all the parts, so that the composition is pleasing to the senses.\textsuperscript{496} He also suggests the following:

\begin{quote}
...Whoever wishes to use the method described above should outline his complete project on a sheet, sketch it roughly and arrange it in an orderly manner before he proceeds to the elaboration. In my humble opinion this is the best way of all to ensure that each part will demonstrate a specific proportion (Verhältniß)\textsuperscript{497}
\end{quote}

Tatlow (2015) also discusses the potential influence of Meinrad Spiess:\textsuperscript{498}

\begin{quote}
In 1746 Meinrad Spiess also recommended compositional planning, in a publication that, in view of their common membership of the Mizler society, Bach would have read carefully. Defining the Disposito as ‘a well-devised division of a musical work’...Spiess recommends ordering both the general and specific details of a composition.\textsuperscript{499}
\end{quote}

Tatlow (2015) cites Spiess as saying, “In brief: [General Disposition] is when the composer gets his head around all the threads of his projected musical composition and forms it into a perfect system.”\textsuperscript{500}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{495} Tatlow 2007, p. 38. \\
\textsuperscript{496} Ibid. p. 39. \\
\textsuperscript{497} Ibid. \\
\textsuperscript{498} Meinrad Spiess (1683-1761) was a German composer. \\
\textsuperscript{499} Tatlow 2015, p. 106. \\
\textsuperscript{500} Ibid.
\end{flushright}
Tatlow goes on to discuss Spiess’ system of general ordering includes the key and instrumentation. Examples of specific ordering include:

...the sectionalisation in ascending order of a well-invented theme, fugue, aria etc. and, significantly for proportional parallelism, deciding the length of a piece, which should be divided into well-proportioned sections.\(^{501}\)

Agostino Steffano (1654-1728) offered a further model of compositional planning. Tatlow (2015) cites Mattheson:

The world-famous Steffani once said to me that before he ever put pen to paper he kept the text of the opera or work by him for a very long time and came to a highly detailed understanding with himself as to how and in what form would be the best way to organise the work. Thereafter he set his movements to paper.\(^{502}\)

The achievement of musical perfection through proportions required musical thinking. In the case of Bach, the motivation to achieve proportional structure was likely to have been underpinned by the Lutheran Religion and a fundamental belief that music was created for the Glory of God. Harmonic perfection, and the achievement of 1:1 unison were especially pleasing to God. Tatlow (2015) states, “Bach knew that the harmonic proportions he used in his compositions were central to the created order in the universe.”\(^{503}\)

---

\(^{501}\) Ibid.  
\(^{502}\) Ibid. p. 107.  
\(^{503}\) Ibid. p. 34.
And:

...[the] common core belief [of highly respected Lutheran musicians of the 1700s] embraced the understanding that harmonically proportioned music reflected the image of God...Proportions were the fundamental, unseen, yet measurable component that lay behind every aspect of this belief, which actively motivated and necessitated a practical response from both musician and listener.\(^{504}\)

In the discovery of a method of composition that would facilitate this process and realising he needed a system or structure, it would appear that Bach’s in-depth study of Vivaldi’s Concerto’s, provided him with the means of developing such a system.

Wolff (2000) cites Forkel (1802) who states:

...[Bach] recognised that there must be order, connection and proportion in the thoughts and that to attain such objective some kind of guide was necessary. Vivaldi’s Concertos for the violin, which were then published, served him for such a guide.\(^{505}\)

Bach found in Vivaldi’s Concertos a “…concrete compositional system based on musical thinking in terms of order, coherence and proportion — an illuminating though abstract historical definition of Vivaldi’s art as exemplified in his concertos.”\(^{506}\)

\(^{504}\) Ibid. pp. 91-92.  
\(^{505}\) Wolff 2000, p. 170.  
\(^{506}\) Ibid. p. 171.
Further:

Concerto composition provided an ideal vehicle for exploring and developing ways of “musical thinking,” and those ways quickly penetrated other instrumental and vocal genres. The concerto as a musical genre or form was a secondary consideration, and the same was true of counterpoint, thematic invention, and other technical aspects of composition, including even word-tone relationships in vocal works. What Bach dubbed musical thinking was, in fact, nothing less than the conscious application of generative and formative procedures — the meticulous rationalization of the creative act. 507

As a composer, Bach understood the need to “...refine the technical skills necessary for the theoretical underpinnings and compositional control of the musical substance at hand and constantly to challenge his musical imagination.”508

His religious beliefs were manifest in the core purpose of his compositions as perfect harmonies to the pleasure of God. Structure and form and strict rules, such as the example imposed in the thorough bass manifesto, already discussed, were a means for him to achieve this.

507 Ibid.
508 Ibid. p. 169.
4.6 Schwanenberger’s role in the quest for perfection

It is, after all, the written text that establishes the only reliable document of the composer’s ideas and intentions, and that is particularly true of a work displaying Bach’s “unusual musical perfections”. - Christoph Wolff

Did the creation of musical perfection on the page include and generate the goal of perfect execution? Bach seemed well aware that musical performances of his works did not automatically match the level of perfection of the compositions, as they existed on the written page. Birnbaum raised this point in a 1739 supplementary essay:

It is true, one does not judge a composition principally and predominantly by the impression of its performance. But if such judgement, which indeed may be deceiving, is not to be considered, I see no way of judging than to view the work as it has been set down in notes.

Tatlow (2007) cites art historian Rudolf Wittkower’s descriptions of proportion in architecture who states:

It is obvious that such mathematical relations between plan and section cannot be correctly perceived when one walks about in a building...we must therefore conclude that the harmonic perfection of the geometrical

---

510 Ibid.
scheme represents an absolute value, independent of our subjective and transitory perception.\textsuperscript{511}

Tatlow then questions whether the proportion levels that exist in the \textit{Violin Sonatas and Partitas} were designed to be perceived within the performance:

"If Wittkower is correct, the answer is ‘no’. Just as the proportions in architecture between plan and section were not planned to be perceived but to represent an absolute value, the musical proportions they remain a feature of the written score only."\textsuperscript{512}

Bach's trepidation surrounding the perfect execution of his works may explain Schwanenberger's involvement in the preparation of the Anna Magdalena manuscript. Conceivably, Schwanenberger, a known violinist at the court Kapelle of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel\textsuperscript{513} may have been a violinist who Bach considered able to execute the works as close to perfectly as they appeared on the written page. Bach's knowledge of Schwanenberger's ability to execute the works as an accurate representation may have been a manifestation of Schwanenberger's involvement in the compositional process.\textsuperscript{514}

This scenario may provide the reason why the combined manuscript of the \textit{Violin Sonatas and Partitas} and \textit{Cello Suites} contains the writing of Schwanenberger within the manuscript pages of Anna Magdalena's konvolt.

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{511} Tatlow 2007, p. 54.
\textsuperscript{512} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{513} See p. 113 of this thesis.
\textsuperscript{514} Performance and/or execution of early workings.
When Schwanenberger became a pupil of Bach's in Leipzig in 1727 a request may have been made of Schwanenberger to play the violin works. This may have allowed Schwanenberger to further understand the compositional workings of Bach and how to execute them to perfection.

Therefore, following the development of Kellner’s manuscript version, Schwanenberger most likely was involved in the early execution of the works, determining compositional errors and flaws and bringing the music to life.

The results of Schwanenberger’s initial execution of the works may have resulted in a number of factors, which were then integrated into the subsequent revision processes towards the development of the complete Violin Sonatas and Partitas.

Schwanenberg’s input may have then resulted in some fundamental changes, such as:

- Articulations
- Additional composition and playability
- Ordering of the works
- Input and suggestions as to the remaining movements e.g. dance movements.

4.7 Tatlow, R. ‘The Theory of Parallel Proportion’

Tatlow’s (2007) research introduces the concept of conscious planning, and its potential application to compositional development by Bach. Her research explores the mathematical and analytical processes that governed the principles behind many of the academic fields of the time. It is based on the presupposition

---

of Smend (1947) that Bach deliberately planned the length of his movements and works, thereby suggesting that he exercised conscious control over the number of bars he included in his compositions. This challenged the concept of the number of bars in a composition arising as a result of the “...working out of musical ideas, i.e. “the composer ends the composition when the working out of the musical ideas is complete.”516

Tatlow refers to very early concepts and writings by Vetruvius (c. 80 – 25 BCE), whose principles for architecture were, and still are, upheld as the standard of beauty. Reigniting these principles in the fifteenth century was Alberti (1404 – 1472) who is anecdotally known to be one, among many, who were strongly influenced by Vetruvius. By the seventeenth and eighteenth century the fundamental principles of Vetruvius were being proliferated throughout academic fields and this is confirmed by Tatlow citing references from Johann Mattheson, “…whose clearest descriptions of compositional planning appear in Der Vollkommene Kapellemeister.” (1739)517

Tatlow explains that it is documented that both Bach and Mattheson were acquaintances of one another at various time periods and, “…in the absence of any statement by Bach on compositional planning, Mattheson’s formulations are important as they were based on contemporary compositional practices.”518

Tatlow states:

516 Tatlow, 2007, p. 38.
517 Ibid.
518 Ibid.
Mattheson’s most detailed description of compositional planning extends over three pages. His first recommendation to the Capellmeister [sic] is to sketch a composition, just as an architect draws up plans for a building.\textsuperscript{519}

Further citing Mattheson:

\textit{…order all the parts and details of a melody or of an entire melodic composition, just as you would design a house, making a sketch or plan to show where a room, a parlour, a chamber etc. should be placed.}”

(Mattheson, Capellmeister (1739).\textsuperscript{520}

Tatlow discusses Mattheson’s role in the theory and formulation of compositional planning:

\textit{Mattheson tells the composer to aim for similar proportions in all the parts, not only so that the composition is pleasing to the senses, but also so that it is durable. He describes how this can be done, although he is aware that it takes time.}\textsuperscript{521}

And:

\textit{Whoever wishes to use the method described above should outline his complete project on a sheet, sketch it roughly and arrange it in an orderly manner before he proceeds to the elaboration. In my humble opinion this is the best way of all to ensure that each part will demonstrate a specific

\textsuperscript{519} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{520} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{521} Ibid. p. 39.  
\textsuperscript{522} Ibid.}
proportion (Verhältniß), uniformity and agreement: for nothing in the world is more pleasing to the ear.\textsuperscript{523}

And:

*How could the composer do the equivalent and organise the exact dimensions within his piece of music, so that ‘each part may demonstrate a specific proportion’ (‘eine gewisse Verhältniß’)? This very clear direction would require specific measurements. The word Verhältniß was a mathematical term, as the eight columns of definitions in Zedler’s dictionary clearly show. When Mattheson used the word Verhältniß he meant a mathematical proportion, and his readers understood this. Forkel also used the word Verhältniß in his famous biography, when he described Bach’s method of composing.*\textsuperscript{524}

*Did Forkel and Mattheson understand the word Verhältniß to convey a specific unit of measurement? And if so, which unit of measurement did they have in mind? Was it the bar, or was it a unit of time or some other unit?*\textsuperscript{525}

Tatlow’s research into the numerical structure of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* is important because it enabled the formulation of a scientific theory based on the results of her findings. She describes her findings as demonstrating a

\textsuperscript{523} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{524} Ibid. p. 40.
\textsuperscript{525} Ibid.
“...remarkable series of proportions that exist concurrently at different constructional levels, numbered as proportion levels 1-5.”

Tatlow uses five levels of proportion to describe her numerical results, with Level 5 being the most complex and Level 1 being the least complex. These levels of proportion are detailed in Table 1 and Table 2.

---

526 Tatlow 2007, p. 47.
Table 1: Tatlow’s Five Levels of Proportion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 5</th>
<th>Proportion formed by two collections.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Proportion formed in the collection as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Proportion formed between two works in a collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Proportion formed between movements of a work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Proportion between sections of a movement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The levels found in the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* are as follows:

Table 2: Proportion Levels and Ratios Found in the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 5</th>
<th>2400:2400</th>
<th>1:1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>1600:800</td>
<td>2:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>408:816 and 272:408</td>
<td>1:2 and 2:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>136:136 and 136:272</td>
<td>1:1 and 1:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>There are no Level 1 proportions in the <em>Violin Sonatas and Partitas</em> i.e. there are no proportions between sections of a movement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the purpose of this thesis, it is the constructional levels that exist at proportion Level 4 – formed in the collection as a whole, and proportion Level 5 – formed between two collections that are of the most significance.

A Level 5 proportion is formed when a collection of Bach’s works has exactly the same, or exactly half, the number of bars as another collection.\(^{527}\) Tatlow explains that this Level 5 proportion exists between two of Bach’s important keyboard

collections, *Das Wohltemperirte Klavier* (BWV 846-869) and *Aufrichtige Anleitung* (BWV 772-801), which together comprise a total of 3120 bars, and the *Klavierubung I* and *Klavierubung II*, which together comprise a total of 3120 bars. These two collections, which both comprise the same number of bars, therefore form a ratio of 1:1, as they are “…united by an identical bar total, and in this sense are proportionally parallel.”

One unanticipated finding was the discovery of the same Level 5 proportion existing between the *Six Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas and Partitas* (BWV 1001–1006) and the *Six Accompanied Violin Sonatas* (BWV 1014-1019). Both of these collections were found to have an identical total of 2400 bars each, therefore forming another perfect 1:1 ratio at proportion Level 5.

Furthermore, the *Six Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas and Partitas* also have a Level 4 proportion identical to that of the *Six Accompanied Violin Sonatas*. A Level 4 proportion is formed between the collections as a whole. Therefore, a Level 4 (2:1) proportion in the *Six Accompanied Sonatas* is formed between the number of Sonatas (4:2) as well as between the numbers of bars in the collection 1600:800. Table 3 and Table 4 demonstrate the Level 4 Proportions formed in the collection of the *Six Unaccompanied Sonatas and Partitas* as a whole and the *Six Accompanied Sonatas* as a whole.

---

528 Ibid. p. 50.
529 Ibid. p. 51.
530 See Tatlow, 2015
### Table 3: Level 4 Proportions in the *Accompanied Violin Sonatas* (BWV 1014-1019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bars (No Repeats)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>S1 (Sonata in B minor)</strong></td>
<td>B 328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S2 (Sonata in A Major)</strong></td>
<td>A 419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S4 (Sonata in C minor)</strong></td>
<td>C 477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S6 (Sonata in G Major)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S3 (Sonata in E Major)</strong></td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S5 (Sonata in F minor)</strong></td>
<td>403 800 bars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4: Level 4 Proportions in the *Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas and Partitas* (BWV 1001-1006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bars (no repeats)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>S1 (Sonata in G minor)</strong></td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P1 (Partita in B minor)</strong></td>
<td>B 408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S2 (Sonata in A minor)</strong></td>
<td>A 396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S3 (Sonata in C major)</strong></td>
<td>C 524 1600 bars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P2 (Partita in D minor)</strong></td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P3 (Partita in E Major)</strong></td>
<td>388 800 bars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tatlow’s findings suggest the proportion levels discovered in Bach’s works may indicate a conscious manipulation of the bar structure so that the works manage to relate at the different levels of construction.

Tatlow observes:

For the Six sonatas (BWV 1014-1019) to have the same level 4 and 5 proportions as the Six solos [the Violin Sonatas and Partitas] (BWV 1001-1006), Bach would have had to make adjustments to only one of the works. We have no copies of a later version of the Six solos, whereas we have three different versions of the sixth (BWV 1019) of the Six sonatas. Although Bach first composed and performed the Six sonatas in Cöthen, he made a final revision of the collection at a later, unknown, date. The existence of earlier versions of the Six sonatas suggests that he may not originally have planned these two works to be companion pieces. The documented adjustments to the sixth sonata, however, were all that was required to manipulate the collection into a perfect companion for the Six solos.531

Tatlow goes on to say that similar proportions appear:

...in almost every work that Bach published or copied in fair hand, whereas they are rarely present in earlier versions. It seems therefore that the formation or proportions at these levels was part of Bach’s revision procedure for a final polished version.532

---

531 Tatlow 2007, p. 52.
532 Ibid.
Tatlow’s comment suggests that Bach published works only when they reached the established (specified/specific) proportions. No proportion levels are found to exist within Kellner’s incomplete manuscript of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas for example, as they appear in the final revisions of Bach’s collections.

As such, Tatlow suggests they may represent “…an indication of the composer striving to recreate perfection or beauty.”

Once the proportion levels in a final version of a work, or collection of works was achieved, copyists would then be well aware of the number of bars they were copying, allowing them to reproduce a perfect replication of the original source.

Tatlow also states that her findings, “…indicate that creating overall balance and proportion through the bar structure was part of Bach’s everyday technique.”

The main issue that emerges from the study is whether or not these proportion levels exist as a result of analytical design, or if they are simply the result or ‘by-product’ of the compositional process.

Despite this uncertainty, Tatlow says it is difficult to explain why, “…at least two levels of proportion exist in all of Bach’s published works and at least two levels of proportion exist in the majority of the works that he transcribed into fair copy.”

533 Ibid. p. 55.
534 Ibid. p. 53.
535 Ibid. p. 56.
Tatlow goes on to state, “…the majority of works surviving in autograph revision and compositional scores [Kellner’s for example] lack these two levels of proportions.”

If it were proven that Bach consciously designed his levels of proportion, it would explain which scores Bach had finally revised to a degree he deemed worthy of publication and/or live performance.

It is apparent that no such numerical structures are present in the Cello Suites, to the levels that exist in the Violin Sonatas and Partitas.

Tatlow then concludes:

Many scholars have surmised that Bach intended there to be a Libro Secondo to his Libro Primo, the Six Solos. It is usually thought that the Cello Suites (BWV 1007 – 1012) were designed to be that second collection.

Interestingly, Anna Magdalena’s copy of the cello suites does not contain the numerical characteristics of a finally revised collection, nor does the numerical structure bear any resemblance to the six solos for violin. In view of this lack of structural resemblance, and in the light of the parallel structure with the Six Solos, I would like to propose that it is the six [accompanied] sonatas (BWV 1014- 1019) rather than the cello suites that merit the title Libro Secondo.

---

536 Ibid.
537 See Tatlow 2007, p. 57.
538 See Tatlow 2015, where the numerical structure of the Cello Suites is discussed in greater detail.
539 On the basis of the title page of the copy Anna Magdalena Bach supposedly made for Schwanenberger (MS P 268) on which she ascribes the subtitle ‘Pars 1’ to the Six Solos and ‘Pars 2’ to the Six Cello Suites.
This supports the evidence that the *Cello Suites* were not originally intended to be Libro Secondo, and that the *Six Unaccompanied Sonatas and Partitas* and *Six Accompanied Sonatas* may have been intended to form a Level 5 proportion as a whole collection. This discovery by Tatlow may in fact be the missing piece of evidence needed to establish the rightful composer of the *Cello Suites*, given that by the time these pieces were written, Bach was already working to a specific formula and adhering strictly to his proportional guidelines with every composition he created.

Tatlow's research provides another clue into the compositional process of Bach, but it is the conclusions reached as a result of comparing the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* with the *Six Accompanied Sonatas* that is most interesting. Tatlow not only discovers that a Level 5 (1:1) proportion is formed between these works but that “…the Six sonatas also have a level four proportion identical to that in the Six solos: the level four 2:1 proportion in the Six sonatas is formed between the number of sonatas (4:2) as well as between the number of bars in the collection 1600:800.”

4.8 Tatlow, R. 2007, *When the Theorists Are Silent*.

Tatlow provides further literary publication on the analytical process of Bach and historically informed analytical techniques. Tatlow explores the features of the score, which could be measured (counted) in order to form proportions. According to Tatlow, a unit of measure was defined by the bar. Tatlow describes:

---

541 Tatlow 2007, p. 51.
The best historical statements I could find were by Praetorius and by Mizler, both of whom described a method to estimate the duration of sacred works, and both of whom used the number of bars as the unit of measurement.\textsuperscript{543}

Tatlow states:

\textit{In Bach’s time in Leipzig, the duration of the music in the main Sunday morning service was a matter of concern to both clergy and musicians. It was important that the music and liturgy at the beginning of the service were timed so that the sermon could begin at the stroke of 8 o’clock.}\textsuperscript{544}

\textit{Praetorius reckoned that in average metre, 80 tempora (bars) would last half of quarter of an hour, 160 tempora fifteen minutes, 320 tempora thirty minutes and so on.}\textsuperscript{545}

Mizler provides an alternate timing measure by bar:

\textit{From experience one can determine the length of a cantata, so that 350 bars, of any metre, will last approximately 25 minutes, which is long enough in winter, although in summer it could be 8 – 10 minutes longer and be roughly 400 bars long. But it’s my opinion that a composer should think more about the music or movement, bringing it in to beautiful order, rather than about the time. It should not depend on specific minutes.}\textsuperscript{546}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{543} Ibid. p. 205.
\item \textsuperscript{544} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{545} Tatlow, 2015, p. 118.
\item \textsuperscript{546} Tatlow 2007, p. 41.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Tatlow states:

*Mizler’s equation shows that the bar and minute were used as units of measurement, although he considered that creating beautiful order in a composition was more important than exact timing. Coming immediately after the announcement of Bach’s contribution of the Canon BWV 1076, the positioning of this quotation in the Musikalischer Bibliotech suggests that these guidelines also came from Bach.*

Early working versions and copies of Bach’s works indicate, that while the bar was used as the standard unit of measure, high level proportional parallelism exists only in his transcription of final fair copies or publications by Bach himself. This indicates he consciously manipulated the number or bars in collections to create proportion and parallelism across his FFCs. Tatlow demonstrates the proportion levels of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* (as) and states:

*This cannot have happened by chance. In order to achieve these specific proportions, Bach must have planned and sketched the numerical order for each part, just as Mattheson had described.*

Tatlow then discusses the Level 5 proportion formed between the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* and the *Six [Accompanied] Sonatas* (as detailed earlier in this thesis), and concludes:

---

*547 Ibid. p. 206.
548 Detailed earlier in this thesis pp. 151-162.
549 Ibid. p. 209.
There is no evidence to suggest that Bach planned this [proportional parallelism] at an early stage. It was as Bach revised the Six sonatas that he decided to make the two collections numerically related.550

And:

It quickly became clear that parallel proportions are a feature of all the collections that Bach published or wrote in fair copy. Perfect proportions were a feature of Bach’s finally revised versions, and not of his early sketches.551

With regard to Mattheson’s references to proportions in his thirty-three guidelines, Tatlow suggests:

Many readers had missed the significance of Matheson’s references to proportion…partly because of a misleading translation of the word Verhältniß and Verhält.4552

Further:

…it was the key word Verhältniß that had changed its shade of meaning. It has been translated as relation and relationship, which is the modern, general meaning of the word. However, it is clear from the thirty-four entries for definitions of Verhältniß in Zedlers Lexicon (1732 – 1754) that it was used exclusively as a mathematical term at that time and meant a

550 Ibid. p. 209.
552 Ibid. The term “Verhält” means to “act in a particular manner.” In this particular context the translation could be interpreted as “manner.”
literal 1:1, 1:2, etc. proportion…When Mattheson used the word Verhältniß he meant a mathematical proportion. His readers in 1739 understood this and the analyst today must also understand this.\textsuperscript{553}

Tatlow’s research, demonstrating that a series of parallel proportion levels are found to exist in Bach’s compositions at different constructional levels, provides clear evidence of structure and mathematical proportions within his works. It does not prove however, whether or not these mathematical proportions occur as a result of Bach’s deliberate manuscript design, or whether they occur as a function (or by-product) of the composition itself.

By-product or not, it clearly gives Tatlow some pause for thought. She states, “Having seen the levels of proportion in the Six Solos I now have to ask whether Bach’s contemporaries knew all along that Bach ordered his compositions in this way”\textsuperscript{554}

Tatlow cites Mattheson’s recommendation that a composer, like an architect to draw up a well-proportioned ground plan the use of proportions in music required specific measurements.\textsuperscript{555} She states:

\begin{quote}
Certain measurements were obvious. For example, the composer could decide to have six movements in a work, or six works in a collection...how could the composer do the equivalent and organise the exact dimensions within his piece of music, so that ‘each part may
\end{quote}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{553} Ibid. p. 214.
\textsuperscript{554} Tatlow 2007, p. 58.
\textsuperscript{555} Ibid. p. 39.
\textsuperscript{556} Ibid.
\end{flushright}
demonstrate a specific proportion’…This very clear direction would require specific measurements.\textsuperscript{557}

\subsection*{4.9 \textit{Tatlow, R. 2015 Bach’s Numbers}\textsuperscript{558}}

Tatlow’s (2015) work confirms the previous research undertaken into parallel proportions. She states:

\begin{quote}
\textit{At its most basic, the theory of parallel proportionalism [sic] shows that Bach created layers of 1:1 and 1:2 proportions...in all the collections and multi-movement works that Bach revised for publication.}\textsuperscript{559}
\end{quote}

Tatlow states that many of the previous observations made by Bach scholars into the architecture of his designs, “their symmetry, order, organisation, connection and proportion...can now be confirmed empirically by parallel proportionalism.”\textsuperscript{560}

The concept of perfection as it relates to unison and thereby the 1:1 ration is discussed.

\begin{quote}
\textit{“The unity and the unison of the 1:1 proportion had become the ultimate expression of both equality and perfection.”}
\end{quote}

\subsubsection*{4.9.1 Three collections for strings}

In her investigation into parallel proportions contained within Bach’s completed works, Tatlow groups the \textit{Violin Sonatas and Partitas}, the \textit{Six Cello Suites} and the

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{557} Ibid. \\
\textsuperscript{558} Tatlow, R. 2015, \textit{Bach’s Numbers}, Cambridge University Press, UK \\
\textsuperscript{559} Ibid. p. 6. \\
\textsuperscript{560} Ibid.
\end{flushleft}
Six Sonatas for Violin and Harpsichord together, stating that Bach’s collection of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas is “…a textbook case of proportional parallelism,” and that, “…the neatness of Bach’s autograph score leaves no doubt that he was copying from a now lost original.”

Tatlow stays well within the traditional understanding of the works, further stating:

The [Six Solos] attracted at least two commissions. In 1726 Johann Peter Kellner…copied an early five-solo version of the collection; and sometime between 1727 and 1731, Bach’s second wife, Anna Magdalena, transcribed the Six Solos and the Cello Suites…for Georg Friedrich Schwanenberger, who himself make a single title page for the set of two collections.

4.10 Drawing up the manuscript – the copyist’s role.

Tatlow (2007; 2015) states:

In order to make an accurate copy of a score, the composer or copyist had to be aware of the number of bars in a movement. The number of bars would help the copyist both to make an economic disposition of the bars on a page and to ensure that the original and the copy were identical. In scores and parts of this period there are many examples of the copyist recording the bar count at the bottom of a page, or at the end of a movement.
Tatlow suggests that Bach and his copyists frequently counted the number of bars in movements, “...paper was expensive and economy was desirable even when it was not a necessity.”\textsuperscript{564} Copying errors were costly and needed to be avoided. Knowledge of the length of the composition, the number of bars per page and per stave, avoided costly errors and ensured the copy was exact. For example, bar numbers appear in three movements in the autograph score of the B minor Mass. These numbers show that Bach and his copyists were conscious of the cumulative total of bars in a movement.

A comparison of Anna Magdalena’s manuscript with the FFC indicates an overall lack of awareness of the number of bars per stave and per page of the original manuscript she apparently copied. This is at odds with other sources, for example, Sources C and L, where a strict adherence to the FFC has been observed.\textsuperscript{565}

\textbf{4.11 Matters of logistics and industry}

It is plausible that in addition to meeting the criteria for harmonic perfection, the concept of compositional planning also solved some apparent logistical issues. Bach was at the mercy of the patronage system. As such he was “…faced with the pressure of cranking out a fresh Cantata every Sunday. And with his wife and sons lined up to copy parts and fill out Bach’s harmonies...the sheer industry of his art becomes clear.”\textsuperscript{566}

\textsuperscript{564} Tatlow 2015, p. 120.
\textsuperscript{565} This is discussed in detail in Chapter VI of this thesis ‘Manuscript Comparison’ p. 215.
To meet the demands, a “rational and consistent” system was required. Bach needed his compositions to be perfect. Clark describes his process of composition as being, “...[a] self generative process, like canons and fugues, once triggered, [which] had to slot together and move forward with the architectural logic of a subway map...Bach was a servant writing music for the Glory of God,” but there was no time for “unpicking, correcting or finessing.” It is not beyond the realms of possibility that composers called on their students to undertake a composition once the design was in place.

Clark suggests that while some mathematical proportions simply occur naturally as a by-product of a piece of music, others are too complicated to be an “artificial construct.”

With regard to the concept of proportion levels, British conductor and Bach scholar, Christopher Hogwood, is of the opinion that:

> A number system is a tremendous aid to composers who don’t want to spoil the form of something; artists and architects rely on golden means and Fibonacci series calculations, and composers are no different...apart from in one way. Pure proportion with nothing else would be a dull piece of music...It’s pleasing to realise something so well-proportioned that it is aesthetically a work of art. But if a piece were to overshoot the Fibonacci series by one bar, I’m not certain that would worry most people.570

---

568 Ibid.
569 Ibid.
570 Ibid.
It does appear, however, to concern Bach. This is evidenced in his arrangement of the Preludio from the *E Major Partita for Lute* (BWV 1006a), which contains a total of 139 bars. In order to create the proportion levels, which exist in the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas*, it would appear that Bach has manipulated the ending of the Preludio to ensure it totals 138 bars. Reducing this movement by one bar thus provides a perfect Level 3, 4 and 5 proportion. This was not necessary, however, for the Lute arrangement and a less abrupt ending of the piece was composed to end on a perfect cadence. An examination of the ending of both the E major Preludio and the arrangement for Lute appears to indicate therefore, a willingness on Bach’s part to compromise the musical integrity of the work in favour of the achievement of levels of proportion. If this is the case he does not share the view of either Mizler or Hogwood.

![Figure 7: Bar 138 of the E Major Preludio (BWV 1006)](image)

![Figure 8: Bars 138 & 139 of the E Major Preludio Arrangement for Lute (BWV 1006a)](image)

Perhaps the simplest way of proving this is to look at Kellner’s manuscript, considered to be an earlier working version of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas*. As a work in progress it lacks proportions at every level. Therefore, it is highly probable that Kellner’s manuscript represents an earlier draft, which was
continually revised and refined before Bach's perfect levels of parallel proportions were reached. Did he draw up his manuscript outline in 1720, “...sketch it roughly and arrange it in an orderly manner”\textsuperscript{571} before passing it on to Kellner as an exercise in compositional structure and proportions? Did Anna Magdalena then collaborate with Kellner and under the watchful eye of Bach, add in the dance movements and missing sections? When this was done and Bach's parallel proportion levels were reached, and thus musical perfection achieved, did Bach then copy out the collaborative efforts of Kellner and Anna Magdalena and sign off on the works with “Soli Deo Sit Gloria”.

Although this up-front manuscript design cannot be proven, other references to structure and patterns in addition to Mattheson's guidelines (of which Bach would most certainly be aware,) further support this. One of these comes from Bach himself where, as mentioned previously, in his re-writing of Niedt’s \textit{Rules and Instructions for Playing Thorough Bass and Accompaniment in Four Parts}, he states:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Figured Bass is the most perfect foundation of music. It is executed with both hands in such a manner that the left hand plays the notes written down and the right hand adds consonances and dissonances. The result is an agreeable harmony to the Glory of God and the justifiable gratification of the senses. For the sole aim and reason the figured bass, as with all music, should be nothing other than God’s Glory and pleasant recreations.}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{571} Tatlow 2007, p. 39.
Where this is not kept in mind there can be no true music, but only an infernal scraping and bawling.\textsuperscript{572}

Tomita (2007) also states, (quoting Wolff):

\begin{quote}
When considering the circumstances of the origin of WTC 2, it is crucial to take into account the fact that at the time Bach had several exceptionally able students who later became some of the most influential figures in the history of Western music... This suggests that the collection evolved from Bach's gathering together of teaching material for his students. Indeed, eleven movements out of forty-eight in WTC 2—which amounts to nearly a quarter of the entire collection—are known to have predecessors in the form of early [student?] versions, and undoubtedly many more originated in early versions that are yet to be discovered.\textsuperscript{573}
\end{quote}

In summary, it is conceivable that the manuscript of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas was designed by Bach with the proportion levels decided upon by him. These were then outsourced as a compositional exercise. In the next chapter the three manuscripts are compared in order to seek evidence, if it exists, to support the hypothesis stated above.

\textsuperscript{572} Herz 1946, p. 127.  
\textsuperscript{573} Tomita, 2007.
5.1 Bach handwriting scholarship - background

When Bach scholarship formally began in the 1950s, “...much of what was written was not rigorous scholarship or research as it would now be defined today.”

Methods used at this time to determine handwriting, chronology and authenticity were a comparison of clef forms and accidentals. In 1957 Georg von Dadelsen validated Walter Emery’s earlier work of 1953 and developed a more extended methodology of identifying Anna Magdalena’s music calligraphy.

In 1985 Dadelsen examined the 1725 Notebook for Anna Magdalena Bach and added to this earlier analysis by using the construction and positioning of accidentals, clef forms and the positioning of the accolade brackets to determine authorship. Importantly, Dadelsen identified the Hakenform ‘C’ clef and asserted Bach first used this in 1723. This was then used as a dating method to track Bach’s later works.

Figure 9: Shows the three clef forms identified by Dadelsen. Number 2 (the Hakenform)

---

576 See 1725 Notebook for Anna Magdalena Bach ‘Afterword’.
Yoshitake Kobayashi (1989), using the techniques and characteristics identified by Emery and Dadelsen further observed extreme variability of the music styles of his manuscripts. No explanation was given for these sudden, erratic changes.\textsuperscript{577}

Other Bach scholars assumed that the writings and music were Bach’s based purely on the handwriting on the title page.\textsuperscript{578} This appears to be the accepted position of the \textit{Violin Sonatas and Partitas}. Vogt (1981) was the first to examine the handwriting of the title page of the FFC dated 1720 and determined it was in Bach’s hand.\textsuperscript{579} From this assessment the assumption was made, and which has remained until now, that Bach wrote the music contained within. There has been no subsequent investigation into this to confirm Vogt’s findings, until Jarvis determined that the writing of the title page of the Autograph did not match the writing in the body of the works.\textsuperscript{580} Although many scholars studied and researched Bach’s handwriting, none of them were based on any scientific method to determine authenticity of Bach’s works. As such, it should be considered nothing more than partially educated conjecture.

It would appear, that new techniques available to determine authenticity of Bach’s works have not been widely examined. In light of the science of FDE, previous research into Bach’s handwriting highlights some significant flaws when examined against the principle of FDE.

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{577} See Jarvis 2007.
  \item \textsuperscript{578} See Jarvis 2010, “The Music Calligraphy of Johann Sebastian and Anna Magdalena Bach”.
  \item \textsuperscript{579} See Vogt 1981.
  \item \textsuperscript{580} See Jarvis 2010.
\end{itemize}
5.2 The principles of Forensic Document (Handwriting) Examination

The main principles of FDE are as follows:

- *Forensic Document Examination is the study of physical evidence, and physical evidence cannot lie.* - Roy A. Huber

- *Handwriting is a product of the brain’s control over bodily movements, in particular the translation of movement by the arm and fingers to a writing implement... these complex movements stem from ‘motor programs’ or ‘motor memories’ within the brain.* - Dr Bryan Found

- *The final conclusion on any...questioned document is based on individual habit patterns, and habit patterns can manifest themselves in every aspect of writing... As every person has certain habits, so does he project certain habits when he puts writing on paper.* - Doris M. Williamson

- *Years of experience have taught me that if there is a single thing wrong in a document, then that document is strongly suspect and should be subject to searing, highly critical examination.* - Charles Hamilton

- *The wide range of variation found for each letter of the alphabet between different writers, the presence in many writings of unusual forms, the number of characters present in writings being compared, means that the chances of finding a match between all the features in combination must be very remote or impossible.* - David Ellen

---

Writing is a conscious act...made up of innumerable subconscious, habitual patterns or mannerisms [and] Only one person writes exactly the same way as the writer of the disputed material. This is the cornerstone of every identification. -Ordway Hilton\textsuperscript{586}

The principles of handwriting identification are based on basic scientific truths about handwriting. The first and foremost of these scientific truths is that no two people write exactly alike in an extended handwriting sample. The use of a signature in legal and financial transactions is possible because unique characteristics in an individual’s handwriting distinguish it from every other handwriting. This principle enables document examiners to differentiate genuine and non-genuine writing and to identify the author of a sample of handwriting.

In summary then:

Failure to follow certain basic principles underlying forensic handwriting evaluations is very likely to result in erroneous conclusions or false positives. While there are many potential sources of error, including methodological and psychological ones, this thesis addresses just three specific ones that appear to have become more frequent in recent experience: (1) failure to give proper weight to differences, (2) failure to consider crucial writing movement characteristics; and (3) using self-serving exemplars.


Calvert is one of the few forensic document examiners to publish such work on music manuscripts. Calvert demonstrates that the “…principles and procedures for examining and comparing a musical score are the same as those employed in making a hand-printing identification.” In the article stated above, Calvert successfully argues that the principles of forensic handwriting identification apply equally to the circumstance of handwritten music manuscript and any copies made thereafter. Calvert’s hypothesis is supported later by the work of Found and Rogers (1999), that handwriting habits, once formed, are deeply ingrained in motor memories in the brain, and, because of the complexity and

---

587 This also includes failure to give proper weight to similarities, as per the Principle of Common Error.
590 Ibid. p. 619.
591 See Found & Rogers 1999.
variation in forms used by a given scribe these habits will betray the writer throughout time. 592

These principles were considered when comparing Source A with Sources B, C, D, and so on.

5.4 Why the handwriting analysis of some Bach scholars may be flawed

When applying the scientific method of FDE, a number of significant issues arise with the previous research undertaken:

The assumed 'Known' manuscripts, which were themselves used to judge further authenticity of Bach's works, may not themselves have been correct. The finding by Vogt (1981), which determined the manuscript of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas was in Bach's hand, was based purely on the identification of the handwriting on the title page – namely the signature, which he deemed to be that of Bach. The FFC has then been used as a 'Known' exemplar of Bach's music calligraphy. In the absence of any further research, all future handwriting observations were based around this presupposition. This contradicts the forensic scientific principle that 'Knowns' must be able to be proved as such. In other words, until the FFC can be established as an absolute certainly that it is entirely in Bach's hand it cannot be used as a 'Standard.' 594

There must be an intra-comparison of the writings to determine that they are internally consistent and of common authorship. Bach scholars have never noted

---

593 The term 'Known' is the standard method of referring to exemplars documents or writings of given scribes. The term 'Questioned' is the standard for referring to documents that are under examination.
594 Once an exemplar is proved to be by a certain scribe, it can then be applied as a 'Standard' to judge other exemplars.
the handwriting inconsistencies of the FFC, which were identified by Jarvis (2010). The fact that Bach scholars have not been able to identify these inconsistencies using the previous traditional approach would seem to indicate that the more recent method of FDE is more reliable.

Kobayashi notes “extreme variability of the music calligraphy style of Bach which he explained as the result of hand strokes changing over time.”  This contradicts the following principle, which states, “…that once a writer has reached the permanent condition of automatic writing, he has reached graphic maturity. From this time, only subtle changes may continue to take place. It will decline as the ageing process reduces one’s skill level.”

Scholarship to date has been based on the fact that the writer of the clefs or time signatures is necessarily the scribe of the entire work. With respect to Point One raised above, scholars have presumed an identification of a work, based on the clef and time signatures. Therefore, if the clef and time signatures were characteristic of Bach, it followed that the music calligraphy was, therefore, that of Bach. This has been proven to not always be the case.

5.5 Kobayashi, Y. 1989 The Neue Bach Ausgabe

The evolution towards the discovery of Anna Magdalena’s handwriting in some of Bach’s music began, according to author Kobayashi, with unclear and contradictory opinions, from various sources as to whom the handwriting in

596 Jarvis 2010.
597 See Chapter V (5.2) p. 176 of this thesis.
question should be allocated. Until scholars began to investigate the handwriting of Anna Magdalena more thoroughly, this lack of clarity emerged not from any sort of evidence base, but “...more from the endearing picture of an indeed Bach-like, but nevertheless, feminine handwriting.”

It was not until Walter Emery made the fundamental observation that there was writing similar to Bach’s in the “London Autograph of the Well-Tempered Clavier Part 2,” (also known as the London 48), that this was hypothetically assigned to Anna Magdalena. Using well-chosen facsimiles, Emery compared the characteristic forms of this music writing with the writing forms of Bach’s and noted that the segments in question in his investigation of the London 48, came from the same writer as the 1725 Notebook P225 and from the Organ Sonata P272, whom he presumed to be Anna Magdalena.

The similarity, or “close togetherness” of the writing, (when a second writer appears), in addition to the varying and contradictory views held by Bach scholars of the handwriting characteristics of Anna Magdalena, made it necessary “...to obtain clues for a more reliable critique of the allocations up until now.”

---

599 Ibid. Jarvis 2007 states, “There is no definitive proof in Forensic Science of such a concept as feminine handwriting. The issue of gender differences in handwriting has been researched a great deal with inconclusive results. However, Middleton’s study [identified]...10 reasons influencing judgements of the...200 judges (100 male). Of those 10, most importantly, are: 1. A woman’s writing is neater, 3. A woman’s writing is prettier, 10. Men press harder on the pen than women. Starch found that females are superior to males in quality and slightly superior in speed though the differences were found to be small, [however]...As a diagnostic tool that fails in 1 out of 4 cases...[it is] of use in only a limited extent. It is safe only, therefore, to conclude that it is slightly more than likely that Anna Magdalena used a lighter pen-stroke, and had neater and prettier handwriting that Johann Sebastian.” p. 94.

600 The work of Emery and Dadelsen, in particular, is of central importance. It is on the basis of their work, that it was established that there are characteristics of another writer’s music-calligraphy within the manuscripts of Johann Sebastian (whom they identify as Anna Magdalena). The Table of Emery formed the starting point of handwriting investigations.


602 Ibid.
In order to do this, Anna Magdalena’s handwriting was compared against what was considered to be the following "solid evidence" of her writing:

After discussion and comparison of these handwriting sources, it is determined that Anna Magdalena is the writer of some of the 1725 Notebook for Anna Magdalena, the Violin Sonatas and Partitas P 268 and the Cello Suites P 269. Therefore, Emery’s early conjectures “...are confirmed in every way.”

However:

It is still to be proved that the writer of the text referred to from P 225 (the Notebook for Anna Magdalena 1725) also wrote the music belonging to it, for it is known that in Bach’s circle there are numerous instances for the opposite – that the music and text come from two different writers.

Kobayashi is of the opinion therefore that the “...music writing of Anna Magdalena can be separated with some relative certainty from other handwritings and also from that of Johann Sebastian Bach,” and that to do this one needs only to look at the “...table of Emery, which offers the best comparison of the handwriting of Johann Sebastian and Anna Magdalena.”

Kobayashi notes that the handwriting in Anna Magdalena’s fair copy, “...noticeably imitates the best writing of Johann Sebastian, which differs clearly from the sketchy concept writing, and can very closely approach the example.”

---

604 Ibid.
605 Ibid. p. 31.
607 Ibid. p. 31.
608 Ibid.
This statement implies there are two different kinds of writing that Bach uses, (best writing and sketchy concept writing). Kobayashi does not state, however, which sources were used to determine either writing form. This remains problematic when the best writing exemplars themselves are still in question as to their authenticity. Kobayashi states:

*Her striking characteristics may be compiled briefly. We refer once again to the Table of Emery which offers the best comparison of handwriting of Johann Sebastian and Anna Magdalena. Besides that, since enough material is available in some easily accessible facsimile editions for comparison, further illustrations can be dispensed with.*

He suggests that in the fair copy Anna Magdalena:

*...basically reconstructs his [Bach’s] writing in an individual way. Thus she uses, at least since 1725, her own definite form of the C clef, from which she now and then deviates, to the relevant clef form of Bach...and that ...again and again we find copies which begin with imitation of Bach’s clef forms, however with ongoing work, the individual signs more or less quickly re-establish.*

Kobayashi draws the following conclusions about Anna Magdalena’s music calligraphy:

---

609 Ibid.
610 By this I presume him to mean the fair copy of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas.
611 Ibid.
1. The accolade brace is in the upper extension, somewhat more strongly domed and reaches further over the system as its example. Its point shows horizontally to the left and not, as often with Bach, to the lower left.

2. The relatively thick, rounded heads of downward stemmed, filled in notes are conspicuous. The stem there is usually pulled out of the middle of the note head, and in fact vertically downward. Bach on the corresponding case, roughly from 1725 on, pulls the stem as a rule from the left side of the head.

3. The note stems themselves are usually thinner with Anna Magdalena than with Bach.

4. With downward directed stems of half notes, Anna Magdalena always begins on the right side of the note, whereas Bach, at least from 1720 on (and particularly in the fair copy) puts the stems in the middle lower half of the note head or still further to the left at their deepest point.\textsuperscript{612}

Kobayashi also suggests that there are “…two clear time related steps”\textsuperscript{613} distinguishable in Anna Magdalena’s writing; her natural signs and the positioning of the bass clef to the accolade bracket. In her earlier copies “…the middle field of the natural sign is closed and in the later, opened. In the earlier period the bass clef stands on the right near the accolade next to the accolade bracket; in the later it cuts as a rule.”\textsuperscript{614}

Further, Kobayashi states:

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{612} This statement is refuted in this investigation. Examples will be presented in Chapter VI which clearly contradict this statement.
\item \textsuperscript{613} Ibid. p. 33.
\item \textsuperscript{614} Ibid.
\end{itemize}
...as this happens so consistently, one has a good aid to the first dating of the hand in question. The transition from the early form of the natural sign to the later may well have taken place between mid-1733 and the end of 1734 but that the...younger form of the bass clef cutting the accolade bracket apparently enters somewhat later than the use of the younger form of the natural sign.\textsuperscript{615}

Within this early stage her writings exist on two levels and can therefore be separated further, “...particularly in the way of writing single downward stemmed eighth notes: in the early form the stem is drawn to the lower left out of the note head merging therewith into the feather/hook.”\textsuperscript{616} However they contradict this statement by saying that “...this form also occurs in fact in the later copies, particularly with hurried writing”\textsuperscript{617} but besides that a second hand enters “...approximately from 1730 – 1732 [when the stem is] ...drawn from the note head vertically downwards, the feather then, is more or less fixed pointed.”\textsuperscript{618}

\textbf{5.6 Jarvis, M. 2007 'Did Johann Sebastian Bach Write the Cello Suites?’}

Jarvis’ (2007) PhD thesis centres on the compositional origin of the Cello Suites whose authorship has traditionally been accepted as being the work of Bach. No autograph manuscript, however, exists of these works – only what is traditionally accepted as being a copy by Anna Magdalena. Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the Cello Suites exists in a ‘double’ manuscript along with her manuscript of the

\textsuperscript{615} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{616} Ibid. p. 34.
\textsuperscript{617} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{618} Ibid. p. 34. It should be noted that Emery and Dadelsen were not trained forensic document examiners and as such their assertions regarding matters of handwriting development must be taken in that context.
Violin Sonatas and Partitas. Jarvis states, “...it is the traditionally accepted view that Anna Magdalena Bach copied both the Violin Sonatas and Partitas and the Six Cello Suites from, in the former case, the supposed ‘1720 Autograph’ and, in the latter case, a missing Cello Suite ‘Autograph.’”

Through detailed forensic handwriting analysis, and a comparative study of the Cello Suites with other Bach Partitas and Suites (violin, keyboard, lute and flute), Jarvis demonstrates that there is strong circumstantial evidence to suggest that Bach was not the principle composer, but that Anna Magdalena is more likely the principle composer of the Cello Suites. Jarvis’s study into the Cello Suites also involved an examination of the three extant manuscripts of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas dealt with in this thesis, as the two collections are so closely linked. Jarvis discusses the timeline ambiguity between Kellner’s ‘working draft’, stating:

> Clearly it is improbable that Peter Kellner prepared his manuscript copy from the ‘1720 Autograph’ as his version is distinctly different. This creates somewhat of a conundrum as Peter Kellner’s manuscript is dated ‘1726’.

> This conundrum has, not surprisingly, given rise to disagreement amongst scholars regarding the authenticity/provenance of Kellner’s manuscript.

Additionally, during his study into the Cello Suites, Jarvis discovered certain anomalies between the manuscripts of Bach, Kellner and Anna Magdalena within the Violin Sonatas and Partitas. This led to Jarvis’s (2008) article, ‘Is the ‘1720 Autograph of the Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas and Partitas what it purports to

620 Jarvis 2007, p. 256.
where he discusses the traditional view of these works but offers possible forensic evidence of Anna Magdalena’s involvement in the manuscript of the FFC. Jarvis points to the unlikely incredible similarity of the handwriting which is noted to be consistent within both copies, which, given their age gap of 16 years, should have resulted in notable differences in their respective handwriting and music calligraphy styles. He offers forensic evidence to suggest Anna Magdalena’s involvement in the preparation of the manuscript.

Figures 10 and 11 indicate the striking similarity of the music calligraphy of the two manuscripts, traditionally by Johann Sebastian and Anna Magdalena. The example at the top is attributed to Bach and the example underneath is attributed to Anna Magdalena.

---

Figure 10: Music calligraphy. Top considered to be by Bach’s hand, Bottom: considered Anna Magdalena’s hand.

---


622 No two people write exactly the same. Handwriting patterns are usually well established by a certain age and changing these habitual patterns (to mimic another’s, as has been suggested in the case of Anna Magdalena and Bach, for example) is generally not possible, as individual handwriting characteristics and traits will always emerge over an extended period of time.
Unlike the *Cello Suites*, the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* exist in two complete manuscript versions and one incomplete. One such completed version is accepted as being in the hand of Bach, and the other accepted as being in the hand of Anna Magdalena. Jarvis states that a casual glance shows both manuscripts appear to be written in the same hand.\(^{623}\) as shown in Figure 11. He explains that errors in Anna Magdalena’s version indicate that hers was copied from a source different from the FFC.\(^ {624}\) In addition, there are times when Anna Magdalena’s manuscript deviates from the supposed Autograph (FFC) but matches the incomplete copy of Johann Peter Kellner.\(^ {625}\)

The long held view is that Anna Magdalena became so good at copying her husband’s work that it is almost impossible to tell them apart, but in fact, a direct comparison of other works she copied, such as the 1725 Notebook for Anna Magdalena show that her music handwriting is quite easily distinguishable from that of Johann Sebastian.

---

\(^{623}\) Jarvis 2007, p. 222.

\(^{624}\) This is now also considered to be the case with the *Cello Suites*. See Szabo, 2015.

\(^{625}\) Jarvis 2007, p. 253. These differences are also shown in chapter VI of this thesis p. 215.
Figure 12 following, the handwriting on top is by Bach and on the bottom by Anna Magdalena.

![Figure 12: Handwriting Styles – Music calligraphy (Fifth Cello Suite/Lute Suite version)](image)

Bach’s handwriting top, Anna Magdalena’s, bottom.

After providing examples of Anna Magdalena’s penmanship in other works and comparing them to that of Bach, Jarvis concludes that the music calligraphy of the supposed Autograph version of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas has more in common with the handwriting traits of Anna Magdalena than Bach. He thus concludes “...there now appears to be very strong evidence of her substantial involvement in the production of that manuscript.”\(^{626}\) By tradition, Anna Magdalena and Bach had not even met in 1720. Jarvis’ forensic evidence, however, also demonstrates that they had already met many years earlier and certainly by the year 1713, probably at Weimar and therefore seven years prior to the traditionally accepted date. Most tellingly, her handwriting is also in the 1720 Notebook for Wilhelm Friedemann.

---

\(^{626}\) Jarvis 2007, p. 229.
Jarvis concludes with the prospect that the presence of Anna Magdalena’s handwriting and music calligraphy within the FFC can only be explained “...if the sequence of the chronology of the manuscripts is different from the traditional position. That is to say, that the Autograph was completed after both Kellner’s copy (dated 1726) and Anna Magdalena’s undated manuscript.” Jarvis suggests that the virtuosic music missing from Kellner’s manuscript was added later for Anna Magdalena’s benefit, as he contends that she was probably a fine violinist—the violinist for whom both the Accompanied Sonatas and the Unaccompanied Sonatas and Partitas were composed. With regards to the articulation/bowing markings which differ so markedly from Anna Magdalena’s manuscript and the FFC of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas, Jarvis proposes a different theory, from the widely held view that this was a result of Anna Magdalena’s lack of knowledge of string playing.

Instead, Jarvis states:

*If Anna Magdalena Bach’s manuscript of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas is not actually a copy of the ‘1720 Autograph’, then it is plausible that what is in her version of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas represents only a sketch of the intended articulation and that is why it is rough and ambiguous. Anna’s manuscript might then form the intervening stage before the final version of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas. This would explain the divergence in the 1st Movement of the G minor Sonata and the Sarabande*

---

628 Robert Marshall, Personal Communication to Jarvis 3 September 2004 “The best guess, surely, is the violin.”
of the D minor Partita and the fact that her manuscript was devoid of titles, until they were added in later by Schwanenberger.\footnote{Jarvis 2007, p. 337.}
5.7 Jarvis, M. 2010, “The Music Calligraphy of Johann Sebastian and Anna Magdalena Bach.”

In this article, Jarvis argues that the previous methodologies used by Bach scholars to separate the music calligraphy of Bach and Anna Magdalena such as Emery, Dadelsen and Kobayashi is in fact, flawed, from a FDE perspective. He provides the following reasons:

*...independent verification of their authenticity. In the case of the FFC of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas, for instance, Bach scholars have not noted in their published work that there are substantial inconsistencies between the handwriting in the body of the same manuscript and the title page.*

Kobayashi (1981) attributes the “*extreme variability of the music calligraphy styles in the manuscripts by asserting that hand strokes change greatly over time*” but Jarvis points out that Kobayashi’s statement, “contradicts the accepted scientific principle of FHE, that such changes in handwriting are normally slight and gradual, unless they are the result of some acute situation.”

---

630 Jarvis 2010. See also Jarvis 2007, where a full forensic handwriting examination of the title page of these works is undertaken. p. 51.
631 Ibid.
632 Ibid.
predicated on the false premise that the writer of the clefs or time signature is necessarily the scribe of the music calligraphy which follows. This would then, of course, lead to the misidentification of the scribe.\textsuperscript{633}

Therefore, Jarvis argues that, because the work of Emery, Dadelsen and Kobayashi does not use the established techniques of FDE, their findings cannot be reliable. He illustrates as evidence, the writing styles of Anna Magdalena and Bach as being so similar, that without a proven scientific method such as FDE it is not a reliable method of identification. Jarvis (2007) states:

\textit{For example, and in the case of the ‘1720 Autograph’ ...one cannot rely on the title of a manuscript as reliable examples of a given scribe’s writing, but must do an intra-comparison of the writings to determine that they are internally consistent and of common authorship.}\textsuperscript{634}

Based on a FDE of the text in both the Anna Magdalena manuscript and the ‘FFC’, along with a comparison of the Sonata in G Major (BWV 1021), Jarvis (2007) concludes that “\textit{...it is Anna Magdalena’s handwriting in both manuscripts of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas.”}\textsuperscript{635}

\textsuperscript{633} Ibid. There are many well-documented examples of the music clefs and time signatures identified as being in a different hand from the body of the manuscript. This is likely a result of preparation of the manuscript prior to the final copy.

\textsuperscript{634} Jarvis 2007, pp. 233-234.

\textsuperscript{635} Ibid.
Further:

...as it is the role of the handwriting examiner to study the variations in the writings and identify inconsistencies, this in turn would have led to the questioning of the authenticity of, for example, the manuscript of the FFC. The handwriting examiner would have noted that these inconsistencies are outside the range of natural variation, therefore, precluding positively identifying a writer.\(^{636}\)

He therefore concludes:

...there are significant differences between the music calligraphic styles of Johann Sebastian Bach and Anna Magdalena Bach, and, that Calvert is correct in his assumption that, given sufficient exemplars “...an identification can be made.”\(^{637}\)

\(^{636}\) Jarvis 2010
\(^{637}\) Ibid.
5.8 Handwriting characteristics of Bach

Jarvis (2007) makes the following general statements that describe the characteristics of Johann Sebastian’s music calligraphy:

Table 5: Handwriting Characteristics of Bach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The stem placement is to the left of the note head on the down-stem and the right of the note head on the up-stem.</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Example 1" /> <img src="image2" alt="Example 2" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The stem curves from the note head into the up or down-stem stroke.</td>
<td>See preceding examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The note head and the stem appear to be connected, suggesting a single pen stroke action, in an either upwards or downwards movement.</td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Example 3" /> <img src="image4" alt="Example 4" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The note heads have an oval appearance.</td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Example 5" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The stems do not protrude through the outer beam.</td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Example 6" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The penmanship appears to be of a light and swift nature.</td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Example 7" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The note heads are relatively small.</td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Example 8" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

 Jarvis 2010, p. 60.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The music calligraphy is concise.</td>
<td>See preceding examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The crotchet rests are in a ‘tick’ (✓) form.</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Example" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The quaver rests are in a right-sloping standard ‘seven’ (7) form.</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Example" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The leger lines are short.</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Example" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The beaming is wavy.</td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Example" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The beaming is parallel when two or more beams are used.</td>
<td>See preceding examples</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.9 Handwriting characteristics of Anna Magdalena

The following are general statements that describe the characteristics of Anna Magdalena’s music calligraphy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Images</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The stem placement is consistently towards the center of the note head, on the down-stem and to the right of the note head, on the up-stem.</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Images" /> <img src="image2.png" alt="Images" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The stem curves from the note head into the up-stem stroke but not in the down-stem stroke, where the stem is straight.</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Images" /> <img src="image2.png" alt="Images" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The note head and the stem appear to be connected, in the upwards stem pen movement, but not in the downwards stem pen movement.</td>
<td>(see preceding examples)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The note heads are round or bobble-shaped, rather than elliptical in appearance.</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Images" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The stems often protrude through the outer beam.</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Images" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The penmanship appears to be of a deliberate and heavy nature.</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Images" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The note heads are relatively large. (see preceding examples)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The music calligraphy is concise.</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Example" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The crotchet rests are in a flattened 'ess' (S) form.</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Example" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The quaver rests are in a right-sloping standard 'seven' (7) form.</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Example" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The leger lines are relatively long.</td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Example" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Referring to the previous work done by Dadelson et al, the handwriting and music calligraphy of the title, movement headings, clefs and any other handwriting used in each movement will come under the FHE methodology. For the purpose of the manuscript comparison it is important to identify only what differences there are in terms of the names of the movements and Sonatas. Similarly, with the treble clefs and time signatures.
5.10 Handwriting investigation

The handwriting investigation undertaken within this thesis utilises the principles of FDE as described above, and draws on the characteristics of Bach and Anna Magdalena’s handwriting as identified and documented by Jarvis (2007 and 2010).

An examination of the music calligraphy and handwriting of the three manuscript versions of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas*, and the handwriting contained within certain faszikels of Kellner’s konvolut, aims to determine, for the purposes of this thesis, whether or not Anna Magdalena’s music calligraphy and/or handwriting appears in the 1720 Autograph, or otherwise, and to establish whether or not her music calligraphy and/or handwriting occurs in certain faszikels contained within the Kellner konvolut.

As stated previously, it is traditionally understood that the handwriting and music calligraphy of Bach and Anna Magdalena is very similar and that this accounts for the incredible similarity between the music calligraphy found to be contained within the manuscripts of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas*. Bach scholars have explained this as being the result of Anna Magdalena copying so much of her husband’s work that her writing became similar to his in every way and that she attempted to ‘mimic’ his writing. However, this explanation does not fit with the principle of FDE, which states that even in copying, certain individual traits prevail – that is indeed how forgeries are detected.\(^{639}\) Therefore, it stands to reason that even between such similar writing styles, certain characteristics can be determined which enable the document examiner to determine

\(^{639}\) Jarvis 2007, p. 87.
penmanship. Jarvis’ research, however, determined that Bach’s music calligraphy is, in fact, easily identifiable from that of Anna Magdalena’s. Furthermore, the long held concept of Anna mimicking her husband’s writing style contradicts other anomalies contained within her manuscript versions. The most apparent of these is her lack of detail to the articulation markings, whereby there appears to be little to no attempt to closely mimic Bach’s detail. Why would Anna Magdalena mimic his music calligraphy but choose not to follow his articulation writings?

5.11 Anna’s handwriting in Kellner’s konvolt
Jarvis (2007) undertook a detailed investigation into the handwriting contained within Anna Magdalena’s version of the Cello Suites and Kellner’s version of the same collection. By way of example, Jarvis analysed the execution of the word “Prelude” in Kellner’s manuscript of the Third Cello Suite and compared it with Anna Magdalena’s execution of the same word in her manuscript version, and others.\(^{640}\) Jarvis argued, “*that on the basis of habituation... it is unlikely that Kellner wrote the word ‘Prelude’ in question,*”\(^{641}\) and “*that there is a strong likelihood that Anna Magdalena wrote the word ‘Prelude’ in question; therefore, her handwriting may indeed be present in Kellner’s copy of the Cello Suites.*”\(^{642}\)

This thesis further examined the music calligraphy and handwriting contained within Kellner’s copy of the Cello Suites and examined the other works in his konvolt for possible evidence of Anna Magdalena’s handwriting.

\(^{640}\) Jarvis 2007, p. 262.
\(^{641}\) Ibid. p. 265.
\(^{642}\) Ibid.
5.12 Defining Kellner's music calligraphy

Stinson (1989) proposes a chronology of Kellner's Bach copies based on Kellner's handwriting, watermarks in the paper and the dates of the exemplars. Stinson allocates copies to twelve different handwriting phases. For example; 1, early, (1724-1725) 1 middle, (1725) 1, late (1726/27) 2, early (1726/1727) 2, middle (1726/27) etc. However, Stinson does not provide any discussion as to how he arrived at these phase types nor any detailed characteristics pertaining to them.

The supposition by Stinson, that Kellner has twelve handwriting phases, occurring between the years 1724 (1, early) and 1750 (4, late) contradicts the aforementioned principle of FHE which states that changes to a person’s handwriting may occur until a person has reached “graphic maturity... From this time, only subtle changes may continue to take place. It will decline as the ageing process reduces one’s skill level.” Stinson's allocation of twelve handwriting phrases within a period of approximately 25 years is simply not credible, nor does he provide any sound reasons as to why there are apparently twelve different phases of handwriting.

644 Koppenhaver 2007, states, "Graphic maturity...usually occurs when a person has reached adulthood, around the age of 21" Forensic Document Examination: Principles and Procedures, Humana Press, New Jersey. p. 30.
### 5.12.1 Characteristics of Kellner's music calligraphy

#### Table 7: Characteristics and Examples of Kellner’s Music Calligraphy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The stem placement is consistently on the right of the note head, on the down-stem and to the right of the note head, on the up-stem.</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Example 1" /> <img src="image2.png" alt="Example 2" /> <img src="image3.png" alt="Example 3" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The stem curves from the note head into the up-stem stroke but not in the down-stem stroke, where the stem is straight.</td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Example 4" /> <img src="image5.png" alt="Example 5" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The note heads are small and elliptical in appearance.</td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Example 6" /> <img src="image7.png" alt="Example 7" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The stems often protrude through the outer beam.</td>
<td><img src="image8.png" alt="Example 8" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The penmanship appears to be of a swift and hurried nature.</td>
<td><img src="image9.png" alt="Example 9" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The music calligraphy is frequently untidy and not concise.</td>
<td><img src="image10.png" alt="Example 10" /> <img src="image11.png" alt="Example 11" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The crotchet rests are heavily stylised.</td>
<td><img src="image12.png" alt="Example 12" /> <img src="image13.png" alt="Example 13" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The quaver rests are not in a standard ‘seven’ (7) form but are more upright with little sloping.</td>
<td><img src="image14.png" alt="Example 14" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The leger lines are long and continuous and frequently run the length of the bar.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The down-stem quaver tails are either very curved, or long and flicked out and the up-stem quaver tails are also curved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The beaming of quaver notes, with up stems, is frequently curved inwards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The natural signs have a curled tail.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.13 The faszikels of the Kellner konvolut

A study of the handwriting contained within the faszikels of Kellner's konvolut MS P 804 reveals the following:

- Faszikel 23 – can be attributed to Kellner.
- Faszikel 24 – is in the hand of an unknown scribe.
- Faszikel 25 – two scribes. It appears to be Anna Magdalena's music calligraphy in the lower voice part and Kellner's in the upper voice part.
- Faszikel 26 – two scribes. It appears to be Anna Magdalena's music calligraphy in the lower voice part and Kellner's in the upper voice part.
- Faszikel 27 – can be attributed to Kellner.
- Faszikel 28 – two scribes. It appears to be Anna Magdalena's music calligraphy in the lower voice part and Kellner's in the upper voice part.
- Faszikel 29 – can be attributed to Kellner.
- Faszikel 30 – can be attributed to Kellner.
- Faszikel 31 – can be attributed to Kellner.
- Faszikel 32 – unknown.
- Faszikel 33 – can be attributed to Kellner.
- Faszikel 34 – two scribes. It appears to be Anna Magdalena's music calligraphy in the lower voice part and Kellner's in the upper voice part.
- Faszikel 35 – Anna Magdalena.
- Faszikel 36 – unknown.
- Faszikel 37 – Anna Magdalena and Kellner.
- Faszikel 38 – Anna Magdalena and Kellner.
- **Six Cello Suites** – Kellner, with what appears to be Anna Magdalena's writing on the final page.
Therefore, eight of the faszikels potentially contain Anna Magdalena’s handwriting and support the hypothesis of collaboration between them.

Figure 13: Faszikel 25

A similar thing occurs in Faszikel 26 of Kellner’s Konvolut, whereby the handwriting appears to diverge markedly from his normal characteristics.

Figure 14: Faszikel 26
Figure 15: Faszikel 28

Figure 16: Faszikel 34

Figure 17: Faszikel 35
Figure 18: Faszikel 37

Figure 19: Faszikel 38b
5.14 Final page of Kellner's *Cello Suites*

The music calligraphy within the final page of Kellner's *Cello Suites* appears to suddenly diverge from the consistent nature of the music calligraphy of the preceding pages.

It would appear that another writer's hand appears.

![Figure 20: Representative of the general characteristics of the music calligraphy throughout the *Cello Suites*](image)

![Figure 21: Shows the changes in the music calligraphy on the final page of Kellner's *Cello Suites*](image)
Given the overwhelming consistency of Kellner’s placement of the downward note stems to the right hand of the note head, it is not easily explainable why this is suddenly not the case on the final page of the Cello Suites. It is of interest, however, that the characteristics of the lower voice part on this page are aligned to that of Anna Magdalena. In the faszikels detailed above, the writing of the notes of the lower voice appear to have little in common with the characteristics of Kellner’s hand and more in common with the characteristics of Anna Magdalena’s music calligraphy.

5.14.1 Summary

The apparent distinction in the handwriting characteristics between the upper and lower voice parts supports the compositional teaching methods detailed by C.P.E earlier645 “…first he added the basses to them himself, and they had to invent to the alto and tenor. Then he taught them to devise the basses themselves.”646

Therefore, it is possible that Bach’s compositional teaching methods could account for the scribal hands within the faszikels detailed above i.e. the lower voice part was written in by someone other than Kellner (possibly a teacher) and his task was to then complete the upper voice lines, perhaps as a lesson in thoroughbass or vertical alignment. This supports the proposition that Kellner may have been a compositional student of Bach and that the works contained within the konvolut were for purposes of tuition.

645 See Chapter III p. 65 of this thesis.
646 Wolff, 2000, p. 328.
Additionally, many of the works contained within Kellner's konvolut contain correction markings in another pen-type in the form of crosses and comments. The prevalence of such markings within the works of the konvolut are also indicative of a student/teacher manual.

Furthermore, the correction markings found within Kellner’s manuscript version of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas demonstrate that it was unlikely that his version was commissioned, as suggested by Tatlow, as such a commission would not contain corrections. Therefore, it is more likely that his version of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas represents an earlier working draft, given to him as a compositional exercise, possibly by Bach.

It is certainly plausible therefore, that the composing of the Violin Sonata and Partitas was achieved through a different compositional process that is traditionally understood and that Kellner's incomplete manuscript was (or may have been) a direct result of this process.

An examination of page 255 of the manuscript reveals that Kellner has scratched out some notes. It would appear that the only explanation for this error is that Kellner had to have been copying Anna Magdalena’s manuscript, somehow became distracted and then wrote the notes that appear one bar ahead in Anna Magdalena’s manuscript. Kellner could not have written those notes incorrectly if he were not copying from Anna Magdalena’s manuscript version.

5.15 Anna Magdalena’s handwriting in the Violin Sonatas and Partitas
It would appear that, for the most part, it is Bach’s handwriting in the FFC. While the similarities between the music calligraphy styles cannot be denied, there are
also clear distinctions between the two hands. As such, the following principle of FHE must be considered:

*The final conclusion on any...questioned document is based on individual habit patterns, and habit patterns can manifest themselves in every aspect of writing... As every person has certain habits, so does he project certain habits when he puts writing on paper.*647

The FFC of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas provides one of the neatest examples of Bach's music calligraphy. When compared with other works and collections known to be in Bach's scribal hand, it appears that extra effort has been made when writing out this manuscript. This can be clearly demonstrated when pitted against the accompanied violin works, for example. This raises the question as to why he would have used a neater writing style here. Additionally, there are numerous occasions where there is a suggestion of Bach attempting to 'copy' Anna Magdalena's writing style. During the copying process, however, his individual habits are nonetheless manifested. Therefore, it would appear that the long held position with regard to the incredible similarity between the writing styles of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas can be challenged and that, rather than Anna Magdalena attempting to 'copy' Bach's music calligraphy, the opposite may in fact be the case. On occasions whereby Bach had to provide an autograph copy, perhaps for purposes of sale, or as being representative of a published version of the works, he 'copied' Anna Magdalena's music calligraphy. Perhaps he admired her penmanship and adapted to her style to create neater music calligraphy. Table 8 which follows, details four examples of this, which can be clearly seen in

647 Williamson, 1981.
the C Major Fugue. In these examples, Bach’s hand is shown at the top and Anna Magdalena’s hand is directly underneath.
Table 8: Handwriting Examples of the C Major Fugue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example 1: In Bar 61 the stems are drawn from the centre of the note heads.</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Example 1" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example 2: In Bar 62, handwriting habits are re-established.</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Example 2" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example 3: At the commencement of Bar 84, it appears that Anna's handwriting suddenly occurs, however by beats 3 and 4, Bach's handwriting characteristics are re-established.</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Example 3" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example 4: In Bar 68 the beaming of the FFC is frequently curved, whereas Anna Magdalena is frequently straight.</td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Example 4" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.16 “Soli Deo Sit Gloria”

The discovery of what appears to be Anna Magdalena’s music calligraphy in the final page of the *Cello Suites* supports an association between Anna Magdalena and Kellner. Further evidence to support this collaboration is found in what also appears to be the sign off “Soli Deo Sit Gloria” in Anna Magdalena’s hand. It remains unknown why the final page of the *Cello Suites* has been signed off by Anna Magdalena. The Figures below show the differences in the signings of “Soli Deo Sit Gloria”. Figure 22 shows two examples by Bach and Figure 23 shows the example found in the middle of Kellner’s konvolute (Faszikel 26) thought to be in the hand of Anna Magdalena.

![Figure 22: “Soli Deo Gloria”](image)

![Figure 23: “Soli Deo Sit Gloria” thought to be in the hand of Anna Magdalena](image)
CHAPTER VI - MANUSCRIPT COMPARISON

6.1 Introduction

The objective of this thesis is to discover if a relationship exists between the three manuscript versions, and thereby determine if a different compositional process, other than that which is traditionally understood, may have taken place. A comparison of the three manuscript versions, identifying the coincidences and divergences between them, therefore, forms an important methodology for the research.

6.2 The traditional understanding of the manuscripts

As it is traditionally understood that Anna Magdalena copied her manuscript version (Source B) of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas from the version made by Bach (Source A) and which is therefore considered to be the FFC of these works, there should be minimal divergences from the FFC and only those that can be clearly attributed as being copying errors.648

Similarly, and, as tradition states, Anna Magdalena’s manuscript should be an almost perfect copy and faithful reproduction of the FFC. Further, if the traditionally accepted view of Kellner’s manuscript (Source D) is correct, i.e. he copied an earlier working draft by Bach (the supposed missing Source X), it would be expected, because it was an early working version, that this manuscript version would contain significant differences from what became the FFC (Source A) and Anna Magdalena’s manuscript (Source B), other than those variants already identified by Braunlich (1981) and Stinson (1989). Importantly, and

648 For the purposes of this thesis, a copying error is considered as such if no musical sense can be established.
according to the traditional understanding, there should be no similarities between Kellner (Source D) and Anna Magdalena’s manuscript (Source B), which do not exist in the FFC (Source A) as well. This is because Anna Magdalena’s manuscript (Source B) is considered by Bach scholars to be a faithful copy of Source A and therefore in theory, bears no relationship to Source D.

What follows in this chapter fundamentally challenges the existing paradigm as described above, regarding the traditional relationship. The evidence presented in this chapter supports the proposition that a new hypothesis is required to explain the relationship between the three manuscript versions.

For convenience throughout the following manuscript comparison, the terminology used to describe the musical examples will be presented in the standard convention, as applied in Bach scholarly literature, i.e. the musical examples of the FFC will be referred to as Source A; Anna Magdalena’s musical examples as Source B and Kellner’s examples as Source D. Furthermore, the musical examples will be presented in the chronological order in which the new hypothesis suggests the manuscripts were written in, viz. Source D, followed by Source B, followed by Source A (horizontally or vertically). They will also be referred to in the same order in any of the text.

6.3 The ordering of the works
The unusual (and apparently somewhat confused) ordering of the works in Kellner’s manuscript (Source D) has been discussed prior, but is repeated here for convenience. Table 9 shows that the ordering of the works in Source D is
significantly different from the ordering of the works in Anna Magdalena’s manuscript (Source B) the FFC (Source A).
Table 9: The Difference in the Ordering of the Works in Kellner’s Manuscript (Source D).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kellner order and omissions (source D)</th>
<th>The FFC (source A) and Anna Magdalena (source B) order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>G minor Sonata</strong></td>
<td><strong>G minor Sonata (BWV 1001)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adagio</td>
<td>Adagio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fugue (Variant Version)</td>
<td>Fugue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siciliana</td>
<td>Siciliana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presto</td>
<td>Presto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not present in Source D</strong></td>
<td><strong>B minor Partita (BWV 1002)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allemande</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Double</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Double</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sarabande</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Double</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tempo di Bourree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Double</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A minor Sonata</strong></td>
<td><strong>A minor Sonata (BWV 1003)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grave</td>
<td>Grave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fugue (Variant Version)</td>
<td>Fuga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andante</td>
<td>Andante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C Major Sonata</strong></td>
<td><strong>D minor Partita (BWV 1004)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adagio</td>
<td>Allemande</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuga</td>
<td>Corrente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largo</td>
<td>Sarabanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegro Assai</td>
<td>Giga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ciaconna (Chaconne)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E Major Partita</strong></td>
<td><strong>C Major Sonata (BWV 1005)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preludio</td>
<td>Adagio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavotte en Rondeau</td>
<td>Fuga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minuet I</td>
<td>Largo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allegro Assai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D minor Partita</strong></td>
<td><strong>E Major Partita (BWV 1006)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarabanda</td>
<td>Preludio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giga</td>
<td>Loure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciaconna (Chaconne)</td>
<td>Gavotte en rondeau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Menuet I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Menuet II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bourree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gigue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Opinions are varied among scholars regarding the reason why the order of the collection differs so significantly between the three sources. Stinson (1989) states:

_Bach substantially changed the ordering of the set when he revised these movements. It is not really all that difficult to believe that Bach’s original scheme was of two distinct halves — sonatas and partitas — the decision to alternate being taken in the revised plan; both arrangements are logical enough. However, certain peculiarities in the ordering and numbering of the pieces in Kellner’s copy suggest that it is derived from a source or sources that presented the works in the same order found in the autograph...He numbers the sonatas on his title page as well as in the individual work headings exactly as does Bach, but with the partitas no numbers are given in work headings and those used on the title page appear after the respective titles...These discrepancies imply that whoever arranged the works in the order found in Kellner’s copy retained numerical designations only for those pieces whose ordering agreed with the autograph._\(^649\)

\(^649\) Stinson 1989, pp. 61-62.
Further discussion on the ordering is detailed in Szabo (2015), who states:

*Kellner started with the three complete Sonatas in their familiar order and then continued with some, but not all, movements of the E Major and D minor Partitas without stating the number in the title; finally the B minor Partita is missing altogether.*

Szabo suggests that the original intention to have the Chaconne at the end of the collection may have been revised when the Chaconne was increased in length, as it would have been “…out of proportion with the rest of the Partita, whereas in a shorter version it may have fitted more easily into the structure of the work.”

---

650 Szabo 2015, p. 76.
651 Ibid. p. 80.
He cites Spitta (1884-85) who states, “[The Chaconne] is longer than all the rest of the suite put together, and must not be considered as the last movement of it…”\textsuperscript{652}

If Kellner's manuscript is an early working draft of the works, the question that must be asked is why the order was changed upon a subsequent revision. It is possible that Schwanenberger's involvement in the production of the manuscripts led to the revised ordering. Upon hearing the works performed by Schwanenberger, the decision was made to alternate the works to end with the E Major Partita (BWV 1006). Consideration may have been given to both the ultimate length of the Chaconne (even in Kellner’s shorter version it would have dwarfed the surrounding movements) and to the minor modality in which the collection would have ended, if performed in their entirety. These two factors combined may have affected the suggestion of the need to alternate between Sonata and Partita. Further, the three Sonatas are polyphonic works, and the Partitas are predominantly single melodic line dance movements. Therefore, the contrast achieved by alternating the polyphonic writing of the Sonatas with the single melodic line of the Partitas may also have been a consideration. Further, the polyphonic writing of the three Sonatas would have been a more appropriate compositional exercise for Kellner as a keyboardist. Single line melodic writing would have been less suited to his particular talents as an organist.\textsuperscript{653}

Irrespective of the reason why this occurred, the different ordering supports the hypothesis that Kellner’s manuscript was an early working draft of what became

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{652} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{653} Table 9, which displays the difference in the ordering of Kellner’s manuscript (Source D), also shows the number of dance movements omitted by Kellner. It appears that the focus of his work was on the polyphonic works foremost.
the FFC (Source A) and further supports the hypothesis of the potential involvement of Schwanenberger in Source B, and then ultimately Source A. The inference being, that Source D was the original working version, followed by Source B and once again, ultimately Source A.
6.4 Variations in the sources: Titles of the works

6.4.1 Title of the G minor Sonata

Table 10 shows that the title of the G minor Sonata is different in the three manuscript versions (See Table 10). Source D has the words “Sonata i a Violino Solo Senza Basso”\(^{654}\) across the top of the manuscript. Source B has the title “Sonata i” written at the top of the manuscript above the first bar, assumed to be in the handwriting of Schwanenberger. In Source A, the words “Sonata 1\(^{ma}\) a Violino Solo Senza Basso – di J S Bach”\(^{655}\) are written across the top of the manuscript.

Table 10: The Difference in the Title of the G minor Sonata.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Sonata i a Violino Solo Senza Basso.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Sonata i.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Sonata 1(^{ma}) a Violino Solo Senza Basso – di J S Bach.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{654}\)Translation ‘Sonata 1 for Solo violin Sonata without bass’.

\(^{655}\)Translation ‘Sonata Prima for solo violin without bass’.
6.4.2 Title of the A minor Sonata

Table 11 shows that in Source D the title is written as "Sonata 2da a Violino Solo Senza Basso," and is positioned at the top of the manuscript. In Source B the title is placed above the stave on the far left hand side and is written as "Sonata 2." Source A has the title written as "Sonata 2da a Violino Solo Senza Basso" positioned at the top of the manuscript.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Image of Source D title" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Image of Source B title" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Image of Source A title" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Shows the Difference in the Title of the A minor Sonata

656 Translation ‘G Solo Violin Sonata without bass’. 
6.4.3 Title of the D minor Partita

Table 12 shows that in Source D the title is written as “Partie a Violino Solo Senza Basso,” and is positioned at the top of the manuscript. In Source B the title is positioned once again above the stave on the far left hand side and is written as “Sonata 2.” Source A has the title written as “Sonata 2\text{da} a Violino Solo Senza Basso”\textsuperscript{657} positioned at the top of the manuscript.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Partie a Violino Solo Senza Basso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Partie 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Partie 2\text{da} a Violino Solo Senza Basso</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above tables provide only three examples of the significant differences between the titles of Source B and Source A (and also Source D). This pattern of differences (in the manner in which the titles are written out) continues throughout the remaining works in three manuscript versions.

\textsuperscript{657} Translation ‘G Solo Violin Sonata without bass’.
It cannot be explained why the title in Source B is significantly different from the titles as written in Source A, omitting the attribution to "J.S Bach" as the composer, if the traditional understanding of the manuscripts is correct. Nor can it be explained why Schwanenberger wrote the title in Source B, and why Anna Magdalena did not. If Source B was a direct and accurate copy of Source A (as traditionally believed), it would be expected that the titles would be the same as those written out explicitly in Source A, irrespective of who wrote them; and just as surely, the attribution to Bach as the composer would have been included. Similarly, and significantly, Source D does not provide attribution to Bach as the composer at this point either.

Furthermore, it is worth stating again that although the order of the Sonatas and Partitas differs markedly in Source D to the eventual order of the works in Source B and Source A, the G minor Sonata is the only Sonata to remain consistent with the ordering in all cases.

6.5 Variations in sources: Source D differs from Source B and Source A

The examples and discussion below provide evidence of the differences in the articulation of Source D (Kellner), which support the hypothesis that Source D preceded Source B (Anna Magdalena).

6.5.1 Articulation divergences

There has been much discussion regarding the vexed issues surrounding Anna Magdalena’s articulation markings in Source B of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas and in Source A of the Cello Suites, which are well documented. Additionally, in
his study into the handwriting of the “London 48”, Emery (1953) describes the phrase markings in Anna Magdalena’s manuscripts as being one of a number of copying weaknesses she displays. Beisswenger (2000), when referring to the Cello Suites, describes Anna Magdalena’s slurring as being, “…characterised by negligence and prodigality.” Jarvis (2007) suggests that the ambiguous articulations are indicative of a version that came prior to the FFC (Source A). Szabo (2015) however, states, “Her devoted if not entirely efficacious efforts to make an accurate copy reveal a lack of understanding regarding some basic principles of string playing.” He then states:

“Undoubtedly, she was a diligent copyist, following the obvious features of an authorial script faithfully (for instance, changing staves and pages with her exemplar), but—perhaps because she was a singer, rather than a string player—she appears to not have understood the significance of the legato as a bowing instruction.”

Szabo’s statement appears to contradict the notion of a ‘diligent copyist,’ who would have taken great care to ensure the bowing directions were the same as the exemplar, unless of course, no such exemplar existed. Further, Robert L. Marshall in a private communication by e-mail to Jarvis in 2004 states that it is most likely that Anna Magdalena was herself a violinist (See pages 188-189). If this is the case, then the concept of Anna Magdalena having no skills or

---

658 The Well-Tempered Clavier Book 2
661 Ibid. p. 4.
understanding of “basic principles of string playing”, as Szabo suggests, makes no sense.

The ambiguous nature of the slur markings in both Source D and Source B, further supports Jarvis (2007) proposition that neither versions were copied from Source A, and the similarities in the articulation markings between their manuscript versions strongly support the proposition that Source D and Source B are more closely related than previously considered or understood.

According to the principle of common error, as stated earlier, “…if the same error appears in more than one source, it is usually safe to assume that they were copied from the same model or that one of them was copied from the other truthfully, including its discrepancies.”

The examples below, whereby Source D differs to Source B and Source A, demonstrate important variations between the three manuscript versions, which support the need to develop a new hypothesis regarding the relationship between the three manuscript versions.

---

662 Grier, 1996.
Example 1

Bar 33 of the A minor Fugue has a missing slur in Source D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="source_d.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="source_b.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="source_a.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 25: Bar 33 of the A minor Fugue

Example 2

Bar 5 of the D minor Chaconne has a missing slur in Source D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="source_d.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="source_b.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="source_a.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 26: Bar 5 of the D minor Chaconne
Example 3

Bar 42 of the D minor Chaconne has two missing slurs in Source D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="source_d_1.png" alt="Source D" /></td>
<td><img src="source_b_1.png" alt="Source B" /></td>
<td><img src="source_a_1.png" alt="Source A" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 27: Bar 42 of the D minor Chaconne

Example 4

Bar 4 of the G minor Fugue has a missing slur in Source D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="source_d_2.png" alt="Source D" /></td>
<td><img src="source_b_2.png" alt="Source B" /></td>
<td><img src="source_a_2.png" alt="Source A" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 28: Bar 4 of the G minor Fugue

Example 5

Bar 13 of the G minor Fugue has two missing slurs in Source D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="source_d_3.png" alt="Source D" /></td>
<td><img src="source_b_3.png" alt="Source B" /></td>
<td><img src="source_a_3.png" alt="Source A" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 29: Bar 13 of the G minor Fugue
Example 6

Bar 1 of the G minor Siciliana has three missing slurs in Source D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="source_d_bar_1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="source_b_bar_1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="source_a_bar_1" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 30: Bar 1 of the G minor Siciliana

Example 7

Bar 4 of the G minor Adagio has a missing slur in Source D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="source_d_bar_4" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="source_b_bar_4" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="source_a_bar_4" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 31: Bar 4 of the G minor Adagio

Example 8

Bar 53 of the G minor Fugue shows a missing slur in Source D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="source_d_bar_53" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="source_b_bar_53" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="source_a_bar_53" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 32: Bar 53 of the G minor Fugue
Example 9

Bar 78 of the G minor Fugue. A bowing pattern is established in Sources B and A, which is not present in Source D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Source D" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Source B" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Source A" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 33: Bar 78 of the G minor Fugue**

6.5.2 Rhythmic divergences

The examples and discussion below show evidence of rhythmic divergences in Source D, which support the hypothesis that Source D preceded Source B.
Example 1

Bars 259 and 260 of the A minor Fugue shows a dotted quaver semiquaver in Source D, which is written as two quavers in Source B and Source A.\textsuperscript{663}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Source D" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Source B" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Source A" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 34: Bars 259 & 260 of the A minor Fugue

Example 2

Bar 73 of the D minor Chaconne shows the first group of beamed notes, which are joined together as semiquavers in Source D. In Sources A and B they are joined together as demi-semiquavers. Additionally Source D does not have the trill marking at the end of the bar, also suggestive of later revision and compositional improvement.

The added slur in Source B, which is not in Source A is suggestive that Bach rejected Anna Magdalena’s alternative articulation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Source D" /></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Source B" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Source A" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 35: Bar 73 of the D minor Chaconne

\textsuperscript{663} This example is discussed in greater detail on pp. 257-268 of this thesis.
Example 3

Bar 4 of the A minor Grave, shows a correction to the beaming on crotchet beat 3, where he has retrospectively added (badly) an extra beam to correct the total rhythmic value of the beat. This is clearly not a copying error but rather a miscalculation on Kellner’s part during the compositional process.

![Figure 36: Bar 4 of the A minor Grave](image)

Example 4

Bar 10 of the A minor Grave shows a rhythmic difference on crotchet beats one and two in Source D, which results in a bar of 5/4. This does not appear to be a copying error because it is clear that this could not have been copied. What appears to have happened, as with previous examples, is that Kellner has miscalculated the rhythmic value of the bar.

![Figure 37: Bar 10 of the A minor Grave](image)
Example 5

Bar 14 of the A minor Grave shows the first beat of the bar has clearly not been copied in Source D because there is a distinctly different rhythmic intention, which has been improved in the subsequent revisions of Source B and then Source A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Source D" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Source B" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Source A" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 38: Bar 14 of the A minor Grave
6.5.3 Notation divergences

The examples and discussion which follow, provides evidence of differences in the notation of Source D, which support the hypothesis that Source D preceded Source B.

Example 1

Bar 3 of the G minor Adagio shows seven different notes in Source D. These notes are written an interval of one third lower than Sources B and Source A. Source D’s musical intent is entirely different from the musical intent of Sources B and A. The best evidence for this is not just that the notes are of a different pitch but the figuration of the final part of the bar, where there is the clear break and the different rhythmic intent. There is also a trill missing in Source D, which is positioned differently in Sources B and A. In addition, when Anna Magdalena and Bach were revising Kellner’s version, the pencil markings underneath the final seven notes are indicative of a recalculation by them of what Kellner has written. The adjustment in pitch of an interval of a third is merely what they considered an improvement on the harmonic flow. In the playing of Kellner's early work, however, it appears entirely musically satisfactory.

![Figure 39: Bar 3 of the G minor Adagio](image)

In all current printed editions, these notes are written as per the FFC and Source B.
Example 2

Bar 5 of the G minor Adagio in Source D, there is a single note at the commencement of the bar, which is written as a three-note chord in Source B and Source A. Similar to the previous example, there is evidence that Anna Magdalena and Bach have added the notes ‘C sharp’ and ‘E’, which then appear in Source B and Source A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Source D" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Source B" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Source A" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 40: Bar 5 of the G minor Adagio

Example 3

Bar 59 of the G minor Fugue is a further example of an apparent deviation from Source B and Source A, but clearly shows that the original intention was note ‘A’ as the bass of the final chord of the bar and not the ‘B flat’ note, which appears in the other Sources. While the harmony is functional in Source D, it has been improved in Source B and Source A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Source D" /></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Source B" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Source A" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 41: Bar 59 of the G minor Fugue
**Example 4**

Bar 88 of the G minor Fugue is a further example of an apparent deviation from Source B and Source A, but clearly indicates that the original intention of the closing three notes of the bar were 'B flat', 'A' and 'G'. In Source B and Source A the last note of the bar is actually an 'F sharp' by implication of the previous F sharp accidental, so it is worthy of note that this 'F sharp' is considered to be an error and is corrected to an F natural in modern publications.665

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Source D" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Source B" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Source A" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 42: Bar 88 of the G minor Fugue

---

665 See, for example, *Bach Sonates et Suites Pour Violon Seul*, Heugel and Co. Paris, 1959
Example 5

Bar 90 of the G minor Fugue has an open note ‘G’ at the commencement of the bar in Source D. In Source B and Source A, this note is written as ‘B flat.’ It appears that the original intention by Kellner was the note ‘G’ because it follows the ‘G’ pedal sequence established in the previous three bars. In Source B and Source A rather than using the established pedal, a decision was made to follow the harmonic linear direction by resolving the ‘A’ to a ‘B flat’, but in the lower octave, thus allowing a smoother transition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="source_d.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="source_b.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="source_a.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 43: Bar 90 of the G minor Fugue
Example 6

Bar 8 of the G minor Siciliana shows a two-note chord in Source D and a three-note chord in Source B and Source A; this chord comprises the notes, from lowest to highest, ‘D’, ‘C’ and ‘F sharp’. In Source D the lowest note of this chord (note D) is not present. The addition of the note ‘D’ in revised editions strengthens the chord by changing the implication of the dominant seventh chord in Source D to an actual dominant seventh chord in Sources B and A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Figure 44: Bar 8 of the G minor Siciliana

Example 7

Bar 13 of the G minor Siciliana shows a single note ‘E flat’ in Source D and a three-note chord in Source B and Source A. The ‘E flat’ existing as a single note in Source D harmonically implies a note from the chord of the dominant eleventh. In Source B and Source A, the addition of the notes ‘B flat’ and ‘F’ strengthens the chord by changing it to an actual dominant eleventh.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Figure 45: Bar 13 of the G minor Siciliana
Example 8

Bar 16 of the G minor Siciliana shows a two-note chord in Source D of an open octave ‘F’. Besides the fact there is no ‘D’ or ‘B flat’ in the chord, the harmonic sequence that follows is radically different from both Source B and Source A. The harmonic sequence itself is quite functional but produces a violinistically unplayable sequence, so it would appear that a decision was made to make the sequence more violinistic, possibly on the advice of Schwanenberger during the revision process to restructure the harmony. Interestingly enough, this shifts the open octave to a more subsidiary position on the ‘E flat’, which follows, i.e. the weak part of the beat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Source D" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Source B" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Source A" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 46: Bar 16 of the G minor Siciliana
Example 9

Bar 16 of the A minor Grave has the note ‘D’ written as an octave double stop at the start of the fourth crotchet beat. In Source D, the lower note of this octave is not present, indicating the harmony has been strengthened upon subsequent revision with the addition of the open D string in Source B and Source A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Figure 47: Bar 16 of the A minor Grave

Example 10

Bar 18 of the A minor Grave is similar to Example 9, whereby the bass of the chord has been added upon subsequent revision to create the interval of a fifth in Source B and Source A, thus strengthening the harmony.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Figure 48: Bar 18 of the A minor Grave
Example 11

Bar 19 of the A minor Grave on the second quaver of the beat, the note 'B flat' has been added to Source B and Source A to strengthen the harmonic implications during the revision process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Source D" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Source B" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Source A" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 49: Bar 19 of the A minor Grave

6.5.4 Music calligraphy divergences - note stems and beaming

The examples in Table 16 which follow, provide evidence of differences in the music calligraphy of Source D, which support the hypothesis that Source D preceded Source B.

The examples provided are taken from the many examples of similar trends throughout Source D where Kellner does not follow the directional beaming of either Source B or Source A. Clearly this implies that Kellner was not copying from a Bach model because habituation strongly suggests that if Source D were a copy of a supposed lost Source X, then surely Bach would have written out the music in the same manner as it appears in the FFC.
Table 13: Music Calligraphy Examples showing Source D differs from Source A and Source B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="source_d1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="source_b1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="source_a1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="source_d2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="source_b2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="source_a2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="source_d3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="source_b3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="source_a3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="source_d4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="source_b4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="source_a4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.6 Variations in sources: Source D coincides with Source B; both differ from Source A

6.6.1 Articulation divergence

In the examples and discussion which follow, Source D aligns with Source B and yet both deviate from Source A. This strongly supports the proposition that Source B was an interim stage of music-textual development towards the FFC (Source A) and fundamentally challenges the relationship between the Sources. Table 17 shows six examples taken from the many occurrences discovered in a forensic examination of the three sources.

Example 1

Bar 122 of the A minor Fugue shows the semiquavers slurred together in pairs in Sources D and B, however, in Source A, a syncopated bowing has been used, resulting in a slur carried over to the first note of the following bar. The articulation used in Source A provides a very strong musical effect. The fact that this syncopation does not occur in either Source D or Source B, strongly indicates a later stage of development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 50: Bar 122 of the A minor Fugue
Example 2

Bar 4 of the G minor Siciliana there are four slurs missing from both Source B and D, which are present in Source A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Source D" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Source B" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Source A" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 51: Bar 4 of the G minor Siciliana

Example 3

Bar 48 of the D minor Chaconne shows two missing slurs in Sources D and B, which are present in Source A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Source D" /></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Source B" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Source A" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 52: Bar 48 of the D minor Chaconne
Example 4

Bar 7 of the G minor Siciliana shows a slur marking missing in Sources D and B, which is present in Source A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Source D" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Source B" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Source A" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 53: Bar 7 of the G minor Siciliana

Example 5

Bars 107 and 108 of the G minor Presto shows four slur markings missing in Sources D and B, which are present in Source A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Source D" /></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Source B" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Source A" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 54: Bars 107-108 of the G minor Presto

6.6.2 Rhythmic divergence

Example 1

Bar 15 of the A minor Grave shows there is a dot missing in Sources B and D, which is present in Source A. The missing dot creates a rhythmic inaccuracy, which has been correct in Source A, but also the principle of common error which suggests that Source B has come from Source D, but has rhythmically corrected
the beaming error of Source D. See further discussion on compositional process below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Source D Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Source B Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Source A Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 55: Bar 15 of the A minor Grave
6.6.3 Notation divergence

Example

Bar 17 of the A minor Fugue shows Source D and Source B with a ‘B’ natural note as the bass note to the chord at the commencement of the bar, while Source A has the note ‘A’.

The only thing that can be reasonably deduced from this is that there must have been a level of collaboration between Sources D and B, because the alignment of the notes in the first chord speaks of a shared originating source.

Further, the chord as it is written in Sources D and B, is effectively unplayable and harmonically dubious, which supports the above proposition that collaboration occurred between Kellner and Anna Magdalena.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Source D" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Source B" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Source A" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 56: Bar 17 of the A minor Fugue

6.7 Variations in sources: Source D coincides with Source A; both differ from Source B

6.7.1 Articulation

In the example below, (Figure 57), Source D is aligned with Source A and not with Source B, which suggests that Bach preferred what Kellner had prepared at that moment compared to what appears in Anna Magdalena’s manuscript.
Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 57: Articulation Example where Source D coincides with Source B and differ from Source A

6.7.2 Notation divergences

In the examples and discussion which follow, Source D aligns with Source A and yet both deviate from Source B. Table 18 shows six examples from the many occurrences discovered in the manuscript examination which further supports the hypothesis presented in this thesis.

Example 1

Bar 35 of the D minor Chaconne shows the third note of the bar as being consistent between Sources A and D but different from Source B. Given the established musical sequence, however, this is likely to be a copying error.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 58: Bar 35 of the D minor Chaconne
Example 2

Bar 26 of the G minor Fugue shows a flat sign written in front of the second note ‘F’ in Source B. This sign is missing in Sources D and A. Again, this is likely to be a copying error.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 59: Bar 26 of the G minor Fugue

Example 3

Bar 39 of the A minor Fugue shows a note missing from the final chord in Source B. This appears to have no bearing on the compositional process and is likely to be a copying error.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 60: Bar 39 of the A minor Fugue
Example 4

Example 4 shows Bar 41 of the A minor Fugue as containing an extra note in the final chord of the bar in both Sources D and A and a three-note chord and an extra note in Source B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Source D" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Source B" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Source A" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 61: Bar 41 of the A minor Fugue

Example 5

Bar 2 of the A minor Grave where the last crotchet beat of the bar has the dotted note written as an ‘E’ in Source B and as the note ‘D’ in Sources D and A. This appears to be a situation where Anna Magdalena has suggested an alternative to Kellner’s manuscript, which is incorrect and has subsequently been corrected in Source A. This supports the proposition that Source B was transitional to Source A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Source D" /></td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Source B" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Source A" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 62: Bar 2 of the A minor Grave
Example 6

Bar 68 of the G minor Fugue shows the last three notes of this bar are notated differently in Source B. The notes as they are written in Source B (notes ‘D’ ‘C’ and ‘B’) occur earlier in Bar 65, so it appears she has simply looked at the stave above while copying and as such it is likely to be a copying error.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Source D" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Source B" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Source A" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 63: Bar 68 of the G minor Fugue
6.7.3 Rhythmic divergences

The two examples provided below (Figures 64 and 65) show instances where Source D aligns with Source A, but both sources differ to Source B.

**Example 1**

Bar 56 of the G minor Fugue shows the rhythm of the last crotchet beat of the bar consisting of a semiquaver, followed by two demisemiquavers in Source D and Source A. In Source B the rhythm is written as four semiquavers. The two demi-semiquavers are slurred in Source A, but the slur marking is omitted in Source D. In Source B the slur marking is placed between the second and third semiquaver. It is possible that the original intention by Kellner in Source D was to have this rhythm, but a revision by Anna Magdalena, perhaps with the input by Schwanenberger, at a later stage affected the change to four semiquavers. This was clearly rejected in the final revision by Bach in the FFC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Source D" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Source B" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Source A" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 64: Bar 56 of the G minor Fugue as it appears in the three manuscripts*
Example 2

In Bar 11 of the A minor Grave, the rhythm is consistent between Source D and Source A. Source B, however, contains an extra beam between the notes of crotchet beat one, resulting in an inaccurate rhythmic bar length. As the rhythm has been clearly written in Source D and Source A it is difficult to explain why Anna Magdalena’s rhythm is different at this point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>![Image of Source D]</td>
<td>![Image of Source B]</td>
<td>![Image of Source A]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 65: Bar 11 of the A minor Grave as it appears in the three manuscripts
6.7.4 Music calligraphy divergences

The examples and discussion below provide evidence of differences in the music calligraphy of Source B, which support the hypothesis that Bach preferred the suggestions made by Kellner in Source D and that Anna Magdalena's suggestions (Source B) were rejected in favour of Kellner's (Source A).

Example 1

In the example below, the note stems and beaming of the first crotchet beat is identified as being consistent between Source D and Source A and different in Source B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="source_d.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="source_b.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="source_a.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 66: Bar 71 of the G minor Fugue as it appears in the three manuscripts
Example 2

Bar 93 of the G minor Fugue provides further support for the hypothesis that Source B cannot have been a copy of Source A. The note stems of the final group of hemi-demisemiquavers in Source B are broken into groups of eight notes and the expression of the slur is unusual in that she appears to be attempting to slur the groups of eight notes together.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Figure 67: Bar 93 of the G minor Fugue as it appears in the three manuscripts

6.8 Evidence of Kellner as the composer

Given that it is known that Kellner was one of Bach’s copyists, it is distinctly probable that Kellner was also one of Bach’s composition students as well. Therefore, it is likely that Kellner would have carried out compositional tasks given to him by Bach; for example, copying manuscripts, filling in harmonies from figured bass, developing motives and other such compositional exercises. The question is, does forensic evidence exist that supports the proposition that Kellner's manuscript points to him being the original composer of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas.

Refer to Chapter III (3.6) of this thesis, 'Bach as Teacher.' p. 90.
6.9 A comparison of the A minor Fugue

Before dealing with the question of the forensic evidence that points to Kellner as being the original composer of these works, it is essential that a direct comparison of the three manuscripts is presented. The reason for this is that there are five divergent bars in the A minor Fugue, not previously identified by any scholar, which raise significant questions regarding the compositional process.

The first significant divergence in the A minor Fugue occurs in Bar 55. In Source A, the first crotchet beat of the bar commences with a four-note chord with the notes (from lowest to highest) ‘E,’ ‘G’ ‘B,’ and another ‘E’ written one octave above the lower ‘E’ (See Figure 68). In Source B, the first note of this bar comprises only a three-note chord. The note missing from Source B and which appears in Source A is the lowest note ‘E.’ Instead, the lowest note of the chord in Source B is the note ‘G’, which is then followed by the notes ‘B’ and ‘E’ (See Figure 68). Source D also has a three-note chord at the commencement of the bar. In the case of Source D, however, the lowest note of the chord is the note ‘E,’ followed by the notes ‘B’ and ‘E,’ therefore missing out the note ‘G’ entirely. Looking closely at Source A (See Figure 68), it is clear that the note ‘E’ has a considerably larger note head than the other notes of the chord.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Figure 68: Handwritten notations as they appear in the three manuscripts" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Figure 68: Handwritten notations as they appear in the three manuscripts" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Figure 68: Handwritten notations as they appear in the three manuscripts" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There appear to be a number of possibilities to account for these differences. The first possibility presented will be dealt with in the context of the accepted understanding of the manuscripts.

Taking the position that Source D is a copy of an early working draft of these works (a supposed Source X), it follows, therefore, that the original compositional intention of this chord, were the notes ‘E’, ‘B’ and a further note ‘E’ one octave higher. When writing out what became the FFC (Source A) Bach mistakenly wrote the note ‘G’ as the lowest note of the chord, and then, realising his mistake, wrote the note ‘E’ underneath. In order to make his intention clear, he then increased the size of the note head, so as to leave no doubt that this note should be an ‘E’ instead of a ‘G’- why Bach did not cross out the ‘G’ is a point of interest. As there are no error markings in the FFC, however, it seems reasonable to suggest that Bach would not have wanted to draw attention to an obvious error marking by crossing it out and re-writing the correct chord. Increasing the size of the note head may have seemed the obvious solution to the problem. Of course, this could all be the other way around, so another possibility is that the lowest note of the chord was originally intended as the note ‘G’ and was revised at a later date to the note ‘E’. This scenario, however, works only for the accepted understanding of Source B, but does not coincide with the hypothesis regarding Source D.
A further alternative is that Bach may have decided to change the note to a G upon a later revision and mistakenly wrote the note ‘E,’ realised his error and then wrote the note G above. He then attempted to ‘rub out’ the note E, creating a large smudge mark in the process. The possibility that Bach may have intended to have the four-note chord at this point cannot be dismissed out of hand, either, and must also be given a fair hearing. For Bach to do this, however, implies he could not have been aware that the chord is virtually unplayable in that form. This is at odds with the remaining 2399 bars of the complete works, which fit more or less comfortably under the violinist’s fingers. It is obvious to conclude, therefore, that the four-note chord was not intended, and that one of the notes (most likely the G) must be an erroneous note. It cannot be adequately explained why Anna Magdalena in Source B has written the note ‘G’ as the lowest note of the chord and further, why she has not included the note ‘E’ at all, if the FFC (Source A) was the exemplar from which she was copying. At this point in the copying process, it is probable that Anna Magdalena would have recognised that the chord was impractical, from the violinist’s perspective, and then chosen between the possibilities presented. But why choose the note ‘G’ out of the two possibilities presented, and not the ‘E’? Further, why would she even need to make a choice at all? Any doubt as to what her husband’s intention was could surely have been a simple matter of clarification from Bach himself. This isolated example is not enough on its own to determine that Bach intended to write the note in question at Bar 55 as an ‘E’. Looking further into the manuscript, however, may provide a clearer understanding.
Figure 70 below shows Bar 54 prior and the notes leading into the questionable chord in Bar 55. It can be seen that the notes of Bar 54 contain a descending figure in the lower voice part with the intervals tone, semi-tone and tone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Figure 70" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Figure 70" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Figure 70" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 70: The descending figure commencing in Bar 54 and resolving in Bar 55

Figure 71 shows the two bars immediately following Bars 54 and 55. These bars reveal another descending quaver passage, which is exactly the same as the one in the previous two bars and that results in the questionable four-note chord.

In the case of the recurring figure at bars 56 and 57, Source B has the note ‘E’ as per the FFC (Source A). Source D, however, has omitted the note ‘E’ entirely.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Figure 71" /></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Figure 71" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Figure 71" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 71: Bars 56 & 57 of the A minor Fugue
It is unknown why this has occurred, but the musical implications are significant. The descending figure of Bars 56 and 57 allows for resolution of the F sharp to the note ‘E’. The point of altering the F natural from its diatonic state and changing it to an F sharp enables it to resolve to the dominant note of the tonic key and makes perfect compositional sense. The absence of the note ‘E’ in Source D means there is no resolution of the second voice part. However, it does not sound musically unsatisfactory at all and appears to have been the original intention, even if the musical effect is somewhat weakened. The alteration of the note F in Bar 56 to an ‘F sharp’ is also seen in Source D, indicating an awareness or intention to create an E minor chord on the first beat of Bar 57.

Based on the above, the omission of this note in Source D further supports the proposition that this manuscript represents an earlier working draft of the works, but also demonstrates a serious compositional flaw. Given the accepted traditional understanding that Kellner’s manuscript (Source D), is a copy of an earlier working version of Bach’s, the question that follows is: Would Bach really have made such an amateur mistake?

The repeated descending figure in Bars 56 and 57 leads to even more confusion with Source B, because in this instance the correct note ‘E’ is written, thus agreeing with Source A at this point. If, during the copying process, given the accepted traditional understanding that Source B is a copy of Source A, Anna Magdalena would have realised that the writing of the note ‘G’ two bars earlier was incorrect (given the repeated passage two bars later). She could then have
written the note ‘E’ underneath, therefore making an exact copy of Source A. Rather, it appears she has made a decision to ignore the ‘E’.

All subsequent printed editions of these works have the note ‘E’ at Bar 55 and in the absence of any known clarification from Bach, the reason for this decision by him must surely be based on the same descending figure in Bars 44-49 and confirmed by the repeated notes in Bars 56 and 57, where the note ‘E’ is used as resolution. Clearly the impracticalities associated with the execution of the four-note chord must have been a factor. See Figure 72.

| Source D |
| Source B |
| Source A |

Figure 72: The similar descending figure in Bars 44-49.
Two other important divergences within the A minor Fugue occur in Bars 131 and 166. In these bars, two notes have been omitted from the final three-note chord in Source D, which are present in both Source A and B. In Source D, in both cases, only the top note of the chord has been given. See Figure 73 and Figure 74.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Figure 73: Bar 131 of the A minor Fugue" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Figure 73: Bar 131 of the A minor Fugue" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Figure 73: Bar 131 of the A minor Fugue" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Bar 131, it is observed that Source D allows for the missing quaver note of the second voice part rhythmically, i.e. the note underneath the two quavers given in Sources B and A is given a crotchet note value. The fact that this note has been assigned that particular rhythmic value in Source D, provides clear evidence that this was an original compositional intention. As such, it was not originally intended to be a three-note chord because the ‘A’ note underneath can be
played as an open string simultaneously with the upper note. As the rhythm of Bars 131 and 166 are the same, it would appear that the original compositional intent was, in both cases, to have only a single note at the end of each of these bars. Upon subsequent revision, and perhaps with the assistance of Schwanenberger to provide violinistic advice, it was decided to include a three-note chord in both bars. By doing this the consistency of polyphonic writing throughout each bar is maintained and the harmony of the bar is strengthened.

Bar 187 of the A minor Fugue further challenges the existing paradigm of the relationship between the manuscript versions. In this bar, the articulation markings in Source A allow for the specific effect of syncopation to be created. Creating this effect indicates a clear compositional intention, as the stress is intentionally given to the weaker parts of the beats within the bar. The absence of the syncopation effect in Sources B and D indicate it was not considered until a much later revision, possibly with some input from Schwanenberger. This is shown in Figure 75 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Figure 75: The semiquavers are slurred in pairs Source D & B and syncopated in Source A.
Further, the only reason for the lack of syncopation in Source B is that Anna Magdalena was not copying from the FFC (as traditionally believed) and that her manuscript version (Source B) was created prior to the FFC (Source A). That is to say, Anna Magdalena was working from an earlier working version (which could possibly be Source D) where the final syncopation effect had not as yet been considered. This further supports the proposition that Source D was an earlier version, but also supports the proposition that Source B was derived from Source D.

Another unusual discrepancy between the manuscripts occurs in Bar 259 of the A minor Fugue. In this bar, both Source B and Source A have two single quavers notes (‘F’ and ‘A’) at the conclusion of the bar and there is a dotted quaver and semiquaver at the commencement of the following bar. In Source D, however, there is a dotted quaver and semiquaver at the end of this bar with the same notes. Source D then has another dotted quaver and semiquaver at the commencement of the following bar, which coincides with Sources A and B. See Figure 76 following.

The subsequent semiquaver value assigned to the next note, can only be explained if this was the original compositional intention. When taking into consideration the dotted rhythm of the first two notes, which follow in Bar 260 in all three sources, it is logical to assume that the original intention was to assign both groups of notes this rhythmic pattern. Upon later revision, a decision was made to change the rhythm to two quaver notes at the end of Bar 259 and to include a trill over the newly revised quaver note in Bar 260, which
is not present in Source D. While it is unknown why this change was made, a possible explanation may be a concern of the overuse of the dotted rhythm in the context of the Fugue, which is more stylistically appropriate to a Courante.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

![Figure 76: Bars 259 & 260 of the A minor Fugue](image)

The currently accepted position is that Bach wrote the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* during his time at Köthen, completing them in the year 1720. This is principally because they are preserved in a manuscript bearing his name and the date, 1720. A comparison, however, of the so-called ‘1720 Autograph’ FFC (Source A) with the two surviving copies of these works by Kellner (Source D) and Anna Magdalena (Source B) reveal many peculiarities, which could challenge the traditionally held views of these works.

Source B contains divergences from the original, in addition to those discussed above, which imply that she could not have been copying from Source A.

Source D differs so markedly from Source A that it cannot possibly have been copied from Source A. The discussion above confirms that a new hypothesis is needed to explain both Source D and its relationship to Sources B and A.
If this is the case, however, it must then challenge the traditionally accepted understanding of when the FFC (Source A) was actually written out in its entirety. Kellner's manuscript (Source D) clearly bears the date 3 July, 1726. If he was copying from an earlier version, which was later revised, it follows that the completion date of the FFC must be later than 1720, and the completed manuscript (Source A) must be later than 1726. The question is, was Kellner copying, or composing?

The A minor Fugue is but one example of a considerable number of divergences identified between the three manuscripts. These differences between the versions point towards the need to revise the traditional beliefs regarding the originating Sources. If this is the case it is likely the compositional process of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas took place over a period of many years, with many revisions, potential collaboration and re-writing before they reached the final version as is known today. In the next section, evidence will be presented supporting the hypothesis that Kellner composed the original manuscript, known as Source D.

The examples, which follow, provide the evidence to support the proposition that Kellner was indeed the original composer. This is because the divergences cannot be adequately explained on the basis of the traditional belief that Kellner copied an incomplete or early version of the works in Bach’s hand. For, if we take this traditional position we are left with a proposition that Bach was a composer of lesser quality than tradition would have it. If Kellner was, however, a compositional student of Bach’s, tasked with creating a first draft of the collection
of unaccompanied violin works, this easily explains all the divergences that exist in the manuscript. Space allows for only some of its presentation here and easily identifies Kellner as the student composer, owing to the musical inadequacies and inexplicable mistakes contained within his manuscript version.

6.10 Further evidence of Kellner as composer

6.10.1 Tempo markings

Example 1

Bar 1 of the G minor Fugue in Source D has no tempo indication. There is, however, a tempo marking of Allegro in Source B and Source A. Further, Source D has a common time signature, whereas Sources B and A have a cut-common time signature. This peculiarity suggests that when Source D was composed, there was no intention to indicate a speed for the Fugue because this was Kellner's first attempt at writing polyphonic music for the violin. And, because he was not a violinist, he would not have had knowledge of the technical issues of playing fugal music on a single melodic line instrument. Upon later revision and with the possible collaboration of Schwanenberger, it became clear that it would be possible to perform the fugue at an Allegro speed and this may then have affected the change to a cut-common time signature, thus giving a feeling of ‘two’ in the bar at an Allegro speed.
6.10.2 Key signatures

Example 1

The use of a modal key signature in Source B and Source A, to express the key of G minor⁶⁶⁷ — the key of the Sonata 1— is an unusual feature within the Violin Sonatas and Partitas. The use of a modal key signature was “...a notational convention of the Baroque period where a composer wrote in modes, instead of major and minor keys”.⁶⁶⁸ Source D contains both ‘B flat’ and an ‘E flat’, however, to indicate the key signature of G minor. This suggests that the original intention of Kellner was to use the key of G minor. Upon later revision in Sources A and B, however, this was changed to reflect the Modal Key system, viz. G Dorian Mode i.e. this is the same as the scale of G minor (descending melodic form) starting on the ‘F’, which, from a key signature perspective, creates the idea that it is written D minor, the same key signature as F Major. Clearly this is an intriguing change, because if Source D was simply a copy of a supposed lost Source X in Bach’s hand, then surely the modal key signature would have been present, and Kellner would

---

⁶⁶⁷ The modal version of G-minor has one flat only – B flat – rather that two flats, where the second flat is E flat.

have copied this. This leads to the inevitable conclusion that Kellner was not copying from the supposed missing Source X.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 78: The key signature of the G minor Sonata

### 6.10.3 Notation

#### Example 1

On the downbeat of Bar 8 of the G minor Siciliana there is a three-note chord, comprising the notes ‘D’ ‘C’ and ‘F sharp’. Figure 79 shows that in Source D the lowest note of this chord (note ‘D’) is missing. Clearly, there is no obvious reason why Bach would have left out the open ‘D’ in the supposed missing Source X. The two notes in Source D, therefore, only imply the dominant seventh harmony, whereas in Source B and Source A, the dominant seventh harmony is fully stated. This provides a further example of Kellner’s lack of knowledge of the violin and inexperience as a composer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 79: Bar 8 of the G minor Siciliana
6.10.4 Additional notes

Example 1

Figure 80 shows Bar 39 of the D minor Chaconne. In Source D on the 2nd, 3rd and 4th semiquavers of the bar, double-stops (thirds) appear to have been written. These do not appear in Source B or Source A. It appears that Kellner was experimenting with this concept, which was rejected upon a subsequent revision process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Source D" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Source B" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Source A" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 80: Bar 39 of the D minor Chaconne*

6.10.5 Articulations

Example 1

Figure 81 shows Bar 84 of the G minor Fugue shows that Source B has a slur marked over only the final pair of quavers and Source A has the last two pairs of quavers articulated with slurs. Source D contains no slur markings.

Additionally, Source D has a clef positioned on the ‘E’ line of the treble stave (known as the violin clef or soprano clef) in front of the second beat of the bar, which is positioned on the ‘G’ line denoting a treble clef. In Source B and Source A there is no such violin clef. This is very significant as this indicates that Kellner, in Source D, has deliberately applied this violin clef as a compositional tool, because there is no other justification for its use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Source D" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Source B" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Source A" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 81: Bar 84 of the G minor Fugue
6.10.6 Missing notes

Example 1

This example contained within the A minor Fugue, shows two notes of the final chord missing in Source D, which has only a single note. Both Source B and Source A contain extra notes, which create a G minor chord. This strengthens the harmony established with the use of the G minor chord at the commencement of the bar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="source_d.png" alt="Source D" /></td>
<td><img src="source_b.png" alt="Source B" /></td>
<td><img src="source_a.png" alt="Source A" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 82: A bar of the A minor Fugue

6.10.7 Missing chords

Example 1:

This example provides further evidence of Kellner as the originating composer. In Bar 15 of the D minor Chaconne there are two chords missing from the bar in Source D, which are present in Source B and Source A. The addition of the chords upon a subsequent revision process, increases the polyphonic nature of this work. Further it appears that Kellner’s idea to create a chord under the first note of the bar ‘D’ has been moved to another place in the bar under the third note ‘D.’ This alters the fundamental harmony of the bar, whereby a chord of D minor is established at the commencement of the bar, followed by an implied G minor chord. The chord, which is written at the commencement of the bar in
Source D is better placed on the third note of the bar as it creates tension before resolving to the note C sharp, thereby creating an A Major chord at this point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Source D" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Source B" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Source A" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 83: Bar 15 of the D minor Chaconne**

### 6.10.8 Divergent intervals

**Example 1**

Bar 20 of the D minor Chaconne shows a single note ‘D’ at the commencement of the bar in Source D, whereas a double stop has been created in Source A and Source B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Source D" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Source B" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Source A" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 84: Bar 20 of the D minor Chaconne**
Example 2

Bar 21 of the D minor Chaconne shows three different notes in Source D. These notes have been raised an interval of a third in Source B and Source A to create a minor seventh interval from the C sharp, whereas Source D has a diminished fifth interval. Clearly, when the works were revised, a decision was made that the interval of the minor seventh was more appropriate than Kellner's suggestion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Source D" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Source B" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Source A" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 85: Bar 21 of the D minor Chaconne

6.13.9 Incomplete bars

Example 1

Bar 2 of the G minor Siciliana shows an example of a compositional error in Source D, where Kellner has failed to complete the bar. In Source B the bar has been completed and duly transferred into Source A, strongly reinforcing the proposition that Source B pre-dates Source A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Source D" /></td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Source B" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Source A" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 86: Bar 2 of the G minor Siciliana
6.10.10 Rhythmic miscalculations

Example 1

Bar 10 of the A minor Grave shows a further compositional error in Source D, where Kellner has miscalculated the rhythmic value of the bar by doubling the value of the first two beats of the bar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 87: Bar 10 of the A minor Grave

6.10.11 Numerous divergences within a bar

Example 1

Bar 2 of the G minor Siciliana is incomplete in Kellner's version and contains many different or missing notes in Source D. As a result of the numerous divergences contained within this bar, a comparison of each quaver beat of the bar will be detailed.

Quaver beat 1 – is written as the note ‘D’ in all three manuscript versions.
Quaver beat 2 – is written as a double stop comprising notes ‘F’ and ‘C’ in all three manuscript versions.
Quaver beat 3 – is written as a double stop comprising the notes ‘G’ and ‘B flat’ in Source A and Source B but as a three-note chord in Source D, comprising the notes ‘G’ and B flat’ and an additional note ‘B flat’ one octave below.
Quaver beat 4 – is written as the note ‘C’ in Source A and Source B. In Source D this quaver note is written as the note ‘F’.

Quaver beat 5 – is written as a quaver note ‘A’ in Source A and Source B and with the semiquaver notes ‘E flat’ and ‘C’ directly above it. These notes are missing from Source D.

Quaver beat six is written as a three-note chord in Source A and Source B, comprising the notes ‘B flat’, a further ‘B flat’ written one octave above, and a ‘D’. These notes are not present in Source D.

Quaver beat 7 - Source D is in agreement with Source A and Source B at this point after omitting the previous three quaver beats. Source D contains the note ‘F,’ which is the same as Source A and Source B.

Quaver beats 8 – 12 are in agreement between the three manuscript versions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>![Image of Source D]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source B</td>
<td>![Image of Source B]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source A</td>
<td>![Image of Source A]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 88: Bar 2 of the G minor Sonata showing numerous divergences within a bar.
6.11 Variations found in the C Major Fugue

6.11.1 “Da capo”

Further evidence to support the hypothesis that Kellner was the composer of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* can be seen in the “da capo” of the C Major Fugue. Figure 89 shows that Kellner has written out the words “da capo”, (indicating a repeat from the very beginning of the movement) as a composer would do.

Neither Source B nor Source A, however, have the words “da capo” written at the end of this section. Instead, both Sources write out all the notes of the repeated section as opposed to using the “da capo” indication. The beginning of the repeated “da capo” section in Sources B and A, however, is different and, according to Stinson (1989) is:

*...in no way a literal restatement of mm. 1-8. Bach adds counterpoint to the first two statements of the subject, beginning with the third beat of m. 289 and extending to the second beat of m. 296, from which point until m. 353 the repeat is note-for-note; only the final chord differs.*

---

669 The term ‘da capo’ translated literally means ‘from the head’. It is an indication that a previously played section of the music is to be repeated.

Figures 90 and 91 which follow, show (in both Sources B and A) the first eight bars of the C Major Fugue as the top image, and the commencement of the “da capo” section written out with the addition of counterpoint added in the lower image.

**Source B:**Bars 1-8 of the C Major Fugue

![Figure 90](image)

**Source B:** Commencement of the “da capo” section with added counterpoint.

![Figure 91](image)

**Source A:**Bars 1-8 of the C Major Fugue

**Source A:** Commencement of the “da capo” section with added counterpoint.

![Figure 91](image)
Of the additional counterpoint added into the “da capo” Stinson cites Braunlich:

This discrepancy between Kellner's copy and the autograph led Braunlich to maintain that Bach originally conceived this movement as containing a literal da capo and that he added counterpoint to the first several bars of the restatement only when he prepared the autograph version.671

Stinson, however, provides a different conclusion to Braunlich on the matter, believing that the original intention of Source D was that the notes of the “da capo” would be identical to those of the C Major Fugue commencement. He points to the rest located under the indication for the note A (Figure 92), occupying the lowest space of the system, as showing intent for the lower voice part. Stinson describes it as follows:

Evidently Kellner realised that the movement was a da capo fugue immediately after notating the rest. It follows that he must have also realised that the repeat was not literal but decided to spare himself the trouble of writing it out since only a short passage differed. What is puzzling is why he did not copy out the repeat until the third beat of the bar corresponding to m. 296 and then provide the da capo indication for the material which is a note-for-note restatement.672

Figure 92: The rest indication in Source D

671 Ibid. p.69.
672 Ibid. p.70.
Stinson goes on to say:

*Lack of space was no problem because Kellner’s “Da Capo” appears on the top system of a page. Copying music is more of less a mechanical process, and I may be assuming more discernment on the part of a scribe than is normally done, but how else can the half rest be explained?*

This thesis, however, offers a different explanation for this. Given there was space on the page for Kellner to write out the counterpoint (if indeed the counterpoint existed at that point in time) there is no explanation as to why he did not do this, other than the counterpoint had not yet been written. Further this would explain the rest under the supposed note ‘A’ in Source D because Kellner did not know what Bach was going to write and used a rest to indicate the lower voice part. Further, the discernment on the part of a scribe, as discussed by Stinson, supports the hypothesis that the works were not copied by Kellner but were composed by Kellner, under the direction of Bach, according to his manuscript design, and that Bach’s intention was always to augment the da capo to include the counterpoint, which did not exist until that time.

Immediately prior to the “da capo” in Source D, there is the addition of six notes, which do not appear in either Source B or Source A (See Figure 93).

---

673 Ibid.
In her discussion of the “da capo” sections in Bach’s works, Tatlow (2015) says:

*The ABA structure of a da capo aria or movement is normally notated with crystal clarity in Bach’s compositions. Bach usually, but not always, indicates a return to the A section at the end of the last bar of the B section with the words ‘Da Capo al Fine’...Sometimes he adds the first bar of the A section after the last bar of the B section, in which case the performer returns to the second bar of the A section. The lengths of the sections are not affected by the notation, but Bach’s layout requires space for one more written bar. If he was working out his proportions from the ground-plan of the score, rather than repeats, it is important to observe this feature literally.*

The choice made by Anna Magdalena (perhaps on the advice of Bach) in Source B, and then in the FFC, to re-write the music in full rather than the use of the “da capo” sign as it appears in Source D of the C Major Fugue, means that the addition of the extra bar is avoided, and consequently the proportion levels are maintained. While not affecting the musical sound overall, the decision to write

---

*Tatlow 2015, p. 21.*
out the notes of the “da capo” section of the C Major Fugue means that the perfection of the notes as they appear on the written page, would not be compromised as the proportion levels are perfectly maintained.

6.11.2 Note stems

The consistent use of down-stems by Kellner in Source D, when writing notes in the lowest voice part, supports the hypothesis that Kellner was composing at the keyboard. These notes are given with upstems in both Source A and Source B. The prevalence of these down-stem notes in the lower voice part, indicate Kellner, in Source D, may have been applying the rules of keyboard composition when composing these works in their early stages. Upon later revision, many of these notes were corrected and given up stems upon later revision.

Example 1

Bar 24 shows down-stems lower voice part Source D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Source D" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Source B" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Source A" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 94: Bar 24 of the C Major Fugue
Example 2

Bar 27 with down-stems in the lower voice part Source D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Example 2 Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Example 2 Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Example 2 Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 95: Bar 27 of the C Major Fugue

Example 3

Bar 37 shows down-stems on the two crotchet notes in the lower voice part.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Example 3 Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Example 3 Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Example 3 Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 96: Bar 37 of the C Major Fugue

Example 4

Bar 102 shows a final minim down-stem on the note ‘G’ in the lower voice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Example 4 Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Example 4 Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image9" alt="Example 4 Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 97: Bar 102 of the C Major Fugue
Example 5

Bar 105 shows a minim down-stem at the commencement of the bar and up stems on the final beats of the bar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="source_d_image" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="source_b_image" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="source_a_image" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 98: Bar 105 of the C Major Fugue

Example 6

Bar 107 shows four crotchet notes with down-stems in Source D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="source_d_image" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="source_b_image" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="source_a_image" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 99: Bar 107 of the C Major Fugue

Example 7

Bar 109 shows down-stems in the lower voice part in Source D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="source_d_image" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="source_b_image" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="source_a_image" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 100: Bar 109 of the C Major Fugue
Example 8

Bar 113 shows down-stems in the lower voice part in Source D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 101: Bar 113 of the C Major Fugue

Example 9

Bar 123 shows down-stems in the lower voice part in Source D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 102: Bar 123 of the C Major Fugue

Example 10

Bar 127 shows down-stems in the lower voice part in Source D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 103: Bar 127 of the C Major Fugue
Example 11

Bar 128 shows down-stems in the lower voice part in Source D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Source D" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Source B" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Source A" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 104: Bar 128 of the C Major Fugue**

Example 12

Bar 133 shows down-stems in the lower voice part in Source D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Source D" /></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Source B" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Source A" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 105: Bar 133 of the C Major Fugue**
6.12 Evidence of Kellner composing at the keyboard

Further support for the hypothesis that Kellner was the original composer comes from the many examples where it appears he has written the music at the keyboard and not take into consideration what was technically possible on the violin. Given that it is accepted that Bach was a violinist of some moderate ability, it is highly unlikely that he would have written such passage work and chords, even if it was only in a supposed missing Source X i.e. an early draft version of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas.

The examples below provide evidence to support this proposition.

Example 1

In this example, the chord in question is a three-note chord in Source B and Source A. This chord comprises the notes ‘D’ (open string), ‘B flat’ and ‘F.’ Source D contains an extra note in this chord — the note ‘D’ (an octave above the open ‘D’ string) See Figure 106. However, this B flat Major chord (written with the doubled third – ‘D’ in Source D), is not possible to execute on the violin. As a piano chord, however, it is entirely reasonable. This indicates that Kellner was composing at the keyboard and upon later revision by a violinist, possibly Schwanenberger, the extra ‘D’ note was removed when it was clear it was unplayable.
Example 2

The three-note chord on the final crotchet beat of Bar 5 of the G minor Fugue consists of the notes ‘F’, ‘D’ and ‘B flat’ in both Source B and Source A. In Source D, however, the middle note of this chord appears to be written as the note ‘E’.

As this is a challenging chord to play if the middle note is an ‘E,’ there are two options:

1. That upon revision it was decided that the chord was too difficult to play and the note was then changed to a ‘D’ which was then reflected in subsequent manuscripts or,

2. This is simply an error by Kellner.
Example 3

Bar 83 of the G minor Fugue (see Figure 108) provides further evidence that Kellner was composing at the keyboard. There is a four-note chord on the fifth quaver beat of the bar. In Sources A and B the notes consist (from the lowest up) of B natural, G, D and F natural. However, in Source D the notes are written as B natural, B (one octave above), D and F natural.

The chord as written in Source D is unplayable on the violin but easily playable at the keyboard, and in fact sounds musically satisfying when executed at the keyboard. A subsequent revision by a violinist – again, possibly by Schwanenberger – would have necessitated the change of note, in order to execute the chord.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Source D" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Source B" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Source A" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 108: Bar 83 with a four-note chord
6.13 Omitted articulations associated with composing at the keyboard

The overall lack of articulation in Source D supports the hypothesis that Kellner was composing at the keyboard, because articulation markings would be irrelevant in that context.

Example 1

Source D provides no slur because it would have no context for the keyboard at that period of music history.

Example 2

Bar 30 of the G minor Fugue contains four slur markings between the quaver pairs, which are absent in Source D. In Sources A and B it is seen as necessary to slur these quaver notes as pairs. In the following bar, which is a falling musical sequence of Bar 30, the notes are slurred in Source D. Furthermore, in Bar 31 there are two slurs missing between the first two quaver pairs in Source B.

The second last quaver beat of the bar consists of a four-note chord in Sources A and B with the notes ‘A’, ‘E’ ‘C sharp’ and ‘A’. In Source D this is written as a three-note chord with the notes ‘E’, ‘C sharp’ and ‘A’, therefore omitting the lowest note of the chord.
From these diversions it can be deduced that Kellner in Source D, composing at the keyboard, initially forgets the need for slur markings between the quaver pairs, but in the second bar realises it may sound better on the violin with slurs. Anna Magdalena in Source B adds the slurs but reconsiders the idea and writes the music out without the slurs in the first two beats of Bar 31. When Bach does the final revisions, he determines that the whole passage would be more effective with slurs in place.

The lack of the note ‘A’ at the base of the chord (the bass note ‘A’) in Source D is strongly suggestive that this is a stage in the compositional process where Kellner has not seen the significance of adding the bass note to the chord as it appears in Source B and Source A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>![Image of Source D]</td>
<td>![Image of Source B]</td>
<td>![Image of Source A]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 110: The four slur markings missing in Source D and the missing bass of the chord
6.14 Anna Magdalena’s bar measurements

As previously discussed in Chapter III, Source B is not an exact copying of FFC in terms of the number of bars per stave and page. From the commencement of the manuscript it can be seen that there is no intention to have an adherence to the number of bars per stave of the exemplar from which she was supposedly copying. This misalignment is consistent within the entire manuscript, which further supports the proposition that Anna Magdalena, in Source B, could not have been copying Source A. This situation is at odds with Tatlow (2007) who details the role of the copyist when drawing up the manuscript, stating:

*In order to make an accurate copy of a score, the composer or copyist had to be aware of the number of bars in a movement. The number of bars would help the copyist both to make an economic disposition of the bars on a page and to ensure that the original and the copy were identical.*

---

675 Tatlow 2007, p.42.
The images below show the misalignment of bars per stave where Source B has clearly not aligned with Source A.

Figure 111: The bar lines as situated in first two staves of the G minor Adagio in Source B

Figure 112: The bar lines as situated in first two staves of the G minor Adagio in Source A
6.15 Evidence of compositional process of the three sources

6.15.1 The G minor Fugue

Example 1

The first main variant commences at Bar 34 of the G minor Fugue. At this point, material is presented in Source D, which does not appear in Source B and Source A. Figure 113 shows that the first two beats of this bar are identical in notation and rhythmic aspects in all three manuscripts. The last two beats of this bar, however, are notated differently in Source D. A series of semiquavers in parallel sixths are written.

![Figure 113: The variance occurring at Bar 34 in Source D](image)

Example 2:

In the bars immediately following the commencement of the variant reading, Source A and Source B are in agreement, apart from one articulation divergence in Bar 36 where Source B is missing a slur marking that is present in Source A. These bars are not present in Source D, which strongly suggests that the arpeggiated section in Source B and Source A was added during the
compositional revision process. As this writing is an advanced violin technique it is possible that Schwanenberger suggested such passagework at this point.

The images below show the added arpeggiated section in Sources B (114) and Source A (Figure 115), which does not appear in Source D.

Figure 114: The arpeggiated section in Source B (Bars 35-41)

Figure 115: The arpeggiated section in Source A (Bars 35-41)
Example 3

At Bar 42 of the G minor Fugue the manuscripts re-join. Figure 116 shows that the first semiquaver of this bar is notated as a ‘B flat’ in both Sources A and B, while Source D has the note D written. In addition, there is a treble clef sign at the commencement of this bar in Sources B and A, which is not present in Source D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Source D" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Source B" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Source A" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 116: The re-joining of the manuscripts at Bar 42 and the different notation in Source D at the commencement of this bar
Example 4

A further unusual variant occurs in Bar 50 of the G minor Fugue. Figure 117 shows that the final eight semiquavers of the bar, which comprise the last two crotchet beats of the bar, are omitted in Source D. The omitted notes are a repeat of the notes contained in the first two beats of the bar, and the word “bis” is written indicating a repeat is written above this bar in the Source D manuscript version. Clearly Kellner is not copying anything because to write the word ‘bis’ has no purpose in a copying exercise. Rather, Kellner is using a form of shorthand because he, as the composer, has made the decision to repeat the two beats.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Figure 117: Bar 43 of Source D and Bar 50 of Source A and Source B where the term ‘bis’ is used only in Source D

---

676 The word “bis” translated literally means ‘to’ or ‘until.’ For example, “bis zum bitteren ende” translates “until the bitter end” and it is likely that the suggestion was a repetition of the notes (until the end of the bar).
6.15.2 Two unusual bars of the G minor Fugue

Example 1

Bars 15 and 80 of the G minor Fugue shows, in Source D, that Kellner's intention was for the placement of the double stop to be over the third quaver of the three quaver motif. Figure 118 shows that in Source B and Source A, the double stop has been shifted to the second quaver of the three quaver motif. Given the regularity with which Kellner places the double stop on the third quaver of the three quaver motif throughout the Fugue, it appears that this placement over the third quaver of the motif was Kellner's original intention and it was subsequent to the revision whereby it was decided that a better effect was achieved by placing the double stop over the second.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 118: Bar 15 of the Fugue as it appears in the three manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 119: Bar 80 of the Fugue as it appears in the three manuscripts
6.16 Syncopated bowings

The two examples below, selected from the many examples throughout the three manuscript versions, provide further evidence of the compositional process commencing with Kellner, in Source D then added to by Anna Magdalena in Source B and finalised by Bach in Source A in the form of syncopated bowings.

Example 1

Figure 120 shows Bar 20 of the G minor Adagio. In Source D there are no articulation markings, Source B has two articulation markings and Source A has three articulation markings, with the addition of a syncopated bow stroke.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Source D" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Source B" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Source A" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 120: Bar 20 of the G minor Adagio with articulation markings
Example 2

Figure 121 shows Bar 51 of the G minor Fugue. In Source D there is only one slur marking and no syncopated bowings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source D</th>
<th>Source B</th>
<th>Source A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Figure 121: Bar 51 of the G minor Fugue with slur markings and missing syncopation
6.17 Additional markings in Source D

The images below in Figure 122 show some of the curious pencil markings that exist mainly in the G minor Sonata of Source D. A simple explanation for these markings in the context of Kellner as a pupil of Bach’s is that having completed the compositional exercise of the G minor Sonata, his work has been evaluated by Bach as his teacher and Bach has provided written commentary on Kellner’s work. Other faszikels of Kellner’s konvolut contain similar markings, which indicate the konvolut was used by Kellner as a student workbook.

![Figure 122: Several occurrences where additional markings appear in Source D of the G minor Sonata](image)

In summary, all the examples above call into question the traditional view that Kellner copied a now lost supposed Source X. Further, what has been presented adds weight to the argument that Kellner was a composition student of Bach’s. Consequently what is seen in Source D is Kellner, having been given motifs for each movement by his teacher Bach, then, having developed the motif into a complete movement, returns to Bach for a critique of what he has written. This
then explains the pencil markings in Source D, which are strongly suggestive of the hand of Bach, as seen in the images above in Figure 120. In addition, this explains why in Source D the ordering is as it is, i.e. the three Sonatas followed by two incomplete Partitas. This is because Kellner, being a keyboard player, was more at ease with polyphonic writing and less comfortable with single melodic line writing.
CHAPTER VII - CONCLUSION

7.1 Key research question

Given that from the 1720s there are three extant manuscripts of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas for Violin Solo Senza Basso attributed to Johann Sebastian Bach, and given that the relationships among them are not at all clear, what can be deduced regarding the relationship the three manuscripts have to each other using a forensic scientific approach?

7.2 The traditional view

The traditional view of the relationship between the three manuscript versions in summary is as follows:

- It is assumed that Bach completed the FFC of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* in 1720, during his time at the Köthen Court under the patronage of Prince Leopold of Anhalt Köthen.

- It is assumed that at some stage later, Anna Magdalena copied the FFC of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas*, along with the *Cello Suites*, and created a konvolut of the two sets of works, which for some unknown reason became the property of the violinist Schwanenberger. The generally accepted position is that both copies were made some time after 1726.  

- Johann Peter Kellner made a copy of a radically different version of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas*, which he apparently completed on 3rd of July,

---

677 See Chapter I (1.5) of this thesis, *The Six Cello Suites.* p. 46.
1726 in his home town of Frankenhayn (see Figure 123). His manuscript contains only five of the six works (there is no B minor Partita), which are ordered differently. Further, his manuscript contains three major variants from the FFC within the G minor Fugue, the C Major Fugue and the D minor Chaconne, as well as many other small variants. It is assumed that Kellner (Source D) created his copy by copying a supposed lost Source X.

Figure 123: “Frankenhayn” written on Kellner’s manuscript with the date “3 July 1726”

7.3 The development of a new hypothesis

In this thesis, material has been presented that clearly challenges the above paradigm; and which now calls for a new hypothesis to be developed regarding the relationship between the three manuscripts.
In order to develop a new hypothesis, however, answers to the following questions must be found from within this thesis:

1. Is there compelling forensic evidence that Kellner’s manuscript of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas actually represents a compositional exercise given to him by Bach?

2. Do the coincidences and divergences between Anna Magdalena's manuscript and Kellner’s exist because of the compositional process?

3. Is there compelling circumstantial evidence that Schwanenberger, as a violinist, was directly involved in the compositional revision process leading to the FFC of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas?

4. Is there circumstantial evidence that suggests that the date of 1720 on the FFC of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas represents the year in which the works were begun, rather than the date of year of completion?

Is there evidence to support the proposition that Kellner’s version was revised by Anna Magdalena prior to a final revision made by Bach, which he then created in accordance with his original compositional intent?
Is there compelling forensic evidence that Kellner's manuscript of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* actually represents a compositional exercise given to him by Bach?

As stated above, the traditional view of the Kellner manuscript (Source D) is that it was copied from a no longer extant early working version by Bach (the supposed Source X). However, as discussed in the body of the thesis, there is no physical evidence that an earlier version by Bach ever existed. And, it follows logically that in order to prove that something is a copy, there must be material evidence that supports the proposition that there was an original from which the copy was made. In the case of Kellner's manuscript of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* there is no evidence whatsoever to support that proposition i.e. there is no indication from any written source from the period that such an early version in the hand of Bach ever existed. A priori, therefore, it cannot be assumed that Kellner's manuscript is a copy.

Despite the traditionally held assumption that Kellner created his "copy" from a now supposed lost exemplar, it is very important to stress that the one question, which has never been adequately answered in any convincing manner, is how and why Kellner copied in 1726 an incomplete version of works supposedly completed in 1720.

Stinson (1989) says that Bach and Kellner were not acquainted before 1727, and, therefore, it is logical to assume that any of Kellner's copies of Bach manuscripts preceding the date in 1727 when they met, must have been copied from supposed manuscripts already circulating in Thuringia.\(^{678}\) Consequently, Stinson then

\(^{678}\) Stinson 1989, p.18.
argues that Kellner’s copy of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* must logically have originated from another source, which was an earlier working version of Bach’s. Therefore, Kellner was using a non-autographed exemplar.\(^6\) Szabo (2015) states in his article that:

*...These exemplars appear to have been unavailable to, or at least not used by any of the people who made the other surviving copies, and as neither of these exemplars has survived, this leaves Kellner’s copy as our only circumstantial evidence of their existence.*\(^7\)

However, this statement conflicts with Stinson’s (1989) suggestion that the exemplar from which Kellner copied, must have been circulating in Germany for Kellner to have copied it, although both are in agreement that no one other than Kellner copied from this mysterious exemplar.

The physical forensic evidence examined in Chapter VI of this thesis clearly demonstrates that the chronological ordering of the manuscripts cannot be as traditionally accepted. For example, in Bar 55 of the A minor Fugue the absence of the three-note chord in Kellner’s manuscript and the rhythmic allowance for the chord (i.e. it is the written crotchet rather than two quavers), cannot be explained via the traditional view, as this is not a copyist error, but rather an earlier version.

Two further examples are the rhythmic differences which occur in Bars 10 and 14 of the A minor Grave. Kellner has, in Bar 10, miscalculated the rhythmic value

---

\(^6\) Szabo 2015, p. 71.
\(^7\) Ibid. p.17.
of the bar and in Bar 14 has applied a distinctly different rhythmic intention, which has been improved in the subsequent revisions of Source B and then Source A.

As such, the so-called ‘copying errors’ are not actually errors at all (which are simply occurring as a result of the copying process) but that instead the apparent deviations represent an attempt by Kellner to create a version of a string work at the request of his composition teacher Bach. Szabo (2015) appears to support this position when he points out the “…strikingly different characteristics” between Kellner’s manuscript and the FFC and that the comparison “…reveals hitherto undervalued information regarding the genesis of these works.” Further, Szabo states, “…in light of this information, the significance of these copies may need to be reassessed.” The ‘strikingly different characteristics’ of the Kellner manuscript and the questionable moments of composition, “…which cannot be authentic Bach.” would also account for the unusual ordering of the works, and the material not found in the Final Fair Copy that is present in Kellner’s manuscript of the G Minor Fugue.

Therefore, the research material presented in this thesis — besides challenging the idea that Kellner copied an earlier version of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas — also supports, and in fact confirms the views of Szabo (2015) and Jarvis (2007), that it is also highly improbable that Kellner copied his version of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas from the FFC or any manuscript that preceded it.

681 Ibid.
682 Ibid.
683 Ibid.
Further, the material detailed and examined in this thesis provides new evidence that strongly challenges the assumption that Kellner had access to a now missing early version of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* and instead postulates that there was actually no such manuscript somehow circulating in Thuringia waiting to be copied by Kellner. This is because there is absolutely no evidence to support the proposition that such a manuscript ever existed. It is argued, therefore, that it was, in fact, Kellner who wrote the initial draft himself.

In summary, the forensic and circumstantial evidence provided in this thesis, strongly supports the proposition that it is more probable that Kellner’s manuscript was not ‘copied’ from an earlier working version of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* in Bach’s hand. It therefore follows that Kellner’s version of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* is instead, the first working draft of these works, composed for the most part by Kellner, but most probably to an earlier compositional design given to Kellner by his teacher Bach.

**Do the coincidences and divergences between Anna Magdalena’s manuscript and Kellner’s exist because of the compositional process?**

The long held and traditional view of the Anna Magdalena manuscript is that she copied her manuscript version from Bach’s Final Fair Copy (FFC). The evidence provided in this thesis, however, further supports the proposition made by Jarvis (2007) that her manuscript cannot have been copied from the Final Fair Copy of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* simply because it contains too many divergences of a significant nature from the FFC. These divergences are simply too great in number and, in many cases, coincide with the version prepared by Kellner in 1726, as described above.
It has been postulated by a number of Bach scholars, and without any material evidence, that Anna Magdalena’s manuscript version was sold as a commission.\textsuperscript{685} Further, Tomita (2006) states that the \textit{Cello Suites} and \textit{the Violin Sonatas and Partitas} were made as a sales copy, and, therefore, “...should have been copied more reliably than many of the performance parts she had made.”\textsuperscript{686} While this scenario is plausible, it must be noted that no material evidence has ever been found to suggest that Anna Magdalena’s copies were made for the purpose of being purchased. Further, Schwanenberger’s handwriting has been identified in her copy of the \textit{Violin Sonatas and Partitas}\textsuperscript{687} and it is his hand on the title page. If this was the case, the question must then be posed as to why Anna Magdalena would not have done this herself if she were indeed making a reliable copy. Further, it would also surely be expected that the titles would have been copied out in full.\textsuperscript{688} This thesis has provided forensic evidence, therefore, that seriously challenges the notion that these copies were made for purchase and offers an alternative hypothesis that Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the \textit{Violin Sonatas and Partitas} is instead an intervening step in the compositional process towards the FFC of the works.

Within the body of this thesis, irrefutable evidence has been provided that Kellner and Anna Magdalena collaborated on many occasions. For example, evidence has been provided to support the proposition that Kellner’s copy of the \textit{Cello Suites} was signed off with the phrase “Soli Deo sit Gloria” by Anna Magdalena.

\textsuperscript{685} See for example, Tatlow 2015, p. 134.
\textsuperscript{686} Tomita 2007, p. 72.
\textsuperscript{687} See Jarvis 2007.
\textsuperscript{688} See pp. 221-224 of this thesis.
Interestingly, Kellner’s copy of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas*, however, has clearly been signed off by him.\(^{689}\) There is clear evidence that the handwritings at the end of Faszikel 26 (in the middle of the Kellner konvolute) and additionally at the end of the Kellner *Cello Suites*, are signed off by the same hand i.e. Anna Magdalena. (See Figures 5 and 6 on page 117). It appears that Bach only ever signed off “Soli Deo Gloria” or the initials ‘SDG’, and it is noted that his handwriting is significantly different to both Kellner and Anna Magdalena (see Figure 22 on page 212).

The fact that Kellner signed “Soli Deo Sit Gloria” at the end of his version of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* (Figure 4, p.117) presents significant material evidence that eliminates him from having signed at the end of his manuscript version of the *Cello Suites*, and this further supports the proposition that there was ongoing collaboration with Anna Magdalena. If “Soli Deo Sit Gloria” signifies authorship, then it makes sense for him to write “Soli Deo Sit Gloria” at the end of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas*, because he is the primary composer. Clearly, there is no reason for a copyist to sign off with the term “Soli Deo Sit Gloria”, because the copyist is, by definition, not the creator of the music being copied.

In the case of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas*, Anna Magdalena and Kellner’s collaboration is now more easily explained; Kellner had returned to his home in Frankenhayn to complete the task of creating the first draft of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas according to Bach’s pre-planned requirements, before he then sent

\(^{689}\) See Figure 4 on p.119 of this thesis.
the manuscript to Bach’s home at Leipzig for further refinement by either Bach or his compositional assistant Anna Magdalena.

**Is there compelling circumstantial evidence that Schwanenberger, as a violinist, was directly involved in the compositional revision process leading to the FFC of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas?**

It is a known fact that Schwanenberger was in the Bach household in Leipzig, studying with him from 1727-1728.690

In an essay written in 1739, Birnbaum states the following:

> It is true one does not judge a composition principally and predominantly by the impression of its performance. But if such judgement, which indeed may be deceiving, is not to be considered, I see no other way of judging than to view the work as it has been set down in notes.691

Further, Wolff (2000) states, “...The written text establishes the only reliable document of the composer’s ideas and intentions and that is particularly true of a work displaying Bach’s unusual musical perfections.”692

With this in mind we pose the question, did the creation of musical perfection on the page include the goal of perfect execution? Bach seemed well aware that musical performances of his works did not automatically match the level of perfection of the composition in question, as they existed on the written page. It was in fact, this aspect that prompted him to have Birnbaum raise this crucial point in his essay of 1739.

---

690 See p. 114.
691 See Wolf 2000, p. 470.
692 Ibid.
As detailed earlier in this thesis, Bach's trepidation surrounding the perfect execution of his works may explain Schwanenberger's involvement in the preparation of the Anna Magdalena manuscript. Conceivably, Schwanenberger may have been one person Bach considered able to execute the works as close to perfectly as they appeared on the written page. Bach's knowledge of Schwanenberger's ability to execute the works may have been a manifestation of Schwanenberger's involvement in the compositional process. i.e. advice on the performance and/or execution of early workings.693

This thesis postulates that this scenario may provide the reason why the combined manuscript of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* and *Cello Suites* contains the handwriting of Schwanenberger within the manuscript pages of Anna's konvolute, and the text on the title page.

As has been cited above by Wolff (2000), the implication is that Bach believed that his music calligraphy only ever existed in perfection on the written page and not in the playing of it. Bach's idea of musical perfection, as Birnbaum affirmed, included the goal of perfect execution.694 Wolff states, "a performance may only represent an approximation...the perfection of the idea and the perfection of its realization may remain unresolved...In the final analysis, only the idea can claim to be truly perfect, and Bach knew it." It appears from what has been written by Bach scholars that architectural design of the manuscript was crucial to him.695 Bach may, therefore, have considered Schwanenberg to be one violinist who could

---

693 See pp. 151-153.
694 See Wolff 2000, p. 470.
695 See Tatlow, 2015
execute these works perfectly “Soli Deo sit Gloria” i.e. to the Glory of God. Further, it is plausible that Schwanenberger was used in the compositional process of these works to potentially provide an expert violinist’s advice. As part of this, Schwanenberger’s key role was most likely the execution of incomplete or impartial parts of the current workings to ascertain discrepancies in the playability and potentially the compositional flow.

During his time in Leipzig in 1727, a request may have been made of Schwanenberger to play the violin works. This may have allowed Schwanenberger to further understand the compositional workings of Bach, and how to execute the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* to perfection, or at least to the satisfaction of Bach.

As the date on Kellner’s manuscript is 1726, it can be safely assumed that this is when he completed his version of the works. This thesis offers that Kellner’s manuscript of the five works (therein contained) made its way to the Bach household. It is quite plausible that Schwanenberger became involved in the compositional process at this point, that is to say, he played Kellner’s version of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* for Bach. They then discussed them and, after some initial review and feedback from Schwanenberger, changes were then made to the works.

Without significant input from a violinist it would be impossible for anyone to have any idea of how the compositions technically functioned from a violinist’s perspective and, subsequently, how they actually sounded. Importantly, while there is no direct evidence that Anna Magdalena, Kellner and Bach played the violin to the technical level required to perform the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas*, it
is definitely known that Schwanenberger was a violinist who probably could perform at the skill level required.

**Is there circumstantial evidence that suggests that the date of 1720 on the FFC of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas represents the year in which the works were begun, rather than the date of year of completion?**

There are manuscript examples of Bach’s works, which clearly demonstrate that the date written on the title page of a given manuscript represents a date of commencement of the manuscript rather than a date of completion. A very good example of this is *The Notebook for Wilhelm Friedemann Bach*, where the title page even states the works were commenced on the 22\textsuperscript{nd} of January, 1720\textsuperscript{696} shows this. Robert Marshall (1990), also confirms this:

> The three albums differ in their content, origin and purpose; and, accordingly, each illuminates the musical private life of the Bach family rather differently. Bach began the Clavier Büchlein vor Wilhelm Friedemann Bach on 22\textsuperscript{nd} January 1720 for his nine-year old son. It was clearly conceived as a systematic, pedagogical keyboard method, beginning with an explanation of the clefs, the names of the notes, and the principles of keyboard fingering…\textsuperscript{697}

In the Afterword of the 1725 *Notebook of Anna Magdalena*, Georg von Dadelsen states that the earlier of the Notebooks, which Bach prepared for Anna Magdalena dates from 1722:

---

\textsuperscript{696} The word, ‘angefangen’ meaning ‘started or ‘commenced’.

\textsuperscript{697} Marshall 1990, p. 194.
Since all other personal testimonies are lacking, the two keyboard books which Bach prepared for her are all the more important. The earlier one, dating from 1722, is known only as a torso...Bach probably discontinued it after a few years and replaced it in 1725\textsuperscript{698} with the new, more well-known book...\textsuperscript{699}

The manuscript of the First Book of the Well-Tempered Clavier has a date on the cover page of 1722. Karl Heinz states in the introduction to this manuscript, “Bach’s chosen title, on the first folio of the manuscript, reveals that the cycle of preludes and fugues in every key, probably dating from 1722, was didactic in purpose.”\textsuperscript{700}

The Well-Tempered Clavier manuscript dated from 1722 has, as its first work in this collection, the C Major Preludium, which had already begun to be composed sometime after 22\textsuperscript{nd} January 1720. This is the date on the title page of the Wilhelm Friedmann Notebook where the Preludium first makes its appearance as an early working draft. We know that this appearance is an earlier working draft of the Preludium in the Wilhelm Friedmann Notebook as Bars 6 – 24 are written out in block chords and there are corrections at the bottom of the first page of the manuscript, which indicates that the work was still being created. By the time it makes its appearance in Book I of the Well-Tempered Clavier it is written out in full, with changes to the harmony and lengthened. It is known that when Bach made changes to his works he almost always increased the length,

\textsuperscript{698} There is no evidence to support the case that the 1725 Notebook for Anna Magdalena was either commenced or completed in 1725.
“When Bach altered the length of a composition in the process of revising it he almost always made it longer.” It is also accepted (though without any evidence) that Bach’s works underwent many processes of revision before a final product was completed. This process of revision could take a period of years, as evidenced in the Well-Tempered Clavier. Of the dating of the Well-Tempered Clavier, Karl Heinz says:

...we may assume with considerable confidence that the manuscript came into being during Bach’s last year at Cöthen (1722), a dating which is however at variance with Bach’s ‘anno 1732’ at the end, which must more likely refer to a later revision.

Further evidence for the proposition that the 1722 Final Fair Copy of the First Book of the Well-Tempered Clavier is a completion date is the existence in the 1725 Notebook for Anna Magdalena of a version of the First Prelude minus five bars in the mid-section of the movement. This also raises the question of the chronological order of the three versions of the 1st Prelude, however discussion of this is outside the scope of this thesis.

Of the Anna Magdalena Notebook of 1725, David Yearsley, in his article: ‘Death everyday: The Anna Magdalena Bach Book and the Art of Dying’, also describes the date of the collection as the date it commenced:

---

701 Stinson 1989, p. 61.
703 See Jarvis, 2007 for a detailed analysis of the issue.
The Anna Magdalena notebook begun in 1725 – the second of the two musical notebooks that bear her name – opens in the loftiest realms reached by eighteenth-century keyboard music, with early versions...copied out by the composer himself.\(^{704}\)

Although Bach scholarly tradition supports the notion that the date on the title page of the 1725 Anna Magdalena Notebook is the date it was compiled, there is no evidence however, to support the proposition that this is the date that the works were composed nor indeed collated into the book, because the faszikel structure of the book is suggestive that the collection of works may have been bound from loose manuscripts much later, possibly by Carl Phillip Emanuel. In fact, Dadelsen refers to the “...chronological disorder”\(^{705}\) of the last section of the book.\(^{706}\) After a discussion on the many different types of handwriting in the Anna Magdalena Notebook he concludes that:

_A particularly late entry is the “Aria” from the Goldberg Variations, which Anna Magdalena notated between the two parts of the aria “Bist Du Bei Mir” ...which she had apparently skipped at first. In all likelihood, she copied it at the time of the publication of the Variations in 1741, or even later. The book was thus completed only in the course of many years, and the last entries date from the late 1740s._\(^{707}\)

---

\(^{704}\) Yearsley, 2001, p. 374.

\(^{705}\) Dadelson, 1988, p. 13.

\(^{706}\) Dadelsen's work on the 1725 Notebook for Anna Magdalena requires some revision insofar that he concludes that the first part of the Notebook is written entirely by Bach. As demonstrated by Jarvis's unpublished work on the first page of the Notebook, the handwriting of Bach and Anna Magdalena is clearly identified as well three other unidentified scribes.

\(^{707}\) Ibid.
From the discussion above is clear that the date on any title page of a Bach composition cannot be taken as meaning the date of completion of the work or works in question. In the absence of any definitive source, and, in the absence of any other known evidence to suggest that the works were completed by 1720 (for example, a known performance of the entire works) it can only be an assumption, based on traditional Bach scholarship. The absence of any reception history of these works at that time (1720) indicates that the works were compiled purely for domestic use within the Bach household. It is clear, from a letter Bach wrote to Erdmann that he considered his family to be a small community of musicians:

...the children of my second marriage are still small...but they are all born musicians, and I can assure you that I can already form an ensemble both vocaliter and instrumentalariter within my family, particularly since my present wife sings a good, clear soprano.708

Marshall also states that “...music and music making occupied a central position in Bach’s private life and was at the core of his relationship with his wife and children.”709 In addition, any performance of these works written for unaccompanied violin senza basso it can be safely assumed that it would have given rise to some form of critical review, as it did years later when they were performed during the Bach revival. 710

---

709 Ibid.
710 Please refer to the discussion on the reception history of these works in Chapter III (3.4) of this thesis p. 74.
Therefore, as there is no other known evidence to suggest that the works were actually completed by 1720 it should surely no longer be assumed, as tradition would have it, that this was the case.

As demonstrated above, the dates on the title pages of Bach’s works cannot, therefore, reliably be known to be dates of completion. All that can be assumed is that they indicate dates of significance. This could now be applied to the 1720 FFC. Therefore, the date 1720 on the title page of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* can no longer be assumed to be the completion date. It is more likely, given the large scale nature of these works and the significant period of time it would have taken to arrive at the FFC of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* of which Bach was happy, that this is the case. Of these works, Werner Breig says, “...it is clear that, as a collection, the six pieces for unaccompanied violin show all the signs of careful overall planning, as one would expect at the beginning of any large-scale project.”\(^{711}\)

The sheer enormity of this compositional process would indicate that these works evolved over a period of years, likely consisting of several revisions, draft copies (for example, Kellner’s manuscript) and re-writes (for example, Anna Magdalena’s manuscript).

It can clearly be seen that rather than ‘1720’ being a “secure date” as stated by Stinson (1989),\(^ {712}\) on the basis of what has been stated above it must now be

---

accepted that there is a considerable degree of ambiguity regarding 1720 as the date of commencement.
Is there evidence to support the proposition that Kellner’s version was revised by Anna Magdalena prior to a final revision made by Bach, which he then created in accordance with his original compositional intent?

As it is known that Kellner was a keyboard player, it is most probable that he wrote his version at the keyboard. This would explain some of the unusual aspects of some of his manuscript and why it appears to scholars that he has taken unauthorised liberties. Further evidence of this can be found in a number of places in his manuscript version of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas. For example, and as mentioned above, on page 274, Bar 2 of the G minor Siciliana was discussed, and it is clear from a comparison of the bars with Anna Magdalena that the problems in the Siciliana, where three quaver beats are missing, Anna Magdalena has created an additional dotted crotchet.

Bach was a musical scientist who believed a structured approach to his compositions was the surest way to achieve musical perfection to the Glory of God (Soli Deo sit Gloria). As discussed in the body of the thesis on pages 150-167, Tatlow (2007) has proven that, “At its most basic, the theory of parallel proportionalism shows that Bach created layers of 1:1 and 1:2 proportions...in all the collections and multi-movement works that Bach revised for publication.

7.4 A new hypothesis

Considering the forensic and circumstantial evidence presented throughout the body of this thesis, a more plausible hypothesis of the relationship and chronological ordering of the compositional process could be framed as follows:

---

713 See Stinson, 1989, p. 56.
715 Tatlow, 2015, p. 6.
1. Kellner’s manuscript, completed in 1726, represents the earliest working draft version of sections of what came to be eventually the complete Violin Sonatas and Partitas.

2. Anna Magdalena’s manuscript represents a collaborative revision of Kellner’s early working version perhaps with the assistance of Schwanenberger.

3. Schwanenberger was used as an executant (violinist) in the compositional revision as part of the process towards the development of the complete works of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas.

4. Schwanenberger was given the Anna Magdalena manuscripts of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas and the Cello Suites as an acknowledgement for his contribution to their eventual completion by Bach of the Final Fair Copy (FFC).

5. The date on the title page of the so-called ‘1720 Autograph’ (the FFC) was added after the works were completed sometime after 1726. It represents the final transcription of the earlier drafts made by both Kellner and Anna Magdalena (with the input of Schwanenberger) with specific additions of more detailed compositional articulations and levels of proportional parallelism.\(^\text{716}\)

6. As such, Bach must have developed the initial premise and structure for his proposed works for unaccompanied violin — what we now know of as the

\(^{716}\)See Tatlow, 2007, p. 47.
Violin Sonatas and Partitas, probably in 1720. However, other than the G minor Adagio, the actual composition of these works was not commenced until sometime prior to 1726 when, as an exercise for Bach’s student of composition, Johann Peter Kellner, Bach gave Kellner the task of composing a first draft.717

7.5 Final conclusion

From what has been presented in this thesis, it is very clear that Bach was a master musician and a genius in manuscript design. This is evidenced by the extraordinary numerical structure and parallel proportions, which underpin the Violin Sonatas and Partitas in Source A, the FFC. In addition, it has been confirmed that Anna Magdalena’s manuscript (Source B) cannot possibly be a copy of Source A, but represents an intermediate stage between Kellner’s manuscript (Source D) and the FFC (Source A), with the strong likelihood that the violinist Schwanenberger also had a significant role in the compositional process in collaboration with Anna Magdalena.

Therefore, in final conclusion, the evidence presented in this thesis points to the need to revise our understanding of Kellner’s role in the preparation of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas and to recognise that there is significant evidence to support the proposition that he was, in all probability, responsible for the preparation of the first draft of these ground-breaking works.

717 There are examples of this in Vivaldi, but also in more contemporary times, when it is now known that Australian composer Peter Sculthorpe did similar with some of his own composition students during the height of his composing career.
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